

## Minutes of a meeting of the Bradford West Area Committee held on Wednesday, 20 September 2017 at Committee Room 1 - City Hall, Bradford

Commenced	1800
Adjourned	1835
Re-convened	1840
Adjourned	1915
Reconvened	1920
Concluded	1950

### Present – Councillors

<b>LABOUR</b>
A Ahmed
Akhtar
Amran
Azam
Engel
Mohammed
Mullaney
Nazir
Shaheen

Observers: Councillors Duffy, Arshad Hussain and Shabbir

### Councillor Amran in the Chair

#### 15. DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

- (1) Councillors Ahmed and Nazir disclosed an interest in the item relating to Duchy Avenue, Bradford – Request for Road Closure (Minute 19).
- (2) Councillor Akhtar disclosed an interest in the item relating to Bradford West Neighbourhood Policing Team activity to address the "Safer Communities" priorities within the Bradford West Constituency Ward Plans for 2016 / 2018 (Minute 23).
- (3) In the interest of transparency, Asad Shah (Clerk; Committee Services Officer) had disclosed an interest in the item relating to Duchy Avenue, Bradford - Request for Road Closure (Minute 19), as he had previously resided on the street and his parent was currently living on the street.

**Action:** City Solicitor

**16. MINUTES**

**That the minutes of the meetings held on 29 March and 26 April 2017 be signed as correct records.**

***ACTION: City Solicitor***

**17. INSPECTION OF REPORTS AND BACKGROUND PAPERS**

There were no appeals submitted by the public to review decisions to restrict documents.

**18. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

There were no questions submitted by the public.

**19. DUCHY AVENUE, BRADFORD - REQUEST FOR A ROAD CLOSURE**

The report of the Strategic Director, Place (**Document “G”**) considered the results of a survey, carried out with local residents, to determine if there was support for a road closure on Duchy Avenue.

The Principal Engineer was in attendance and gave a synopsis of the report. In addition, he stated that he had received a further petition on the same subject matter as being discussed at this Committee to which he had acknowledged.

Following a synopsis of the report by the Principal Engineer, a question and answer session ensued:

- What had been the total cost to date to the Council from the point of the petition being submitted through to the delivery of the survey to determine the final outcome?
  - Around the sum of £5,000;
- How many residents had expressed favour towards a road closure?
  - A total of 45 residents of Duchy Avenue;
- Why were the residents of Duchy Avenue in the mind set that officers had given more emphasis on the concerns of residents outside of Duchy Avenue including neighbouring Wards?
  - The immediate neighbouring Ward was part of the residential area in which Duchy Avenue was and residents outside of Duchy Avenue had expressed concerns as to the knock on detrimental flow of traffic being transferred onto their streets, should a road closure be approved;
- Was it correct that a number of residents had raised concerns to have not received any form of correspondence during the consultation?
  - Every resident had been hand delivered a consultation letter on 26 July 2017. In response to the question at hand, this is correct, therefore a second letter had been hand delivered to all residents who had stated they had not received any form of correspondence and in order to ensure that every resident who raised concerns, a



Senior Engineer was on site to ensure the smooth delivery of the consultation to each respective household;

- What was the basis of Appendix 2?
  - A detailed statistical representation of households response to the survey;
- There was a clear reflection of residents' frustration towards speeding vehicles driving excessively, hence the petition. Had officers embarked on the pursuit of seeking any other alternative to bring concerns to an amicable halt for concerned residents?
  - The initial inception of the petition was not due to speeding vehicles but through passing traffic and residents were adamant on a road closure as opposed to implementing restriction to reduce the levels of speeding vehicles. Nevertheless a discussion had emanated previously on other traffic calming measures but this was a proposal that was not favoured;
- Clarification was sought on the further petition submitted by residents prior to this Committee meeting?
  - This was correct but the petition had not been included into **Document "G"** as it was submitted only 3 days prior to this scheduled item on the same subject as this item. As mentioned earlier, the petition had been acknowledged;
- What would be the impact on highways of a road closure?
  - Duchy Avenue may improve but this would be at the cost of other streets being inundated with increased volumes of traffic including conflict of traffic on other busy road junctions. It would also result in inconvenience for the residents of Duchy Avenue as they would have to divert around the closure.

Following the question and answer session, the Chair invited 3 Petitioners who were in attendance to address their concerns to the Committee, as follows:

- Petitioner 1: The residents were all law abiding citizens but were victims of continuous road rage, verbal abuse with the occasional violence by car users driving through Duchy Avenue. Residents had also been spat at during times of altercations. The closure would give Duchy Avenue residents a sense of safety, peace and only the residents on the street would be affected by the closure as opposed to traffic being transferred to neighbouring streets.
- Petitioner 2: Children's lives were being put at risk on a daily basis hence it was time this safety concern being finally addressed at this stage. Resident cars were incessantly being damaged by passing vehicles. Most residents of Duchy Avenue were families with young children.
- Petitioner 3: That he had lived on the corner of Duchy Avenue at the junction of Heights Lane and had witnessed 4 serious accidents in the course of his residence. His garden wall had been driven into twice by non resident vehicles.

Following representation of Petitioners, a further question and answer session arose, as follows:

- It was earlier stated that "the immediate neighbouring Ward was part of the



residential area in which Duchy Avenue was and residents had expressed concerns as to the knock on detrimental flow of traffic being transferred from Duchy Avenue onto their streets, if a road closure was approved. Therefore this Committee had implemented a road closure on Crow Tree Lane in 2015. Why were residents of Duchy Avenue not consulted on the proposals for traffic calming measures Crow Tree Lane during the consultation stage?

- Crow Tree Lane was a Casualty Reduction Scheme hence a very different distinct purpose as opposed to Duchy Avenue. Also it was remote from Duchy Avenue; and,
- What information was given to residents during the survey's consultation process for Duchy Avenue?
  - Residents were given a basic Yes or No option for a road closure.

During this point, the discussion of the item ascended to comments being made by the Committee, as follows:

- It could be assumed that the possibility of language barriers amongst residents which was a restricting factor for not understanding the concept of the consultation;
  - *In response to comment*, or it could be argued that not everyone was in favour of a road closure;
- The whole point of traffic calming measures on Crow Tree Lane was to reduce road accidents; and,
- It was clear that many residents were not in favour of a closure and transferring a problem from one area to another would be totally unfair.

Two Councillors of the Bradford West Constituency were at the meeting and shared their sentiments, as follows:

- Ward Councillor, Toller made representations to the statement of, if a road closure was approved by the Committee then the current levels of traffic passing through Duchy Avenue would be transferred to Coniston Grove and other surrounding streets in his Ward resulting in traffic being transferred from one area to another without a solution to a problem. Crow Tree Lane had the highest number of road accidents in one year in the whole surrounding area hence the implementation of a traffic calming scheme. This Committee had always favoured the majority entreaties of residents.
- Ward Councillor, Heaton highlighted that 3 of his constituents had written to him in support of the closure on Duchy Avenue. Equally so, a number of residents had been in contact and had expressed their opposition to a closure. During the Municipal Year 2012-13, two ex Councillors of the Heaton Ward had also been heavily involved with discussions on a road closure with residents and there had been a similar mixed feeling as to discussions during this time round. In the past, two other streets in neighbouring areas had road closures implemented but a few years later residents had submitted requests to reopen the closures.

The Committee concluded that if a road closure was approved then the volume of traffic would mean moving a problem from one area to another. It was further



commented that many residents were not in favour of a closure and therefore:

**Resolved –**

**That no further action be taken on the request to introduce a road closure on Duchy Avenue.**

*Note: In accordance with Paragraph 42.2 of Part 3A of the Constitution, the Chair and Councillor Mohammed requested that their votes against the above decision be recorded.*

***ACTION: Strategic Director, Place***

**20. ABERDEEN TERRACE, BRADFORD - REQUEST FOR A DISABLED PERSONS PARKING PLACE (EXCEPTION TO POLICY)**

The report of the Strategic Director, Place (**Document “H”**) was to consider an application for a Disabled Persons Parking Place where the applicant does not meet all the Policy criteria.

**Resolved –**

**That the item be considered at a future meeting subject to the applicant submitting the necessary documentation.**

***LEAD: Strategic Director, Place***

**21. STREET LIGHTING COLUMN REPLACEMENT PROGRAMME**

The report of the Strategic Director, Place (**Document “I”**) sought to advise the Committee regarding the replacement of street lighting columns determined as non compliant and the subsequent recommendations as to how the West Yorkshire Local Transport Plan Funding allocation is most effectively utilised.

**Resolved –**

**That the Priority 1 street lighting column replacement scheme listed in Table A of Appendix 1 of the report be implemented.**

***ACTION: Strategic Director, Place***

**22. DERELICT BUILDINGS ON PRIESTMAN STREET, BRADFORD**

The report of the Strategic Director, Place (**Document “J”**) had been produced for the Bradford West Area Committee to describe the condition of the buildings known as Lund Humphreys and Unit 71 on Priestman Street, Bradford and what actions could be taken to address the deteriorating condition of the buildings.



The Principal Building Control Surveyor was in attendance and gave a synopsis of the report.

A question and answer session ensued:

- Why had Council made promises to residents that it would take the appropriate action to address the issue surrounding this building but eventually failing to take necessary steps in delivering its promise?
  - It was possible for the Council to claim back the reasonable costs incurred in demolishing a building and removing the materials from site. However, if the owner decided not to reimburse the Council it was possible to make a charge on the land under Section 107, Building Act. Until the land was sold, the Council may not be compensated for the costs it would incur and, further, the value of the land could be less than the sums expended in the demolition process;
- What would be the cost of demolition?
  - The cost of demolition and clearance was estimated to the region of £350,000, however this cost could accelerate significantly if materials such as asbestos were found to be present to an increased cost of an additional £50,000;
- Had the Council discussed issues of the site with the owner? There had been on going discussions over 3 years but no resolution had yet been agreed;
  - What were the health risks of such toxic materials in the building? If materials were released through some form of disturbance then there was the possibility of health risks but the asbestos, if any, was closed inside the building; and,
- This was a long standing issue with health risks therefore on what grounds was the Council not able to take control and move forward in taking the required action?;
  - The costs in demolition were significant and there was a lack of budget for the Council to move forward.

The Committee then commented on the fact that no mature resident walked pass the building because of being conscious of the dangers yet children played near to the derelict building on a daily basis without the awareness of the health risks. The community was also aware that this building was a haven for drug dealers to store illegal substances. Furthermore, this derelict building was an eyesore and ruined the surrounding community.

#### **Resolved –**

- (1) That the Council resolves to underwrite the costs and liabilities of carrying out works in default of notice to remedy the condition of the ruinous and dilapidated buildings on Priestman Street subject to the risks in recovering such expenditure.**
- (2) That the Bradford West Area Co-ordinator arranges a meeting between the Chair of the Bradford West Area Committee,**



**Manningham Ward Councillors and the Strategic Director Place to discuss the dilapidated buildings on Priestman Street.**

***ACTION: Strategic Director, Place***

**23. BRADFORD WEST NEIGHBOURHOOD POLICING TEAM ACTIVITY TO ADDRESS THE "SAFER COMMUNITIES" PRIORITIES WITHIN THE BRADFORD WEST CONSTITUENCY WARD PLANS FOR 2016 / 2018**

The report of the Bradford West Area Co-ordinator (**Document "K"**) gave an update of some of the work undertaken by the Bradford West Area Neighbourhood Policing Team and an overview of the Bradford West Constituency Performance data.

Police Inspector Tom Casey and Police Sergeant Noel Whittaker were present and with the permission of the Chair, jointly gave a summation of the report.

Following the verbal presentation, a question and answer session succeeded, as follows:

- Business owners had raised concerns to an increase level of anti social drinking outside businesses in the Bradford 7 area. It could be assumed that this was the result of work covered in the City Centre, hence a knock on detrimental impact of a problem moving from one area to another. What action was or would be taken to alleviate the concerns raised by business owners?
  - The need for action would be taken when this concern would become a significant problem;
- Why had crimes against people not been showcased in the appendix to **Document "K"** such as Child Sexual Exploitation (CSE)?
  - That would be highlighted in a separate report due to the nature of the crime type. CSE was not classed in the same level of crime as presented in the report;
- What was being planned in the community, for the community, in order to change the statistics presented in the Appendix?
  - To ensure priority crimes were taken in a holistic approach and educate communities in crime preventative techniques. It was equally important for Police Community Support Officers to engage further within the communities they were interacting in.

The Committee turned the representatives' attention to the incident that had ignited on Grantham Road during Eid 2017 celebrations. The Committee took this opportunity to compliment officers on the swift manner the incident was put to an end. Equally, an officer who had been injured during the incident was also highly praised.

The Police representatives went further by thanking the Bradford West Area Co-ordinator and all elected Members of the Bradford West Constituency for the value of partnership that existed to make communities a safer place to live.





In response to comment, the Chair, on behalf of the Committee, thanked the Police representatives and their officers who worked tirelessly to make the communities in the Bradford West area a safer and better place to live.

**Resolved –**

- (1) That the work undertaken by the Bradford West Neighbourhood Policing Team from April 2017 to July 2017 that contributed to addressing priorities within the ward plans for the Bradford West be noted.
- (2) That the positive partnership working that has been established with Elected Members, Council Officers, community organisations, volunteers and residents within the Bradford West Area be noted.
- (3) That an update report be presented to the Bradford West Area Committee in 12 months time.
- (4) That the Bradford West Neighbourhood Policing Team, the Bradford West Area Co-ordinator's Office and Ward Members be commended on the work undertaken in the Bradford West Constituency.

***ACTION: Strategic Director, Place***

**24. THE GREAT GET TOGETHER SMALL GRANTS PROGRAMME 2017**

The report of the Assistant Director, Neighbourhood and Customer Services (**Document "L"**) informed the Bradford West Area Committee of the projects funded by the Great Get Together Small Grants Programme for the Bradford West constituency.

**Resolved –**

**That the positive work undertaken to support local community action through the implementation of the The Big Lunch Great Get Together Grants programme be noted.**

***LEAD: Assistant Director, Neighbourhood and Customer Services***

Chair

**Note: These minutes are subject to approval as a correct record at the next meeting of the Bradford West Area Committee.**

THESE MINUTES HAVE BEEN PRODUCED, WHEREVER POSSIBLE, ON RECYCLED PAPER

