

**Minutes of a meeting of the Bradford East Area  
Committee held on Tuesday, 11 July 2017 in Committee  
Room 1 - City Hall, Bradford**

Commenced 6.05 pm  
Concluded 8.15 pm

**Present – Councillors**

<b>LABOUR</b>	<b>LIBERAL INDEPENDENT</b>	<b>DEMOCRAT AND</b>
<b>Salam Jamil Shafiq H Khan</b>	<b>R Ahmed Stubbs J Sunderland R Sunderland Ward</b>	

**1. APPOINTMENT OF CHAIR (Standing Order 35)**

**Resolved-**

**That Councillor Rachel Sunderland be appointed Chair of the Bradford East Area Committee for the 2017/18 Municipal Year.**

**ACTION: City Solicitor**

**Councillor Rachel Sunderland in the Chair**

**2. APPOINTMENT OF DEPUTY CHAIR (Standing Order 35)**

**Resolved-**

**That Councillor Stubbs be appointed as Deputy Chair of the Bradford East Area Committee for the 2017/18 Municipal Year.**

**Action: City Solicitor**

**3. DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST**

- (1) Councillor Janette Sunderland disclosed an interest in Minute 12 as she was the Trustee of the Springfield Youth Centre and Chair of Inspired Neighbourhoods.**
- (2) Councillor Salam disclosed an interest in Minute 7 as he was the Council's cycling champion.**

**Action: City Solicitor**

**4. MINUTES**

**Resolved-**

**That the minutes of the meeting held on 30 March 2017 be signed as a correct record.**

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

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

**6. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

There were no questions submitted by the public.

**7. CITYCONNECT 2 - BRADFORD CANAL ROAD CORRIDOR CYCLEWAY SCHEME (MOVING TRAFFIC) ORDER AND (WAITING LOADING AND PARKING) ORDER - OBJECTIONS**

Previous Reference: Executive, Minute 35 (2016/17)

At the meeting of the Executive held on 20 September 2016, the CityConnect 2, Bradford Canal Road Corridor Cycleway Scheme was considered and the principles were approved.

The scheme, in order to be implemented, required changes to be made to the way in which the highways along the route were used.

The Executive authorised the Strategic Director, place, among other things, to process and advertise any traffic regulation orders that were necessary and it was decided that any valid objections were to be submitted to the Executive or this Area Committee, as appropriate for consideration.



Accordingly, the Strategic Director, Place presented **Document “D”** which considered objections to the recently advertised (moving traffic) Traffic Regulation Order and to the (waiting, loading and parking) Traffic Regulation Order. The report identified factors and options to be considered.

The Principal Engineer, Design and Construction informed Members that three objections had been received, one to the TRO regarding prohibiting vehicles turning from Queens Road into Valley Road, prohibiting entry from Queens Road into Valley Road and restricting the one-way flow of traffic to a northerly direction on Valley Road.

The remaining two objections were to the “no waiting and no loading/unloading at any time” along the full length of the Cycle Superhighway comprising lengths of Hillam Road, Valley Road, Bolton Lane, Queens Road, Canal Road, Stanley Road and Lower Kirkgate, Bradford.

It was reported that prior to advertising the Orders a consultation exercise was held. Businesses were contacted and offered individual meetings to discuss any issues and concerns. Not all businesses took up that offer and some that did were not satisfied with the outcome. Others did engage in those meetings and where it was possible to make design modifications to the scheme then those businesses had been satisfied with the proposed Orders.

Members were informed that consideration had been given to amending the TRO in order to reduce the length of the restriction for one-way traffic flow on Valley Road. The aim would prevent vehicles entering Valley Road from Queens Road whilst still allowing two way flow of traffic along the rest of Valley Road for local traffic between business premises. Traffic could still enter Valley Road from the south only but would be able to leave in either direction. The carriageway would be widened to enable a car and a LGV to pass each other and some passing places could be provided to enable two LGV's to pass. However, this option would result in the cycle track width being less than the recommended width for a two-way cycle track and would compromise safety for cyclists. A high wall on one side and moving traffic on the other side would increase the danger to cyclists as the risk of cyclists catching their handlebars on the wall or with another cyclist whilst shying away from the edge of the cycle track nearest to passing motor traffic. This option would therefore not be recommended.

It was reported that consideration had also been given to acquiring some land between Valley Road and the railway in order to build the cycle track away from Valley Road. The price being sought for the land, the high cost of enabling works and the timescale necessary to carry out the procedures required by Network Rail regarding acquiring land from them and working in close proximity to the railway was beyond the scope of this project. This, therefore was not a feasible option.



Members were informed that consideration had also been given to an alternative route via Midland Road and Hamm Strasse. This route would introduce a steep hill in an otherwise level route and a segregated cycle track along Hamm Strasse would require space to be taken from the carriageway thereby reducing the capacity of this major road. The higher level of air pollution along Hamm Strasse would be a concern for cyclists health. This route, therefore, was not considered to be a feasible option.

It was reported that consideration had been given to the possibility of an alternative route along Canal Road. Although this route was level a segregated cycle track would require space to be taken from the carriageway thereby reducing the capacity of this major road. Feasible solutions for crossing side roads and accesses had not been found and the higher level of air pollution along this major road would be a concern for cyclists' health. For comparison, Canal Road carried 35,000 v.p.d. (vehicles per day) whereas Valley Road carried 3,000 v.p.d. This route was therefore not considered to be a feasible option.

Members were informed that the CityConnect Advisory Group which comprises mainly cyclists experienced in similar schemes had commented and provided advice throughout the scheme development process. The group support the current scheme proposals and the advertised TRO's.

It was reported that the proposed scheme provided a segregated continuous cycleway between Bradford and Shipley which allowed families to cycle along the route. Turning it into a lesser scheme would be a blow to cyclists. The needs of businesses were understood but the wider cycling strategy for the District and the benefits to health needed looking at.

A representative of Bspoke representing cyclists spoke in support of the proposed scheme; she reported that she was on the City Connect Advisory Board and reported that a lot of cyclists were involved in the plans; she reported that families would be able to cycle from Shipley to Bradford in safety.

A representative of Uriah Woodhead spoke in objection to the scheme and thanked Members for considering the additional letter submitted by Uriah Woodhead and stressed that the proposals did not address the issues for the business in that; 80% of suppliers entered from Queens Road; it was a 150 year old family run business and was the first building merchants when it opened but had many competitors now; proceeding with the TRO's would put the company at serious disadvantage; no account had been taken of the issues facing the company should the proposal proceed which were outlined in the objection letter at paragraph 6 onwards; creating new road restrictions would be to the detriment of an established local business.

Members commented on a number of issues which included:



- Why did the scheme cost so much?
- Motorists would find the scheme confusing, some lengths of the road were one way and some were two way.
- How were businesses consulted?
- How were the public consulted? How were employees of businesses in the area consulted?
- Members had discussed the proposed scheme with local businesses and people were not as satisfied as officers were saying; where were the consultation exhibitions?
- How would employees of business such as Tesco attend exhibitions at Gaisby Lane at lunch time?
- How many letters had been received back from the consultation?
- Who owned the stone wall on Valley Road?
- Concerns were raised about the condition of the dry stone wall and who had responsibility to keep it maintained; the land on the other side of the dry stone wall would be more suitable for the scheme; needed to explore whether that piece of land could be purchased which would then be an attractive green cycle path rather than something that sits alongside a crumbling wall on the side and HGV's on the other.
- Scheme being proposed was not one which a lot of people liked and did not have a lot of public support.
- Would the proposed scheme engage people to cycle?
- It was felt that the route had been chosen because it was there and not because it was ideal.
- Alternative routes should be looked at; look at the opportunity of doing something similar to the Greenway cycle path which was an attractive cycle route.
- Welcomed a cycle scheme but concerned about the implications to businesses of the current scheme.

In response to Members' questions it was reported that:

- Costs of the scheme included the installation of new traffic signals and pedestrian/cycle crossing facilities at several road junctions; new kerb lines to construct a segregated two way cycleway, traffic management etc..
- The two way cycle track was clearly identified; there was a demarcation similar to the cycle superhighway that goes from Bradford to Leeds; some safety issues that had been raised on that scheme had resulted in design amendments to include additional lining and signing.
- As many businesses as possible were contacted by letter, and where requested, visits had been made to discuss the proposals; some businesses did not make any contact; public consultation exercise was held; examined consultation comments and modified designs where it could be revised.
- Members of the public generally supported the scheme.
- The exhibition was at a Community Hall at Gaisby Lane.



- 3,000 consultation letters were sent as well as press notices and notices advertised on streets associated with the TRO's.
- Consultation feedback was managed by an outside organisation, the consultation report was written and available.
- The dry stone wall on Valley Road was in private ownership; some parts of the wall needed repair.
- The land adjacent to the stone wall on Valley Road was either in private ownership or belonged to Network Rail; the business owner of the land had been approached and the Council were informed that the owner would sell the whole of the land and not a piece of it and this would be extremely costly and there was not sufficient time to progress such a scheme; the funding would be lost if not spent by 31 March 2018.
- Cycle paths on Canal Road itself would not attract cyclists due to the high volume of traffic on that road.

A Member of the Committee who was also the Council's Cycling Champion stressed that he understood the reservations to the scheme but expressed strong support for it. He felt the scheme proposed was the most suitable option and officers were working with businesses; as a cyclist he would use the route proposed; the Council had been working hard to encourage businesses to persuade their employees to cycle to work; part of the project was to engage with businesses and schools to encourage cycling.

#### **Resolved-**

- (1) That the Committee recognises and welcomes the Cycle link.**
- (2) That the Committee is not content that the solution offered is a safer, more attractive urban environment that will make the positive contribution to Bradford's Cycling ambition. The Committee also recognises the challenges of the current site.**
- (3) That Officers are asked to fully investigate an alternative scheme in the urban green space along side Valley Road, Bradford.**
- (4) That the consultation be extended to include people who work along Valley Road, Bradford and whether they had access to Cycle to Work Scheme.**
- (5) That the decision to overrule the objections be delayed until the above work is undertaken and presented to the Committee.**

**Action: Strategic Director, Place**

(Regeneration and Economy Overview and Scrutiny Committee)



## 8. ANNUAL UPDATE ON ROAD SAFETY IN BRADFORD EAST

The report of the Strategic Director, Place (**Document “A”**) sought to update Members on current casualty levels and trends in Bradford East and on the road safety education, training and publicity initiatives aimed at reducing these casualties.

It was reported that in 2016 there was an overall decrease in casualties in the Bradford District and the long term downward trend had been maintained; this mirrored the long term downward trend for West Yorkshire.

Members were informed that in Bradford East there was an overall decrease in casualties and, as with the District, the long term trend was downward.

In response to Members’ questions it was reported that officers would work with priority schools not participating in road safety sessions being offered.

### **Resolved –**

- (1) That the information in respect of casualty trends and road safety activities in Bradford East be noted.**
- (2) That the evidence based approach to determining road safety priorities continues to be supported.**

**Action: Strategic Director, Place**

(Regeneration and Economy Overview and Scrutiny Committee)

## 9. DEVOLVED BUDGET - SAFER ROADS SCHEMES

The Area Committee was asked to consider **Document “B”** in which the Strategic Director, Place sought approval for a programme of safer roads schemes for Bradford East for the 2017/18 financial year.

Members made the following comments:

- Traffic management schemes such as New Lane needed to be added to priority List 1 (Appendix 1).
- What had happened to Orchard Grove (outside Parkland Primary) – should be included back on the reserved list.
- What measures could be put in place to deal with bad driving on Leeds Road at Bradford Lane?
- There was no evidence of issues relating to the back street closure on Lindley Road – other streets that had not been prioritised had the same issues.



It was suggested that officers consult with Ward Members to seek nominations for priority Traffic Management schemes for their wards to the maximum value of £7,000; New Lane could be considered as part of that exercise; Orchard Grove (outside Parkland Primary School) could be added to the reserve list.

**Resolved –**

- (1) That a programme of Casualty Reduction Schemes for 2017/18 listed in Appendix 1 to Document “B” be approved.**
- (2) That the proposed programme of Traffic Management Schemes for 2017/18 listed in appendices 2 (subject to the removal of the item in respect of Lindley Road) and 3 to Document “B” be approved.**
- (3) That Officers consult Ward Members to seek nominations for priority Traffic Management schemes in their respective wards to the maximum value of £7000 and report findings to the Committee in September 2017.**
- (4) That any Traffic Regulation Orders or any legal procedures linked to the processing of traffic calming measures or pedestrian crossing facilities which are necessary to implement the chosen schemes be approved for processing and advertising subject to the scheme details being agreed with the local Ward Members.**
- (5) That any valid objections to the advertised Traffic Regulation Orders, traffic calming or pedestrian facilities be submitted to this Area Committee for consideration or in the event of there being no valid objections the Traffic Regulation Orders be sealed and implemented and the traffic calming or pedestrian facilities be implemented as advertised.**

**Action: Strategic Director, Place**

(Regeneration and Economy Overview and Scrutiny Committee)

**10. PETITION - RAGLAN TERRACE**

Previous Reference: Minute 55 (2016/17)

**Document “C”** updated Members on a petition regarding through traffic and fly-tipping issues on and around Raglan Terrace which was originally considered at the meeting held on 16 February 2017. At that meeting it was resolved:-





That in relation to New Lane and Raglan Terrace, Bradford, alternative options be explored to reduce the issues raised in the petition, including the possibility of CCTV and a review of the road layout and a report be presented to the Committee in the next three months.

Accordingly the Strategic Director, Place updated Members on those issues.

It was reported that:

- It was not considered that the implementation of an alternative white lining layout at this location would deter either fly-tipping or through traffic.
- An audit of the area was undertaken including rubbish in back gardens. This was followed by door knocking by Wardens to residents who had rubbish in their back gardens. This rubbish had now all been removed apart from a couple of gardens where agreements were in place as to how and when it would be removed.
- Bradford Council's Neighbourhoods Team had worked with local residents to carry out backstreet clean ups in the area and oversaw the removal of fly-tipped items by residents. The Council Wardens had increased passing patrols who were monitoring the area for any new fly tips.
- The residents were aware of their responsibilities and had agreed to maintain the cleanliness of their back gardens and not to dump waste in the back street. They had been educated regarding the options available to properly dispose of their waste. They had also been informed how to report fly tipping to the Council so that action could be taken.
- The Environmental Enforcement Team manager had also confirmed that this area was not a hot-spot for fly-tipping. It had been agreed that Wardens would regularly patrol the area.

Members commended the work of the wardens and the Area Co-ordinators office.

**Resolved –**

- (1) That the white lining layout remains as existing.**
- (2) That the Council Wardens regularly patrol the area.**
- (3) That the petitioners be informed accordingly.**

**Action: Strategic Director, Place**

(Regeneration and Economy Overview and Scrutiny Committee)



## 11. STREET LIGHTING COLUMN REPLACEMENT PROGRAMME

The Strategic Director, Place submitted **Document “E”** which informed the Area Committee of the requirement to replace street lighting columns that had been identified as non-compliant. That was, they were in need of urgent replacement due their age and condition based upon the findings of inspections carried out during reactive maintenance visits.

**Resolved-**

**That the Priority 1 street lighting column replacement scheme listed in Table A of Appendix 1 to Document “E” be implemented.**

**Action: Strategic Director, Place**

(Regeneration and Economy Overview and Scrutiny Committee)

## 12. YOUTH SERVICE - SERVICE CHANGES AND BUDGET 2017-18

The Strategic Director, Place submitted **Document “F”** which gave an update on changes to the Youth Service made in response to budget savings and staff re-structure and gave details of the budget for the Youth Service in 2017/18.

It was reported that:

- Following the budget decisions approved on 25 February 2016 the Youth Service has had to make savings of £750,000 over the two years 2016/18. In order to ensure that these savings could be realised, the Youth Service undertook a number of budget saving measures which included discontinuing the support offered to Tier 1 NEET (Not in Education Employment or Training) young people which was transferred back to Children’s Services.
- The measures had also involved the closure of the two Information Shops for Young People in the District (at Culture Fusion and Keighley Town Hall). Two information officers were transferred to Customer Services and were now based at Britannia House and Keighley Town Hall and a Young People’s Information and Advice ‘App’ was being developed. Youth Workers in the Area teams would be given training on the use of the App and they would continue to support young people in being able to access appropriate information, Advice and Guidance in the most relevant and helpful way for each young person.
- Following consultation with Trade Unions and staff Senior Youth Worker numbers had been reduced from 6.5 to 2.5. Those senior workers who were not successful in securing a permanent post had been retained on a 12-month fixed term contract due to the extra funding secured from the Buddy contract.



- The Service anticipated having to make redundant full-time professionally qualified youth worker staff as part of the budget savings but due to voluntary redundancies and the successful award of a commission from the Bradford and Airedale Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCGs) the Service had been able to complete the restructure with no compulsory redundancies to Youth Workers.
- In line with the budget decisions staff had been allocated to each Area team according to youth population size rather than an equal number for each area.

Members commented on a number of issues which included:

- How easy was it for young people to contact Information Officers based at Britannia House and Keighley Town Hall as the offices were only opened about eight hours.
- It was more appropriate for Information Officers to be based in Culture Fusion as it was more accessible and inviting; concerned about Information Officers not being located in a suitable setting.
- Did not feel that a Young People's Information and Advice App would help a young person not engaged in the service.
- When would the Young People's Information and Advice App be launched?
- Some people would not be able to access the Advice App on their telephones; what were the Youth Service doing alongside for people who could not access the information App.
- It was not appropriate to be reliant on the App; the App was not going to be the solution for everything and was not contributing to solving problems.
- Could not find the KPI's (Key Performance Indicators) for the Youth Service and the vision statement.
- Would like to receive the results of the KPI's for the first quarter.
- The KPI's listed in the report mentions "support young people's learning potential to help raise aspirations" which did not have a youth offer element and number next to it; how was raising attainment going to be measured?
- How do you ensure Youth Workers had a range of skills such as experience in dealing with mental health, child sexual exploitation, migrant workers etc?
- Concerned about the way the Buddy system was working – a Buddy system was supposed to be about support from someone who feels like them concept; concerned about the risk to thousands of young people not being diagnosed; primary mental health worked in schools.
- Would like to examine how the Buddy Support Scheme was working?

In response to Members' questions it was reported that:

- Information Officers were not always based in Britannia House/City Hall but did sessions in other centres and were flexible.



- Discussions were taking place in having a Youth Club and an Information Officer at St Augustine's.
- The information App would be launched in the summer.
- Youth Workers offered advice and guidance to young people; events were held on what Youth Services offered; Youth Service passed information on what other organisations offered to young people and directed them to those services.
- Young people were wanting an information App; acknowledged that there would be a co-hort of young people who did not have a telephone which they could access the App on.
- Briefing notes on the app could be circulated to Members.
- Range of experience required in youth work had not changed, issues such as CSE and new arrivals had always been there; Youth Workers may not have certain specialities but the relationship a young person had with a youth worker was important.
- As part of the wider health service initiative called Youth in Mind, the CCG's were now commissioning the Youth Service to deliver "Buddy Support" to support young people who had been assessed by the Child and Adolescent Mental Health Service (CAMHS) to have mental health issues; Youth in Mind was part of the CCG's strategy to broaden support for young people with mental health issues within non medical/specialist services.
- Youth workers had access to other agencies offering immigration and housing advice.

#### **Resolved-**

- (1) That the changes made to the Youth Service as detailed in Document "F" and the budget for the Service for 2017-18 be noted.**
- (2) That Officers organise an event for the Area Committee to examine the Buddy Support Scheme.**
- (3) That Officers circulate to Members of the Committee the Youth Service new Vision Statement and the results of the Key Performance Indicators for the first quarter.**

Action: Strategic Director, Place

**(Regeneration and Economy Overview and Scrutiny Committee)**

Chair

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

