

## Minutes of a meeting of the Bradford East Area Committee held on Thursday, 12 October 2017 in Committee Room 1 - City Hall, Bradford

Commenced 6.05 pm  
Concluded 7.45 pm

### Present – Councillors

LABOUR	LIBERAL DEMOCRAT AND INDEPENDENT
Jamil Iqbal H Khan Shafiq	R Ahmed N Pollard Griffiths R Sunderland Ward

Observers: Councillor J Sunderland (minute 29)

### Councillor R Sunderland in the Chair

#### 24. DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

The following disclosures of interest were received in the interest of clarity:

- Councillor Jamil disclosed that she was a trustee of Womenzone community centre and a governor at Hanson School (minute 28).
- Councillor Ward disclosed that he was a trustee of Springwood Youth Centre (minute 28)
- Councillor J Sunderland disclosed that she was a trustee of Springwood Youth Centre (minute 28)
- Councillor Griffiths disclosed that he had been involved in the planning application associated with Harrogate Road but that he had not taken any position on the associated traffic regulation order and that he would approach the matter at this meeting with an open mind (minute 29)

**Action: City Solicitor**

#### 25. MINUTES

**Resolved –**

**That the minutes of the meeting held on 14 September 2017 be signed as a correct record.**

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

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

**27. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

There were no questions submitted by the public.

**28. YOUTH OFFER - BRADFORD EAST AREA**

The Director of Place submitted **Document “N”** which informed the Area Committee of the progress made in relation to the establishment of the new youth offer across the Bradford District and specifically in the Bradford East Area.

Officers from the Youth Service Team attended the meeting and made a detailed presentation respect of the youth offer, both District-wide and in Bradford East.

A number of young people also attended the meeting and described their positive experiences of the youth service provision in Bradford East, including the buddy programme; the youth club at the Karmand Centre; volunteering; summer camp and residential courses; the National Citizenship Service (NCS) and provision for young people who identified as LGBT. They described activities they had undertaken and how much they had enjoyed them, how their confidence had improved and, in some cases how they had been inspired to become volunteers for other young people following on from them.

Members thanked the youth team for the report and their presentation and expressed their support for schemes such as NCS. They went on to question the team in respect of the following issues:-

- Did the service undertake work in support of community cohesion?
- Did the service work with faith organisations?
- Did young people access the information service at Britannia House or did the formality of the setting make it off-putting?
- How did the open access provision in Bradford East compare with the rest of the District?
- Was the amount of sessional youth work referred to in the report for Bradford East only or District wide?
- Were the 333 young people who completed the youth survey resident in Bradford East and how did that number compare to the overall number of young people in the constituency?
- How could the number of young people surveyed be increased?



In response, the Youth Commissioner and her team advised that:-

- A lot of work was directed at bringing young people together, even though it was not explicitly described as community cohesion.
- The service did work alongside faith organisations and had participated in such activities as the “Mile of Tolerance” walk.
- Figures would be provided in respect of the information service at Britannia House.
- Participation in open access provision in Bradford was well above the 15% target which had been set.
- The sessional work referred to was District wide.
- The 333 young people who completed the youth survey were resident in Bradford East. There were 12000 13-19 year olds in the constituency.
- It was hoped that as the survey would be annual, the number of participants would increase.

A Member thanked the young people in attendance for their presentations and stressed how important it was to listen to them. He asked if their involvement in interview panels had made a difference to service delivery and was informed that young people had been involved in two appointment panels and had been influential in getting the right person for each post.

The Member went on to enquire about looked after children and was informed that such young people were often referred to the youth service individually and that as such cases were often very complex, it was difficult to quantify outcomes.

#### **Resolved-**

- (1) **That the achievements of the Youth Offer Working Group, and the Youth Sector as a whole, as outlined in the Action Plan (Appendix A of Document “N”) be noted and a further update be presented to the Committee in 12 months time.**
- (2) **That the shared direction of travel and the continued commitment from the Youth Sector to work together, and to do things differently be noted.**
- (3) **That the work already undertaken around Youth Voice be noted and Youth Voice arrangements in respect of the Bradford East Area Committee work plan for 2017-18 be formalised.**

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

#### **29. HARROGATE ROAD, APPERLEY BRIDGE - OBJECTIONS RECEIVED TO A PROPOSED TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER**

The Strategic Director, Place submitted **Document “O”** which considered objections to the recently advertised proposals for No Waiting At Any Time restrictions on Harrogate Road, Apperley Bridge, Bradford.



The Principal Engineer, Traffic and Road Safety attended the meeting and advised Members that the restrictions had been proposed in response to the requirement for a new access for a development of 130 properties. He also advised that 78 objections had been received in respect of the proposed scheme, mainly centring around the impact on St John's Church Hall.

A ward Member attended the meeting and spoke in objection to the proposed TRO, stressing that it was adjacent a significant junction improvement scheme which would itself result in the loss of 17 parking spaces. She also advised the meeting that St John's Church Hall was a very well used community facility and that this, coupled with the impact of the junction improvement meant that the TRO needed to be reconsidered. She circulated photos of a field at the side of the church which she considered could provide alternative parking.

A Member expressed sympathy for the view of the objectors as he noted that the TRO would remove both parking and access for the church hall. He stressed the need to plan for the ramifications of the housing development and to come up with a creative solution.

Members stressed that they were not attempting to prevent the development of the junction as the planned scheme was impressive but they had concerns that the TRO had not been considered in context.

Members asked what the impact of a delay to the TRO would be and were informed that there would be a concern about the impact on the operation of the junction but that any impact would be on a sliding scale as the new housing was not yet occupied.

A local resident attended the meeting and also spoke in objection to the proposed TRO, stressing that the hall had 300 users per week and that a meeting had been held with a Council engineer to discuss alternative parking but residents' suggestions had not been taken up. He stressed that if there was no access or parking at the church hall, especially for the elderly and disabled, the hall would close.

Members queried the cost to the Council of any delay and were informed that there would be none as costs would be borne by the developer.

**Resolved-**

- (1) That it be noted that the major junction improvement referred to in paragraph 2.4 of Document "O" removes around 75% of the on-street parking used by the community attending community activities in the Community Hall at St John's the Evangelist, Greengates.**
- (2) That the objections raised be noted and residents and Ward Councillors be thanked for attending the meeting to raise these concerns.**



(3) That a decision be deferred until outline proposals for car parking in and around Harrogate Road between the new junction (Appendix 1) and Greengates/New line Junction are developed in conjunction with Ward Councillors and key stakeholders.

(4) That a report on progress be presented to the Committee within three months.

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

**30. CLEANER AND GREENER STREETS AND NEIGHBOURHOODS IN BRADFORD EAST - DEVOLUTION TO AREA COMMITTEE**

The Area Co-ordinator submitted **Document “P”** which provided an update relating to Council Wardens, environmental enforcement and street cleansing in the Bradford East Area. It highlighted a developing approach that delivered on the cleaner/greener agenda at an Area, Ward, neighbourhood and street level that was supported by residents, businesses and community organisations as part of the People Can Make a Difference Campaign.

In response to questions from Members, it was confirmed that prescriptive working had begun across four wards within the District and that it was being developed in such a way to benefit most from the new way of working.

It was also confirmed that all wardens were trained on issuing fines for incidents of dog fouling, however the Chair advised that she had been told that wardens couldn't issue tickets to dog owners for this offence. The Area –Co-ordinator undertook to investigate.

Members asked questions in respect of fly-tipping and were advised that the Police would not necessarily report back to the Area Office in respect of success in locating offenders. The Area Co-ordinator explained the system for recording incidents of fly-tipping and advised that the latest statistics showed the efforts being made in respect of this offence were paying dividends. She also advised that a lot of educational work was underway in the Bradford East area.

Members also asked questions in respect of publicity and marketing and whether local councillors were consulted in respect of which areas to target. They were advised that a range of projects was being considered.

In response to a question in respect of rubbish in gardens, Members were advised that residents were initially sent a letter, which was followed up if necessary by a visit from a warden or enforcement officer. If repeated attempts to visit did not result in success a community protection order would be issued. The most serious cases could involve fines of £85 or prosecution.

Further to a question in respect of flytipping, Members were advised that, where the statistics showed that it had increased, it involved the recording of a lot of single items being dumped.



Members also referred to the use of CCTV footage from private individuals, which had been discussed at a previous meeting, and were advised that the Area Office had recently used this type of footage and had achieved a successful outcome.

**Resolved-**

- (1) That the information in Document “P” be noted and welcomed.**
- (2) That the effectiveness of prescriptive working in Bradford Moor be noted and it be requested that prescriptive working be rolled out more quickly across Bradford East.**
- (3) That Ward Councillors be consulted in respect of the proposals on publicity.**
- (4) That those who carry out the work to keep the streets of Bradford East clean, including frontline staff and community volunteers, be thanked.**

***ACTION: Area Co-ordinator***

Chair

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

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

