

Minutes of a meeting of the Bradford East Area Committee held on Wednesday, 20 February 2019 in Committee Room 4 - City Hall, Bradford

Commenced 6.00 pm
Concluded 8.20 pm

Present – Councillors

LABOUR	LIBERAL DEMOCRAT	INDEPENDENT
H Khan Jamil Shafiq Mir	R Ahmed Humphreys Stubbs Ward	Stelling

Observers: Councillor Kamran Hussain

Councillor Hassan Khan in the Chair

47. DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

In the interest of transparency Councillor Stubbs disclosed an interest in Minute 52 as his child attended Idle CE Primary School.

Action: City Solicitor

48. MINUTES

Resolved –

That the minutes of the meeting held on 10 January 2019 be signed as a correct record.

Action: City Solicitor

49. INSPECTION OF REPORTS AND BACKGROUND PAPERS

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

50. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

There were no questions submitted by the public.

51. 446 HAREWOOD STREET, BRADFORD - REQUEST FOR A DISABLED PERSONS PARKING PLACE

The Committee was asked to consider **Document “X”** which outlined an application that had been made for a disabled persons parking place at 446 Harewood Street, Bradford and where the application had received objections.

In response to a Member’s question it was reported that the applicant had met all the criteria required to secure a disabled parking space outside his home and that there was no off-street parking at these premises.

Members were informed that as part of the Disabled Persons Parking Place application investigation process, officers undertook consultations with adjacent neighbours to determine if there were any objections to the proposal. This consultation had resulted in two objections being received from adjacent neighbours.

The applicants representative attended the meeting and spoke in support of the application and why the disabled persons parking space was necessary.

An objector to the application for a Disabled Persons Parking Place also attended the meeting and spoke about the concerns and the difficulties that a loss of a parking place would cause for him and his family and he felt that he could not understand what difference a disabled persons parking place would make.

The objector was informed that anyone holding a blue badge could park on the disabled persons parking place.

Resolved –

- (1) That the installation of a disabled person parking place at 446 Harewood Street be approved.**
- (2) That the applicant and objectors be informed accordingly.**

Action: Strategic Director Place

(Regeneration & Environment Overview & Scrutiny Committee)

52. BRADFORD EAST AREA WIDE TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER - OBJECTIONS

Previous Reference: Minute 10 (2018/19)

The Strategic Director, Place presented a report (**Document “W”**) which considered objections that had been received to the recently advertised Bradford East Area Wide Traffic Regulation Order.

The report explained the objections that had been received in respect of proposals at three sites and outlined the officer comments on each objection.

It was reported that the Bradford East Area Wide Traffic Regulation Order had been promoted to address a number of requests for small areas of existing waiting restrictions to be amended or new restrictions to be introduced. The requests had been raised by local residents, schools and businesses to resolve safety and access issues.

Members were informed that the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) was advertised between 10 December 2018 and 7 January 2019. At the same time consultation letters and plans were delivered to residents, schools and businesses affected by the proposals. This had resulted in objections to the proposals at 3 sites - Cutler Heights Lane, Greaves Street, Little Horton and Town Lane, Thackley. One letter of objection was received to each.

A summary of the points of objection were highlighted at the meeting and were detailed at 2.4 of the report.

Members discussed the various schemes and objections to them.

It was felt that further work was needed on the issues relating to the encroachment of the footway on Idle Road by adjacent businesses and that a multi agency meeting be held to consider the problem.

Members were informed that if the encroachment of the footway on Idle Road continued the issue would be re-looked at when the Committee next considers such schemes.

A Member felt that the proposed parking restrictions on Greaves Street be extended to 8.00 pm Monday to Friday.

Resolved –

- (1) That the original proposals for a Traffic Regulation Order on part lengths of Idle Road and Pollard Lane be abandoned.**
- (2) That the Bradford East Area Co-ordinators Team organises a multi-agency meeting to include the Police and Ward Members to consider options to enforce the encroachment of the footway on Idle Road by adjacent businesses.**

- (3) That items for a Traffic Regulation Order and Bollards on Idle Road remain on the Bradford East Area Committee list of potential future schemes.
- (4) That the objections to Town Lane, Thackley be overruled.
- (5) That the objection to the proposals for Cutler Heights Lane be upheld and that this element of the scheme be removed from the Order.
- (6) That the proposals in respect of Greaves Street be modified to extend the proposed restrictions to 8.00pm Monday to Friday, subject to there being no valid objections from affected frontages.
- (7) That any outstanding objections in respect of resolution 5 above be reported to the Bradford East Area Committee or, in the event of there being no valid objections, the order be sealed and implemented as modified.
- (8) That the objectors be informed accordingly.

Action: Strategic Director Place

(Regeneration & Environment Overview & Scrutiny Committee)

53. **STRONGER COMMUNITIES STRATEGY AND DELIVERY PLAN**

The Strategic Director, Place presented a document (**Document “Y”**) which asked the Committee to consider the Stronger Communities Strategy and Delivery Plan, produced by the Bradford Stronger Communities Partnership.

It was reported that the Strategy was intended to increase opportunities for people from different backgrounds to: mix together, increase their mutual understanding and respect of each other and reduce misunderstandings and to remove barriers that prevent people from taking full advantage of the opportunities available to all people living in Britain.

Members were informed that the Green Paper and local strategy were intended to amplify the benefits that could be realised from existing programmes that support integration and other programmes that support social mobility such as the Education Opportunity Area Programme and Economic Strategy.

It was reported that the development of the local Stronger Communities strategy and associated consultation had been funded through a combination of mainstream Council funding and through £100,000 of ‘seed funding’ provided by the MHCLG (Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government). This funding had been used to employ an ‘Integrated Communities Programme Lead’ to commission reports relating to this area of work and to lead on engagement with people and with district residents on their priorities.

Members were informed that the MHCLG had committed financial support to the five 'Integrated Communities Pilot Areas'. Bradford Partnership's submission, through the local 'delivery Plan' sought funding of £4.9 million towards delivering a range of projects. MHCLG had allocated £1,187,101 for year one expenditure. A decision on the residual funding for year two would be announced in January 2019 and funding from MHCLG needed to be committed by 31st March 2020.

A short discussion was held on the Linking Network and linking schools in deprived areas with schools in affluent areas.

Members commented on a number of issues which included:

- A number of initiatives mentioned in the strategy such as linking schools had taken place previously but had not produced any positive outcomes; how was the project going to get parents from affluent areas to go to deprived areas so that their children could mix and integrate? A system was being created where there was more segregation in schools on faith, gender and class and the historic initiative of bussing children to different areas did not work.
- Asking schools to consider changing their admission policy was optimistic as certain schools such as academies had their own admissions policy and schools such as Dixons allocated very few places to children who lived in the local area and did not benefit deprived areas instead they operated a more selective system and did not see how this was a fair admission process.
- A new free girls school that had opened in Bradford would cause further gender segregation.
- Areas such as Ravenscliffe and Eccleshill had a lack of positive male role models.
- Did not feel the school linking programme would have a positive outcome; needed to look at informal structures such as meeting at a restaurant; needed to build relationships with people from different Wards.
- Little Horton and Toller were highly deprived Wards and previous systems had failed them and hoped that this programme would not fail the community; women were still not able to speak English; a lot of money was going into integration which needed tracking; local people should be asked rather than the University undertaking a research project and informing how things should be done and the challenges facing Bradford; needed to look at issues such as graduates not being able to gain employment; needed to see programmes that were robust.
- It was crucial the programmes were value for money; how was the Partnership Board going to ensure the programmes provided value for money in terms of outcomes? integration and community cohesion was the responsibility of every community hoped that the Partnership Board would take that on board; there was a perception that only certain communities needed integrating.
- It was good to hear emerging and hard work taking place which would benefit all communities; would like to see information on which schools took part in the linking schools programme and which did not.
- Improving language skills would make a huge amount of difference to the various communities.

- When would the various programmes be reviewed to ascertain what benefit they had made and whether the provided value for money? Needed a report back on what worked and what did not.

In response to the comments raised by Members it was reported that:

- Issues such as single sex, faith schools and less parental choice were being raised with the Department for Education.
- Discussions would be held with schools on the various challenges.
- There was a graduate research hub, employment skills was a separate research fund that helped support graduates; training graduates in jobs where there was growth, matching students in areas of work.
- The programme would be looking at what the barriers were for people wanting to learn English.
- The comments made by the Committee would be reported to the Partnership Board.

Resolved –

- (1) That the work carried out in the development of the Bradford Stronger Communities Strategy and Delivery Plan by the Stronger Communities Partnership be noted.**
- (2) That the comments/issues raised by members of this Committee be submitted to the Stronger Communities Partnership Board.**
- (3) That a progress report on the delivery plan be submitted to this Committee in September 2019.**

Action: Strategic Director Place

(Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Committee)

54. ALLOCATION OF COMMUNITY BUILDING GRANTS FOR 2019-2021

Previous Reference: Minute 38 (2018/19)

Members were asked to consider **Document “Z”** which set out the recommendations of the Bradford East Area Committee Grants Advisory Group for the allocation of Community Buildings Grants 2019-2021.

It was reported that on 17 January 2019 the Grants Advisory Group met to discuss the Community Buildings Grants applications submitted for the constituency. After full consideration of all the bids the recommendations from the Bradford East Area Grants Advisory Group were detailed at paragraph 3.1 of the report.

Resolved –

That the Community Buildings Grants outlined in paragraph 3.1 of Document “Z” be approved.

Action: Strategic Director Place

(Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Committee)

55. STREET CLEANSING - SERVICE REDESIGN AND DEPLOYMENT OF RESOURCES

Previous Reference: Minute 39 (2018/19)

The Area Co-ordinator presented a report (**Document “AA”**) which provided information on the service redesign of Street Cleansing and options for operational deployment of resources.

It was reported that at the Committee held on 22 November 2018 a report was presented outlining future changes to Street Cleansing and Warden services, in particular the 25% reduction in the district-wide Street Cleansing budget would mean the loss of 28 frontline staff and five mechanical sweeper vehicles. It was emphasised that all the staff that had been displaced due to the reduction in budgets had secured employment in the Council.

Members were informed that In terms of clean team staff numbers the total number across the district staff working in clean teams would be 73. Allowing for holidays, sickness and any training it was expected that approximately 60 staff would be working on the ground at any one time covering 30 wards. In Bradford East 17 staff would work in the clean teams representing 23% of the available district resources. There would also be two mechanical pavement sweepers dedicated to the area and also a large mechanical road sweeper would be shared for the areas of Bradford West, South and East.

It was reported that there were two proposals available for Members consideration which included:

Option 1a: Area Constituency- pooled resources with fixed weekly work pattern

This option would see staff move into two larger groups per constituency and then work through the Area Constituency in a prescribed manner. Each Constituency would be broken down in to Zones which would be considered a balanced days' work for a group to complete under normal circumstances.

Option 1b: Area Constituency pooled resources

This option assumes all parts of the Area Constituency receive a varying frequencies for different zones some zones would be done twice weekly and other zones were attended once every four weeks.

Zones could be scheduled for a weekly / fortnightly / three-weekly or four weekly visits depending if any prioritisation needed to be set e.g. type of housing, industrial rural roads etc.

A discussion was held on the options available and Members felt that Option 1b did not seem fair as residents in different wards would not be provided with the same level of service.

Members strongly felt that a further report should be submitted to the Committee which gave options based on the current revised budget.

Resolved –

- (1) That the service re-design for gateways be adopted.**
- (2) That a further report be submitted to this Committee on 21 March 2019 with options for delivery models.**
- (3) That the Committee reviews any option chosen after a six month trial period.**

Action: Strategic Director Place

(Corporate/Regeneration and Environment 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.

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