

Minutes of a meeting of the Shipley Area Committee held on Wednesday, 8 November 2023 in the Council Chamber - Shipley Town Hall

Commenced 6.00 pm
Concluded 8.10 pm

Present – Councillors

LABOUR	CONSERVATIVE	GREEN
Rowe Fricker Dearden Steele	F Ahmed Davies Sullivan Felstead	Warnes

Observers: Members of SCAPAG

Councillor Dearden in the Chair

22. DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

There were no disclosures of interest made for any matters under consideration.

23. MINUTES

Resolved –

That the minutes of the meeting held on 13 September 2023 be held as a correct record.

24. INSPECTION OF REPORTS AND BACKGROUND PAPERS

No requests to view documents were received.

25. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

No questions were submitted.

26. *SHIPLEY AREA COMMITTEE AND SHIPLEY CONSTITUENCY AREA PARTNERS' ADVISORY GROUP (SCAPAG) ISSUES

No issues were reported.

27. SHIPLEY AND BINGLEY DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORKS

The report of the Strategic Director, Place (**Document “J”**) was presented to the Committee and set out the background and purpose of the Shipley and Bingley Development Frameworks. It outlined the approach being taken to public engagement on the draft frameworks and considered the opportunities for member involvement.

The purpose of the Development Frameworks was to guide the future regeneration and development of the city and towns as well as attracting new investment into the area. Building on the success of the Towns Fund, the Draft Development Frameworks looked beyond the Council’s existing projects and City of Culture 2025. They set out an overarching vision, objectives and potential interventions for regeneration looking at the next 15-20 years. As the frameworks were not funded programmes, it was not to be expected that all would be achieved, it was intended to put the District in a good position to take advantage of future funding opportunities.

The report included a breakdown of the stages of development and details of engagement activities with targeted stakeholders and the wider public in relation to recommended interventions and specific proposals.

Following the Officer’s presentation, members were then given the opportunity to comment and ask questions. The details of these and the responses given are as below.

- A member commented that the maps in the draft documents were not clear/detailed enough to identify specific locations without names
- A member asked about the cost of the project and was advised that £100K had been allocated for the Shipley and Bingley projects and was approximately £700K for the whole district
- A member commented that the results of the survey from the Telegraph and Argus were not included in the draft document. There was a brief overview of the contents of the feedback received that Officers would circulate if members wished
- A member asked if the outcomes of the ‘Let’s Talk’ exercise could be included on the Council’s website as a consultation and was advised that this could be looked into but it’s pre-existing location could be more clearly signposted with improved links as it was an engagement and promotional exercise rather than a formal consultation. It was also noted that those people who did not access online media should not be excluded
- A member commented regarding connectivity and asked that it be addressed and reinforced in relation to the canal corridor
- The low carbon impact in the draft programmes was noted but Members asked that it be given a higher profile in the next draft and appear more frequently
- A Member relayed some information to officers regarding parking charges in Bingley and the plans for parking facilities which officers stated they would pass onto the relevant team and it would be considered in more detail
- The Chair noted that the development frameworks were aspirational and encouraged safe access for pedestrians to town centres with further discussion on ideas for access/parking outside Bingley Railway Station

- suggested
- A member of the SCAPAG group was in attendance and asked if the focus would be on principle towns only and commented on the similarity to a design code. Officers advised that whilst there were draft development frameworks covering the whole district, they had a town centric focus and provided an explanation of how these were chosen and whilst they were not a statutory document and would allow more creativity and inspiration working within statutory policy
 - The question of what would be proposed for those outside of those included and were advised that officers could not comment but the frameworks were concerned with opportunities for regeneration.

Resolved –

That the proposed options be considered and Members' views be noted.

To be actioned by: Strategic Director, Place

28. HATE CRIME

The report of the Strategic Director, Place (**Document “K”**) was presented to the Committee and provided a detailed information on the multi-agency response to the recommendations and findings of the Hate Crime Scrutiny review.

The report contained a definition of what was considered a hate crime and a hate incident and how the work on Hate Crime was delivered and funded following the withdrawal of Home Office funding in April 2022. Funding was then allocated from the Community Safety Partnership. The responsibility for Hate Crime work remained with the Stronger Communities Team, Bradford Council working alongside West Yorkshire Police Hate Crimes staff. Hate Crime statistics and the efforts made to address the recommendations in turn in the report from the Scrutiny review were included but not limited to projects such as hosting publicity events, Hate Crime Training, podcasts and the launch of a new Bradford Hate Crime Alliance (BHCA) website.

The presenting Officer (Director of Bradford Hate Crime Alliance – BHCA) advised Members that the sole purpose of Bradford Hate Crime alliance work aimed at encouraging the reporting of hate crime, to educate our communities about what hate crimes were and to support victims of hate crime. The main obstacle seemed to be that Hate Crimes were underreported so the aims of the recommendations sought to raise awareness of hate crimes and how to either log them or report them. Members were offered a Hate Crime workshop to help them identify what a Hate Crime was. They were also informed that a reporting tool via a phone app had been launched in collaboration with the University of Bradford who had developed it. The app had received 10,000 hits but the number of reports/logs were still low. The Hate Crime reporting centres were not being well used and usage was less than before Covid.

A Hate Crime report was provided on a monthly basis by the Police to the Hate Crime Strategic Management Team showing incidents reported in both the Bradford District and West Yorkshire region. Latest figures showed that inter faith incidents were at the same level with the exception of Islam which had showed a

marked increase alongside Trans and LGTBQ+. It was also reported that requests from schools had increased as teachers were requesting help to address hate crime incidents by providing education to both staff and students to deal with specific incidents.

Members were then given the opportunity to ask questions and comment. The details of these and the responses given are as below.

- A member referred to the Hate Crime Reporting Centres (HCRC) and asked how many reports were made there and whether they were viable and was advised that the number of reports was low and viability was a consideration. There were no specific figures available, however. All hate crime reporting centres were provided with signage to hi-light the importance of hate crime reporting and useful links to establish contact via their own phones
- A brief discussion took place around boys being allowed to go to university but girls in the same families not going due to fees and whether this could be categorised as a Hate Crime, or whether it was financial, cultural etc or simply parental choice. Rather than it being a hate crime it was possible discrimination, but it related to the perception of what a person considered to be a Hate Crime and the formal definition.
- The presenting Officer also addressed the absence of gender and gender identity which was covered by other legislation.
- A Member asked whether the review of the HCRC's had taken place and was advised that it was underway across the District.
- A Member noted that the number of incidents had gone down leading up to May 2023 and asked if there was a recent increase in light of the situation in Israel and Gaza. Officers responded that there was no significant change.
- A Member asked about the list of themed days contained in the report and asked if they were being externally organised or run by the Council and was advised that the Council were supporting events, but they were externally organised.
- The words 'Hate Crime' were strong words, did Officers consider these to be a barrier to reporting and/or logging and whether the app captured low level discrimination rather than crimes. The Hate Crime Officer confirmed that these were captured and logged.
- A Member referred to part of the Equalities Act concerned with reference to the phrase 'remove or minimise disadvantage' and was advised that in relation to statutory equality duties, that Officers worked in compliance with all associated rules and legislation.
- A member asked about visits to schools and was advised that events were organised that actively involved them. The question of whether the six films mentioned in the report could be circulated around the District's schools and

the Hate Crime Officer confirmed that teachers were anxious not to say the wrong thing. In relation to which schools were visited, Members asked if they could engage with schools to have input and were advised that they could do so via the Governor Service or directly with Heads of School. It was noted that events taking place in schools were subject to costs.

Resolved –

That the report be noted.

To be actioned by: Strategic Director, Place

29. BIODIVERSITY AND THE ENVIRONMENT ACT 2021 - HABITAT BANKING

The report of the Strategic Director, Place (**Document “L”**) was presented to the Committee to provide Members with details of its duties under The Environment Act 2021

The Act was given royal assent at the end of the year and brought in several changes that affected the Council that were additions to previous statutory requirements. The new act required public authorities to ‘conserve and enhance’ biodiversity.

- Updated Biodiversity Duty within the NERC Act 2006. Public bodies were now required to Protect and Enhance biodiversity during their normal operations.
- Biodiversity Net Gain was made a condition of planning permissions for most Town and Country Planning Act Applications.
- Local Nature Recovery Strategy – which was being developed with WYCA

The presenting Officer provided a verbal overview of the changes and the contents of the report and explained how new biodiversity gains could be achieved in Planning, whether within development sites or elsewhere as offsets, biodiversity credits and habitat banks. It was expected that secondary legislation would be introduced at the end of November 2023.

The new legislation presented some obstacles in terms of Council’s use of S106 agreements and responsibilities to deliver agreed improvements.

Members were then given the opportunity to ask questions and comment. The details of which and the responses given are as below.

- A Member asked if the money to fund offset measures for the 30-year period were payable upfront and was advised that they were.
- A question of whether the Council had powers to limit the parameters of ‘offsetting’ was asked and Members were advised that it was under investigation to ascertain whether it could be built in so benefits offset residents’ losses. There was also a ‘built-in’ disincentive as distance was a factor in the value of offsetting outside the site of development.

There was a brief discussion relating to flood management and a pragmatic

approach to tree planting to ensure the right species were planted and in a beneficial manner.

It appeared there could be a discrepancy with ecology studies and the accuracy of developer's reports and how could the accuracy of these be assured. The subject of habitat banks was also discussed which were not statutory so there was no market but were being developed for when legislation would come into effect. Offsetting credits would be more expensive.

- A Member asked if funding had been received in relation to the South Pennines Nature Recovery Project for habitat mitigation work and was advised that the money had been received but not spent. Work was underway in collaboration with Yorkshire Water to allocate and spend the money.
- A Member asked about habitat bank sites as Norcliffe Park was already identified and was advised that there were others including Low Moor Banks, Brackenhill Meadows, Pitibeck and Baildon Moor.
- A Member asked if it was possible to restrict artificial grass to stop it from being used and was advised that vegetated gardens were included in metric scoring, but efforts were being made to ensure that this type of covering would not count as part of offset calculations.
- A Member asked whether work would continue or whether it would depend on further funding from DEFRA and would it be sufficient. The presenting Officer explained that the sale of bio-diversity units would self-fund the work but there was a significant challenge relating to working out the value/cost and additional IT resources would be needed to carry out the complex calculations.
- The report submitted indicated that there were difficulties relating to agreement to use Council assets for BNG and Members asked what these were. The presenting Officer stated that it was a new concept and there were large numbers of assets being managed. A new Assistant Director had been appointed and the team were working more closely as a result.
- The subject of glyphosate usage came up and a request for progress was made regarding weeds between paving on public footpaths. Members were advised that use had been reduced in parks with very few complaints, but the situation was difficult to resolve as alternative options were significantly more expensive.
- Members of SCAPAG were present at the meeting and asked how to attract resources to the benefit of their area and were advised that there was an opportunity to use the conservation ecologist to develop a management plan for woodland they owned. Management and implementation needed to be ensured so that it existed for 30 years.

There was a discussion relating to how offsetting worked and the value attached to onsite and offsite BNG. The impact of development assessed the effects on habitats on site and those also affected elsewhere. The Local Nature Recovery

Strategy would be improved and further protection given to improve connected habitats. Members were concerned that land could be developed after the initial 30 years and were advised there was nothing currently that could legally prevent it. A Member commented that off-site BNG should cost more and be in perpetuity.

A suggestion was made to hand land over to charities so that it could be kept in perpetuity, but the preferred option was for land to remain in council ownership with the possibility of charities managing but not owning them.

One final observation was made that developers were frustrated by the complexities of the BNG process with dialogue going back and forth. There was a brief discussion relating to existing SPD's and what resources developers could access to help.

Resolved –

- 1. That the content of the report be welcomed and supported.**
- 2. That Habitat Bank sites in Shipley, such as Northcliffe Park and others be supported and promoted to offset biodiversity losses.**

To be actioned by: Strategic Director, Place

30. COST OF LIVING CRISIS FUNDING

The report of the Shipley Area Co-ordinator (**Document “M”**) was presented to provide Members with details of the applications received from eligible local organisations across the Shipley constituency from the amalgamated funding that came from the United Kingdom Shared Prosperity Fund (UKSPF), the West Yorkshire Mayor's Cost of Living Fund (CoLF) and the Household Support Fund (HSF).

The Area Co-ordinator gave a brief overview of the contents of the report that summarised the recommendations from the Grants Advisory Group (GAG) and thanked the Members of GAG and Officers for the work undertaken. Members were advised that allocations were made from £2K to up a maximum of £10K with a total fund of £81K. Of the total fund, £41,793 was still available to be allocated, subject to approval with previous applicants still eligible to apply for up to £10K. This was an urgent process due to time limits and Members were advised that the funds were not for Council operations.

Members asked about monitoring of grants awarded and were advised that if information received was not satisfactory then no further funds were awarded.

As the closing date to apply was imminent, it was imperative that applications were received as soon as possible.

Resolved –

1. That the proposals for the funding allocations outlined in Document “M”, Appendix 1 be agreed.
2. That the Grants Advisory Group be thanked for their work with this funding.

To be actioned by: Shipley Area Co-ordinator

31. CLIMATE CHANGE FUNDING

The report of the Shipley Area Co-ordinator (**Document “N”**) was presented to the Committee to provide Members with a breakdown of applications received from community groups in the Shipley area to support them to carry out climate-friendly projects as part of the drive to being a net zero carbon region. The report included recommendations from GAG relating to allocation of funding.

The process to gain funding was in two stages and consisted of grants of between £5K and £50K to enable groups to achieve net zero who, otherwise struggled to do so.

The Shipley area had been allocated £73K and the report summarised the nature of suitable projects to support proposals to achieve improvements under 4 headings.

- **Energy** – local clean and flexible energy solutions
- **Building** – healthy, affordable and efficient community buildings
- **Transport** – walking, cycling and public transport
- **Nature** – green and climate ready nature and biodiversity solutions

Members did not have any additional questions or comments on the reports' contents.

Resolved –

1. That the proposals for the funding allocations outlined in Document “N”, Appendix 1 be agreed.
2. That the Grants Advisory Group be thanked for their work with this funding.

To be actioned by: Shipley Area Co-ordinator

Chair

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

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