

Dear Sir/Madam,

Re: Petition – Rear of Garforth Street

Ref: 2018 – 21 ( Please see attached confirmation letter 03-12-2018 Acknowledge Petition)

I am emailing for a Petitioner panel for the Petition for back of Garforth Street for Street Lighting and tackle Antisocial Behaviour, as we residents are unsatisfied regards the outcome from the letter sent to myself from Zaiem Khan – District Co-ordinator – West Oldham District on behalf of the Coldhurst ward Councillors.

I would like an independent review of this petition from a fresh pair of eyes and not been involved in regards to the Coldhurst ward, as this has been going for many numbers of years, whereas Garforth street is right on the board line of Coldhurst ward and North Chadderton, whereas all even number houses of Garforth Street is on the Coldhurst ward and the other side of the road, even number houses are on the North Chadderton ward.

(Although Garforth Street is split in half on the boulder line between both ward Coldhurst and North Chadderton, but both side of Garforth Street are in Chadderton as per the HM Land Registry and Royal mail)

Please see the scanned copy of the outcome letter dated 8<sup>th</sup> Jan 2019 sent from Zaiem Khan (08-01-2019 Outcome letter from Zaiem).

Also see an additionally attached Letter date 18<sup>th</sup> Dec from Zaiem Khan (20-12-18 Letter from Zaiem Khan)

The reason I am unsatisfied of the outcome and requesting for a Petitioner panel;

1. On the letter it there is NO reference to the actual council policy and where it say this?
  - a. How does the road get classed a secondary route and by who and show proof of that in regards to Garforth Street and the actual policy refereeing that?
  - b. Where and which Oldham Council Street lighting policy is say “does not prioritise the lighting of secondary routes”
    - i. Where and which?
    - ii. Provide proof?
    - iii. Copy of the policy?
    - iv. Actual copy of that policy along with reference?
  - c. Also Explain in detail as where is the council policy it say “go against council policy and does not qaulify”

“Please see attached the outcome letter attached (08-01-2019 Outcome letter from Zaiem), to quote from the letter from Zaiem

“The road is classed as secondary route and as per the Council streetlighting policy does not prioritise the lighting of secondary routes, therefore the council will not, as a matter of course, consider installing streetlighting in the alleyway (Road) at the rear of Garforth Street.

d. The statement, below, how is this decision made, by whom and why?  
In this case the provision of funding for streetlighting would go against council policy and as such does not qualify for such an allocation”

2. I believe this petition has not been investigated as petition, only taking into account previous details and only this time just had one meeting between ward member and environment service and street lighting PM the final outcome without considering all options or giving us any option or arranging a meeting with us before coming to an outcome.
  - a. Secondly, I have asked for meeting(s) note on an email on 3/01/2019 to Zaiem Khan, but I have had no reply to this email and request.
  - b. I also asked if I can attend the meeting(s), but still no reply.
3. We have not been giving any other options regards street lighting and for tackle Antisocial Behaviour
  - a. E.g. Other lighting solutions?
  - b. Part fund its Council and Councillor to look for other scheme or private fund to cover rest
  - c. Install the lighting in 3 part to break the CAPEX into 3 part to lower the cost of installation to three financial terms, according to the diagram done in 14/01/2012 there is 3 part of the lighting and each part required electricity from a different source from where the electricity will be routed from.
4. I believe this matter had not been taken to Neighbourhoods Services which has Street Lighting on their service to Cabinet Members Cllr Arooj Shah and Cllr Ginny Alexander
5. The point regards referring the back of Garforth Street as “Alleyway” is incorrect as this road, as the back of Garforth Street is sole entrance for parking and bin access for the even door numbers of Brierley Walk.

Whereas the odd number doors of Brierley Walk entrance for parking and bin access is Denmark way which is a dead end has street lighting.

As highlighted the road behind front of Brierley Walk and back of Denmark way, Chancery Street road access, which are ALL dead end all have street lights but not behind Garforth Street, which is heavily used by member of the public, all by all road users driving around Garforth Street and access for all residents.

6. Also, the respond to the letter Zaiem Khan dated 18<sup>th</sup> Dec, I have had no reply, as I respond to the points made by the letter, which I do not agree with
  - a. The scheme and costing you mention, there are just only desktop costing, nothing official, there is NO actual scheme, unless am wrong? if so please can you provide actual and official full details of the scheme survey, design, official quote, minutes of meetings and decision email or paperwork?

Also, John McAuley from Lighting team did confirm there is no actual scheme, no survey just desktop

There are no quotes for the scheme only schedules that are embedded in the PFI contract.” And

“There are no formal documents of the survey only the street lighting layout drawing and schedule”

- b. The request alleygating, from what I can remember, the residents did agree be they was not installed? Correct me if am wrong and please provide details and reminder?
- c. As its been mentioned there has be meetings, but there are no minutes or paperwork showing notes of the meetings. Also, as point 1, John McAuly confirm there is NOT official.
- d. Yes, meeting the residents on site, but we still it does not make a difference of lighting and antisocial behaviour ...
- e. Yes, again as above, does not make a difference of lighting and antisocial and drugs behaviour, plus when residents call the police, they DO NOT come out!
- f. Yes, I have giving my Thanks from myself and residents!

7. On the letter it tells me to “*refrain from sending further unreasonable persistent email to the councillors...*”

How can it be said unreasonable persistent as I am chasing number of times to my elated councillors for a reply to questions, would you agree it totally Unprofessional for someone NOT to acknowledge and reply to an emails which was sent over 3-week-old, as I a merely chasing and asking for a reply to my emails for answer, but no reply or acknowledgment.

8. Regards the PFI, FOI, John McAuley did confirm there was new street installed 22<sup>nd</sup> Nov 2013 funded by the PFI contract back Chancery Street, between number 35 and 37, This shows there are no lighting been installed, not just replacing existing.
9. In regards to the antisocial behaviour, there is nothing regards Oldham Police, as young boys are drug dealing, taking drugs, drinking alcohol, leaving drug waste and broken alcohol bottle waste.
  - a. Also, since this side of Garforth Street is on the Coldhurst ward, its reasonability of Oldham Police, so when a resident call the police, they do not come, whereas the other side of Garforth Street is in the North Chadderton ward, Chadderton police come out, when called from the resident other side of Garforth Street ( which is North Chadderton). as problem of boarding wards.

Please can I ask:

1. What is a petitioner panel?
2. What’s the progress and time lines?
3. Who would be member and part of the petitioner panel?
4. How would this be looked into?
5. How would a decision be made?

6. When decision is made, is this bind?
  - a. If favoured on petition, would the Councillors have agree and arrange for the street lightings?
  - b. If favoured on the councillor, Is this last stop? Or other steps and process for the petition?

Please confirm and acknowledge email.

If you require any further details or information, please let me know

Many thanks and best regards,

Mohammed Miah