

Present: The Mayor – Councillor Fida Hussain

Councillors Ahmad, Akhtar, Alcock, A. Alexander, G. Alexander, Ames, Azad, Ball, M Bashforth, S Bashforth, Bates, Blyth, Briggs, Brownridge, A Chadderton, Chauhan, Cosgrove, Dawson, Dean, J Dillon, Fielding, Garry, Haque, Harkness, Harrison, Heffernan, Hibbert, Houle, Hudson, Iqbal, Judge, Klonowski, Larkin, Malik, McCann, McLaren, McMahan, Moores, Murphy, Mushtaq, Price, Qumer, Rehman, Roberts, Sedgwick, Shah, Sheldon, Shuttleworth, Stretton, Sykes, Toor, Ur-Rehman, Williamson, Williams and Wrigglesworth

1

QUESTIONS TO CABINET MEMBERS FROM THE PUBLIC AND COUNCILLORS ON WARD OR DISTRICT ISSUES

The Mayor advised the meeting that the first item on the agenda in Open Council was Public Question Time. The questions had been received from members of the public and would be taken in the order in which they had been received. Council was advised that if the questioner was not present then the question would appear on the screen in the Council Chamber.

The following questions had been submitted:

1. Question from Joe Fitzpatrick via email:

“I have learnt that a senior officer involved with Council finances has declared that the funding of the capital programme is risky. Normally reliable sources inform me that the inducements being offered to Mono pumps are in the region of £4 million and the money to be paid to attract a national company to be the anchor store in your plans to develop Prince’s Gate will also be financed out of the capital programme.

How can you justify adding this payment to a capital programme, already judged to be risky, and how can you ignore the European Union Regulations designed to prohibit the payment of such inducements. “

Councillor McMahan, Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Regeneration and City Region gave the following response:

“May I thank Mr. Fitzpatrick for his question. I disagree entirely with the principle that the capital programme is risky. The Capital programme funding is not risky and the Council has a healthy Capital Programme. A recent summary review identified £10m. The Council’s debt is the third lowest in Greater Manchester. The Council has a significant number of PFI liabilities to central

government. The Council has not given Monopumps any money but received funding through a Regional Growth Fund. I am pleased that Marks and Spencer is coming to Oldham and delighted that a disused area is becoming a Gateway we can be proud of. Contracts have been exchanged and the development will happen. The town is coming out fighting and providing a positive future. The Council will come forward with the development of the site.”

2. Question received from Jit Patel via email:

“Behind Langham road in oldham coppice is being plagued with fly tipping. I have reported this many times and to be fair it has been cleaned up, however now I am told that the council no longer clear this fly tipped rubbish as the area is un-adopted. Fly Tipped rubbish started when the council introduced waste collection charges am I supposed to live in a dumping ground as I am no longer in a position to clear it my self.”

Councillor Brownridge, Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods and Cooperatives gave the following response:

“We agree that the flytipping is completely unacceptable. We are trying to find out who owns the land so we can take legal actions against them. This is not Council owned land and we cannot continue to clear it. The owners must take responsibility. Enforcement Officers will work with the landowners

Officers from Neighbourhood Enforcement will work with the landowners to establish who has flytipped and they will be prosecuted, ultimately it is the landowner’s responsibility.”

3. Question received from Amanda Lane via email:

“I have been to a meeting recently with Gary McBrien Head of Additional and Complex Needs Services. As you are aware there are big budget cuts to be made across the council and to children's services. The meeting tonight focussed on Short Breaks for Disabled Children. 350k has to be saved from this service which currently has allocated 1.2 million, so quite a big cut around 25%. My son accesses this service and has overnight respite care once a fortnight. Tonights meeting was about getting parent's views on this and giving us an opportunity to have our say.

I would like to ask the question how much money was spent on Oldham's entry into Bloom and Grow, how much extra money has it cost in terms of staffing ie a biodiversity officer, manpower tending the flower boxes, staff costs for tending all the areas ahead of judging, the

cost of the flowers, plants and seeds etc. Huge cuts are taking place I think Oldham Council needs to be far more accountable as to where money is spent and also to prioritise in this difficult financial climate.”



Councillor Brownridge, Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods and Cooperatives gave the following response:

“There is a misconception that Bloom & Grow is all about flowers when in reality the benefits stretch to support local businesses, improve education by enabling children to attain their Diplomas, clean streets free from litter and graffiti as well as looking to improve the health of local communities. The £200000 that is currently allocated to the Bloom & Grow initiative is funded through the Public Health transformation fund and the investment is to support all parts of our communities in improving general health and wellbeing. We feel that the investment made in the town centre and the districts is an essential part of the make Oldham a place where people choose to live and provide savings for us as the residents looking after their areas and the Council does not have to pick up flytipping and other waste.”

4. Question received from Chris Gloster via email:

“My understanding is that the consultation period for the proposed changes to Shaw Market Ground are now complete.

Why did the so called consultation give no option for retaining the market on the existing market ground?

Many users have expressed annoyance at this.

Some included the missing option upon the consultation document prior to submitting it.

I am sure many others would have ticked the current location box if it had existed on the document, which would have given a large majority in favour of keeping it where it is.

Why is the finance not available to redevelop the existing market ground, it feels like local people like me are being bribed to agree to it being moved?

Would it not be better to redevelop the existing site, therefore revamping the Market and tackling to substantial anti-social behaviour that currently exists in that area with the current market set up?”

Councillor Stretton, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Town Centres, Culture and Tourism gave the following response:



Oldham
Council

"I have answered a similar question at a previous Council meeting but will answer it again.

The consultation was about whether the Council should invest up to £120,000 on improving Shaw Market. There is a great risk that Shaw market will not survive unless it gets more customers and a greater variety of stalls. Both of these factors are dependent upon each other and our Markets Manager has been consistently trying to attract new stall holders without success because of the dwindling numbers of people using the market. So the principle we were testing out via the consultation was whether moving the market closer to the heaviest footfall in Shaw i.e. closer to Asda and Aldi, would attract new customers.

The Council is already investing £100,000 in Business Improvement Grants in Shaw so it was also important for us to consider what impact any changes to the location of the market and shifting of footfall might have on other Shaw businesses.

I was clear at the outset that leaving the market on the same site and investing £120,000 on improving the stalls would not make the market more visible or easier to get to for supermarket customers who might be encouraged to also become Shaw market shoppers. If the Council is to invest, we need to be sure that we will eventually get a return on our investment. Simply modernising the stalls is unlikely to generate the extra footfall or encourage new traders.

Nevertheless, I can assure Mr. Gloster that the consultation process did allow people to express their views about staying on the same site. Many of the consultation results were achieved by face to face interviews and the Council staff noted all additional views that were expressed. Many people also added their own written comments about the location and staying on the same site. Many existing market customers did tell us that they wanted the market to stay on the current site and we are considering all of the comments very carefully before reaching such an important decision.

However, we must all be realistic. Shopping habits have changed. How many people have bought their Christmas presents on line this year and how many bought them from a local market?

5. Question received from Chaz Sharp via Twitter:

“Why does Oldham Council have the highest wheelie bin per capita in the whole of western civilisation?”

Councillor Brownridge, Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods and Cooperatives gave the following response:

“The Council takes recycling very seriously and have to ensure there are enough bins to do that properly which saves us money on landfill tax. The number of bins and containers issued to residents is similar throughout Greater Manchester. We do appreciate that some properties have space issues If space is an issue then we do provide alternative sizes and types of containers such as boxes or bags.”

6. Question received from Metromeerk via Twitter:

“Will Oldham please look into MCR Metrolink. Expensive, unreliable, overcrowded and failed completely on Sat AM?”

Councillor Hibbert, Cabinet Member for Housing, Planning and Transport gave the following response: “Metrolink prices are comparable with train travel. The reliability on the Oldham Rochdale line was rated at 98% during September and October which is above the benchmark. There were some issues with signalling equipment which impacted on services in November which have now been corrected.

We are aware that the trams are often overcrowded at peak times shows how popular and there are plans to deal with this. TfGM recently introduced another double unit into the peak service and is looking to add a further double early in 2015. The current 12 minute service will be replaced by a 6 minute service in early 2016 when the City crossing is completed.

The whole of the Metrolink service was disrupted last Saturday because of icy conditions which we agree need to be addressed if possible because this affects Oldham because we are the highest borough in Greater Manchester.

The Council receives regular reports about the efficiency of Metrolink at formal meetings with Transport for Greater Manchester and closely scrutinises the data about the performance of the Oldham Rochdale line. Councillors will question the reliability during icy conditions at the Metrolink meeting this week.”

7. Question received from Doctor of Letters via Twitter:

“How are people parked on double yellow lines expected ever to be held to account (i.e. A FPN) because in an



evening there is nobody to issue tickets so they get away with it as the car parked on Ashton road has on at least eight evenings in the last 15 they have got away with it and will continue to do so. Defacto legalised.”

Councillor Stretton, Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Town Centres, Culture and Tourism gave the following response:

“The council does regulate through enforcement in the evenings Borough wide. Along Ashton Road there are a number of different restrictions, some of which stop at 6.30pm. We note the concerns raised in this particular area, and will ask officers to ensure that this is provided particular attention over the next few weeks.”

8. Question received from Andrew Colin Hindley via email:

“I have just heard the news that there is a plan to move the Oldham Coliseum Theatre to a new site on Union street

Are there going to be 2 theatre venues in Oldham?, if not I am kinda wondering why Oldham council spent £1.7 million pounds on revamping the old theatre less than 2 years ago if there where plans in the pipeline for it to close and move to a new site.”

Councillor Stretton, Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Town Centres, Culture and Tourism gave the following response:

“The Council has been working with Oldham Coliseum Theatre for a number of years to develop a new Coliseum Theatre and Heritage Centre on Union Street. The project is viewed as having a crucial role in the cultural regeneration of Oldham town centre with the main funders being OMBC, The Arts Council and the Heritage Lottery Fund. It will form a new and exciting extension to the Cultural Quarter and will have a regional profile.

Oldham Coliseum will relocate into the new building once it has been completed. Work is ongoing to consider the future use of the existing Coliseum building.

Urgent repairs to the mechanical and electrical elements of the current Coliseum building were carried out by the Council to ensure that there was not a forced closure of the theatre as the building is approaching the end of its economic life and key elements were at the point of failure. By doing so the Council has secured the medium term future of the theatre.”

9. Question received from Mr. Brooks via email:

“Oldham Council promotes a spectrum of co-operative working with an open and honest co-operative approach. In fact the Community Call-in pilot offers the opportunity to strengthen local democracy and build closer engagement between communities and decisions made at a district level. It also enhances local accountability and influence people have over local decisions.

With the Co-Operative charter in mind and particularly the values contained within it why have Oldham Council refused to consult and engage with the people of Saddleworth regarding the siting of the new Saddleworth School? The last public meeting on this emotive issue was in October 2013.”

Councillor Chadderton, Cabinet Member for Education and Safeguarding gave the following response:

“Oldham Council strongly recognises the need to be as transparent as possible regarding Saddleworth School and have endeavoured to release information wherever possible. Indeed, in April 2014, the Council released a set of Frequently Asked Questions which are still available and answer this very point.

After receiving confirmation of EFA funding, the Council considered a total of 15 sites which were all appraised based on timescales, deliverability, cost, legal, planning, highways and engineering risk. The details of these 15 sites were released in the public domain and were published in the local press. As Mr. Brooks states a public consultation was held 13 months ago. There is not that large an update as we are still awaiting confirmation of the site of the school. Moving forward, it is understood by the Council and the EFA and the potential contractor of the school that that there will be a number of public consultation events that will take place in early 2015 and the Council would welcome feedback at the appropriate time.”

The following questions were submitted by Councillors on Ward or District Matters:

1. Councillor Malik to Councillor Stretton:

“Oldham Market is very important to Oldham, because it is situated in Coldhurst Ward it is of particular interest to Coldhurst Ward Councillors and residents. Can the cabinet member responsible for the Market update us on the occupancy levels in Tommyfield indoor market hall?”

Councillor Stretton, Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Town Centres, Culture and Tourism gave the following response:

“Despite the general economic climate the indoor market currently has a high level of trader occupancy that would compare well with other indoor markets in the UK. The turnover of traders within the indoor Market Hall is also low, something many other markets struggle to achieve.

The indoor market has an occupancy level of 92.2%.”

2. Councillor Blyth to Councillor Harrison:

“Why has the podiatry service that was delivered at Crompton Health Centre, been moved to Royton Health centre without prior consultation with the service users?

Moving this service has caused distress to users and also extra cost to travel to Royton.

It seems that everything is been moved to Royton at the expense of the residents of Shaw again.

Can the Cabinet member make representations to the Health and Wellbeing Board to have this service returned to Crompton Health Centre so that service users can receive the service they used to have in the town they live in?”

Councillor Harrison, Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Public Health gave the following response:

“I have received the following information from Pennine Care NHS Foundation Trust, the main provider of community based healthcare in Oldham.

Pennine Care Oldham Podiatry Service has been spread historically across 11 centres within Oldham Clinical Commissioning Group footprint, many of which were in old buildings with single chairs. The challenges for the service in delivering from this number of venues have been significant and include reduced access for patients, as the clinics cannot be staffed all week and clinics being cancelled at times of sickness and annual leave.

The service reviewed current clinic utilisation with a view to working from venues where more than one chair is available, which evidence demonstrates has improved clinical outcomes for patients. At the same time, this enables the service to meet the challenges and pressures of the current financial situation as it not just the Council finding financial pressures for the wider NHS and Pennine Care. The venues chosen to deliver podiatry are LIFT buildings as they are modern, fit for purpose, fully comply with infection control, and support the effective use of resources. Moving provides a healthier, safe place for patients.”

3. Councillor Ames to Councillor Hibbert:

“Fuel Poverty is a big problem in Oldham and has a real impact on the residents of Hollinwood. Could the relevant Cabinet Member update members on the progress of the Warm Homes Oldham scheme and the impact this has made helping people out of fuel poverty?”

Councillor Hibbert, Cabinet Member for Housing, Planning and Transport gave the following response:

“The Warm Homes Oldham scheme helped over 1000 people out of fuel poverty in the first year. In total 439 households accounting for 1079 people were assisted out of fuel poverty (i.e. no longer spending more than 10% of their income on heating bills).

During the first year the project brought in over £1.3 million of external funding to help install 364 boilers, 19 lofts/cavities and 80 homes benefitted from solid wall insulation. Energy efficiency advice is given at every home visit and the average savings per household for year one have been over £250. Benefits checks are done with residents and we also help people get off prepayment meters and get fuel debt wiped.

Due to its success the partners who put in the original funding for the project (Oldham Council, Oldham Clinical Commissioning Group and Oldham Housing Investment Partnership) have all agreed to continue the project for at least another year (2014/15).

Since April this year a further 475 people have been brought out of fuel poverty, towards our target of 1200, already attracting over £500,000 worth of external investment.

So as you can see there are a variety of options of help available to residents of Oldham who are in fuel poverty, if you know of any residents in Hollinwood or any other Oldham area who may need assistance please refer them to the scheme and we can see how we can help. Call 0800 019 1084 or go to www.warmhomesoldham.org.uk”

4. Councillor McCann to Councillor Chadderton:

“I am very disappointed we are still awaiting a decision on the site of the new Saddleworth School due to the full investigation being conducted on four possible sites.

Could I ask the Cabinet Member to give me an estimate of the cost, the extra inflationary cost, arising from the delay and confirmation that this money will reduce the amount available for the new school build?”

Councillor Chadderton, Cabinet Member for Education and Safeguarding gave the following response:



“I share the frustration and disappointment that things have been pushed back. As raised in the previous question it has been 14 months since the consultation and it was anticipated that we would be building the school in anticipation of it opening in 12 months time., clearly that won’t be taking place. With regards to finance and additional costs, the Council has committed over £1m to work with highways and other issues and other extras specific to the work. This feasibility work is being funded by the EFA and, whilst the Council have assisted this process by sharing relevant documents and plans, the Authority isn’t privy to the costs associated with this process and therefore, would be unable to confirm the cost and extra inflationary cost arising from the delay.”

5. Councillor Dean to Councillor McMahon:

“My constituents living in Waterhead Village are very concerned at the Post Office proposals to move the Waterhead branch to Lees
This Post Office provides services for many elderly residents and has 5 warden schemes within 100 yards of this Post Office.
Over 300 residents have sent written objection to this move.
I would ask if the Cabinet member would support my constituents in opposing the Post Office proposals.”

Councillor McMahon, Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Regeneration and City Region responded that he had not been sighted on the exact details but recognised the importance of the local post office and the services they provide and support can be offered when called upon.

6. Councillor Alcock to Councillor Brownridge:

“Can the relevant cabinet member please tell us, whether the community cafe in Dunwood Park was paid for with funding from the lottery?

I'm hearing that there are plans to let the community cafe on a long term lease. If this goes ahead will this mean that the lottery will be looking for the money they contributed to be returned to them?

If so how much will this be and which budget will this money be coming from?”

Councillor Brownridge, Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods and Cooperatives gave the following response:

“The Community building was funded through the Lottery funding. Over recent weeks we have been working with colleagues to explore/develop a sustainable future for the building and consideration is being given to develop a café in the community building to serve the local community.



We have identified from the lottery Funding Agreement that we would require consent/approval from HLF as part of due diligence in exploring options once we are in a position to move forward with our proposals.

At this stage we are not in a position to confirm whether or not it will mean the return of any of the grant funding supplied by the lottery. However the lottery will be able to make comment on our proposals and at that stage the council will be able to make a decision to accept or reject the terms that are determined by the lottery before entering into any final agreement.”

7. Councillor Shuttleworth to Councillor Hibbert:

“The former Rose Mill site in Chadderton south has remained vacant for some time and the access road for the former mill, Rose St, has now become an area where residents/others regard this as an easy area in which to dump waste.

As this is a prime location for the Metro link as well as other local services, and also borders on the Coalshaw Green Park, may I ask the Cabinet Member to provide an update as to the intended long term use of this piece of land.”

Councillor Hibbert, Cabinet Member for Housing, Planning and Transport gave the following response:

“The mill has been demolished for some time and a blight on the area. I have been deeply involved to get something to happen on this site. I am aware that a company are interested in the development of the site which was not surprising as it is so close to Metrolink. Phase 1 would be the development of the site. One of the accesses would be Rose Street would be the access to the site but cannot confirm that as I have not seen the plans. I will make sure fellow councillors are aware of any proposals as details have not been made yet.”

8. Councillor Williamson to Councillor Brownridge:

“The former gardeners store building at High Crompton Park has been up for sale or long lease for months now. I understand there has been at least three expressions of interest.

I know that these things take time, but I am concerned that if the Council is seen to be dragging its feet, those looking at turning it into a business, that will benefit the community in High Crompton will lose out yet again, like when former Crompton Councillor, Ann Wingate tried to get a café opened up there.

Therefore, can the relevant cabinet member please give me an update?"

Councillor Brownridge, Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods and Cooperatives, gave the following response:

"Following a period of little or no interest in the former Direct Services Organisation building at High Crompton Park, Officers considered the possibility of the Council's Parks Service re-using the premises in conjunction with the local bowling club. Whilst this was being evaluated a number of parties came forward expressing an interest in operating a café business as well as one for a Children's Party Centre.

In view of the renewed interest, the proposal to re-use the building for the Council's own purposes has been shelved. Instructions have since been passed to the Council's marketing agent, Roger Hannah & Co, to contact all interested parties to secure written offers & obtain further details of each proposal. Roger Hannah will make a recommendation to the Council in due course.

Ward Councillors will be kept informed of progress."

9. Councillor Murphy to Councillor Brownridge:

"After a recent incident where criminal damage was carried out on a 40 year old oak tree in Shawside Park in Crompton, Council tree officers had to make the area safe and eventually cut down the tree.

Can the relevant cabinet member please let me know what action is being taken to find out who carried out this damage and whether all costs associated with this case will be recouped from the culprit?"

Councillor Brownridge, Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods and Cooperatives, gave the following response:

"With cases of criminal damage it is normal procedure for the Council Officer attending the site to knock on properties adjacent to the incident and ask for any information relating to the incident. Sometimes this can glean enough information to pursue the matter, but unfortunately in most cases including this one nobody was forthcoming with any information.

Officers will now do a letter drop in the area in an attempt to solicit the necessary information to at least recover the council's costs, and secure replacement trees. The matter has also been reported to the police. If anyone has any information please let us know as soon as possible."

10. Councillor Sedgwick to Councillor Stretton:

"I am pleased that this Council is committed to investing £100,000 in Lees high street.

I have previously asked if some of this money could be used to improve security for local businesses as well as improving the shop fronts.

Please can I ask the Cabinet Member if this administration is willing to work with ward members and local businesses to spend some of this money to address security concerns in Lees?"

Councillor Stretton, Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Town Centres, Culture and Tourism gave the following response:

"I note that this mentions ward members but I have consulted with one ward member who is not in agreement with this proposal.

The Business Improvements Grant scheme is specifically focused on improving the vibrancy of Shaw and Lees, by providing a grant to independent local businesses towards works that will improve their business. The grant will pay 50% of the costs of eligible works up to a maximum grant payment of £3000. The business or property owner pays the remaining costs. The Shaw and Lees schemes were introduced following the success and popularity of the £1m grant scheme for the Independent Quarter in Oldham town centre and we are also currently extending the Business Improvements Grant scheme to include the Failsworth A62 Corridor.

The grants can be used to improve the exterior of premises and can also be used for the interior where it will help the business to grow and/or create new jobs. Priority is given to applications that maximise visual improvement, have a sustainable business plan and where the improvement is likely to be long lasting and/or where there will be business growth.

I am aware that some businesses in Lees have requested that the grant funding be used to pay for CCTV on the High Street itself, but this is not what the grant scheme was intended to deliver. All businesses in Lees have been offered a security and safety inspection from our

community safety officer so that they can receive professional and free advice about how best to make their premises secure.”



Oldham
Council

RESOLVED that the questions raised and the responses given be noted.

2 TO RECEIVE APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Councillors Dearden, Harkness, Jabbar, Kirkham and Salamat.

3 TO ORDER THAT THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COUNCIL HELD ON 22ND OCTOBER 2014 BE SIGNED AS A CORRECT RECORD

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the Council meeting held on 22nd October 2014 be approved as a correct record.

4 TO RECEIVE DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN ANY MATTER TO BE DETERMINED AT THE MEETING

In accordance with the Code of Conduct Councillors Dean, McCann, Shah, Stretton and Sykes all declared a personal interest in Item 16b – Minutes of the Unity Partnership Board by virtue of their appointment to the Board. Councillors Brownridge, Chauhan, Harrison and McCann all declared a personal interest in Item 16b – Minutes of the Oldham Care and Support Company by virtue of their appointment to the Board. Councillor McMahon declared a personal interest in Item 10 by virtue of his appointment to the GMCA/AGMA Executive. Councillor Williams declared a personal interest in Item 13 by virtue of his appointment as Chair of Governors at New Bridge School. Councillors Chadderton, Roberts, Williamson and Wigglesworth declared a personal interest in Item 9 by virtue of their appointment to the Positive Steps Board.

5 TO DEAL WITH MATTERS WHICH THE MAYOR CONSIDERS TO BE URGENT BUSINESS

The Mayor advised the meeting of one item of Urgent Business. New Cabinet Members portfolios had been circulated in the Chamber.

6 TO RECEIVE COMMUNICATIONS RELATING TO THE BUSINESS OF THE COUNCIL

The Mayor made reference to the recent death of Joel Barnett who was the Member of Parliament for Heywood and Royton from 1964 to 1983. Councillors Judge and Sykes spoke in remembrance of Mr. Barnett.

Council held a Minutes Silence in memory of Mr. Barnett.

7 TO RECEIVE AND NOTE PETITIONS RECEIVED RELATING TO THE BUSINESS OF THE COUNCIL

The Mayor informed the meeting that there were no petitions received for noting by Council.



Oldham
Council

8

OUTSTANDING BUSINESS FROM THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The Mayor informed the meeting that there were two items of outstanding business from the previous meeting.

“Motion 1

Councillor Price MOVED and Councillor Haque SECONDED the following motion:

Oldham Council, with its responsibility for Public Health, is determined to improve health outcomes in the borough.

This Council notes:

There are three and a half million overweight or obese children in England.

That one in every seven hospital beds is occupied by someone with diabetes.

The number of admissions in NHS hospitals with a primary diagnosis of obesity has risen over 11 times in the last decade.

That 34 per cent of children in year six in Oldham are overweight or obese.

That 6.4 per cent of Oldham’s population are recorded as having diabetes; this is above the average for England.

The NHS currently spends £1 million an hour on diabetes, equivalent to 10 per cent of its annual budget. If a new government allows local government to reinvest a fifth of existing VAT on soft drinks, fast food and confectionery in activity programmes, it could help to prevent problems such as obesity and diabetes to help reduce the burden of ill health later in life.

This Council Resolves:

To support the Local Government Association’s First 100 days of the next government campaign.

Also to instruct The Chief Executive to write to the leaders of all three parties calling on them to adopt the proposal in ‘100 days’ to help the three and a half million overweight or obese children by reinvesting a fifth of existing VAT on soft drinks, fast food and confectionery on activity programmes.”

Councillor Dean spoke in support of the motion.

Councillor Harrison spoke in support of the motion.

Councillor McCann spoke in support of the motion.

Councillor Price did not exercise her right of reply.

On being put the vote the MOTION was CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

RESOLVED that:

1. The Local Government Association's First 100 Days of the next government campaign be supported.
2. The Chief Executive be instructed to write to the leaders of all three parties calling on them to adopt the proposal in '100 days' to help the three and a half million overweight or obese children by reinvesting a fifth of existing VAT on soft drinks, fast food and confectionary on activity programmes.

"Motion 2

Councillor Heffernan MOVED and Councillor Williamson SECONDED the following motion:

The Council notes that:

- Local authorities are currently obliged by law to sell entries from the open electoral register to marketing companies. This personal information – the names and addresses of electors in this borough – is used by these companies for direct marketing purposes generating junk mail.
- Like nuisance calls, junk mail is an irritant to many residents in this borough.
- 90% of all junk mail is immediately deposited by its recipients in the bin
- 17.5 billion items of junk mail are produced every year in the UK, using 550,000 tonnes of paper and 16.5 billion litres of water. It takes about 17 mature trees to produce a tonne of paper. The equivalent of 550,000 tonnes of paper is therefore 9.35 million trees.

This Council believes that this legal obligation:

- Demeans and cheapens local democracy
- Deters some potential voters from registering to vote by compromising their privacy
- Is damaging to our local environment and runs contrary to the authority's commitment to reducing its carbon footprint

This Council therefore supports the position of the Local Government Association that:

- The open register be scrapped
- The obligation on local authorities to sell electors' personal details be abolished

This Council resolves to:

- Request that the Chief Executive write to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government, The Rt. Hon. Mr. Eric Pickles MP, outlining the Council's support for the LGA's position.
- Request that the Chief Executive also write to our three local MPs asking them to make representations to the Secretary of State supporting this position."

AMENDMENT

Councillor Ahmad MOVED and Councillor Ames SECONDED the following Amendment:

Delete: This personal information – the names and addresses of electors in this borough – is used by these companies for direct marketing purposes generating junk mail.

- Like nuisance calls, junk mail is an irritant to many residents in this borough.
- 90% of all junk mail is immediately deposited by its recipients in the bin
- 17.5 billion items of junk mail are produced every year in the UK, using 550,000 tonnes of paper and 16.5 billion litres of water. It takes about 17 mature trees to produce a tonne of paper. The equivalent of 550,000 tonnes of paper is therefore 9.35 million trees. Deters some potential voters from registering to vote by compromising their privacy
- Is damaging to our local environment and runs contrary to the authority's commitment to reducing its carbon footprint

Motion will then read:

Local authorities are currently obliged by law to sell entries from the open electoral register to marketing companies.

This Council believes that this legal obligation:

Demeans and cheapens local democracy This Council therefore supports the position of the Local Government Association that:

- The open register be scrapped
- The obligation on local authorities to sell electors' personal details be abolished

This Council resolves to:

- Request that the Chief Executive write to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government, The Rt. Hon. Mr. Eric Pickles MP, outlining the Council's support for the LGA's position.
- Request that the Chief Executive also write to our three local MPs asking them to make representations to the Secretary of State supporting this position.

No members spoke on the amendment.

Councillor Heffernan did not exercise his right of reply.

Councillor Ahmad did not exercise his right of reply.

A vote was then taken on the AMENDMENT.

On being put to the vote the AMENDMENT was CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

A vote was then taken on the SUBSTANTIVE MOTION.

On being put to the vote the MOTION was CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

RESOLVED that:

1. The Chief Executive be requested to write to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government, the Rt. Hon. Eric Pickles MP, outlining the Council's support for the LGA's position.

2. The Chief Executive be requested to write to the three local MPs asking them to make representations to the Secretary of State supporting this position.

BUDGET PROPOSALS 2015/16

Consideration was given to a report of the Interim Borough Treasurer which presented the detailed budget proposals of sufficient value to deliver a balanced budget for 2015/16 together with the initial savings proposals for 2016/17. These proposals built upon the work that had been undertaken in previous financial years to address budget challenges and to ensure financial stability for the Council. Councillor McMahon thanked the Performance and Value for Money Committee for their work.

Councillor Mushtaq spoke in support of the Budget Proposals.
Councillor McCann spoke on the Budget Proposals.

Councillor S. Bashforth spoke in support of the Budget Proposals.

Councillor Blyth spoke in support of the Budget Proposals.
Councillor Hudson spoke in support of the Budget Proposals.

Councillor McMahon exercised his right of reply and spoke in support of the Budget Proposals.

On being put the vote the MOTION was CARRIED
UNANIMOUSLY.

RESOLVED that:

1. budget proposals of £27.471m for 2015/16 as set out in Appendices 2 and 3 of the report be approved.
2. the budget proposals totalling £7.758m for 2015/16 for which the conclusion of public consultation exercises was still required as set out in Appendices 5 and 6 be noted.
3. the information contained in the Equality Impact Assessment document be noted.
4. the savings target may need to be revised as a result of further financial developments which included changes to Government funding and this may require the consideration of further budget proposals be noted.
5. the initial budget proposals for 2016/17 be noted.
6. approval for the inclusion of the Council in a business rates pool for 2015/16 be delegated to the Cabinet Member for Finance and HR in consultation with the Executive Director, Corporate and Commercial Services and the Interim Borough Treasurer.
7. Consideration of the option D040 at Appendix 5 be deferred to the February Council meeting cycle.

TRANSITION TO A DIRECTLY ELECTED MAYOR

Consideration was given to a report of the Chief Executive which set out an agreed Greater Manchester approach to the evolution of Greater Manchester governance arrangements, in return for the devolution of significant additional functional and fiscal responsibilities by Government, the details of which were set out in the report.

The Devolution Agreement which had been negotiated between the Government and the Greater Manchester Combined Authority set out the additional powers and responsibilities which would be transferred to Greater Manchester in return for governance changes – involving an Appointed Mayor as the lead member of the Combined Authority and a directly elected Mayor as part of a Cabinet of Leaders through new legislation.

Councillor Hudson spoke in support of the Devolution of Powers

Councillor Rehman spoke in support of the Devolution of Powers

Councillor Murphy spoke on the Devolution of Powers

Councillor Hibbert spoke in support of Devolution of Powers

Councillor S Bashforth spoke in support of the Devolution of Powers

Councillor Bates spoke against the Devolution of Powers

Councillor Mushtaq spoke in support of the Devolution of Powers

Councillor McMahon exercised his right of reply and spoke in support of the Devolution of Powers.

On being put to the vote FIFTY FOUR VOTES were cast IN FAVOUR of the MOTION with ONE VOTE cast AGAINST and NO ABSTENTIONS. The MOTION was therefore CARRIED.

RESOLVED that:

A) Council recommended:

1. The principles which have guided Greater Manchester's approach to devolution and governance changes, as set out in the report to the Greater Manchester Combined Authority be endorsed.
2. The Devolution Agreement and the significant switch in powers and access to resources it represents which would have a positive impact on those who live and work within Oldham and Greater Manchester be welcomed.
3. The proposed changes in governance including an Appointed Mayor as the 11th Member of the Greater Manchester Combined Authority as a transition to a Directly Elected Mayor for Greater Manchester be supported.
4. The balance between new powers to be vested in the Combined Authority as well as new powers to

be vested in the directly elected Mayor who will be the Chair of the Greater Manchester Combined Authority and accountable to the Cabinet of Leaders in the exercise of those powers; and the Mayor and the Cabinet being subject of scrutiny by the Combined Authority Pool be noted.

5. The Greater Manchester Combined Authority to conclude the statutory review of the Governance arrangements as soon as possible to enable a final scheme to be submitted to the Secretary of State as a pre-requisite to the changes being made to the Statutory Orders to give effect to the transitional arrangements.
6. Delegated authority be given to the Leader in consultation with the Chief Executive and the Leaders of the Opposition to respond formally to the Greater Manchester Combined Authority consultation on devolution in the terms as set out in the report.

B) In addition to the recommendations required by all member councils above, the following principles be agreed which the Council would seek to influence through negotiation:

1. That the costs of the Directly Elected Mayor and enhanced Greater Manchester Combined Authority were funded through a Precept or Levy, so as to be transparent about the cost of the function.
2. That the creation of a Directly Elected Mayor and enhanced Greater Manchester Authority was for the purpose of receiving additional powers and budget responsibility from central government.
3. That the creation of a Directly Elected Mayor and enhanced Greater Manchester Combined Authority did not impede or infringe the work of the ten councils which make up the Greater Manchester City Region, and that the sovereignty of each council was maintained and respected.
4. That the Directly Elected Mayor and enhanced Greater Manchester Combined Authority did not seek to assume, other than with full Council consent, any powers currently vested in Oldham Council and the other nine councils which made up the Greater Manchester City Region.
5. That the administrative boundary known as Greater Manchester was not intended to consume or replace the unique and historic identities of our communities.
6. That work was undertaken to ensure Directly Elected Mayor and enhanced Greater Manchester Combined Authority had a clear plan in place to rebalance the City Region economy which addressed the “north-south” economic divide in the city region.
7. That while the principle of “Earn-back” investment of public funds be supported, sufficient funds should be made available to gap fund regeneration and

infrastructure investment where a legitimate commercial gap existed.



Oldham
Council

11 **YOUTH COUNCIL**

The Mayor advised the meeting that there were no items of business received from the Youth Council.

12 **LEADER AND CABINET QUESTION TIME**

The Leader of the Opposition, Councillor Sykes, raised the following three questions:

Question 1 - Learning Lessons from the Coffey Report:

The Leader will doubtless be aware of the recent publication of the findings of the Inquiry, chaired by the Chair of the All Party Parliamentary Group for Runaway and Missing Children, Stockport MP Ann Coffey.

The Inquiry into child sexual exploitation in Greater Manchester followed the failure of statutory agencies to safeguard vulnerable children and young people in Rochdale and Rotherham.

Chair Ann Coffey spoke of “the failure of police and partner agencies to listen properly to young victims and their families and to adequately respond to them...”

It is clear that victims in Rochdale and elsewhere were not identified or taken seriously because of negative and discriminatory attitudes of the police and other partner agencies towards them.

Their behaviour was seen as a life style choice and because of that they were not seen as vulnerable children and were not given the protection they should have expected from organisations with a responsibility to safeguard them”.

This sounds identical to the tenor of Professor Jay’s Report on Rotherham.

However this Report, titled ‘Real Voices’, is more shocking because it features the voices of vulnerable children and young people from our own communities across Greater Manchester – they could very well be the sons and daughters of our friends and neighbours.

Can the Leader please tell me how this Council will be responding to the findings of this Report to ensure that the children and young people of our Borough will be protected from such exploitation in the future?

Councillor McMahon responded that these were very serious issues and would not go away for some time to come. He accepted that the institutions had to undergo a cultural change. This was a complex issue which no one can pre-empt and the

pattern of abuse was changing all the time and beginning to understand what we don't know. The Council would want to ensure that everyone is safeguarded. Systems and processes were in place as well as training and a review had taken place when issues for authorities were highlighted. There is a culture of learning and we must never pretend to know more than you do. The Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub (MASH) was established and working well with agencies sharing information and accessing databases. Members have visited the team and were impressed with the systems in place. There was a play highlighting issues currently going around schools which highlighted the issues, promoted discussion and raised awareness and has been proven beneficial. The media has been proportionate in its covering of the issues and came to meet staff for a better understanding. The Council has taken on board the report and not take it in isolation but one element of a wider issue. This was not just the Council's or police's job but for members of the public to report which would be investigated and support offered.

Question 2 - Supporting Candidates and Councillors with Disabilities:

The Leader may be aware that the period from 22nd November to 22nd December is designated Disability History Month.

During this month we are asked celebrate the lives and achievements of disabled people and encouraged to hold awareness raising activities about disability.

It will soon be apparent to Members opposite that disability issues will be a major focus for the Liberal Democrat Group at tonight's Council.

I am sure that the Leader will agree with me that it is proper that this Council reflects the make-up of the borough's population. It is important therefore that this Chamber includes Councillors with disabilities and that the Council's workforce is inclusive of disabled employees.

Not only is this the right thing to do, but it is also practical - for how otherwise will we as Councillors or Council Officers be aware of the needs and aspirations of disabled people and so be able to provide appropriate services and opportunities?

For my second question, I want to focus on the support provided to electors with disabilities who wish to become Councillors.

The Leader will be aware that the Local Government Association is working with the Government's Equalities Office on a pilot programme to encourage more disabled people to become Councillors.

This builds on the LGA's 'Be a Councillor' programme which encourages people from all walks of life to consider becoming a Councillor and this Government's excellent 'Access to Elected

Office for Disabled People Fund', which provides financial support to disabled people seeking elected office or when carrying out their duties once elected.



Oldham
Council

I am also conscious that this Council Chamber will eventually be refurbished to make it 'fit for purpose' for the 21st Century. I hope that this refurbishment will be undertaken with the needs of people with disabilities in mind.

Can the Leader please tell me what this Council is doing to encourage disabled people to come forward as candidates for election in 2015 and beyond, what support will be available to those candidates if elected, and what steps are being taken to ensure that this Chamber when refurbished will meet the needs of Councillors with disabilities?

Councillor McMahon, Leader of the Council, acknowledged that the facilities were not fit for purpose and it was important to do something. On a broader level, when approached, the Council does do its best to be as accessible for those who want to be a candidate and when elected make it as easy as possible. Promotion needs to be done with access funding in place for improvements. The LGA and Home Office were trying to get funding in place. This was an area where Scrutiny could add value and suggested that Scrutiny be asked to come forward where improvements could be made.

Question 3 – Laughing Gas is Latest Legal High

Nitrous Oxide, or laughing gas, is the latest in a long line of 'legal highs' that can be purchased from corner shops and street vendors.

Commonly used as an anaesthetic in dentistry and in surgical procedures, it is now estimated that some 200,000 people use laughing gas 'recreationally' across the UK.

It can give users a feeling of euphoria, but it can also lead to lower blood pressure, anaemia, fainting, heart attacks and poisoning of the nervous system.

That is of course why in medical environments its use is limited to pain relief and supervised by trained personnel.

Last month, Manchester University banned students from using 'laughing gas' on university property and Manchester City Council has also voted to toughen its stance on the sale of such gas, with money from the public health budget is being used to raise public awareness of the dangers of its use.

And in Taunton, Somerset, Council business tenants are to be banned from selling "legal highs" over the counter.

Can the Leader please tell me tonight whether this Council is prepared to follow the lead shown by Manchester and Taunton?

And how is this Council working with the Police and other partners to combat other 'legal highs'?



Oldham
Council

Councillor McMahon acknowledged the issue and would need to get back following consultation with Health and Wellbeing. The LGA through work with authorities began work on the danger of the gas back in August and had a toolkit ready for adoption.

The Leader of the Conservative Group, Councillor Hudson, put the following question to the Leader:

Councillor Hudson referred to the upcoming upgrade to Greenfield Station and the disruption which would be caused due to the works being taken on a main thoroughfare to Saddleworth which is a big tourist centre and has been promoted as such. He requested that to members be kept informed and that colleagues in Manchester get as much local knowledge and expertise in order to create the least chaos. It is necessary to upgrade the railway and lift the height of the bridge, but he raised the issue of traffic, deliveries and ambulances and asked that TfGMC were aware of the difficulty of alternative routes.

Councillor McMahon responded that Councillor Hibbert has been involved in discussions. The works were being completed under an Act of Parliament, the Council would have to be consulted as the Highway Authority and would ensure that local members are informed.

The Leader of the UKIP Group, Councillor Peter Klonowski, put the following question to the Leader:

Councillor Klonowski referred to a recent incident regarding a parking ticket given to a disabled user in the Town Centre. He has since been made aware of other similar incidents in the town centre and asked if people had been dealt with fairly.

Councillor McMahon responded that it was difficult to comments on individual and as to why the ticket was issued. A system was in place for appeals and if the tickets were issued incorrectly this is addressed. There are users who do not display the ticket correct but the Council does strive for fairness.

Members raised the following questions:

1. Councillor Sedgwick to Councillor Stretton

"I am sure that all Councillors wish to see blue badges issued to and used appropriately by people with disabilities.

Blue badge fraud prosecutions have doubled in three years.

There were 686 successful council prosecutions in 2013 - up from 330 in 2010 as councils cracked down on offenders.

Manchester City Council has a 100% conviction rate with more than 500 prosecutions in the past five years while Stoke-on-Trent City Council, Plymouth Council and Hull City Council recently secured their first prosecutions against fraudsters.

Can the Cabinet Member please tell Council what action is being taken on this matter and the most recent figures for convictions locally?"



Oldham
Council

Councillor Stretton, Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Town Centres, Culture and Tourism gave the following response:

"At the present time the Civil Enforcement Officers are not actively involved in gathering evidence to enable the Council to take forward prosecutions.

Parking Services were actively involved between 2009 and 2012 when we had one Civil Enforcement Officer dedicated to Disabled Badge Fraud. Unfortunately this process came to an end in 2012 due to the financial pressures on the budget as the Civil Enforcement Officer was needed to fulfil the duties within the enforcement contract.

The Internal Audit and Counter Fraud Team continue to investigate cases where alleged blue badge misuse has taken place. Over the past 12 months the team have only received 4 allegations; cautioning 2 blue badge holders for abusing the scheme. A further case is currently being worked on jointly with the Department for Work and Pensions as Welfare Benefit Fraud is also alleged.

Also as part of the Audit Commissions National Fraud Initiative a total of 81 Blue Badges were returned to the authority as the badge holder had passed away. This exercise is completed every 2 years by the Internal Audit and Counter Fraud Team. The next data match is due in February 2015.

In regards to the Council's named in the question they are very successful in finding and prosecuting those individuals who use disabled badges illegally. Manchester and Liverpool both pay for a Police Officer to accompany their Officers when gathering evidence. In the context of the scale of financial cuts we have to make this cannot be justified at the moment."

2. Councillor Blyth to Councillor Akhtar

"This Council will recall that when the Remploy factory in Bardsley was about to close, a £50,000 loan was made to support the establishment of a new facility to manufacture UpVC windows and doors in Shaw.

This facility called the 4Ds creditably took on some of the former Remploy workers with disabilities.

Can the Cabinet Member please tell me whether this Council has since awarded any contracts to the 4Ds for the supply of windows and doors and if the Council has also actively promoted this facility to social housing providers, commercial

housing builders, colleges, the NHS and the like as a supplier of windows and doors?”

Councillor Akhtar, Cabinet Member for Employment and Enterprise gave the following response:

“We have researched this supplier and can confirm that we have not commissioned any works via this supplier either from the Council or via Unity Partnership and there were not payments or orders made on the system.

4Ds were made aware of opportunities through the Chest and Construction Framework. It was not appropriate for the Council to promote any particular business over others. When Remploy was closed by the Coalition Government, 4Ds they lost contracts were unable to win any back.”

3. Councillor Williamson to Councillor Harrison

“It is estimated that 10% of young people are struggling with a mental health problem.

I understand that groups offering mental health support to children and young people in England are now eligible to bid for government top-up funds worth up to £750,000 from the £25m Voluntary and Community Sector Grants fund.

Can the Cabinet Member please tell me if this Council has supported any such group to make an application for a grant?

I also understand that the Government is in the process of establishing a child mental health taskforce.

Can the Cabinet Member please advise me if this Council will be able to have some input into the work of this taskforce and how?”

Councillor Harrison, Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Public Health gave the following response:

“In Oldham, we take the issue of young people’s mental and emotional health very seriously and have recently established the multi - agency Emotional Wellbeing and Mental Health partnership to establish a joint approach across agencies particularly the Council and the Clinical Commissioning Group. In regards to the grants fund we have liaised with one local provider organisation which has submitted a bid focussing on improving attachment between parents and infants as this has a significant bearing on a child’s health and wellbeing in later life. The Government’s child mental health taskforce has already undertaken a consultation exercise to which Council commissioning staff contributed, feeding back local experiences and suggested ways in which the offer to young people can be

improved. We will ensure Oldham is represented in any further opportunities to inform the work of the taskforce.

Council officers have been working closely with young people in identifying how local services can be improved and the Youth Council have recently been successful in a grant application to the CCG for funds to enable the Young Minds organisation to deliver mental health training to professionals working with young people”

RESOLVED that the questions raised and the responses to those questions be noted.

13

TO NOTE THE MINUTES OF THE MEETINGS OF THE CABINET HELD ON THE UNDERMENTIONED DATES, INCLUDING THE ATTACHED LIST OF URGENT KEY DECISIONS TAKEN SINCE THE LAST MEETING OF THE COUNCIL, AND TO RECEIVE ANY QUESTIONS OR OBSERVATIONS ON ANY ITEMS WITHIN THE MINUTES FROM MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL WHO ARE NOT MEMBERS OF THE CABINET, AND RECEIVE RESPONSES FROM CABINET MEMBERS

The Cabinet Minutes for the meeting held on 20th October 2014 and the Draft Cabinet Minutes from the meeting held on 8th December 2014 were submitted. The Urgent Key Decisions from 24th February 2014 to 20th October 2014 were also submitted. The Mayor reminded the meeting that, as previously agreed by Council, the last eight minutes of this section would be reserved for observations on responses received and responses to observations.

RESOLVED that:

1. The minutes of the Cabinet meetings held on 20th October 2014 and 8th December 2014 be noted.
2. The Urgent Key Decisions from 24th February 2014 to 20th October 2014 be noted.

14

NOTICE OF ADMINISTRATION BUSINESS

The Mayor advised that there were no items of Administration Business received.

15

NOTICE OF OPPOSITION BUSINESS

Motion 1

Councillor McCann MOVED and Councillor Murphy SECONDED:

“This Council recognises that a significant number of disabled residents and carers of this borough wish to secure appropriate employment.

As a Council, we are committed to supporting them in this ambition as part of our aspiration to Get Oldham Working.

Many people with disabilities or long-term ill-health have conditions which fluctuate in intensity on a day-by-day basis and many carers care for loved ones with similar conditions. Traditionally employment is offered on the basis of a set number of hours on a set number of days each week.

This means that where such individuals are seeking employment they do so at a significant disadvantage to able-bodied applicants as they may find it impossible to commit to a regular pattern of work.

Some employers are however open to employing workers on the basis of flexible attendance.

Council recognises that identifying those local employers who are able to offer suitable employment opportunities on this basis to candidates with disabilities or with caring responsibilities will:

- advance our corporate goal to Get Oldham Working and
- help create more-inclusive local workforces that harness the talent and commitment of disabled people and carers

This Council therefore resolves to:

- Establish a register for disabled persons and carers wishing to secure flexible employment with local employers
- Contact those employers who have pledged to support Get Oldham Working to identify those who are willing to offer future opportunities on this basis
- Provide a service to match suitable applicants from the register to suitable opportunities advertised by employers
- Promote such a Flex-Ability scheme, and the Access to Work support available through the Department of Work and Pensions, widely to prospective applicants and employers, especially through the Council webpages

It was **MOVED** that the Motion be put to the vote and was **CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**.

Councillor McCann exercised his right of reply.

On being put the vote the Motion was **CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**.

RESOLVED that:

- a register for disabled persons and carers wishing to secure flexible employment with local employers be established.
- those employers who have pledged to support Get Oldham Working to identify those who are willing to offer future opportunities on this basis be contacted.

- a service to match suitable applicants from the register to suitable opportunities advertised by employers be provided.
- such a Flex-Ability scheme, and the Access to Work support available through the Department of Work and Pensions, widely to prospective applicants and employers, especially through the Council webpages be promoted.

Motion 2

Councillor Sykes MOVED and Councillor Blyth SECONDED:

Disability hate crime is defined by the Crown Prosecution Service and the Association of Chief Police Officers as being – ‘Any criminal offence which is perceived by the victim, or any other person, to be motivated by hostility or prejudice based on a person’s disability or perceived disability’

Disability hate crime comprises verbal abuse, harassment, damage to the property of a person because of their disability, and, in three in ten cases, a physical assault.

Council notes that

- there is much general hostility toward disabled people, some of which is whipped up by sensational and vindictive media reporting and by intemperate and ill-advised comments by politicians and candidates.
- despite an overall rise of over 1,000 in convictions for other forms of hate crime in 2013/14, disappointingly the number of disability hate crime convictions fell over the year from 494 to 470.
- there has been good work carried out by the Police, the Association of Chief Police Officers, the Crown Prosecution Service, and the Disability Hate Crime Network, but the Director of Public Prosecutions acknowledged ‘that there is more to do, especially around disability hate crime’.

Council resolves to:

- Ask Overview and Scrutiny Committee to:
 - convene a special hearing to investigate, with disability advocacy groups, the prevalence of this type of crime in Oldham and what can be done locally through a multi-agency approach to prevent it and what can be done to bring about criminal prosecutions
 - bring a report back to full Council as soon as practicable.
- Support the Disability Hate Crime Network, an umbrella body that promotes the reporting of disability hate crimes and supports the work of the Police in bringing prosecutions.
- Support Mencap’s ‘Stand by Me’ campaign to help stop hate crime against people with a learning disability.
- Ask the Chief Executive to write to the Justice Minister, the Rt. Hon. Simon Hughes MP, and Director of Public Prosecutions, Alison Saunders, urging them to:

- redouble their efforts to prosecute offenders
 - consider introducing new legislation for England and Wales which mirrors that which already exists in Scotland (the Offences (Aggravation by Prejudice) (Scotland) Act 2009)
 - provide magistrates with appropriate training so that they are aware of the extra sentencing powers they have to deal with disability hate crime offences.
- Ask the Chief Executive to write to the Police and Crime Commissioner Tony Lloyd urging him to:
- ensure the prosecution of perpetrators of disability hate crime is given equal prominence to the prosecution of those committing other hate crimes
 - ensure that reporting procedures allow for British sign language and appropriate formats for those with learning difficulties
- Ask the Cabinet Member for Education and Safeguarding, Cllr Amanda Chadderton, to promote the materials published by the Crown Prosecution Service to support the delivery of the Disability Hate Crime Schools Project in local schools and academies
- Ask the Cabinet Member for Corporate Support, Cllr Abdul Jabbar, to review the existing support mechanisms for employees who become victims of disability hate crime to ensure that these model best practice.

Councillor Chadderton spoke in support of the motion.

Councillor Heffernan spoke in support of the motion.

Councillor Sykes exercised his right of reply.

On being put the vote the Motion was CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

RESOLVED that:

- Overview and Scrutiny Committee be asked to:
- convene a special hearing to investigate, with disability advocacy groups, the prevalence of this type of crime in Oldham and what can be done locally through a multi-agency approach to prevent it and what can be done to bring about criminal prosecutions
 - bring a report back to full Council as soon as practicable.
- the Disability Hate Crime Network, an umbrella body that promotes the reporting of disability hate crimes and supports the work of the Police in bringing prosecutions be supported.

- Mencap's 'Stand by Me' campaign to help stop hate crime against people with a learning disability be supported.
- the Chief Executive be asked to write to the Justice Minister, the Rt. Hon. Simon Hughes MP, and Director of Public Prosecutions, Alison Saunders, urging them to:
 - redouble their efforts to prosecute offenders
 - consider introducing new legislation for England and Wales which mirrors that which already exists in Scotland (the Offences (Aggravation by Prejudice) (Scotland) Act 2009)
 - provide magistrates with appropriate training so that they are aware of the extra sentencing powers they have to deal with disability hate crime offences.
- the Chief Executive be asked to write to the Police and Crime Commissioner Tony Lloyd urging him to:
 - ensure the prosecution of perpetrators of disability hate crime is given equal prominence to the prosecution of those committing other hate crimes
 - ensure that reporting procedures allow for British sign language and appropriate formats for those with learning difficulties
- the Cabinet Member for Education and Safeguarding, Cllr Amanda Chadderton, be asked to promote the materials published by the Crown Prosecution Service to support the delivery of the Disability Hate Crime Schools Project in local schools and academies
- the Cabinet Member for Corporate Support, Cllr Abdul Jabbar, be asked to review the existing support mechanisms for employees who become victims of disability hate crime to ensure that these model best practice.

Motion 3

It was MOVED by Councillor Heffernan that this item of business be WITHDRAWN. The Motion had been CARRIED under Outstanding Business.

Motion 4

Councillor Klonowski MOVED and Councillor Bates SECONDED

“In order to make a contribution to the £60 million savings required, Council should reduce all Councillors’ allowances and special responsibility payments by 50% with immediate effect. The savings made will all be used to protect jobs within the Council workforce.”

Councillor Klonowski exercised his right of reply.

On being put to the vote TWO VOTES were cast IN FAVOUR of the MOTION with FIFTY THREE VOTES were cast AGAINST and NO ABSTENTIONS. The MOTION was therefore LOST.



- 16 (a) To note the Minutes of the following Joint Authority meetings and the relevant spokespersons to respond to questions from Members

To note the Minutes of the following Joint Authority meetings and the relevant spokespersons to respond to questions from Members

Minutes of the Joint Authorities were submitted as follows:

Transport for Greater Manchester	12 th September 2014
Greater Manchester Fire and Rescue Authority	4 th September 2014 16 th October 2014
Greater Manchester Combined Authority	26 th September 2014 31 st October 2014 3 rd November 2014
Joint GMCA/AGMA Executive	26 th September 2014 31 st October 2014
Greater Manchester Waste Disposal Authority	3 rd October 2014
Police and Crime Panel	29 th August 2014

RESOLVED that the minutes of the Joint Authorities as detailed in the report be noted.

- 16 (b) To note the Minutes of the following Partnership meetings and the relevant spokespersons to respond to questions from Members

To note the Minutes of the following Partnership meetings and the relevant spokespersons to respond to questions from Members

Minutes of the Partnerships Meetings were submitted as follows:

Unity Partnership Board	3 rd September 2014
Health and Wellbeing Board	9 th September 2014
Oldham Care and Support Company	18 th September 2014

RESOLVED that the minutes of the Partnerships as detailed in the report be noted.

17

COUNCIL TAX REDUCTION SCHEME 2015/16

Consideration was given for the approval of the Council Tax Reduction Scheme 2015/16. Legislation as detailed in the Local Government Finance Act 2012 placed a requirement that each year a Collection Authority must formally consider revising its Council Tax Reduction Scheme.

Before any revision, legislation requires consultation be undertaken. Consultation was undertaken between 25th July 2014 and 30th September on two options which were to leave

the current Council Tax Reduction Scheme unchanged from 2015 onwards to increase the level of Council Tax Reduction should the financial position of the Council be able to support the change. The current scheme had been in place since 1st April 2014.

RESOLVED that:

1. Option 2 be agreed and the Council implement a Council Tax Reduction Scheme from 1st April 2015 for all applicants of working age which would:
 - Increase the maximum amount of reduction available to 85% of a Band A rate of Council Tax.
 - Maintain other changes introduced in the 2014/15 Oldham Council Tax Reduction Scheme.
2. The scheme at Appendix 2 of the report would be subject to any changes resulting from prescribed requirements issued by the Secretary of State under paragraph 2(8) of Schedule 1A of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 and any changes from time to time to the figures prescribed by central government for welfare benefit purposes.

18

LICENSING ACT 2003 - REVIEW OF STATEMENT OF LICENSING POLICY

Consideration was given to a report which outlined the revised Statement of Licensing Policy. The Licensing Act 2003 requires that licensing authorities prepare and publish a statement of its Licensing Policy every five years. The policy must be kept under review.

The Council adopted the current Statement of Licensing Policy on 15th December 2010. Since coming into effect a number of substantial changes to the Licensing Act 2003 which included deregulation of some “regulated entertainment”, the introduction of powers to introduce Early Morning Restriction Order, and/or a Late Night Levy and the introduction of “Public Health” as a responsible authority.

RESOLVED that the revised Statement of Licensing Policy be approved.

19

CIVIC APPRECIATION NOMINATION

Consideration was given to a report of the Chief Executive which sought approval of the nomination to receive the Civic Appreciation Award in recognition of outstanding services and dedication to the Borough of Oldham. Group Leaders have recommended Mr. Dave McGealey be nominated to receive this award.

RESOLVED that:

1. Dave McGealey be the agreed nomination to receive the Civic Appreciation Award for 2015.
2. the ceremony for the award will take place at the Council meeting on 4th February 2015.

20

LAND AND PROPERTY PROTOCOL AMENDMENT

Consideration was given to a report which sought approval for the amendment to the Land and Property Protocols to improve the Council's decision making process. It was proposed to change the wording in cases of disposal at less than best consideration to:

- where the undervalue is below 80% by the Corporate Property Officer or the Director of Development and Infrastructure in the case of strategic regeneration projects, subject to consultation with the Executive Director Commercial Services or Chief Executive respectively.
- Where the undervalue is greater than 80% or above, by Cabinet, unless this is £50K or less in which case it will be delegated to the Cabinet Member for Finance and Human Resources, in consultation with the Corporate Property Officer for the corporate estate or the Leader, in consultation with the Director of Development and Infrastructure, for strategic regeneration projects.

RESOLVED that the Land and Property Protocols be amended as detailed within the report.

21

POLLING DISTRICT AND POLLING PLACE REVIEW 2014

Consideration was given to a report of the Borough Solicitor which presented proposals on polling arrangements as a result of the review of Polling Districts, Polling Places and Polling Stations.

The Electoral Registration and Administration Act 2013 required the Council to undertake regular reviews of all polling districts and polling places in its area. Subsequent reviews must be every five years within a sixteen month period beginning with 1st October 2018.

The report outlined proposed changes to polling districts and polling places which incorporate recommendations in respect of Chadderton North, Failsworth West, Hollinwood, Royton South, St. James and Waterhead. There was to be one minor amendment to Waterhead Polling District 8 with all even numbers on Clarksfield Road to be included.

RESOLVED that:

1. the proposals made to polling districts and polling places and the polling district review incorporating any changes considered appropriate be approved.

2. the Chief Executive be authorised as Returning Officer in consultation with the Group Leaders to identify an alternative polling station, if necessary, for any other polling stations unavailable on the date of the election.
3. the Waterhead Ward Polling District 8 be amended to include all even house numbers on Clarksfield Road.



22

UPDATE ON ACTIONS FROM COUNCIL

Consideration was given to a report of the Borough Solicitor informing members of actions that had been taken following previous Council meetings and providing feedback on other issues raised at the meeting.

RESOLVED that the report be noted.

The meeting started at 6.00 pm and ended at 9.28 pm