

Present: The Mayor – Councillor Heffernan (Chair)

Councillors Ahmad, Akhtar, Ali, Azad, Ball, M Bashforth, S Bashforth, Bates, Blyth, Briggs, Brownridge, Chadderton, Chauhan, Cosgrove, Dean, Dearden, Fielding, Garry, Gloster, Goodwin, Haque, Harkness, Harrison, Hewitt, Hudson, A Hussain, F Hussain, Jabbar, Jacques, Kirkham, Klonowski, J Larkin, McCann, McLaren, Moores, Murphy, Mushtaq, Price, Qumer, Rehman, Roberts, Salamat, Sheldon, Shuttleworth, Stretton, Sykes, Toor, Turner, Ur-Rehman, Williamson, Williams and Wrigglesworth

1 **CIVIC APPRECIATION AWARD**

The Mayor opened the meeting by offering his, along with his fellow Councillors sympathies, to those who had lost their lives or were injured in the attack on Westminster on 22nd March 2017.

Council held a minute's silence.

A presentation took place for Mr. Dave Benstead in recognition of his outstanding service and dedication to Oldham.

Councillors Stretton and Sykes gave congratulatory speeches to Mr. Benstead.

Mr. Benstead was then presented with his award and made a short acceptance speech to the Council.

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

The Mayor advised the meeting that the next 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 screens in the Council Chamber.

The following questions had been submitted:

1. Question received from Chris Ackroyd via email:

“Could Oldham Council tell me why the Crompton UDC chain is locked in a safe in Shaw Parish Council Offices and has been for a number of years, instead it should be reunited with its medallion counterpart displayed at the civic centre - surely this valuable part of history should be in a safe, secure facility displayed for future generations.

Will Council Officials instruct Shaw Parish Council to return it where it rightfully belongs.”



Councillor Stretton, Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Economy and Enterprise responded that the Urban District Chain was originally loaned to Shaw and Crompton Parish Council whilst arrangements were made for the Parish Council to attain their own. This year was the 30th anniversary of the formation of the Shaw and Crompton Parish and it was expected that the chain would be returned to the Civic Centre as part of the celebrations. Initial discussions had taken place between the Mayor's Office and the Parish Clerk. The Mayor would formally write to the Parish Chairman. The chain would be displayed with the other Urban District Council Chains in the heritage display cabinets at the Civic Centre.

2. Two similar questions were received regarding First Choice Homes Oldham.

Question received Mr. Stewart via email:

“Why are recently introduced Service Charges by FCHO being paid for by Housing Benefit? These Service Charges are not in my Tenancy Agreement so there is no legal, contractual obligation (confirmed by a Contract Lawyer) on the part of the council to spend public money to bail out FCHO incompetence and mismanagement. Doing so would mean mismanagement of public funds by the council.” And

Question received from Shaun McGrath via email:

“Why to date, some six months since FCHO tenants began their campaign against the new service charges, has not one single councillor made a public statement on FCHO breaking contract law?”

Councillor Brownridge, Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods and Cooperatives responded to both questions. First Choice Homes Oldham (FCHO) could (after consultation with affected tenants) increase, add, alter, reduce or remove any services for which a charge or charges for such services was paid or introduced a new service and charge for it. Therefore, there had not been a breach of any tenancy agreement or contracts. First Choice Homes Oldham and Oldham Council before the stock transfer levied service charges for many years for services such as communal heating, communal TV aerials, concierges and housing support services. In the 2010 Stock Transfer Offer Document, the Council made a five year rent promise that FCHO would only increase rents in line with Government policy and guidelines and that no new service agreements would be introduced for existing services without customer agreement. The five

year rent promise in the Stock Transfer Offer Document had expired in February 2016 and Oldham Council ensured that this promise had been fully adhered to. The Government's decision to reduce independent housing association rents like FCHO by 1% per annum for four consecutive years meant that in real terms FCHO had to find £3.5m of efficiency savings per annum and could no longer afford the provision of additional services free of charge. FCHO had confirmed that they had consulted with all affected tenants and Oldham Housing Benefits service prior to the introduction of the service charges to ensure all the proposed charges were eligible for Housing Benefit. If an individual FCHO customer qualified due to their low income, then the service charge would be paid by Housing Benefit.

FCHO are an independent registered housing provider, with rent and service charge setting for FCHO assets and therefore no longer under the control of Oldham Council. As a registered provider, FCHO was fully regulated by the Home and Communities Agency (HCA) who were responsible for ensuring that FCHO fully complied with the law.

3. Question asked by Noel Mahon:

"I represent an Oldham Community Group named "Save Royton's Greenbelt". We currently have a membership in excess of two thousand, three hundred concerned local residents. We have an association with similar community groups in Shaw and Chadderton that have memberships in excess of a further 2000 local residents between them. Our common aim is to oppose the GMSF proposals to build on Oldham's precious Greenbelt land. Furthermore, whilst we appreciate that further housing may be required to be provided within the Oldham Borough, we feel it is disproportionate to expect Royton, Shaw and Chadderton to bear the bulk of this proposed future housing allocation.

As the leader of Oldham Council, can you reassure the residents of Oldham that, regardless of any possible revision of the GMSF Draft Plan, OMBC will adopt a Policy of Brownfield First. By adopting this policy, Oldham Council would endeavour to proactively source brownfield sites as alternatives to building on registered greenbelt sites within the borough and not consider building on any greenbelt until all potential brownfield alternatives Boroughwide have been exhausted?"

Councillor Stretton, Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Economy and Enterprise, confirmed that in line with the Government's recent Housing White Paper, the Council would only amend Green Belt Boundaries when all other reasonable options had been exhausted.

These options included:

- Brownfield sites;
- Estate regeneration;

- Underused and surplus public sector land;
- Optimising density; and
- Exploration whether other local authorities could help meet identified needs.

However, at this point, the Borough's housing and employment land needs could not be met as legally required, then the Council would have no choice but to consider release of Green Belt to ensure that future generations had the quality housing and jobs needed to thrive.

4. Question received from Melanie Platt via email:

"What is the total global gross interest amount which the council expects to pay in the next financial year? I would like this figure to be the total and not to include any offsets or write downs from interest earned from other sources (given this is a global figure there should be no conflict of interest or commercial sensitivities)."

Councillor Jabbar, Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Finance and Human Resources, responded that the gross interest payable on outstanding debt (excluding any offsets or write-downs) was approximately £29.5m per annum of which £7.7m was interest payable direct to lenders such as the Public Works Loan Board and £21.8m was interest payable related to PFI projects that the Council had entered into.

5. Question received from Mrs. C. Birtles via email:

"I would like to ask why in the St Mary's ward we have 3 labour councillors and not a single one holds a surgery or any public meeting I can see. There are no activities organised unlike Councillor Ginny Alexandra ward that hold job clubs life long learning advice centre for all community. How can the councillors in St Marys ward represent the ward when they have no contact except by email with the people they are supposed to represent. With this kind of representation the Labour party will soon lose the trust of the people of Oldham, or do they think government by email is acceptable?"

Councillor Brownridge, Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods and Cooperatives responded with the correction that the St. Mary's ward was represented by two Labour and one independent member. In terms of contact with the public, the Council's approach was to allow each member to choose the method most appropriate for the communities they served. In some cases, this was to hold regular surgeries. However, this worked in some areas, but members had found that such surgeries were poorly attended in their ward. St. Mary's ward members made themselves available by telephone and email and were happy to make arrangements to

meet with residents when requested. The contact details for all Councillors were available via the Council's website. In addition, the Councillors in question attended public meetings by invitation or arranged meetings in order for specific concerns to local people to be addressed. St. Mary's ward councillors had used their local budget to support delivery of activities such as counselling services and the Citizen's Advice Bureau from the NEON Community Hub at Holt Street. This location was central to the St. James', St. Mary's and Waterhead Wards and delivered support to nearby residents of those areas. For those parts of the St. Mary's ward close to the town centre, this type of support was centrally provided. More broadly, and in line with other wards, the St. Mary's ward councillors had supported numerous local groups this year such as the Higginshaw Rugby Club, the Ghazali Trust and Holy Cross Primary School to deliver activities for their communities.

6. Question received from Louie Hamblett via email:

"With the recent opening of the second city crossing, both services that either pass through or start at Shaw and Crompton terminate at the same location (East Didsbury). This means that all passengers heading into Manchester have to change at Victoria or St Peters Sq .

Would it not be better for Metrolink customers to have one service going to East Didsbury (via Exchange Square) and the other terminating at Ashton (via Piccadilly), and so connecting the vital link to a mainline station for passengers to travel from?

I conclude by asking members of this Council

Would they agree with myself that this is an inefficient and poorly planned service for Oldham?

Would they join me in imploring TFGM to rethink the Rochdale line plan to help it become a more efficient, reliable and cost-worthy service for the residents of Oldham that I know it has been and can be."

Councillor F. Hussain, Cabinet Member for Environmental Services responded the routing patterns that were introduced as part of the opening of the Second City Crossing may change when a new operator takes over the Metrolink Service this summer. Oldham Council was already in discussion with Transport for Greater Manchester regarding the routing of Oldham Metrolink services with a view to changing routes to give Oldham residents more choice of destinations, including a direct link to Manchester Piccadilly Rail Station. A number of representations had been made on the issue to Metrolink service planners in recent months which had resulted in TfGM agreeing to look at alternatives for the Rochdale/Oldham line. The outcome of this work would be reported to the Greater Manchester Combined Authority and it would ultimately be a decision for the ten

Greater Manchester Council Leaders to agree the final routing pattern for when the new operator of the Metrolink took over this summer. The Council would continue to work with TfGM to secure an outcome over the coming weeks.



At this point in the meeting, the Mayor advised that the time limit for this item had expired.

The Mayor reminded Members that the Council had previously agreed that questions would be taken in an order which reflected the political balance of the Council. The following questions were submitted by Councillors on Ward or District matters:

1. Councillor Toor asked the following question:

“With the anticipated increase in housing within Medlock Vale & across West Oldham, would the Cabinet Member for Education and Early Years advise what are Oldham Council’s plans to meet this extra demand for schooling?”

Councillor Chadderton, Cabinet Member for Education and Early Years responded that Northmoor Academy had opened as a result of pupil projections and demand in the West Oldham area. Projections were reviewed on a 12 monthly basis. If there were any changes, members would be made aware.

2. Councillor Ball asked the following question:

“Could the relevant cabinet member please give me an update on the progress towards Persimmon signing the agreement regarding the Northgate Estate, Moorside?”

Councillor Brownridge, Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods and Cooperatives, responded that on investigation of the land ownership details for the purposes of the Section 38 agreement, it appeared that a small area of the highway was in unknown ownership. The Council were therefore amending the Section 38 Agreement to deal with the problem.

3. Councillor M. Bashforth asked the following question:

“Further to the council serving notice to clear the site in February, can the relevant cabinet member please give an update on the current situation with regard to the derelict building which at one time housed the ‘Sofa Company’ on Holden Fold Lane in Royton and can residents and ward members be assured of the continued support of the cabinet member and council officers in ensuring the notice is enforced and the safety of this site and local residents is ensured?”

Councillor Brownridge, Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods and Cooperatives confirmed that Environmental Health officers had served a legal notice on the owner of the building and asked for the building to be demolished. The notice would expire on 25th March 2017 and the owner had recently contacted the Planning Department to explore options for the site going forward.

4. Councillor Harkness asked the following question:

“The result of the Judicial Review by Mr. Justice Kerr relating to Saddleworth School, whilst dismissing most of the objectors’ claims, now causes further delays on a project where a new school should have occupied for the preferred site for quite some time.

The Manchester Evening News and Oldham Chronicle reported that “The Court heard the Council accepted that redeveloping the school on its existing site, whilst a more expensive option, would be ‘viable and affordable’.

The implication of this statement being that the Education Funding Agency would provide even more funding to cover the significant costs of building in Uppermill and presumably financially supporting the decant of students to alternative accommodation during the process.

This contradicts every single briefing I and my colleagues have ever received from Oldham Council and others.

Would the cabinet member please clarify the situation? If the accusations are true, then will she agree to a full investigation and disciplinary action and, if they are false, agree that the local media reports of this nature are irresponsible and misleading?

I am more than willing to work with the cabinet member to ensure that we get a new school for Saddleworth, something some others seem set against.”

Councillor Chadderton, Cabinet Member for Education and Early Years, responded that the issue was still ongoing. Councillor Chadderton expressed her thanks to the Liberal Democrat Group in the Saddleworth area for their support. The reasonable majority were being drowned out by a vocal minority. Officers had met with the Education Funding Agency and the DfE since the Judicial Review and the current position remained the same. Diggle was still the preferred site. A meeting had been held with the Headteacher, the Chair of Governors and a meeting was being arranged with the local group in favour of the school site. The reports in the residents’ group opposed to the site were misleading. The Council position had not changed and all parties remained committed to the project. Saddleworth children deserved a new school and to be taught in modern facilities if they were to excel. The commitment to bring a new school to Saddleworth was confirmed.

5. Councillor Jacques asked the following question:

“It was widely reported that the heavy downpours on the evening of Monday the 21st November caused flooding in parts of Saddleworth. However Saddleworth was not the only area to have been affected. Stannybrook Road in Failsworth was flooded so badly that the road was completely closed that evening. This caused inconvenience for residents and the popular Daisy Nook Garden Centre.

This was not the first time Stannybrook road has been affected in this way and so I would like to ask the relevant cabinet member what measures are the Council taking to try and reduce the risk of flooding in this area?”

Councillor F. Hussain, Cabinet Member for Environmental Services, responded that in recent years there had been unprecedented levels of intense rainfall, which had caused flooding issues not just locally but nationally as reported. Unfortunately, low lying areas near to riverbanks such as Stannybrook were now unfortunately more prone to flooding events, with water levels breaching previous defences – in this case parts of the road through Stannybrook. Unity Partnership’s Drainage and Highway Engineers were aware of the problem and were reviewing what practical options and defences could be afforded, mindful of the Council’s economic constraints. The Council’s Head of Strategic Facilities Management has made arrangements to visit the premises owner to discuss the matter and see what, if any, short-term measures could be considered.

6. Councillor Mushtaq asked the following question:

“Alexandra Ward councillors invested some of their budget in CCTV cameras to help combat fly tipping. Can the relevant Cabinet member tell us when we can expect to see them installed?”

Councillor Brownridge, Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods and Cooperatives confirmed that the Council had completed the tendering process and officers were addressing the important issues surrounding information security and governance prior to installation. One of the deployable cameras which had been purchased was being piloted in the Hathershaw area in a direct attempt to combat the problems associated with continuing flytipping. The result of the pilot would help structure how the cameras were used in the future.

7. Councillor Fielding asked the following question:

“Dog fouling in Failsworth has visibly increased in recent months and I have received a number of enquiries from concerned residents including the PTA at St. Mary’s Primary School. I have erected a number of ‘Love Where You Live’ signs in the worst locations but the impact of these is limited. Could the cabinet member responsible

investigate and advise whether there is anything more the Council could do centrally to tackle this problem through stiffer enforcement, a targeted communications campaign or otherwise?”

Councillor Brownridge, Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods and Cooperatives, sympathised with the gross problem for residents. Residents were encouraged to report details to focus enforcement officer patrols. Officers would be asked to give consideration to a communications campaign and installation of enforcement signage around the school.

8. Councillor Murphy asked the following question:

“Should Crompton House School staff and Governors agree to an almost 50% increase in pupil numbers - will Oldham Council as a partner at the earliest opportunity, before plans are submitted for planning permission, agree that a community involvement process (in other words a public consultation) takes place where residents will have the opportunity to comment?”

Councillor Chadderton, Cabinet Member for Education and Early Years responded that public consultation would take place as part of the planning process for the Crompton Housing Governing Body to increase the numbers to 1500.

9. Councillor McLaren asked the following question:

“The Block Lane residents Association have expressed some concern about the condition of the carriageway on Robinson Street. Would the appropriate cabinet member be able to advise on the date when the next inspection is due and whether there are any outstanding repairs still to be completed?”

Councillor F. Hussain, Cabinet Member for Environmental Services responded that Robinson Street was inspected annually with the last safety inspection carried out on 31st August 2016. A number of carriageway defects had been identified and repairs were completed on 20th September 2016. A missing street nameplate was also identified and this was replaced on 17th October 2016. There were no outstanding work orders for Robinson Street. The next scheduled inspection was due in August 2017.

10. Councillor Roberts asked the following question:

“At a recent meeting between the police and Royton North Guinness Partnership tenants there were numerous complaints about the poor responses from the 101 telephone service. Could the relevant Cabinet Member press the Police and Crime Commissioner to investigate and find a way of getting the 101 service

phones answered more quickly to enable residents to report crimes and have confidence in using this service?”



Oldham
Council

Councillor Brownridge, Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods and Cooperatives responded that a piece of work was being undertaken which explored a number of alternative pathways for contacting the police. A new website was being developed that would have an online reporting tool. There would also be information and advice available that would enable answers to be found to frequently asked questions through the 101 services. It was intended that this would reduce the demand on the 101 telephone service in order for people who did need to speak to someone to get through more quickly. The advice from Greater Manchester Police was that the 101 service was less busy at off peak times, therefore unless you needed the police to respond to an ongoing incident it would be better to contact them at a less busy time. Concerns were shared and the Community Safety Manager would raise the issue again at the Greater Manchester Police and Crime Leads meeting.

11. Councillor Garry asked the following question:

“Parking at the Lord Lane shopping parade is of significant concern to local residents in the area, there are simply too few spaces to meet demand. Meanwhile there is a large area of tarmaced open space adjacent to the post office which has become an informal car park for the area, though without markings the space is not used as efficiently as it could be. Could the cabinet member responsible investigate the ownership of this land and whether it would be possible to provide additional parking in the area at this location?”

Councillor Brownridge, Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods and Cooperatives responded that the land in question was not in Council ownership. Officer had made enquiries with the Land Registry and ascertained details of the registered owner who would be approached to explore the potential for the land to be used as a car park as suggested. There were likely to be costs if terms were agreed and an appropriate budget would need to be identified. Progress would be reported in due course.

12. Councillor Sheldon asked if consideration could be given to concerns around the junction on the A635 at the Royal George Hotel. This was the only junction where the roads had a speed restriction of 30 mph but increased to 40 mph just before the junction. He asked if the 40 mph signs could be removed for speed reduction and to make the junction safer.

Councillor Hussain, Cabinet Member for Environmental Services, agreed to the request.

13. Councillor Ali asked the following question:

“Residents of Chadderton North have recently been concerned with the increase in burglaries. In response Ward councillors have done a great deal of engagement with residents, in partnership with officers and police in providing useful advice in keeping their property safe. It is acknowledged there is still work to be done. Chadderton North is generally a safe area, were people aspire to live. The fact remains, residents are still concerned with the very low levels of prosecutions taking place.

I would like to know from the relevant cabinet member; if there is anything that can be done by the Council to deter and detect burglars or increase prosecution in the affected areas.”

Councillor Brownridge, Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods and Cooperatives responded that all nine elected members from the Chadderton District contributed to the Secure Homes Scheme which funded target hardening of properties. Since the scheme started in 2013, over 50 homes had received security improvements and this work continued. Visible security measures were a deterrent. It was also essential that residents did not leave themselves vulnerable to burglary by leaving doors and windows open. Successful prosecutions relied upon the evidence available to the Crown Prosecution Service. There were ongoing prosecutions and disruption work was taking place. There was regular information sharing between Community Safety and Police Officers from Oldham and Manchester for the identification of criminals who were coming into the borough to commit offences. Where offenders were identified, in addition to criminal prosecution, consideration would be given to the use of civil powers such as Criminal Behaviour Orders to control and disrupt criminality. Any person with information was asked to contact the police on 101 or Crimestoppers on 0800 555 111.

14. Councillor S. Bashforth asked the following question:

“The busy industrial estates on Salmon Fields, Moss Lane and the old gas works together with the large distribution depots in Shaw generate a constant stream of HGV traffic 24hrs a day down the stretch of Broadway from Elk Mill to Shaw Rd. End and beyond.

This causes continuing noise nuisance from the traffic in the late evening and early hours of the morning, mainly caused by these HGVs.

Following discussions with the residents and after looking at the data collected from recent speed/volume surveys we feel there are two options that should be considered.

- Extend the 30mph speed limit to fully include the entire length of the section of Broadway, from Shaw Road End to the Elk Mill roundabout.
- And secondly to move the existing speed camera from its current, ineffective location, to a position where it is much more likely to discourage speeding and catch those who do.

Will the relevant cabinet member support us to impress on Greater Manchester Drive safe how necessary this action is?”

Councillor F. Hussain, Cabinet Member for Environmental Services understood that a number of traffic and speed surveys had been undertaken on Broadway in response to local concerns about the alleged speed of, and vibrations caused by, HGV's along the road. The surveys' findings did not suggest that there was a particular issue with either speeding or excessive use, particularly regarding the nature and function of the existing road. Officers would be asked to examine a way forward to the concerns which had been raised.

15. Councillor Dean asked the following question:

“Could the Cabinet Member for Education, update me on issues that have received significant media interest about Clarksfield School Governing Body . These issues are creating great concern and distress to parents and the local community. And we hope the situation is resolved as early as possible.”

Councillor Chadderton, Cabinet Member for Education and Early Years responded that since the media report around perceived issues on Clarksfield the Council had been working closely with the Governing Body and the Headteacher over the last few months related to governance and this work continued. It was understood how media interest caused concern, but this had been unfair and not reflective of what had gone on in the school. A response had been sent to the local MP. Responses and an offer of a meeting had been sent to local ward councillors, but no response had yet been received from them.

16. Councillor Gloster asked the following question:

“My constituent has recently moved into a FCHO property at George Street Shaw. The rear garden, if that is what it can be described as, backs onto George Street Playing Fields. The garden itself could only be described as a boggy jungle and in no way represents a garden. FCHO have replaced a practically none existent fence and turned the jungle over with a machine, however this garden remains unusable as it is a waterlogged mud bath.

Representations to FCHO reveal that they are not prepared to put land drains into gardens unless the water is likely to have a structural effect upon the property. As a result, the two children of Ms Kennedy are unable to play in their own garden for reasons of health and safety. Can I ask the Cabinet Member how FCHO can justify letting properties where such Health and Safety issues exist, and when fully aware of these issues, are not prepared to rectify them, putting tenants at risk, and what can be done to remedy this situation.”

Councillor Brownridge, Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods and Cooperatives responded that she had raised the issue with First Choice Homes Oldham. The property was in a bad state when the tenant had moved in and completing work on the sloping and flooded garden had been exacerbated by bad weather. FCHO have said the issue would be escalated, a specialist drainage survey would be completed as soon as possible for a resolution on the ongoing problems as well as issues related to the slope of the garden. Councillor Brownridge had been assured that FCHO would keep Councillor Gloster and his constituent updated on progress.

At this point in the meeting, the Mayor advised that the time limit for this item had expired.

RESOLVED that the questions and responses provided by noted.

3 **TO RECEIVE APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors A. Alexander, G. Alexander, Ames, Brock, Iqbal, T. Larkin and Malik.

4 **TO ORDER THAT THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COUNCIL HELD ON 14TH DECEMBER 2016, EXTRAORDINARY MEETING 1ST MARCH 2017 AND BUDGET COUNCIL 1ST MARCH 2017 BE SIGNED AS A CORRECT RECORD**

RESOLVED that the minutes of the Council meetings held on 14th December 2016 and 1st March 2017 and the Extraordinary Council meeting held on 1st March 2017 be approved as a correct record.

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

In accordance with the Code of Conduct, elected members declared the following interests:

Councillor Sykes declared a personal interest at Item 16b by virtue of his appointment to the Unity Partnership Board.

Councillor McCann declared a personal interest at Item 16b by virtue of his appointment to the Unity Partnership Board, Unity Joint Venture Board, MioCare Board and the Pennine Acute Hospital NHS Trust Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

Councillor Stretton declared a personal interest at Item 16b by virtue of her appointment to the Unity Partnership Board.

Councillor Jabbar declared a personal interest at Item 16b by virtue of his appointment to the Unity Partnership Board.

Councillor Harrison declared a personal interest at Item 16b by virtue of her appointment to the MioCare Board.

Councillor Chauhan declared a personal interest at Item 16b by virtue of his appointment to the MioCare Board.

Councillor Dean declared a personal interest at Item 16b by virtue of his appointment to the Unity Partnership Board.

6 **TO DEAL WITH MATTERS WHICH THE MAYOR CONSIDERS TO BE URGENT BUSINESS**

There were no items of urgent business.

7 **TO RECEIVE COMMUNICATIONS RELATING TO THE BUSINESS OF THE COUNCIL**

There were no communications related to the business of Council.

8 **TO RECEIVE AND NOTE PETITIONS RECEIVED RELATING TO THE BUSINESS OF THE COUNCIL**

The Mayor advised that one petition had been received for noting by Council:

Economy, Skills and Neighbourhoods

'Stop the Three Week Bin Collection', e-petition received 30 December 2016 with 806 signatures (Ref: 2016-09).

RESOLVED that the petition received since the last meeting of the Council be noted.

9 **OUTSTANDING BUSINESS FROM THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

The Mayor informed the meeting that there was one item of outstanding business from the previous meeting.

Motion 1

Councillor McCann MOVED and Councillor Sykes SECONDED the following motion:

"This Council notes:

- The Government's stated commitment to encourage people with disabilities to return to paid employment

- The important role of railways in getting people to and from their places of work
- That, in contrast to Metrolink, disabled people still face difficulties in accessing some rail services
- The importance of the £102 million Department for Transport 'Access for All' programme in funding adaptations to railway stations to make them more accessible
- That around half of all of the 96 railway stations across Greater Manchester still require more work to make them accessible, including the only railway station in the borough, Greenfield Station

This Council notes with concern:

- Proposals within the recent Hendy Report to defer half of the 'Access for All' projects until the period 2019-24 meaning unacceptable delays in the adaptations to stations
- That any delay to the adaptation of a station means that rail services there will not be accessible to all which is contrary to UK equalities legislation

Council resolves to ask the Chief Executive to:

- Write to the relevant Secretary of State asking him to reject the proposed re-phasing of Access for All Projects and to instead, wherever possible, undertake more station adaptations at the current time.
- Write to the Chair of Transport for Greater Manchester Committee and the Lead member on the Greater Manchester Combined Authority for Transport Tony Lloyd urging them to reconsider how more funding can be made available to bring our region's railway stations up to the high accessibility standards of Metrolink."

Councillor McCann did not exercise his right of reply.

A vote was then taken on the MOTION.

On being put the VOTE, the MOTION was CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

RESOLVED that the Chief Executive be requested to:

1. Write to the relevant Secretary of State to ask him to reject the proposed re-phasing of Access for All Projects and to instead, wherever possible, undertake more station adaptations at the current time.
2. Write to the Chair of Transport for Greater Manchester Committee and the Lead Member on the Greater Manchester Combined Authority for Transport Tony Lloyd urging them to reconsider how more funding could be made available to bring our region's railway stations up to the high accessibility standards of Metrolink.

Consideration was given to a report of the Leader of the Council which set out the Administration's priorities for 2017-2019 inclusive.



From May 2011, the Administration had been working to ensure Oldham was a Co-operative Borough. Building on the co-operative principles, the early ambition for the Council was:

- Strong Local Democracy
- Co-operative Future for the Community
- A regenerated Oldham
- New way of delivering Council Services
- Reconnect with communities and residents.

In June 2014, these were endorsed and most continued as 'business as usual'. Significant progress had been made in areas as outlined in the report.

The report detailed updated priorities set out under five key themes which looked to the future and a Cabinet Member would be assigned to oversee each area.

The five themes were:

- Ambitious for Everyone
- A Borough of Opportunities
- A Good Place to Live
- Thriving Districts and Neighbourhoods
- A Healthier and Caring Borough

RESOLVED that the contents of the report be noted and the Administration's Priorities for 2017-19 inclusive be endorsed.

11 **YOUTH COUNCIL**

There were no items submitted by the Youth Council.

12 **LEADER AND CABINET QUESTION TIME**

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

Question 1:

"My first question tonight to the Leader relates to the recent fire at Maple Mill in Hathershaw.

My understanding is that the firefighters on attending the fire, found that the building was a huge repository for the illegal dumping of waste and that the combustible nature of these materials contributed to the longevity and severity of the blaze? Not only did this situation further jeopardise the lives of firefighters and other emergency service workers, as well as some of our own officers and staff from First Choice Homes Oldham, all courageously attending the incident, but there was the potential of toxic air pollution impacting on the lives and health of residents in the surrounding area.

My understanding is that the dumping of rubbish in Maple Mill was not a one-off and that there are reports of similar activity at many of the redundant industrial premises and old mills in our Borough.

Can the Leader please tell me what she knows about the extent of this problem and what is being done by our officers and those of other public agencies to stop it? And would she like to tell Council how members of the public – as our eyes and ears in our communities – can help this effort?

And can she also give me any estimate as to the potential cost to this local authority, or to the emergency services, from clear-up operations and attending to further incidents of this nature involving this blight?

I would have thought the bill could run into hundreds of thousands of pounds if this illegal practice is widespread as I believe it could be.”

Councillor Stretton, Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Economy and Enterprise responded that members, staff and agencies did an excellent job in responding to the incident. There had been concerns about air quality and interventions had been made related to residents and staff working in the area and issues dealt with in a dignified manner. The situation was more serious that a fire in a mill first appeared as events unfolded. There had been significant dumping at the mill. It had been discovered that the basement had been capped with concrete which had trapped methane gas. Methane was an industrial waste. Conversations had taken place with the Environment Agency as this was an environmental crime. An estimate of £100,000s was below the final cost. If members or residents were aware of incidents of illegal dumping anywhere they were requested to report it.

Question 2:

“My next question concerns the future of the Greater Manchester University Technical College building, which is on Middleton Road next to Oldham College. Members will be aware of the recent fiasco that was the wholesale academic under-performance at this expensive white elephant. Millions spent on a building and equipment and nothing to show for it, as not one of the initial cohort of forty six students achieved a Grade C in both English and Mathematics and the College is now scheduled for closure.

This is such a waste – such a waste of public money and such a waste of the promise and potential that these young students had – but with the College’s closure there must also be an opportunity. For Oldham College sits right next door to this soon abandoned building and Oldham College is crying out for more new quality buildings in which to deliver tuition.

So can I tonight through you, Mr. Mayor, make a plea to the Leader and to the Cabinet Member for Education that they make urgent representations to the key decision-makers in the Department for Education asking them to transfer this publically funded asset to Oldham College?

This must be common-sense? For at least then we will see something come out from this mess that will be of long-term benefit for the students of this Borough and a small vindication of the spending over £9 million pounds.”



Councillor Stretton, Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Economy and Enterprise responded that members would have said “told you so” on a number of certain free schools and academisations which was a direct result of fragmentation of education. The authority was responsible for the education of students. However, control over the institutions was being wrenched away. It was a shame that those young people who had graduated had not received a qualification. The Leader agreed to join in the representations to be made to transfer the asset to Oldham College.

Question from the Leader of the Conservative Party:

Councillor Hudson’s question requested an update on the replacement of Greenfield Primary School.

Councillor Stretton, Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Economy and Enterprise referred to page 75 of the Council Summons, Minutes of the Cabinet Meeting held on 27th February 2017, Item 6, Proposal to Expand Greenfield CP School – Public Notice and Statutory Consultation Responses. The planned expansion had been approved. The Cabinet Member for Education and Early Years would provide a written response to all Saddleworth Councillors.

The Mayor reminded the meeting that Council has agreed that, following the Leaders’ allocated questions, questions would be taken in an order which reflected the political balance of the Council.

1. Councillor Mushtaq asked the following question:

“Much of Alexandra Ward is in the Selective Licensing Scheme, Can the relevant cabinet member report on the impact that the scheme is having?”

Councillor Brownridge, Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods and Cooperatives confirmed that three distinctive selective licensing neighbourhoods were located within the ward and had become fully operational in a phased approach agreed by Cabinet. Each of the neighbourhoods were now in their second year of the five year scheme. In total, there were 2,263 properties that were part of the selective licensing scheme in the Alexandra ward and from this the team had already received over 300 applications for licenses from private landlords. Progress with the scheme across all eight neighbourhoods was recently reported to the Council’s Overview and Scrutiny Comment where the reporting regime on the impact of the scheme had been approved. It was agreed that the scheme would report at the end of

Year 2 and Year 4 for each neighbourhood which measured the impact against the original criteria. The impact of the scheme would be examined across all the neighbourhoods.

2. Councillor Dearden asked the following question:

“Could the relevant Cabinet Member confirm the Teaching Schools based in Oldham and summarise the work they do to provide school to support? Is she able to tell us more about the recent announcement of a Research School and how this new initiative will fit in with the work already done by our Teaching Schools?”

Councillor Chadderton, Cabinet Member for Education and Early Years responded that there were five teaching schools in Oldham: Blue Coat; Kingfisher and Mills Hill; Oasis Limeside; St. Chad’s CE Primary School; and New Bridge. The Teaching Schools played an important role in the Oldham Education Partnership by supporting Initial Teacher training, providing newly qualified teacher training and hosting professional development events. In addition, teaching schools were an integral to the local School Improvement model as they provided direct support to schools. In January this year, the Education Endowment Foundation and the Department for Education announced additional funding for Research Schools in the Social Mobility Opportunity Areas. Research Schools were intended to give additional capacity to Oldham Schools, alongside, Teaching Schools by sharing the knowledge and detail of best practice as identified by research from a range of schools and educational providers.

3. Councillor Garry asked the following question:

“In this year's budget the Chancellor announced an increase in the rate of Class 4 National Insurance contributions. This was contrary to the Conservative Party's 2015 election manifesto pledge not to increase National Insurance contributions and would have affected the thousands, and growing numbers of self-employed people in Oldham.

The Chancellor's humiliating U-Turn less than a week later is therefore welcome. However, there is now an estimated £2 billion black hole in the Country's finances because of this incompetence. Does the relevant cabinet member have any indication where this money will come from? Are we expecting the government to abdicate responsibility for their shambles and again pass the cuts to local Council's like ours which have already been hit disproportionately by austerity?”

Councillor Jabbar, Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Finance and Human Resources

responded that at this time there was no information as to how the Chancellor would fill the 'black hole'. The Chancellor had advised that he would use the next Autumn Budget to set out further measures to 'fund in full' the "£2 bn" lost from dropping this particular measure. It was possible that Local Government would receive further cuts but this was not known at this time. Many self-employed people worked extremely hard, and small businesses earned a small amount of money. The "u-turn" was welcomed but the Council would have to wait until the Autumn Statement if Local Government was to receive any further cuts.

4. Councillor Murphy asked the following question:

"The Cabinet Member for Housing will doubtless recall that I have previously asked a number of questions about the future use for housing of sites currently occupied by derelict mills.

In December 2015, we witnessed the dramatic destruction by fire of the Maple Mill in Hathershaw, a location with a previous history of blazes – and at this point Mr. Mayor I would just to take a moment to pay tribute to the professional and courageous response to this incident by our own staff, those of the emergency services and of First Choice Homes Oldham.

Can I ask the Cabinet Member, in light of the need to build more homes in our borough and our desire to build these homes wherever possible on Brownfield sites, whether a commitment can be given by this Administration tonight to use this cleared site for housing and so eliminate an eyesore and save some small part of our precious Green Belt?"

Councillor Brownridge, Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods and Cooperatives responded that sites could only be allocated for housing that were suitable, available and viable. The site would be examined with other brownfield mill sites against the criteria in the tests set out in the National Planning Policy Guidance.

5. Councillor Fielding asked the following question:

"Recently Derby Council have advised their local parents that they will not fine the parents who take their children on Holiday during School Term Time. Could the Cabinet member please advise what Oldham Council's guidelines are on this matter?"

Councillor Chadderton, Cabinet Member for Education and Early Years responded that Oldham did not presently issue Penalty Notice fines for Holidays in term time unless there were previous unauthorised absences and attendance was less than 90% and a warning letter had been issued prior to the holiday.

6. Councillor Goodwin asked the following question:

“I had the opportunity of accompanying the Neighbourhood Beat Officer for my ward recently, to observe his role and work he undertakes. During this time, I observed large groups of youths, mainly under the age of 18, congregating in several locations. These groups were in excess of 100 in number and I can appreciate the disruption and annoyance this causes to residents affected by this. I can also appreciate that some of the youths themselves are extremely vulnerable due to the consumption of alcohol or other substances. With the Easter holidays, lighter nights and then the Summer Holidays approaching, I can envisage this being a serious concern.

Can I ask the Cabinet member responsible, that adequate resources will be provided to the officers involved with young people and that partners, such as the Police, licensing and community safety are involved fully to alleviate this situation?”

Councillor Brownridge, Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods and Cooperatives responded that the increases seen related to anti-social behaviour had already been recognised as a priority for the Community Safety and Cohesion Partnership for 2017. Planning was already underway for a number of partnership initiatives to take place throughout the Spring and Summer and officers from Community Safety, the Detached Youth Team, Licensing, Children’s Social Care, Positive Steps, Metrolink and the TravelSafe Unit would be working with local Neighbourhood Policing Teams on the initiatives. A number of Stay Safe Operations would be scheduled throughout 2017. Stay Safe was specifically targeted at ensuring that young people identified as vulnerable through intoxication were safe and that parents / guardians / carers were notified immediately about their condition so they could be collected. The work would be resource intensive and funding would be sought from all available sources to support any work which needed to take place which could not be met through mainstream capacity. Any young people who were identified as being involved in anti-social behaviour would also be contacted by the Community Safety Team. The Team would be working closely with GMP and the use of all available tools and powers to tackle anti-social behaviour would be considered. Parents would also be aware that they may face consequences if they failed to control the behaviour of their children or were found to be supplying alcohol to their children.

7. Councillor Roberts asked the following question:

“Could the relevant Cabinet Member update us on the implications of the changes to Business Rates for businesses in Oldham, including the changes announced

in the budget also notable for the attempted raid on the income of the self-employed?”



Councillor Jabbar, Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Finance and HR responded that due to the 2017 revaluation, Oldham businesses would, on average, pay less business rates. In the 'Policy Landscape' report presented to Budget Council, it was estimated that Business Rates payable by Oldham businesses would reduce by around £5.2m. Paragraph 3.52 of that report detailed other Government measures designed to help businesses including changes to Small Business Rates Relief Thresholds. It was widely reported that businesses had been concerned about the impact of revaluation especially for those in more prosperous areas of the country. The Chancellor's recent budget acknowledged these concerns. The Government would set out its preferred approach to future revaluations in due course and would consult on it prior to the next revaluation exercise in 2022. Three new measures to help businesses would also be announced by the Chancellor:

- No business losing small business rates relief would see an increase by more than £50 per month in 2017/18;
- All public houses with a rateable value of less than £100,000 would receive a £1,000 rates discount for 2017/18;
- Local authorities would receive a share of £300m in new funding over four years to deliver discretionary relief to local business that had been hit hard in the 2017 revaluation. Oldham's share was £301,000 for 2017/18, £140,000 for 2018/19, £60,000 in 2019/20 and £9,000 in 2020/21.

The DCLG had published a consultation on the design of the additional discretionary relief and also sought views on other issues such as the allocation of the £300m new funding. The consultation would be open until 7 April 2017 and the Council would prepare a response. The new policy would be introduced when final guidance had been issued.

8. Councillor Gloster asked the following question:

“1st – 31st March is Prostate Cancer Awareness Month. Organised by Prostate Cancer UK, this special month aims to raise awareness of prostate cancer, as well as raise money so the charity can provide even better support to both sufferers and their families. Prostate cancer is the most common cancer in men and it is thought that here in the UK around 36,000 are diagnosed with this terrible disease each year. Throughout the awareness month volunteers from Prostate Cancer UK are working across local

communities, giving group talks and providing information.

Can the Cabinet Member please tell me what work is being carried out by our public health to work with Prostate Cancer UK staff to increase public awareness and early diagnosis of this awful disease?"

Councillor Moores, Cabinet Member for Health and Wellbeing responded there were approximately 40 deaths from prostate cancer in Oldham every year. This compared to approximately 150 deaths per year from lung cancer and 40 from breast cancer. Public Health coordinated work on cancer through the Health and Wellbeing Board's Health Protection Sub-Group and there were several campaigns to improve public awareness and prevention, for example, through screening programmes and tackling lifestyle risk factors such as obesity. Oldham was in the early stages of implementing the GM Cancer Champions initiative which included work on prevention of all forms of cancer. Cancer champions would be introduced in the voluntary sector. Work included raising awareness and signposting with local communities and working with General Practice for the initiation of brief interventions on cancer screening and prevention. Oldham had been selected to take part in a GM pilot study with Salford to improve communication around cancer prevention and support for patients and relatives with cancer. Cancer Research UK would provide 2 cancer nurses who would hold 'drop in' clinics for residents on a fortnightly basis.

9. Councillor Ali asked the following question:

"The Chancellor in his recent budget proposal announced an extra £2BN for social care. I would like to know what it means for Oldham in real terms? Will Oldham's allocation compensate for the cash that has been squeezed out over several years from the social care system at every point? In particular will this additional amount resolve the issues facing social care in Oldham?"

Councillor Harrison, Cabinet Member for Social Care and Safeguarding responded that the announcement from the Chancellor on the 8th of March resulted in the Council being awarded extra funding for social care of £5.1m for 2017/18, £3.2m for 2018/19 and £1.6m in 2019/20. The funding was very welcome, however, a long term solution for the funding challenges within Adult Social Care was required. This would not compensate the Council for all the budget reductions it had to make from social care since 2010 when the austerity regime was introduced and the cuts to Local Government funding started. The Council had to support Adult Social Care particularly when the 2016/17 and 2017/18 budgets were set by allocating resources to address pressures which arose

from the national living wage, increased demand and support for the local hospital in managing delayed transfers of care. In addition, the adult social care market was fragile and providers were challenged operating within the existing price framework. This resulted in regular requests for uplifts to the fees the Council paid for services. Formal guidance was expected for how the money was spent, and there was an expectation that the NHS would be supported in its applications. The additional funding would not resolve all the issues, but it would help. The Council was giving consideration as to the best way for the new resources to be utilised.

At this point in the meeting, the Mayor advised that the time limit for this item had expired.

RESOLVED that the questions and responses provided 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 minutes of the Cabinet meetings held on 19th December 2016, 23rd January 2017 and 27th February 2017 were submitted.

Members raised the following questions:

1. Councillor McCann – Cabinet Meeting, 27th February 2017, Item 6: Proposal to Expand Greenfield CP School – Public Notice and Statutory Consultation Responses. Councillor McCann commented on the statutory duty for the provision of school places and the current shortfall in Saddleworth and Lees. The additional spaces would be provided to local children and gave his thanks to the Administration. Councillor McCann asked, subject to the consultation and planning regulations, if a date could be given as to when the school would be started.

Councillor Chadderton, Cabinet Member for Education and Early Years responded that shortfalls had been projected in Saddleworth. A projected date was subject to planning. Cabinet had agreed to the expansion. Saddleworth schools predominantly take students from the local area more than any other. The process for the school would be started and members and the public would be kept up to date.

2. Councillor Goodwin – Cabinet Meeting, 23rd January 2017, Item 6: Council Tax and Non-Domestic Rates Tax Bases 2017/18. Councillor Goodwin asked for an update on the changes to exemptions to Council tax.

Councillor Jabbar, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Finance and Human Resources responded that following representations from several members a scheme would be brought forward for the exemption to care leavers aged 18 - 21. By nature care leavers had a difficult time and for those who planned to live independently the Council would do what could to support them.

3. Councillor Blyth – Cabinet Meeting, 23rd January 2017, Item 9: Foxdenton Development, Broadway, Chadderton, Oldham. Councillor Blyth referred to the offer to pay money to help with infrastructure costs. Was this a handout to developers? How long would it be to get the money in council tax? Councillor Blyth referred to the release of green belt, payment for infrastructure, schools were already full and where would further places come from?

Councillor Jabbar, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Finance and Human Resources responded that Foxdenton was an extremely complicated development. This was based on commercially sensitive discussions and proper answers could not be provided in the public domain. Regeneration was needed for the creation of employment and quality homes for the realisation of aspirations. Complete rigor and due diligence was in place and assurances provided. The development was in phases, there was a statutory responsibility for school places which were reviewed annually.

Members raised the following observations:

1. Councillor Ateeque Ur-Rehman – Cabinet Meeting, 19th December 2016, Item 14: Land to the Rear of the Former Centre for Professional Development, Rosary Road, Fitton Hill. Councillor Ur-Rehman welcomed the decision to grant the lease to Fitton Hill Bulldogs as this had been a long-standing dream. He thanked the whole of the Cabinet and the continued support to good standard of sporting facilities.
2. Councillor Hudson – Cabinet Meeting, 23rd January 2017, Item 9: Foxdenton Development, Broadway, Chadderton, Oldham. Councillor Hudson's observation referred to the support given to the application at Planning.

RESOLVED that:

1. The minutes of the Cabinet meetings held on 19th December 2016, 23rd January 2017 and 27th February 2017 be noted.
2. The questions and responses on the Cabinet minutes be noted.
3. The observations on the Cabinet minutes be noted.

14

NOTICE OF ADMINISTRATION BUSINESS

Motion 1

Councillor Roberts MOVED and Councillor Dearden
SECONDED the following MOTION:

“On the 8th March 2017 women from Oldham were among those who celebrated International Women’s Day and Oldham Libraries hosted events including showing ‘Boomtown Girls’ highlighting Oldham women’s roles in the First World War and a talk about the life and work of Annie Kenney – the appeal to raise funds for a statue to Annie was also launched on the 8th March.

This Council notes that these celebrations of women’s achievements took place against the backdrop of government policies which have had a disproportionate impact on women in Oldham and across the UK: tax and benefit changes since 2010 have increased the gender income gap.

The independent Women’s Budget Group shows that tax and benefit changes since 2010 will have hit women’s incomes twice as hard as men by 2020: it estimates women will be £1,003 worse off a year in comparison to men who will lose £555. Oldham is a low pay area and poorer women will be worse hit losing an average of £1,678 a year.

Women’s independence will be undermined by the introduction of Universal Credit which is paid by default into the bank account of the main earner in the household rather than to individuals. Lone parents (90% are women) will be particularly badly affected by the introduction of Universal Credit.

Women continue to earn less than men: the Fawcett Society estimates that at the current rate of progress it will take 62 years for women’s pay to equal men’s.

Affordable and good quality childcare is essential to enable women to work and take up training opportunities and while this Council welcomes the extension of free early education for some 3 and 4 year olds to 30 hours a week from September 2017, Council also notes that this needs to be properly funded and that many childcare providers are warning that the rate on offer is not enough to cover costs.

Council supports the call of the Women and Equalities Select Committee for an independent inquiry into why the government has not published a proper analysis of how its spending plans will affect women, minorities and disabled people.

Council resolves to:

1. Write to the LGA to ask for it to lobby for
 - a. an independent enquiry into why the government has not published a proper analysis of how its

- spending plans will affect women, minorities and disabled people.
- b. a realistic funding rate for free early education and childcare which meets the costs of providers (including schools) and enables them to provide high quality services.
2. Write to the Borough's three MPs to ask them to take whatever action is possible
 - a. to highlight the impact of austerity on women and to call for an independent enquiry into why the government has not published a proper analysis of how its spending plans will affect women, minorities and disabled people.
 - b. to secure a realistic funding rate for free early education and childcare which meets the costs of providers (including schools) and enables them to provide high quality services.
 3. Publicise the 'Annie Kenney Fund' appeal for the money needed to erect a statue of Annie Kenney in Parliament Square."

Councillor Harrison spoke in support of the motion.

Councillor Chadderton spoke in support of the motion.

Councillor M. Bashforth spoke in support of the motion.

Councillor Toor spoke in support of the motion.

Councillor Sykes spoke in support of the motion.

Councillor Roberts exercised her right of reply.

In accordance with Council Procedure rule 12.3 at least five Members requested a recorded vote on this Motion. The Vote was recorded as follows:

Councillor		Councillor	
Ahmad	FOR	Hussain, F.	FOR
Akhtar	FOR	Iqbal	ABSENT
Alexander A.	ABSENT	Jabbar	FOR
Alexander G.	ABSENT	Jacques	FOR
Ali	FOR	Kirkham	FOR
Ames	ABSENT	Klonowski	ABSENT
Azad	FOR	Larkin, J.	FOR
Ball	FOR	Larkin. T.	ABSENT
Bashforth, M.	FOR	Malik	ABSENT
Bashforth, S.	FOR	McCann	FOR
Bates	FOR	McLaren	FOR
Blyth	FOR	Moores	FOR
Briggs	FOR	Murphy	FOR
Brock	ABSENT	Mushtaq	FOR
Brownridge	FOR	Price	FOR
Chadderton	FOR	Qumer	FOR
Chauhan	FOR	Rehman	FOR
Cosgrove	FOR	Roberts	FOR
Dean	FOR	Salamat	FOR
Dearden	FOR	Sheldon	ABSENT

Fielding	FOR	Shuttleworth	FOR
Garry	FOR	Stretton	FOR
Gloster	FOR	Sykes	FOR
Goodwin	FOR	Toor	FOR
Haque	FOR	Turner	FOR
Harkness	FOR	Ur-Rehman	FOR
Harrison	FOR	Williams	FOR
Hewitt	FOR	Williamson	FOR
Hudson	ABSENT	Wrigglesworth	FOR
Hussain, A.	FOR	Heffernan	FOR

On a recorded vote being taken the MOTION was CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

RESOLVED that:

1. The LGA be written to ask it to lobby for:
 - a. An independent enquiry into why the government had not published a proper analysis of how its spending plans would affect women, minorities and disabled people.
 - b. A realistic funding rate for free early education and childcare which meets the costs of providers (including schools) and enabled them to provide high quality services.
2. The Borough's three MP's be written to ask them to take whatever action was possible:
 - a. To highlight the impact of austerity on women and to call for an independent enquiry into why the government had not published a proper analysis of how its spending plans would affect women, minorities and disabled people.
 - b. To secure a realistic funding rate for free early education and childcare which met the cost of providers (including schools) and enabled them to provide high quality services.
3. The 'Annie Kenney Fund' appeal for the money needed to erect a statue of Annie Kenney in Parliament Square be publicised.

Motion 2

The Mayor informed the meeting that the time limit for this item had expired and Councillor Stretton as Mover of the Motion and Councillor Sykes as Seconder of the Motion requested the motion be put to the vote.

“This Council notes with alarm that there are currently no legislative provisions in place to disqualify a Councillor who is placed on the sex offenders' register. Section 27(1) of the Localism Act 2011 declares that it is the job of a Council to promote and maintain high standards of conduct by members and co-opted members of the authority. Disallowing us to exclude Members who are placed on the sex

offenders register compromises the Council's duty to maintain high standards of conduct by its members.

Oldham's definition of the role of a Councillor states that he/she should 'be an active and visible community leader on behalf of the whole community'. This Council acknowledges that an individual placed on the sex offenders register cannot honestly represent a whole community when they have shown clear contempt towards members of that community.

The nature of a Council's work makes it unsuitable for an individual on the sex offender's register to work as a Councillor. The Council works with children, adults in need of social care and adults with disabilities. A Councillor's role can involve working with these vulnerable groups and therefore it is unsuitable for those groups to have interaction with someone on the sex offenders register.

With this in mind, this Council resolves to:

Make representations to the Secretary of State to extend the 1972 Local Government Act to automatically disqualify any member who after conviction is placed on the sex offenders register."

Councillor Stretton did not exercise her right of reply.

In accordance with Council Procedure rule 12.3 at least five Members requested a recorded vote on this Motion. The Vote was recorded as follows:

Councillor		Councillor	
Ahmad	FOR	Hussain, F.	FOR
Akhtar	FOR	Iqbal	ABSENT
Alexander A.	ABSENT	Jabbar	FOR
Alexander G.	ABSENT	Jacques	FOR
Ali	FOR	Kirkham	FOR
Ames	ABSENT	Klonowski	FOR
Azad	ABSENT	Larkin, J.	FOR
Ball	FOR	Larkin. T.	ABSENT
Bashforth, M.	FOR	Malik	ABSENT
Bashforth, S.	FOR	McCann	FOR
Bates	FOR	McLaren	FOR
Blyth	FOR	Moores	FOR
Briggs	FOR	Murphy	FOR
Brock	ABSENT	Mushtaq	FOR
Brownridge	FOR	Price	FOR
Chadderton	FOR	Qumer	FOR
Chauhan	FOR	Rehman	FOR
Cosgrove	FOR	Roberts	FOR
Dean	FOR	Salamat	FOR
Dearden	ABSENT	Sheldon	FOR
Fielding	FOR	Shuttleworth	FOR
Garry	FOR	Stretton	FOR
Gloster	FOR	Sykes	FOR
Goodwin	FOR	Toor	FOR
Haque	FOR	Turner	FOR
Harkness	FOR	Ur-Rehman	FOR

Harrison	FOR	Williams	FOR
Hewitt	FOR	Williamson	FOR
Hudson	FOR	Wrigglesworth	FOR
Hussain, A.	FOR	Heffernan	FOR



On a recorded vote being taken, the MOTION was CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

RESOLVED that representations be made by the Council to the Secretary of State for the extension of the 1972 Local Government Act to automatically disqualify any member who after conviction was placed on the sex offenders register.

Motion 3

The Mayor informed the meeting that the time limit for this item had expired and Councillor Ur-Rehman as Mover of the Motion and Councillor Fielding as Secunder of the Motion requested the Council permit the following motion be rolled over for discussion at the next Council meeting.

“This Council supports the TUC’s Dying to Work Campaign’s charter as being an imperative way of preserving the rights and dignity of its workers who are diagnosed with a terminal illness. Currently, workers with a terminal illness do not have a ‘protected characteristic’, and therefore have limited legal protection. Employers are free to dismiss terminally ill workers once they can prove they have made ‘reasonable adjustments’ to the employee’s job to assist with the illness. In addition, this leaves an employee facing the possibility that they will lose their death in service benefits, adding further stress at a time when security for a family’s future should be protected.

This Council believes that it should be the right of the employee to choose when or if they leave employment. An employee who is diagnosed with a terminal illness should be properly informed of their options and decide what is right for them, safe in the knowledge that they will not be put under undue pressure by their employer.

This Council recognises that in order to encourage other organisations to respect the rights of any of their terminally ill employees, the Council must lead by example.

Therefore this Council resolves to:

- 1) Sign the Dying to Work charter and integrate its contents into our HR procedures.
- 2) Instruct the Chief Executive to write to the Secretary of State for Work and Pensions lobbying for an amendment to the Equality Act 2010 that safeguards the rights of terminally ill employees.
- 3) Instruct the Chief Executive to write to the Borough’s three MPs asking them to do everything they can to press for an amendment to the Equality Act 2010 that safeguards the rights of terminally ill employees.”

RESOLVED that the Motion be rolled over to the Council meeting scheduled on 12th July 2017.

NOTICE OF OPPOSITION BUSINESSMotion 1

Councillor Sykes MOVED and Councillor Murphy SECONDED the following MOTION:

“This Council notes that:

- All councils are required by government to have a Local Plan which identifies land for housing, offices and industry;
- The proposed Greater Manchester Spatial Framework (GMSF) is one approach to fulfilling this requirement; however other local authorities have fulfilled this requirement by developing their own Local Plan;
- The GMSF is a twenty year plan, requiring a third more housing land to be identified than would be required by typical fifteen year Local Plans produced by many other local authorities, and is based upon pre-Brexit growth assumptions over such a long period, which cannot be verified;
- The GMSF proposals include significant releases of green-belt in the Borough of Oldham, particularly in Shaw, Crompton, Chadderton, Royton and Saddleworth;

Council further notes that:

- These early proposals were developed without sufficient involvement of residents or ward members;
- Many residents and local politicians, particularly in Shaw, Crompton, Chadderton, Royton and Saddleworth, are strongly opposed to many of these proposals;

Council firmly believes that new housing development should first take place on brownfield or derelict sites, on sites with existing planning permission; and by converting long-term empty mills, shops and offices into homes; and that existing long-term empty homes should also be brought back into use, before any consideration is given to allocating green-belt or other protected open land for housing.

Consequently, Council condemns the current GMSF proposals as they fail to identify such sites that are available for development and are instead predicated upon developing new housing on green-belt land in the Borough of Oldham.

Council therefore resolves to:

1. Formally withdraw from the Greater Manchester Spatial Framework process and make arrangements to ensure that the GMSF does not apply to the Borough of Oldham.
2. Pursue Oldham’s own local plan. This should be a fifteen year Local Plan for the Borough which identifies that new housing development should first take place on brownfield or derelict sites, on sites with existing planning permission; and by converting long-term empty mills, shops and offices into homes; and that existing long-term empty homes should also be brought back into use,

- before any consideration is given to allocating green-belt or other protected open land for housing.
3. Make arrangements to comply with the duty to cooperate with other planning authorities.
 4. Review existing development plan documents and build in a review process every five years.”



Councillor Brownridge MOVED and Councillor Steven Bashforth SECONDED the following AMENDMENT:

“After ‘this council notes that’

At the end of the first bullet point add:

‘and Oldham’s current Local Plan was approved by a government inspector in 2011.’

At end of second bullet point deleted from (GMSF) to end and add:

‘is a joint plan to manage the supply of land for jobs and new homes across Greater Manchester and as such, the GMSF will not cover everything that a Local Plan would cover’

- Delete third bullet point and replace with
- ‘The Housing White Paper proposes a standard methodology for calculating ‘objectively assessed need’ which will mean that whether a strategic or local (or both) approach is taken to identify housing land, the same amount of housing will need to be provided.’

In fourth bullet point line 1 insert ‘as they were originally published’ after the GMSF proposals and before include significant releases... add fifth bullet point:

- ‘taking a Greater Manchester approach enables land supply to be spread out between the 10 districts – it may very well be that relying solely on a Local Plan will increase the pressure on land in Oldham.’

After ‘This council further notes’ in bullet point 1 line 1 insert ‘for discussion in between ‘developed’ and without’.

In bullet point 2 line 1 insert ‘at this stage’ between ‘politicians’ and ‘particularly’

Delete paragraph 2 and replace with:

‘Council is taking the following steps to ensure that a brownfield first strategy is delivered:

- Pressing for a Greater Manchester Land Reclamation programme and funding to make the development of brownfield land as cost effective as possible
- Reviewing the calculation of housing need to ensure that demand has been accurately identified
- Developing a Mills Strategy which balances Oldham’s heritage against housing and employment needs and assesses the costs of producing land viable and available for development

After Council resolves to:

Delete text in point 1 and replace with:

‘1. Press for changes to the Greater Manchester Spatial Framework which reflect the concerns raised by residents and ward councillors at the initial proposals including ensuring a robust brownfield first approach’

In point 2 line 1 delete Pursue and replace with 'Update' and add after 'own local plan' 'in accordance with the statutory requirements and 'delete this should be a fifteen year Local Plan for the borough'

Delete existing point 3 and renumber point 4. Add at end of new point 3 'as required to meet land supply obligations and protect greenbelt land' and delete 'every five years'.

Amended motion to read:

"This Council notes that:

- All councils are required by government to have a Local Plan which identifies land for housing, offices and industry and Oldham's current Local Plan was approved by a government inspector in 2011
- The proposed Greater Manchester Spatial Framework (GMSF) is a joint plan to manage the supply of land for jobs and new homes across Greater Manchester and as such, the GMSF will not cover everything that a Local Plan would cover
- The Housing White Paper proposes a standard methodology for calculating 'objectively assessed need' which will mean that whether a strategic or local (or both) approach is taken to identify housing land, the same amount of housing will be need to be provided
- The GMSF proposals as they were originally published include significant releases of green-belt in the Borough of Oldham, particularly in Shaw, Crompton, Chadderton, Royton and Saddleworth;
- Taking a Greater Manchester approach enables land supply to be spread out between the 10 districts – it may very well be that relying solely on a Local Plan will increase the pressure on land in Oldham.

Council further notes that:

- These early proposals were developed for discussion without sufficient involvement of Oldham residents or ward members;
- Many residents and local politicians at this stage particularly in Shaw, Crompton, Chadderton, Royton and Saddleworth, are strongly opposed to many of these proposals;

Council firmly believes that new housing development should first take place on brownfield or derelict sites, on sites with existing planning permission; and by converting long-term empty mills, shops and offices into homes; and that existing long-term empty homes should also be brought back into use, before any consideration is given to allocating green-belt or other protected open land for housing.

Council is taking the following steps to ensure that a brownfield first strategy is delivered;

- Pressing for a Greater Manchester Land Reclamation programme and funding to make the development of brownfield land as cost effective as possible
- Reviewing the calculation of housing need to ensure that demand has been accurately identified

- Developing a Mills Strategy which balances Oldham’s heritage against housing and employment needs and assesses the costs of producing land viable and available for development.

Council therefore resolves to:

1. Press for changes to the Greater Manchester Spatial Framework which reflect the concerns raised by residents and ward councillors at the initial proposals including ensuring a robust brownfield first approach
2. Update Oldham’s own local plan in accordance with the statutory requirements and which identifies that new housing development should first take place on brownfield or derelict sites, on sites with existing planning permission; and by converting long-term empty mills, shops and offices into homes; and that existing long-term empty homes should also be brought back into use, before any consideration is given to allocating green-belt or other protected open land for housing.
3. Review existing development plan documents and build in a review process as required to meet land supply obligations and protect greenbelt land.”

Councillor Harkness spoke against the AMENDMENT.

Councillor Jabbar spoke in support of the AMENDMENT.

Councillor Sykes exercised his right of reply.

Councillor Brownridge exercised her right of reply.

In accordance with Council Procedure rule 12.3 at least five Members requested a recorded vote on this Amendment. The Vote was recorded as follows:

Councillor		Councillor	
Ahmad	FOR	Hussain, F.	FOR
Akhtar	FOR	Iqbal	ABSENT
Alexander A.	ABSENT	Jabbar	FOR
Alexander G.	ABSENT	Jacques	FOR
Ali	FOR	Kirkham	FOR
Ames	ABSENT	Klonowski	AGAINST
Azad	FOR	Larkin, J.	FOR
Ball	FOR	Larkin. T.	ABSENT
Bashforth, M.	FOR	Malik	ABSENT
Bashforth, S.	FOR	McCann	AGAINST
Bates	FOR	McLaren	FOR
Blyth	AGAINST	Moores	FOR
Briggs	FOR	Murphy	AGAINST
Brock	ABSENT	Mushtaq	FOR
Brownridge	FOR	Price	FOR
Chadderton	FOR	Qumer	FOR
Chauhan	FOR	Rehman	FOR
Cosgrove	FOR	Roberts	FOR
Dean	FOR	Salamat	FOR
Dearden	FOR	Sheldon	AGAINST
Fielding	FOR	Shuttleworth	FOR

Garry	FOR	Stretton	FOR
Gloster	AGAINST	Sykes	AGAINST
Goodwin	FOR	Toor	FOR
Haque	FOR	Turner	AGAINST
Harkness	AGAINST	Ur-Rehman	FOR
Harrison	FOR	Williams	FOR
Hewitt	FOR	Williamson	AGAINST
Hudson	AGAINST	Wrigglesworth	FOR
Hussain, A.	FOR	Heffernan	AGAINST

On being put the VOTE, 41 votes were cast in FAVOUR of the AMENDMENT and 12 votes were cast AGAINST with 0 ABSTENTIONS. The AMENDMENT was therefore CARRIED.

Councillor Sykes exercised his right of reply.

A vote was then taken on the SUBSTANTIVE MOTION.

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

RESOLVED that:

1. Changes be pressed to the Greater Manchester Spatial Framework which reflected the concerns raised by residents and ward councillors at the initial proposals including ensure a robust brownfield first approach.
2. Oldham's own local plan be updated in accordance with the statutory requirements and which identified that new housing development should first take place on brownfield or derelict sites, on sites with existing planning permission; and by converting long-term empty mills, shops and offices into homes; and that existing long-term empty homes should be brought back into use, before any consideration was given to allocating green-belt or other protected land for housing.
3. Existing development plan documents be reviewed and a review process be built in as required to meet land supply obligations and protect greenbelt land.

Motion 2

The Mayor informed the meeting that the time limit for this item had expired and Councillor McCann as Mover of the Motion and Councillor Blyth as Seconder of the Motion requested the motion be put to the vote. Councillor McCann in moving the MOTION to the vote ACCEPTED the AMENDMENT.

“Council recognises that:

- Bees and other pollinators play an essential role in the Earth's ecosystem being vital for our food crops, gardens and countryside. Eighty percent of all crops reproduce as a result of the intervention of pollinators. The

Government has estimated that this intervention is worth around £500 million to the UK food economy alone.

- The number of bees is in decline and some species have become extinct. Pollinator decline is attributed to a variety of factors including disease, climate change, loss of habitat, and the use of insecticides, such as neonicotinoids (neonics).
- The use of herbicides containing glyphosate also poses a health hazard to humans.

Council recognises the value of establishing an action plan for the borough to help support bees and pollinators, and minimising the use of neonicotinoids and glyphosate on its land.

This Council resolves to:

- Cease the use of neonicotinoids and glyphosate on all land that it manages, with the exception where it is absolutely necessary in the control of Schedule 9 plants (under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981) or to protect Council assets.
- Establish a bees and pollinators action plan for the borough. Such a plan could include:
 - Using planning powers to protecting habitats that are important to bees and pollinators
 - Encouraging all new developments to provide for pollinators
 - Stopping the use of insecticides on local authority land
 - Establishing wildflower meadows on public green spaces and along public highways
 - Planning pollinator-friendly plants, such as those identified in the Royal Horticultural Society's Perfect for Pollinators scheme
 - Planting trees for bees, such as blossom-producing, spring flowering trees
 - Identifying measures to enable bee-keeping to thrive in our borough
 - Asking the public not to use insecticides in their garden and to plant bee-friendly plants
 - Encouraging schools to help children engage with this agenda
 - Asking the public health bodies and social housing partners to support our efforts
- Ask the Chief Executive to write to the Minister responsible calling on the Government to maintain the temporary ban on the use of neonicotinoids and to fund proper research into the hazards of neonicotinoids and glyphosate on human health and the environment."

AMENDMENT

The Mayor informed the meeting that the Chief Executive had received notice that Councillor Brock would be unable to move this amendment and nominated Councillor Roberts to take her place.



Councillor Roberts MOVED and Councillor Briggs SECONDED the following AMENDMENT:

“Amend paragraph 2, lines 12 to 14, to as follows:

‘Council recognises the national pollinators’ strategy as the best way of stemming the decline of bees. Bees do not know borders – therefore in order to best protect bees there needs to be a national strategy that is upheld by all local authorities.’

The final paragraph containing the resolution is to be amended by removing the second bullet point.

Insert a new third bullet point to say

- ‘maintain the standards outline in the National Pollination Strategy as much as is practicably possible’

Insert a new fourth bullet point to say:

- ‘continue to use the Green Dividend Fund to create more ecosystems where bees can flourish.’

Insert a new fifth bullet point to say:

- ‘Use this year’s consultation on Bloom and Grow to inform residents of the best way for maintaining their local ecosystems and identify measures to enable bee keeping.’

Amended motion to read:

“Council recognises that:

- Bees and other pollinators play an essential role in the Earth’s ecosystem play an essential role in the Earth’s ecosystem being vital for our food crops, gardens and countryside. Eighty percent of all crops reproduce as a result of the intervention of pollinators. The Government has estimated that this intervention is worth around £500 million to the UK food economy alone.
- The number of bees is in decline and some species have become extinct. Pollinator decline is attributed to a variety of factors including disease, climate change, loss of habitat, and the use of insecticides, such as neonicotinoids (or neonics).
- The use of herbicides containing glyphosate also poses a health hazard to humans.

Council recognises the national pollinators’ strategy as the best way of stemming the decline of bees. Bees do not know borders – therefore in order to best protect bees there needs to be a national strategy that is upheld by all local authorities.

This Council resolves to:

- Cease the use of neonicotinoids and glyphosate on all land that it manages, with the exception where it is absolutely necessary in the control of Schedule 9 plants (under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981) or to protect Council assets.
- Ask the Chief Executive to write to the Minister responsible calling on the Government to maintain the temporary ban on the use of neonicotinoids and to fund proper research into the hazards of neonicotinoids and glyphosate on human health and the environment

- Maintain the standards outlined in the National Pollination Strategy as much as is practicably possible
- Continue to use the Green Dividend Fund to create more ecosystems where bees can flourish
- Use this year's consultation on Bloom and Grow to inform residents of the best for maintaining their local ecosystems and identify measures to enable bee keeping.

Councillor McCann did not exercise his right of reply.

A vote was then taken on the SUBSTANTIVE MOTION.

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

RESOLVED that:

1. The Council cease the use of neonicotinoids and glyphosate on all land that it manages, with the exception of where it was absolutely necessary in the control of Schedule 9 plants (under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981) or to protect Council assets.
2. The Chief Executive be asked to write to the Minister responsible calling on the Government to maintain the temporary ban on the use of neonicotinoids and to fund proper research into the hazards of neonicotinoids and glyphosate on human health and the environment.
3. Standards be maintained as outlined in the National Pollination Strategy as much as is practicably possible.
4. The use of the Green Dividend Fund be continued to create more ecosystems where bees could flourish.
5. This year's consultation on Bloom and Grow be used to inform residents of the best way for maintaining their local ecosystems and identified measures to enable bee keeping.

Motion 3

The Mayor informed the meeting that the time limit for this item had expired and Councillor Harkness as Mover of the Motion and Councillor Turner as Seconder of the Motion requested the motion be put to the vote.

“Council notes that:

- In April 2015, a motion was carried in relation to the application of benefits sanctions which stated that ‘People who are already vulnerable are often more likely to incur sanctions’
- Vulnerable claimants, particularly claimants with mental health conditions, conditions on the autism spectrum, or learning disabilities, continue to be disproportionately sanctioned.
- Guidance from the Department of Work and Pensions (DWP) to its staff recognises the need for additional



safeguards for vulnerable claimants in receipt of Employment Support Allowance (ESA) to reduce the incidence of sanctions.

Council welcomes the work that has been carried out by its officers with colleagues at the Department of Work and Pensions, to:

- Build on the 'minimum standards' in DWP guidance by creating additional safeguards for vulnerable claimants in receipt of ESA in Oldham, based on a model successfully introduced in the London Borough of Greenwich.
- Create a Vulnerability Guide and process flow chart for DWP staff and advisors in front-line organisations, backed by bespoke training, so they can better support vulnerable benefit claimants

Council hopes that these measures will help reduce the incidence of sanctions in Oldham amongst this client group and looks forward to the expansion of the pilot project to vulnerable claimants in receipt of other benefits later in 2017.

Council resolves to work with DWP staff to:

- Promote the new safeguarding model to front-line Council staff and those of partners who support vulnerable claimants, as well as through local disability, employment and housing forums and the Action Together Poverty Agenda Group.
- Feature information on the new safeguards on the Council's website and in future Council publications.
- Support the establishment of a local liaison group, with representation from FWP, work programme providers, and relevant local agencies to monitor the impact of safeguards."

A vote was then taken on the MOTION.

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

RESOLVED that the Council work with DWP Staff to:

1. Promote the new safeguarding model to front-line Council staff and those of partners who supported vulnerable claimants, as well as through local disability employment and housing forums and the Action Together Poverty Agenda Group.
2. Feature information on the new safeguards on the Council's website and in future Council publications.
3. Support the establishment of a local liaison group, with representation from DWP, work programme providers, and relevant local agencies to monitor the impact of safeguards.
 - a To note the Minutes of the following Joint Authority meetings and the relevant spokespersons to respond to questions from Members

The minutes of the Joint Authorities were submitted as follows:

Transport for Greater Manchester	3 rd February 2017 11 th November 2016
Greater Manchester Fire and Rescue Service	13 th January 2017 8 th December 2016
Police and Crime Panel	16 th February 2017
Greater Manchester Combined Authority	30 th June 2016 25 th November 2016 16 th December
2016	
Joint GMCA/AGMA Executive	27 th January 2017 28 th October 2016 16 th December
2016	
Greater Manchester Waste Disposal Authority	27 th January 2017 2 nd December 2016 13 th December
2016	
	20 th January 2017 10 th February 2017

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

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

The minutes of the Partnership meetings were submitted as follows:

Oldham Leadership Board	17 th November 2016
MioCare	12 th January 2017
Health and Wellbeing Board	7 th November 2016
Unity Partnership Board	1 st November 2016 24 th November 2016

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

17 **UPDATE ON ACTIONS FROM COUNCIL**

Consideration was given to a report of the Director of Legal Services which informed members of actions that had been taken following previous Council meetings and provided feedback on other issues raised at the meeting.

RESOLVED that the Update on Actions from Council report be noted.

18 **WHO PUT THAT THERE?: A STREET CHARTER FOR OLDHAM**

Consideration was given to a report which related to a motion which proposed the creation of a Street Charter that supported those who lived in, worked in or visited the borough who were visually impaired or blind. The motion had been referred to the

Overview and Scrutiny Board, and following a period of research and engagement, a Charter had been developed and commended by Overview and Scrutiny to Council.



Oldham
Council

The Royal National Institute for the Blind's "Who Put That There" Campaign was a call on local authorities to engage with blind and partially sighted people in the area for the development of a Street Charter that put a 'clear highway' policy at the heart of their local decision making. The Charter highlighted the eight most common and dangerous faced by those with sight loss. The Charter had been developed using the suggested Street Charter content as well as Oldham specific findings which were outlined in the report.

The RNIB's overall aims were complementary to the Council's aims for health communities and as a co-operative Council.

Options /Alternatives

Option One – To approve the Street Charter. If the Charter was approved, work would start on progressing each of the commitments as set out in the Charter.

Option Two – Not approve the Street Charter.

RESOLVED that the Street Charter be approved.

19

CHANGE TO COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

Consideration was given to a report which proposed the appointment of a new Licensing Committee Chair for the remainder of the 2016/17 Municipal Year following the resignation of the current Chair.

RESOLVED that Councillor Norman Briggs be appointed Chair of the Licensing Committee for the remainder of the 2016/17 Municipal Year.

The meeting started at 6.00 pm and ended at 9.40 pm