

COUNCIL
11/09/2019 at 6.00 pm



Present: The Mayor – Councillor G. Alexander (Chair)

Councillors Ahmad, Akhtar, Al-Hamdani, Ali, Alyas, Ball, M Bashforth, S Bashforth, Briggs, Brownridge, Byrne, Chadderton, Chauhan, Cosgrove, Davis, Dean, Fielding, Garry, C. Gloster, H. Gloster, Goodwin, Hamblett, Haque, Harkness, Harrison, Hewitt, Hobin, Hudson, Hulme, A Hussain, F Hussain, Ibrahim, Iqbal, Jabbar, Jacques, Judd, J Larkin, Leach, Malik, McLaren, Moores, Murphy, Mushtaq, Phythian, Price, Roberts, Salamat, Shah, Sheldon, Shuttleworth, Stretton, Surjan, Sykes, Taylor, Toor, Ur-Rehman, Williamson and Williams

1 **TO RECEIVE APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies were received from Councillor Curley.

2 **TO ORDER THAT THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COUNCIL HELD ON 10TH JULY 2019 BE SIGNED AS A CORRECT RECORD**

RESOLVED that the minutes of the Council meeting held on 10th July 2019 be approved as a correct record.

3 **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 M. Bashforth declared a personal interest in Item 8d by virtue of her appointment to the MioCare Board.

Councillor S. Bashforth declared a personal interest in Item 8d by virtue of his appointment to the MioCare Board.

Councillor Chauhan declared a personal interest in Item 8d by virtue of his appointment to the MioCare Board.

Councillor Hamblett declared a personal interest in Item 8d by virtue of his appointment to the MioCare Board.

Councillor F. Hussain declared a personal interest in Item 8d by virtue of his appointment to the MioCare Board.

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

There were no items of urgent business.

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

The Mayor made reference to the recent death of former Councillor Raymond Mallinson.

Councillors Harrison and Sykes paid tribute to the work of former Councillor Mallinson.

Council held a minute's silence.

6

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

There were no petitions received to be noted.

7

YOUTH COUNCIL

There were no items submitted by the Youth Council.

8

QUESTION TIME

a Public Questions

The Mayor advised that the next item on the agenda was Public Question Time. 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, the question would be read out by the Mayor.

The following questions were submitted:

1. Question received from Eddie Keating via email:

“I have been campaigning for over 5 years on behalf of the residents of the estate off Godson St Coldhurst which contains Overdale Close, Downhill Close, Underhill Road and others. Initially Michael Meacher took an active part in the discussions regarding the ongoing and increasing problems caused by local hospital staff and visitors (which on numerous occasion have been rude and aggressive) and are making this estate their go to area where they are causing all sorts of issues i.e. double parking, blocking residents driveways, making emergency vehicles and council vehicles access impossible, pedestrians being unable to use pathways etc, etc, etc. The surrounding areas one by one has been given residents parking which has only pushed the hospital staff and visitors further into the estate and surrounding streets where there are no restrictions. Myself and the residents would like a question to be raised at the next council meeting regarding this ongoing problem as the councillors Abdul Jabbar and Abdul Malik have not been very helpful in resolving this issue despite promises years ago that this problem would be resolved and residents parking would be given to at least the affected estate. Once again we find ourselves fighting to achieve residents parking only status and despite the council actually stating there would be no more areas given this status what happens, Godson St and surrounding streets are given residents parking which as stated made the estate the hospital staff and visitors go to area. Jim Mc Mahon who has been as helpful as he can be contacted the hospital CEO who literally fobbed us off with no real solutions. We managed to arrange a meeting with Zaiem Khan (once again no sign of a councillor) the district coordinator who was extremely helpful and sympathetic to our cause but once again could not really help in moving this issue forward or offer any real solutions. So if we could ask the question



Oldham
Council

on behalf of the residents at the next council meeting it would be most appreciated. Question being how do we achieve residents only parking for the residents of the estate as mentioned?”



Councillor Ur-Rehman, Cabinet Member for Neighbourhood Services responded that there was an ongoing increased high demand for on-street parking around Royal Oldham Hospital. Due to the volumes, at this time adding additional residents only parking areas on an estate-by-estate basis could not be seen as a solution as it would result in displacing parking to other nearby residential streets. Local residents were consulted on a scheme and were not in favour of it. Councillors Jabbar and Malik had been in contact with Mr. Keating. The Council was working with the hospital and was currently carrying out a review of its Town Centre Parking Strategy. In addition, the Royal Oldham Trust had commissioned the Oldham Hospital Masterplan which would consider parking need strategically in addition to other matters. The outcomes of these strategic reviews would seek to propose solutions that would either make further residents only parking schemes in the area either unnecessary, or be viable to be implemented.

2. Question received from Yvonne O'Mara via email:

“Our new campaign to end homelessness by covering essential costs for people on the streets or at risk has just launched with the website

www.realchangeoldham.co.uk<<https://eur02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.realchangeoldham.co.uk&data=02%7C01%7CYvonne.omara%40depaulcharity.org.uk%7Cff4cc693407d4556a72908d7261b8736%7C717fb8abbacc47f78a0992a18e33b7a0%7C0%7C0%7C637019771991718310&sdata=yEMa5gldHtVO2M5am8ZIPnsv0g1Dci8YFioJJSROuw4%3D&reserved=0>>. As someone

who has recently been homeless and now living with Real Change Oldham partner De Paul, thank you for the support the Council has already shown. How else does Oldham Council think the Council and its members can help spread the word about this new way to give to people who are homeless or at risk in Oldham?”

Councillor Roberts, Cabinet Member for Housing, responded that Real Change Oldham was a new local partnership which aimed to ensure that no one stayed or became homeless due to a lack of money for essential items that some might take for granted. It supported some of the most vulnerable residents and gave practical support to cover essential costs needed to help. Donations went directly towards practical items people needed to build their lives away from the streets; things like ID to register with a landlord, bus fares to get to key appointments or money for the electric meter to settle into their new home. There were lots of ways Oldham Council and its members could help in



Oldham
Council

raising awareness of the Real Change Oldham campaign:

- Share the campaign on social media by going to the website and following the footer at the bottom of each page;
- Become a Real Change Ambassador and introduce the Partnership to a business or community group you are in touch with;
- Get an image or poster from the homelessness team and use in a newsletter or put on display;
- Invite someone from the campaign along to a community event, conference or team activity to talk about what they are doing;
- Hold a fundraising event like a bake sale or run the event so the campaign could raise funds to cover essential costs for people;
- Real Change Oldham was looking for volunteers with connections to entrepreneurs and businesses in the borough to get the word out about how they could contribute to ending homelessness in the area;
- Follow the example of the Youth Mayor which had nominated Real Oldham as her charity;
- Place a bid on one of the 'Our Oldham' art works on display at Oldham Library; or
- Just make a donation at realchangeoldham.co.uk.

Getting involved in this partnership approach to ending and preventing homelessness and together Real Change could be brought about in Oldham.

3. Question received from Trevor Widdop via email:

“When will action be taken to stop the violation of double yellow line car parking on Broadbent Rd/Ripponden Rd junction? Since 1st April 2019 not one ticket has been issued (details released under FOA 2000). Cars are parked here day in day out.”

Councillor Ur-Rehman, Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods responded that the Council's Civil Enforcement Officers enforced the whole of the borough and when vehicles were seen in contravention of the restrictions, a penalty charge notice would be issued. It had been requested that the area be given extra attention by the officers over the coming weeks to try and alleviate illegal and inconsiderate parking, however, it was to be noted that during the observation time to see if loading or unloading was taking place, drivers may return to their car and drive away. Any blue badge holders could park on double yellow lines for up to three hours.

4. Question received from Simon Nicholson via email:

“I would like to ask what Oldham Council is doing about the use of fireworks in the borough, especially late at night? What means are being used to enforce the law as people

are blatantly flouting it at present.”



Councillor Shah, Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Social Justice and Communities, responded that the issue of enforcement against the use of fireworks during night time hours was a police enforcement responsibility. The Council was involved in a Greater Manchester wide operation called Operation Treacle that pulled together activity from Councils, Greater Manchester Fire and Rescue Service (GMFRS) and the Police. The Trading Standards team from the Council were involved in proactive work focussing on underage sales and safety standards of the products. The team also sent safety and advice information to all points of sale as well as reacted to any intelligence reported by members of the public. All other enforcement activities, which included the licensing of premises that sold fireworks, were carried out by GMFRS. Council was also once again holding its Big Bang Bonfire and Fireworks spectacular on Tuesday, 5th November this year when residents and visitors in Oldham could enjoy the occasion in a safe environment.

5. Question received from Jeffrey Schofield via email:

“Hello, My name is Jeffrey Schofield I run a community clean-up group called Hathershaw litter Busters and get support from the local authorities and was wondering to report and prosecute fly tipping and anti-social behaviour could we have some more camera's around Hathershaw seeing as I hear there are funds available. Thank you for your time.”

Councillor Shah, Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Social Justice and Communities expressed her appreciation for all the hard work Mr. Schofield and the community clean up group carried out in Hathershaw. Councillor Shah confirmed that the Council had four deployable CCTV cameras already located around Hathershaw in areas where persistent issues of both fly-tipping and anti-social behaviour had been reported. Councillor Shah suggested that an officer arrange to meet with Mr. Schofield and the group so further opportunities could be explored on where work could be done together as well as explain the justification needed before any new possible sites for CCTV could be considered.

6. Question received from Anthony Prince via Facebook:

“Hi, I have a question for our Councillor's. How many places of worship in Oldham pay no business rates?”

Councillor Jabbar, Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Finance and Corporate Services responded a Non-Domestic property that was a ‘place of religious worship’ was exempt from Business Rates under



Schedule 5 of the Local Government Finance Act 1988. The Valuation Office Agency (VOA) rather than the Council decided whether a property should be exempt. Any buildings which were exempted by the VOA did not appear in the Ratings List which the Council used to calculate a bill for Business Rates so the Council could not advise as to the number of places of worship for which no Business Rates were payable.

7. Question received from John Power via email:

“I would like to know if the u turn that has been suggested by Councillor Sean Fielding about building in the centre rather than in our green spaces will be put into action, as developments such as Knowls lane have been approved when false statements regarding OPOL was put to members when the meeting was held. Also is it not a conflict of interest when one George Hulme who is the son of the housing senior is allowed to vote when we all know targets need to be met?”

Councillor Fielding, Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Economy and Enterprise explained first that public question time at the meeting was different as the questions would not be read out but would be summarised by the relevant Cabinet Members as part of the response. This would allow for more questions to be fit into the time allocated. The questions and responses would be published on the Council’s website.

In response to the question, Councillor Fielding was not clear as to what u-turn had been perceived. Since becoming Leader of the Council in May 2018 it had been clear that it was an ambition to build as many as residential units as possible in the town centre to support the local economy which was trying to be built there. If the by-product of that was that it took pressure off the greenbelt allocations the Council was required to make as part of the Greater Manchester Spatial Framework (GMSF), then all the better. With regard to the recent Knowls Lane Planning Application, 50% of that site had already been designated as a housing site. An additional area of land adjacent to that site which was designated as OPOL was proposed to be developed upon, but none of that land was greenbelt and so the decisions around GMSF had not had a bearing upon that. Councillor Fielding also confirmed that Councillor Hulme’s relationship to the Cabinet Member did not preclude him from voting on the Planning Committee.

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.

b Questions to Leader and Cabinet



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

Question 1: OAP Tram Charge

“I want to bring to your attention the rather unpleasant and underhand news that the Greater Manchester Combined Authority are planning to tax the elderly residents of this Borough before they can even board a tram. Pensioners who currently enjoy free travel on public transport across Greater Manchester are being forced to pay an annual fee if they want to travel from A to B on Metrolink. The new Charge will be £10, whereas before it was free. This new tax will be live as early as January 2020. I hope we plan to communicate this to our elderly residents in the Borough? We must also think about if this new strategy should be means tested and not rolled out to everyone regardless of their own personal circumstances. The national law states free travel for the over sixty fives on buses, but from next year any pensioner wanting to claim free travel on the Greater Manchester Train and Metrolink Tram network will be forced to pay an annual administration charge. This £10 charge is simply a hidden Labour stealth tax on our elderly. OAPs now must pay for TV licences and struggle with heating and other bills in winter. Information freely available on the NHS website says hundreds of thousands of elderly people are cut off from society and suffer from loneliness. This applies especially to the over 75s as over one million of these older people live alone. This begs the sad question, why did the Labour party at the last full council meeting in July say they want to maintain free TV licences for the over 65s but now plan to charge pensioners for claiming their rightly entitled free travel? Please explain this to me because I know a lot of people will be just as puzzled as I am.”

Councillor Fielding, Leader of the Council, responded that it was dishonest to claim the charge was a stealth tax. It was correctly referred to later in the question as the £10 administration charge. The charge was for the additional benefit of travelling for free on Metrolink trams and trains within the Greater Manchester conurbation. Free bus travel remained free and despite the way it had been spun in the media, free bus travel remained free and there was no charge for the pass to gain that travel. The administration charge was the cost of loading on the additional benefits for free travel on the Metrolink and heavy rail network in Greater Manchester. The £10 administration charge brought this charge into line with the administration charges the holders of other passes throughout the Greater Manchester conurbation also had to pay such as the new ‘Our Pass’ which provided free bus travel and additional benefits in terms of a leisure and cultural offer as designed by the Greater Manchester Mayor, Andy Burnham. ‘Our Pass’ carried a £10 administration charge. The WASPI Pass which had also been brought in by the Greater Manchester Mayor to close the injustice between free travel and the pension age changes seen by the WASPI women had a £10 administration charge. The ‘IGO’ passes which allowed young children who go to



school on the bus to pay concessionary fares also carried a £10 administration charge. The introduction of the £10 administration charge for the additional Metrolink and Heavy Rail benefit had brought that in line with the charges paid by people who accessed similar passes. The money raised from the administration charges was ringfenced to be reinvested to transport projects throughout Greater Manchester. The charges of £10 would raise in excess of £1m that would go towards things like bus franchising, extensions to Metrolink and improving the quality of the heavy rail services in Greater Manchester when the devolved powers called for in controlling heavy rail services were in the region rather than be controlled by the Department for Transport in London.

Question 2: Greater Manchester Spatial Framework Proposals

“It is widely known, that the Greater Manchester Spatial Framework (GMSF), will build on large chunks of Oldham Borough’s untouched and finite Greenbelt and green spaces including our valuable Protected Open Space. This is a persisting issue in the Borough and there have been mass demonstrations and organised protests against these proposals. This wide-ranging plan will decide the future of the Borough for generations. I have yet to hear which Oldham Council meeting will discuss the proposals detailed in the framework and for the Council to discuss and agree the terms laid out in the strategy. Given the importance of the subject, it would be wise, in the Liberal Democrats opinion, that Oldham Borough have a special one item agenda Council meeting about the Greater Manchester Spatial Framework. Can the Leader confirm when the much promised GMSF proposal will see the light of day? Can the Leader confirm that Oldham Council will hold a special one item agenda Council meeting to discuss, agree and comment on published GMSF proposals? And that there will be consultation on when that meeting might be held and a significantly long notice of when it will be held? If there is no special meeting planned, which ordinary meeting of Council, will this important matter be shoe horned into?”

Councillor Fielding, Leader of the Council, shared the frustration on the amount of time that had dragged on to give the people in Oldham a clear answer on where it was proposed to release land for development for the housing to be built as determined by the Office for National Statistics figures which the Government required the Council to use. The events in Westminster meant there was little certainty coming on what population figures the Council were expected to use in determining the number of houses, when the numbers would be confirmed and that left the Council in a kind of limbo. From conversations at Greater Manchester level, it had been understood that the Government would like the amount of greenbelt reduced for development, but the Government were also insistent that the Council used the 2014 ONS population projects on which it was impossible to deliver on the housing needed without releasing greenbelt for development. Until there was a clear answer from Government the Council was not in a position to confirm when GMSF would come forward and a special meeting of Council scheduled. The Leader was in agreement with Councillor

Sykes there would need to be a special meeting to agree proposals, allow sufficient time for discussion and be open and transparent on the issue. When the Leader was in a position to confirm the method by which GMSF would come to Council, the usual consultation method would take place when Constituted meetings were to be changed or additional meetings called. The Leader looked forward to the conversation with Councillor Sykes and hoped the proposals would come forward as soon as possible to clear the issues on the minds of elected members and the members of the public.

Councillor Hudson, Leader of the Conservative Group, asked a question related to local democracy, asked which District Executive had underspent and asked if local councillors could not be trusted in being accountable in spending ratepayers' money in their wards. Councillor Hudson seen this as another nail in local democracy in the borough.

Councillor Fielding, Leader of the Council, responded that there had been underspends in all areas and challenged the assertion on trust. The allowances for members had been increased which members had to spend in their wards.

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

1. Councillor Ahmad asked the following question:

“Waterhead Academy recently won the National Inclusive School Accord Award: will the cabinet member for Education and Skills join me in congratulating Waterhead Academy on this amazing achievement?”

Councillor Mushtaq, Cabinet Member for Education and Skills, joined in congratulating Waterhead Academy on the award. Councillor Mushtaq, as a former governor was fully aware of the background and context to which the school was striving on community cohesion and the belief that it could change. The award showed the successful effort.

2. Councillor Chauhan asked the following question:

“Posts have been shared on social media and allegations subsequently repeated in letters to local newspapers that undue influence was exerted on Members of the Planning Committee to direct them to vote in a certain way at a recent Planning Committee meeting. Could the Leader advise Council on the veracity of these claims?”

Councillor Fielding, Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Economy and Enterprise responded that the essence of some of the claims that had been made were symptomatic of society today. Different views could be held on the same



information which had been received. Planning Committee was a quasi-judicial function with the Council. Members were required to attend the Committee with an open mind. The Leader had faith that all members of all parties who attended the Planning Committee did this. The Leader had been a member of the Planning Committee in previous years and voted for decisions that were unpopular. The Leader had faith that elected members attended Planning Committee with an open mind and no decisions made prior to the evidence being given whether it was given by elected members, members of the public or by officers in the presentation, in writing or verbally at the meetings.

3. Councillor Garry asked the following question:

“Could the Cabinet Member for Finance comment on the Spending Review announced by the Chancellor? Will the money granted to local government meet Oldham’ needs, particularly in adult and children’s services?”

Councillor Jabbar, Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Finance and Corporate Services responded that when the Chancellor had presented the Spending Round, it contained some good news but only covered one financial year. Whilst there were a range of funding announcements, it was very pleasing to hear the following confirmed:

- Firstly, there would be no reduction in Government departmental day-to-day budgets which gave an assurance that general Council funding would continue at this year’s levels. There had been concern that there would be a further fall in grant.
- Secondly, £2.5 bn of existing Social Care Grants would continue with a further £1bn of grant promised. There had been concern that Social Care Grants would cease and the continuation of the funding was very welcome.
- Thirdly, there would also be additional funding for schools – a national total of £2.6bn in 2020/21 including £700m for High Needs which was most welcome given the challenges being faced in Oldham Schools.

Whilst the individual Authority allocations were yet to be announced, this was much better than had been anticipated. The announcement did not go far enough to reverse the effects of austerity. Since 2009/10 the Council had been forced to make budget reductions of £216m which had had a massive impact on Oldham. New research by the TUC and the New Economics Foundation think-tank had found that Government cuts would leave local authorities with a £25bn black hole, leading to more cuts to services and increasing the chance of more councils being forced to declare bankruptcy. In Summary, the new was pleasing. However, it was pleasing news, however, for more needed to be done to restore funding levels and allow meaningful financial planning.

4. Councillor Williamson asked about complaints received by Crompton ward councillors about the Crompton House School expansion build. The complaints were mainly about the hours of

construction, vehicular movements which were in clear breach of planning condition no. 27 which stated 'during construction and demolition no vehicle movements from construction vehicles to and from and within the site shall take place except between 7.00 am and 6.00 pm each day Monday to Saturday and at no times on Sundays, public or bank holidays'. Despite warnings, the contractor had ignored this condition four times just on a Sunday. There were more breaches on weekdays as well. Councillor Williamson asked if Oldham Council would reassure residents who had photographs and videos to evidence the breaches that the Council would use the full force of planning enforcement officers and prosecute the contractors for breaches in planning conditions and that there would be no further future breaches. What was the point of a planning condition if the Council did not do anything about it and let the contractor do what they wanted with no consequences. It was also to be noted that the contractor had been commissioned by Oldham Council's Unity Partnership to carry out this particular project. If the Council could not get its house in order, what chance was there. In addition, the contractor had a lot to answer for in failing to deliver the school build on time which had resulted in Years 10 and 1 not returning back to school on time. Perhaps the Cabinet Member would like to comment on that?

Councillor Roberts, Cabinet Member for Housing, responded that planning enforcement officers would take action but evidence would be needed in order to do so. Councillor Roberts urged Councillor Williamson and local residents to submit their evidence to the Interim Head of Planning so the information could be sent to the planning enforcement officers for action to be taken. There was no guarantee given on the outcomes as the evidence would need to be examined to determine whether it was sufficient to support a prosecution. In terms of Unity Partnership and the delivery of the project, it was understood that the delivery was a week late and the school was now open with the new build completed. The provision of good facilities for local children was something to be welcomed.

5. Councillor Davis asked the following question:

"I have been asked on quite a few occasions recently by members of the public about the availability of affordable 4 bed homes in the Borough, it appears when the more affordable 4 bed homes and larger are up for sale they are being sold to developers who are turning them in to HMOs, I understand there is a shortage of larger homes in Oldham and would it be possible to stop them being turned in to HMOs so families who require this type of property have a chance to remain in the Borough and have no need to move away?"

Councillor Roberts, Cabinet Member for Housing responded that developers were competing in an open market and would be able to outbid residents in buying what was available. Currently, conversion to a 3 to 6 bed HMO was permitted development and did not need planning permission. If there was clear evidence to



demonstrate that converting large houses to HMOs was causing serious problems then it was possible to issue an Article 4 Direction to remove permitted development rights to convert a dwelling to an HMO. This was not straightforward as it removed a legal right but there were examples where this had been achieved. The Council would need to show there were high concentrations of HMOs being formed that were affecting local neighbourhoods. It was most likely that this could be demonstrated in a focused area. Evidence of serious problems would be needed, for example changes to the character of an area or in terms of parking, rubbish and neighbour nuisance. Officers had begun to collate the number of HMOs but more would be needed to achieve a Direction. If members felt it would be helpful to discuss evidence gathering further, the Strategic Planning Team could help. The issues about housing need and the data that had been collated to support the housing strategy came into play at the planning application stage. Should the Council be successful in removing permitted development rights, permission would be needed to convert a home into an HMO which would be determined on a case by case basis.

6. Councillor Hewitt asked the following question:

“On the 2nd of September I phoned my doctor for an appointment and was given a date of 3rd of October a wait of just over a month, what provision will be put in place when Birks Quarry, Stonebreaks and Knowls Valley developments over 700 houses are built for access to doctors and other services?”

Councillor Roberts, Cabinet Member for Housing, responded that planning permission had been granted for 265 new homes on Knowls Lane and consultation had taken place on 213 homes at Springhead Quarry, whilst Birks Quarry had 36 homes allocated in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA). The Council had a well-established process which ensured that there were sufficient school places available as populations grew and shifted – St. Agnes’ school would be gifted land as part of the planning agreement on Knowls Lane. The Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) did not anticipate the new developments would have a destabilising effect on any one GP practice. For example, there were 13 practices within two miles of the Knowls Valley Site. More generally, the CCG was taking steps to ensure good access to GPs for both routine and urgent appointments. An additional 520 appointments were available every week at evenings and weekends which can be booked on 0161 934 2827. There were currently 7,000 households in housing need in the borough who were already using GPs, schools and other services. Evidence from recent developments such as Thorp Road in Royton and Broadway Green, was that most people who moved into these new homes were already living in the borough either locally or further afield. For example, shared ownership offered people the opportunity to own their own home moving from the private rented sector or affordable rent offered young people the chance to leave the family home. It would be wrong to assume that 514 homes in total meant 514 extra families in needing public services.



7. Councillor Shuttleworth asked the following question:

“The opportunity for residents of this Borough to directly ask questions of the Administration at full council is a positive one which was welcomed by elected members when first introduced some years ago by the then Leader of the Council, Jim McMahon. Many residents have seized this opportunity either in person or via email and have done so in a positive way. Unfortunately, very much a minority have seen such an open and transparent opportunity to create a disturbance once they have asked their question, and on one recent occasion a member of the public harangued the Leader from the public area when he went to the water fountain. Councillors are rightly subject to a Code of Conduct and while I don't know, nor should I know, how many such complaints are submitted, this is the right afforded to residents if they believe they have been wronged. Having said all that, may I ask the Leader that taking this into account, does he agree with me that residents should also conduct themselves, either by question or from the public area, in a manner which they rightly expect from elected members, be this face-to-face or in this Chamber?”

Councillor Fielding, Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Economy and Enterprise responded that he had been a Councillor in Failsworth for eight years which had had some challenging times. The Leader highlighted the openness and transparency of Council and the ease by which people could ask questions at full Council. The Leader welcomed people asking questions which were sometimes difficult to answer and challenging. If, as some alleged, outside the Chamber elected members were somehow not transparent and dishonest, why would elected members invite people in, to stand at the lectern and ask questions directly to the members. The Leader welcomed the opportunities for residents to engage directly with councillors in Council and other forums such as residents meetings and ward surgeries, wherever it would be to find councillors in an accessible locations. Councillors did have to adhere to the Code of Conduct. It was to be expected that when Council was opened up to allow people to come and engage directly, that good behaviour was reciprocated. The Leader invited more questions to Council as not all the time allotted to public question time was used but it also had to be accepted that there were process and procedures in the Chamber and asked that people respect these and the answer that was given at the time of asking.

8. Councillor Al-Hamdani asked a question related to the lack of a five-year housing supply plan which had caused a problem when making objections on planning applications and decisions being biased in favour of developments given that the Council had not plan in place. When was the Council going to get a five-year housing supply plan and why did the Council not have one already?



Councillor Roberts, Cabinet Member for Housing, responded that the Council did not have a five year supply plan which meant there was a presumption in favour of sustainable development in terms of the applications that were put in front of the Planning Committee. As the Council had failed the Housing Delivery Test, this reinforced that position. The Council's Housing Land Supply was published annually and would be updated later this year. Details of the current position which included the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) was available on the Council's website. One of the issues which the Greater Manchester Strategic Framework (GMSF) was attempting to address was the issue of land supply and the longer term planning which a 20 year plan allowed the Council to do and helped to address some of the issues around land supply by looking at what was needed over a 20 year period and what land would be coming forward further down the line. The Council could use that as a defence having to agree and apply the presumptions to sustainable development. Part of the reason for being involved in GMSF process was to try to protect the Council's position in the longer term, but left aside the controversy about some the sites. The Council was not in a position to say when there would be a five year plan as the land in the borough was not in the Council's control and were reliant on sites coming forward by land owners and developers coming forward with viable proposals. The Council would be assisted if the Government made changes to its policies particularly, the policy on helping make brownfield land suitable and economic to build on. It would also help if the Government changed the way it managed the many billions of pounds given to Homes England in terms of subsidies and what the Council could be entitled to apply for to meet the housing needs in the Borough. The Council was in the position where to do the best that it could on an annual basis was to scan the borough, talk to people, put into land supply everything that could be found, but equally more land could not be found that didn't exist. The best the Council could do was to plan and campaign to get resources needed in order to develop more of the brownfield land that everyone would like to see used more sustainably and to the benefit of local people.

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.

c Questions on Cabinet Minutes

Council were requested to note the minutes of the Cabinet held on the undermentioned dates and to receive any questions on any items within the minutes from members of the Council who were not members of the Cabinet and receive responses from Cabinet Members. The minutes of the Cabinet meetings held on 24th June 2019 and 22nd July 2019 were submitted.

Members raised the following questions:

1. Councillor Murphy, Cabinet Minutes, 24th June 2019, Item 12, Highways Improvement Programme 2019/20 – 2021/22 Update. Councillor Murphy asked if consideration could be given to getting funding through rubber tires for road surfacing.

Councillor Ur-Rehman, Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods Services welcomed the opportunity and would discuss the idea with Highways Officers.

2. Councillor H. Gloster, Cabinet Minutes, 24th June 2019, Item 12, Highways Improvement Programme 2019/20 – 2021/22 Update. Councillor H. Gloster asked if there was a maintenance regime in place for signage. Some signage had become obscured by moss and lichen.

Councillor Ur-Rehman, Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods Services responded that there was an annual maintenance budget and an annual inspection. Councillor H. Gloster was asked to send the particular signs which were an issue to Councillor Ur-Rehman.

RESOLVED that:

1. The minutes of the Cabinet meetings held on 24th June 2019 and 22nd July 2019 be noted.
2. The questions and responses provided be noted.

d Questions on Joint Arrangements/Partnerships

Council were asked to note the minutes of the following Joint Authority and Partnership meetings and the relevant spokespersons to respond to questions from Members.

The minutes of the following Joint Authorities and Partnerships meetings were submitted as follows:

Greater Manchester Health and Care Board May 2019	31 st
Greater Manchester Transport Committee July 2019	12 th
Greater Manchester Waste and Recycling Committee March 2019	14 th
National Park Authority July 2019	5 th
	(AGM
)
	19 th
	July 2019
MioCare Board March 2019	11 th
Greater Manchester Combined Authority June 2019	28 th

Members raised the following questions:

1. Councillor Hamblett, Greater Manchester Health and Care Board, 31st May 2019, Item HCB 28/19, Chief Officers Report. Councillor Hamblett asked about the Primary Care Networks and Trent Road Surgery. The CCG had paused on the decision and asked if the Council would use the opportunity to signpost residents to join the nearby Crompton Health Centre instead of travelling to Royton and have sustainable health care in local areas?

Councillor Fielding, Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Economy and Enterprise referred the question to Councillor Chauhan, Cabinet Member for Health and Wellbeing. Councillor Chauhan responded that patients had a free choice to sign up to surgeries and could sign up to any surgery. It was a patient's choice.

2. Councillor Murphy, Greater Manchester Waste and Recycling Committee, 14th March 2019, Item WRC 18/70, Interim Services Contract Update. Councillor Murphy referred to the position on overall diversion rates to landfill which had continued to increase to over 90% achieved by increased recycling rates, production of Refuse Derived Fuel and less waste sent to landfill. Councillor Murphy asked if reassurances could be provided that one problem wasn't being solved by another and air pollution issues being created?

Councillor Hewitt, Spokesperson for the Greater Manchester Waste and Recycling Committee responded that technology was in place. Material in furnances was very pure, most the smoke was recycled similar to clear burn fires in homes with 95% of the fuel combusted and provided assurance that the atmosphere was not being polluted.

RESOLVED that:

1. The minutes of the Joint Authorities and Partnership meetings as detailed in the report be noted.
2. The questions and responses provided be noted.

9

NOTICE OF ADMINISTRATION BUSINESS

Motion 1 – Kashmir

The Chief Executive had been notified of a change to the Mover and Seconder to the Motion.

Councillor Shah MOVED and Councillor Chauhan SECONDED the following MOTION:

In moving the Motion the MOVER requested an alteration to the motion to add the following at paragraph 3:

“6. Allow essential aid such as food and medicine to be provided to residents of Jammu and Kashmir under the supervision of the United Nations and international charities.”



Oldham
Council

“This Council notes with concern

- (i) The Indian Government’s decision to remove Article 370 and 35A from the Indian Constitution, which grants special status to Indian-controlled Kashmir, the recent movement of troops into Kashmir and the imposition of travel restrictions and a communications blackout affecting landlines, mobile phones and the internet.
- (ii) The Human Rights abuses in both Indian and Pakistani administered Kashmir as detailed in the United Nations Human Rights Commission reports of 2018 and 2019

This Council recognises that this unilateral action affects many Oldham residents with family and friends living in Kashmir who are concerned for their safety and well being. This Council believes that the UK Government and international community should use all diplomatic and economic measures at their disposal to influence the Indian and Pakistan Governments to:

1. Ensure that democracy is respected and that the Kashmiri people are at the heart of any negotiation or settlement of this issue.
2. Ensure that United Nations Security Council resolutions on Kashmir are respected, including UNSCR 47 which refers to the people of Jammu and Kashmir having the right to self-determination.
3. Respect the 1972 Simla Agreement which refers to the future of Jammu and Kashmir being determined by peaceful means.
4. Ensure that the rule of law is upheld and human rights are protected by lifting the telecommunications black out and allowing independent, international observers to the region.
5. Support the assistance of a United Nations Special Envoy for Kashmir in facilitating a peaceful and sustainable future for Kashmir and all its peoples.
6. Allow essential aid such as food and medicine to be provided to residents of Jammu and Kashmir under the supervision of the United Nations and international charities.”

Council resolves to ask the Chief Executive to write to

1. The Prime Minister registering the Council’s concern at the action of the Indian Government and urging the UK Government to press for a resolution of the crisis based on the principles outlined in this motion.
2. the Borough’s three MPs thanking them for the action that they have already taken and ask them to use all parliamentary measures at their disposal to support the principles outlined in this motion.”

Councillor Mushtaq spoke in support of the Motion.

Councillor Akhtar spoke in support of the Motion.

Councillor Sykes spoke in support of the Motion.

Councillor Chauhan exercised his right of reply.

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



RESOLVED that:

1. The Chief Executive be asked to write to the Prime Minister registering the Council's concern at the action of the Indian Government and urging the UK Government to press for a resolution of the crisis based on the principles outlined in this motion.
2. The Chief Executive asked to write to the Borough's three MPs thanking them for the action that they had already taken and ask them to use all parliamentary measures at their disposal to support the principles outlined in this motion.

Motion 2 – Oldham's Urban Forest

Councillor Jabbar MOVED and Councillor Hulme SECONDED the following MOTION:

“This Council notes the following results from the i-Tree eco projects as detailed in the report ‘Valuing Oldham's Urban Forest’:

- There are over 465,000 trees in the Borough of Oldham.
- The Borough's trees remove around 65 tonnes of pollution from Oldham's air each year.
- Oldham's trees store more than 65,000 tonnes of Carbon and sequester a further 3000 tonnes per annum.
- Trees in Oldham helps cause 200,000³ of stormwater runoff to be avoided.

Council further notes that Oldham is located in the proposed Northern Forest, an area spanning the whole of the North of England where it is proposed to plant 50 million new trees to increase tree cover from 7.6%, a figure which is well below the European average.

Recognising the benefits of trees to our Borough and our location in the proposed Northern Forest, Council therefore resolved to:

- Sign the Charter for Trees, Woods and People.
- Appoint a Champion to join the Woodland Trust's active network of Tree Champions.”

Councillors Judd spoke in support of the Motion.

Councillor Jabbar exercised his right of reply.

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

RESOLVED that:

1. Oldham Council sign the Charter for Trees, Woods and People.

2. A Councillor be appointed to join the Woodland's Trust active network of Tree Champions.

NOTICE OF OPPOSITION BUSINESS

Motion 1 – Declaring a Climate Emergency

Councillor Harkness MOVED and Councillor Murphy SECONDED the following MOTION:

“This Council notes:

- That the intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) holds that climate change represents ‘an urgent and potentially irreversible threat to human societies and the planet.’
- That the overwhelming weight of scientific evidence points to climate change being man-made.
- The harmful effect that climate change has on our lives, natural habitats and eco-systems.
- The IPCC’s call to governments and civil society to take urgent action to address climate change.
- The resolutions made by over 100 UK local authorities and the UK Parliament in declaring climate emergencies.
- The commitment under the 5-Year Environment Plan by the ten Greater Manchester authorities to become carbon neutral by 2038.
- Rochdale, Wigan, Bury, Salford, Manchester city, Trafford & Stockport Metropolitan Boroughs have all declared a climate change emergency, Oldham Borough should too.

This Council welcomes:

- The ambitious commitment at the July 2019 Council of the Deputy Council Leader and the Cabinet Member for Finance and Corporate Resources and Low Carbon to make the Council carbon-neutral by 2025.
- The opportunity provided by the expiry of the Council’s current Climate Change strategy in 2020 to make new and more ambitious commitments to achieve carbon-neutrality by 2025.

This Council therefore resolves to:

- Declare a Climate Emergency and publicise why this declaration has been made to the people of our Borough, our media outlets and our statutory, voluntary and business sector partners to enlist their support in taking collective action in addressing climate change.
- Solicit the views and ideas of our staff, elected members, our partners and the general public in helping to craft a new Climate Change Strategy to replace our current strategy in 2020.
- Identify clearly within this Strategy the ambition for this Council to become carbon-neutral by 2025.
- Sign up to the UK100 Pledge to commit to consuming energy from renewable sources, including renewable energy generated by the Council itself.
- Re-establish a cross-party Climate Change Strategy Group to oversee the delivery of the new strategy in

partnership with the Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Finance and Corporate Resources and Low Carbon.

- Ask the Chief Executive to write to the relevant Ministers, the Mayor of Greater Manchester and the Leaders of the other Greater Manchester authorities seeking their endorsement of our Climate Change declaration and our ambition to become carbon-neutral and requesting of central government the powers and financial resources to enable us to become carbon-neutral.”



AMENDMENT

Councillor Jabbar MOVED and Councillor Judd SECONDED the following AMENDMENT:

“Insert before Section 1; ‘The impact of climate change is already causing serious damage around the world and all governments (national, regional and local) have a duty to act. Strong policies to cut emissions have associated health, wellbeing and economic benefits. This council therefore declares a ‘Climate Emergency’.

Section 1 – This Council Notes:

Insert after bullet point 4;

- ‘That Oldham has signed the UK100 Pledge to commit to consuming energy from renewable sources, including renewable energy generated by the Council itself.’

Insert new bullet point 9

- ‘The report “Climate Change and Green Oldham” presented at the meeting meeting of the Council on July 10th 2019 which highlighted the progress made by the Council on tackling climate change and environmental issues, with initiatives including:
 - Warm Homes Oldham
 - Oldham Community Power
 - Tommyfield Market Hall solar PV system’

Section 2 – ‘This Council welcomes:

Insert new bullet point 1:

- ‘The trailblazing commitment to an “Oldham Green New Deal” in the report “Climate Change and Green Oldham” presented at the meeting of the Council on July 10th 2019’
- In new bullet point 3 add after ‘more ambitious commitments’: ‘in the ‘Oldham Green New Deal’ such as the target for Oldham borough of ‘net zero’ carbon emissions by 2030 ahead of the GM target of 20138’
And delete ‘to achieve carbon neutrality by 2025.’

(new bullet point to read:

- ‘The opportunity provided, by the expiry of the Council’s current Climate Change strategy in 2020, to make new and more ambitious commitments in the ‘Oldham Green New Deal’ such as the target for Oldham borough of ‘net zero’ carbon emissions by 2030 ahead of the GM target of 2038’.)

Section 3 – This Council therefore resolves to:

Bullet point 1: delete all after “Declare a Climate Emergency”
Delete bullet point 3 starting “Identify...” and ending “2025.”
Delete bullet point 4 starting “Sign...” and ending “itself.”



The motion as amended to read:

“The impact of climate change is already causing serious damage around the world and all governments (national, regional and local) have a duty to act. Strong policies to cut emissions have associated health, wellbeing and economic benefits. This council therefore declares a ‘Climate Emergency’.

This Council notes:

- That the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) holds that climate change represents ‘an urgent and potentially irreversible threat to human societies and the planet.’
- That the overwhelming weight of scientific evidence points to climate change being man-made.
- The harmful effect that climate change has on our lives, natural habitats and eco-systems.
- The IPCC’s call to governments and civil society to take urgent action to address climate change.
- That Oldham has signed the UK100 Pledge to commit to consuming energy from renewable sources, including renewable energy generated by the Council itself.
- The resolutions made by over 100 UK local authorities and the UK Parliament in declaring climate emergencies.
- The commitment under the 5-Year Environment Plan by the ten Greater Manchester authorities to become carbon-neutral by 2038.
- Rochdale, Wigan, Bury, Salford, Manchester city, Trafford and Stockport Metropolitan Boroughs have all declared a climate change emergency, Oldham Borough should too.
- The report ‘Climate Change and Green Oldham’ presented at the meeting of the Council on July 10th 2019 which highlighted the progress made by the Council on tackling climate change and environmental issues, with initiatives including:
 - Warm Homes Oldham
 - Oldham Community Power
 - Tommyfield Market Hall Solar PV System

This Council welcomes:

- The trailblazing commitment to an ‘Oldham Green New Deal’ in the report ‘Climate Change and Green Oldham’ presented at the meeting of the Council on 10th July 2019.
- The ambitious commitment at the July 2019 Council of the Deputy Council Leader and Cabinet Member for Finance and Corporate Resources and Low Carbon to make the Council carbon-neutral by 2025.
- The opportunity provided by the expiry of the Council’s current Climate Change strategy in 2020 to make new and more ambitious commitments in the ‘Oldham Green New Deal’ such as the target for Oldham borough of ‘net

zero' carbon emissions by 2030 ahead of the GM target of 2038.

This Council therefore resolves to:

- Declare a Climate Emergency.
- Solicit the views and ideas of our staff, elected members, our partners and the general public in helping to craft a new Climate Change Strategy to replace our current strategy in 2020.
- Re-establish a cross party Climate Change Strategy Group to oversee the delivery of the new strategy in partnership with the Deputy Council Leader and Cabinet Member for Finance and Corporate Resources and Low Carbon.
- Ask the Chief Executive to write to the relevant Ministers, the Mayor of Greater Manchester and the Leaders of the other Greater Manchester authorities seeking their endorsement of our Climate Emergency declaration and our ambition to become carbon-neutral and requesting of central government the powers and financial resources to enable us to become carbon-neutral.”



Councillor Harkness ACCEPTED the AMENDMENT.

A vote was then taken on the AMENDMENT.

Councillor Harkness did not exercise his right of reply.

Councillor Jabbar did not exercise his right of reply.

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

Councillor Al-Hamdani spoke in support of the Substantive Motion.

Councillor Harkness exercised his right of reply.

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

RESOLVED that:

1. A Climate Emergency be declared.
2. Views and ideas of our staff, elected members, partners and the general public be solicited in helping to craft a new Climate Change Strategy to replace the Council's current strategy in 2020.
3. A cross-party Climate Change Strategy Group be re-established to oversee the delivery of the new strategy in partnership with the Deputy Council Leader and Cabinet Member for Finance and Corporate Resources and Low Carbon.
4. The Chief Executive be asked to write to the relevant Ministers, the Mayor of Greater Manchester and the Leaders of the other Greater Manchester authorities seeking their endorsement of the Council's Climate

Emergency declaration and our ambition to become carbon-neutral and requesting of central government the powers and financial resources to enable us to become carbon-neutral.



Motion 2 – Closing the Loophole

Councillor Williamson MOVED and Councillor C. Gloster SECONDED the following MOTION:

“This Council believes that our duty to protect our young people is paramount. Any chance of a slippage in the law that leaves young people unsafe or at threat of exploitation must be rectified.

Council notes that:

- The NSPCC (the National Society for the Protection of Children against Cruelty) has recently reported that in the last four years police in England have recorded 1,025 crimes of Abuse of Position of Trust of a Sexual Nature.
- The present legislation on Position of Trust makes it a criminal offence for teachers, care workers and youth justice workers to engage in sexual activity with 16/17-year olds in their care, but faith workers, youth workers and sports coaches are currently exempted.
- Councils have received 653 complaints about adults who are not currently covered by the criminal law engaging in sexual activity with children in their care.

This Council believes that the Government should:

- Extend the Position of Trust law to include all roles where an adult holds a position of power over 16 and 17-year-olds.
- Make it illegal for any adult to have sexual activity with a young person under 18 in their care.

As this accords with the objectives of the NSPCC’s ‘Closing the Loophole’ campaign, Council agrees to give the campaign its support and resolves to:

- Ask the Chief Executive to write to the Chief Executive of the NSPCC to register this Council’s support for the campaign
- Ask the Chief Executive to write to the Minister of Justice and of Sport urging them to introduce the necessary change in legislation
- Ask the Chief Executive to copy into this correspondence the Mayor of Greater Manchester and our local Members of Parliament seeking their support for the Council’s position and for the NSPCC campaign.

Councillor Chadderton spoke in support of the Motion.
Councillor Shah spoke in support of the Motion.

Councillor Williamson exercised her right of reply.

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

RESOLVED that:



Oldham
Council

Motion 3 – Ban on Fast Food and Energy Drinks Advertising

Councillor H. Gloster MOVED and Councillor Hamblett
SECONDED the following MOTION:

“Council notes that:

- Fast food contains high level of fats, salt and sugar and energy drinks often contain high levels of caffeine and sugar.
- Excessive consumption of these products contributes to obesity, tooth decay, diabetes, gastro-intestinal problems, sleep deprivation and hyperactivity.
- The Royal College of Paediatrics and Child Health predicts half of all children in the UK will be overweight or obese by 2020.
- The Mayor of London banned all fast food advertising on publically-controlled advertising spaces across London’s entire transport network.
- Sustain and Foodwatch recently published a report ‘Taking Down Junk Food Adverts’ which recommends that local authorities regulate adverts on public telephone boxes and that the Advertising Standards Authority should be able to regulate advertising outside nurseries, children’s centres, parks, family attractions and leisure centres.

As a local authority with a statutory responsibility for public health, Council believes that it should do all that is possible to discourage the consumption of fast food and energy drinks.

Council therefore resolves to:

- Ask the Chief Executive to write to the Chief Executive of Transport for Greater Manchester asking TFGM to impose a ban on the advertising of fast food and energy drinks on publicly owned poster sites etc across the Greater Manchester transport network.
- Ensure that fast food or energy are not advertised on any hoarding or within any building owned by this Council including large advertisements on bus stops.
- Ensure that such products are not sold to children or young people on any of our premises.
- Ask our NHS, social housing, voluntary and private sector partners, including the Mayor of Greater Manchester, to make a similar undertaking.
- Ask the Chief Executive to write to the relevant minister requesting the recommendations of the ‘Taking Down Junk Food Adverts’ report be adopted as government policy as soon as possible; copying in our local members of Parliament to seek their support.

Councillor Chauhan MOVED and Councillor Ur-Rehman
SECONDED that under Council Procedure Rule 8.4(d) the
motion be referred to the Overview and Scrutiny Board.

On being put to the vote, that the MOTION be REFERRED to Overview and Scrutiny was CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.



Oldham
Council

RESOLVED that under Council Procedure 8.4(d) the motion be referred to the Overview and Scrutiny Board.

11

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 issues raised at the meeting.

RESOLVED that the updated on Actions from Council be noted.

12

BREXIT UPDATE

Councillor Fielding **MOVED** and Councillor Sykes **SECONDED** a report of the Director of Legal Services which provided the anticipated impact of leaving the EU and what Greater Manchester and Oldham could do to mitigate against any likely negative consequences.

The report provided an overview of the potential impact of a 'no deal' scenario on Oldham. The Greater Manchester Combined Authority had published briefings on Brexit Preparations. The report outlined EU Exit Planning in Oldham which included work of an officer led project group. The group had been working to:

- Ensure that the impact of Brexit had been considered on the context of service-level Business Continuity Planning.
- Identify potential risks to the Council of a 'no-deal' Brexit scenario.
- Review policies relevant to the management of these risks, to ensure they are fit for purpose in the new environment.
- Monitor staffing issues following a review of services which could be most affected.
- Monitor the impact and implications of any future agreement between the UK and EU.
- Update elected members regarding the major categories of risk as appropriate.
- Make recommendations to Executive Officers on how the EU Exit mitigation funding should be allocated.

Oldham had been provided and allocation of £0.210m between the financial years 2018/19 and 2019/20. To date £20k of the funding had been allocated to support Oldham's Emergency Food Provision Sector (EFPS).

The report also detailed economic impact, social impact, community cohesion, supply chain resilience and organisational impact implications. At GM level there was ongoing activity to support GM businesses and raise awareness of the need to ensure preparations were underway for the changes resulting from Brexit. A multi-agency Economic Resilience Taskforce had been established which brought together key GM bodies to try to ensure a coherent and comprehensive package of support.

Councillor Hudson spoke on the report.
Councillor Roberts spoke on the report.
Councillor Chauhan spoke on the report.
Councillor Hamblett spoke on the report.
Councillor Shuttleworth spoke on the report.
Councillor Al-Hamdani spoke on the report.
Councillor Hulme spoke on the report.

Councillor Fielding exercised his right of reply.

RESOLVED that:

1. The ongoing work to help Oldham plan and mitigate for a 'no-deal' EU Exit be noted.
2. Future report provided further detail on the impact on community cohesion.

13

TREASURY MANAGEMENT REVIEW 2018/19

Councillor Jabbar MOVED and Councillor Fielding SECONDED a report of the Director of Finance on the Treasury Management Review for 2018/19. The report had been commended to Council by Cabinet at its meeting held on 22nd July 2019.

The Council was required by regulations issued under the Local Government Act 2003 to produce an annual review of treasury management activities together with the actual prudential and treasury indicators for 2018/19. The report met the requirements of both the CIPFA Code of Practice on Treasury Management (The Code) and the CIPFA Prudential Code for Capital Finance in Local Authorities (The Prudential Code).

During 2018/19 the minimum reporting requirements were that full Council should receive the following reports:

- An annual treasury strategy in advance of the year (approved 28 February 2018)
- A mid-year (minimum) treasury update report (approved 12 December 2018)
- An annual review following the end of the year describing the activity compared to the strategy (this report).

The regulatory environment placed responsibility on members for the review and scrutiny of treasury management policy and activities. The report was, therefore, important in that respect as it provided details of the outturn position for treasury activities and highlighted compliance with the Council's policies previously approved by Members.

The Council confirmed it had complied with the requirements under the Code to give prior scrutiny to all of the above treasury management reports. The Audit Committee was charged with the scrutiny of treasury management activities in Oldham and was, therefore, requested to review the content of the report prior to its consideration by Cabinet and Council. A programme of Treasury Management training had been developed in conjunction with Link Asset Services, the Council's Treasury Management advisors and a session for leading Members and senior officers had already been delivered and further training

was arranged to assist Members of the Audit Committee with their scrutiny role.



Oldham
Council

The Audit Committee had scrutinised the Treasury Management Review at its meeting on 25th June 2019. In addition, the report had also been presented to and approved by Cabinet at its meeting on 22nd July 2019. Both the Audit Committee and Cabinet were content to commend the report to Council.

During 2018/19, the Council complied with its legislative and regulatory requirements. The key actual prudential and treasury indicators, which detailed the impact of capital expenditure activities during the year were detailed in the report. The actual capital expenditure was less than the revised budget estimate for 2018/19 presented within the 2019/20 Treasury Management Strategy report considered at the Council meeting on 27 February 2019.

The outturn position was significantly less than the £8.658m original capital budget for 2018/19 as approved at Budget Council on 28 February 2018. During the course of the year, the Capital Programme saw substantial rephrasing. A number of major schemes including the Eastern Gateway Improvement Regeneration scheme and the Coliseum Theatre project were re-phased or re-aligned into future years to allow for either a review of the scheme to be undertaken (as was the case with the theatre project) or to align with revised project timelines. The planned expenditure had therefore been reprofiled into 2019/20 and future years.

No borrowing had been undertaken during the year. This was because of the policy of self-financing which was utilised due to the uncertainty around interest rates and the availability of cash, caused the Council to use cash reserves rather than incur additional borrowing costs. Other prudential and treasury indicators were to be found in the report. The Director of Finance also confirmed that the statutory borrowing limit (the Authorised Limit) had not been breached.

The financial year 2018/19 continued the challenging investment environment of previous years, namely low investment returns.

In moving the report, Councillor Jabbar informed the meeting that Oldham was the first local authority to close their 2018/19 Final Accounts in the country. Councillor Jabbar thanked the Senior Management Team and the Director of Finance and her team on their hard work.

Councillor C. Gloster spoke on the report and reiterated the comments of Councillor Jabbar.

RESOLVED that:

1. The actual 2018/19 prudential and treasury indicators presented in Treasury Management Review 2018/19 be approved.

2. The Annual Treasury Management Review report for 2018/19 be approved.

14

ORGANISATIONAL FRAMEWORK : UPDATE

Consideration was given to a report of the Chief Executive. Oldham had driven changes to the arrangements, structures and models of its delivery in order to ensure the Council continued to deliver against each key plan. There was a requirement to have appropriate Executive Leadership arrangements in place to respond to statutory services and priorities. Oldham continued to demonstrate its move from an organisation-centric structure to more integrated provision which focussed on achieving outcomes for people and places. A priority was to ensure Oldham was a place where Children and Young People thrived.

In 2018, interim arrangements had been put in place for the statutory role of Director of Children's Services (DCS) and Full Council had agreed a level of remuneration for the post within a salary banding up to £120k per annum.

Since then, the organisation had taken steps to move from interim arrangements to a permanent position of Managing Director, Children and Young People. As part of the recruitment process, a review of national pay rates had been undertaken and as a result it was recommended that the level of remuneration banding for the post be extended to £130k per annum.

RESOLVED that the remuneration for the post of Managing Director Children and Young People (DCS) be approved.

15

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY ANNUAL REPORT

Consideration was given to the Overview and Scrutiny Annual Report for 2018/19. The report outlined the purpose of Overview and Scrutiny, the roles and responsibilities of the Overview and Scrutiny Board, the Performance and Value for Money Select Committee and the Health Scrutiny Sub-Committee. The report contained a summary of the work undertaken in 2018/19 and outlined how individuals could get involved in Overview and Scrutiny.

In moving the report, Councillor McLaren thanked members and officers for their support.

Councillor Williams spoke on the report.

Councillor Williamson spoke on the report and sought clarification that Movers and Seconders of motions referred to Overview and Scrutiny be invited to attend workshops / task and finish groups.

Councillor McLaren exercised his right of reply.

RESOLVED that the Overview and Scrutiny Annual Report for 2018/19 be approved.



Oldham
Council