

Present: The Mayor – Councillor

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

1 **CIVIC APPRECIATION AWARD STEVE HILL**

A Civic Appreciation Award was conferred on Mr. Steve Hill MBE in recognition of his significant voluntary contribution and dedication to the borough and community of Oldham.

Councillors Fielding, Sykes and Harrison gave congratulatory speeches about Mr Hill.

Mr. Hill made a short acceptance speech to the Council.

It was noted that the presentation of the Award would take place in the Mayor's Parlour at a later date.

2 **TO RECEIVE APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND ATTENDANCE**

Consultation had been undertaken with Group Leaders to vary the order of the agenda due to the changes to the regulations. Councillor Fielding MOVED and Councillor Sykes SECONDED an amendment to Council Procedure 15.5 and proposed that timings would include the extensions, therefore any members wishing to speak would be granted 4 minutes and 30 seconds and those members with a right of reply 6 minutes and 30 seconds. On being put to the vote, this was AGREED.

Apologies were received from Councillor Alexander, Councillor Hudson, Councillor Salamat and Councillor Surjan.

3 **TO ORDER THAT THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COUNCIL HELD ON 16TH DECEMBER 2020 AND 4TH MARCH 2021 BE SIGNED AS A CORRECT RECORD**

Councillor Hobin asked that it be noted that he was present throughout the meeting on 4th March but had been unable to participate due to connection issues.

RESOLVED that the minutes of the Council meetings held on 16th December 2020 and 4th March 2021 be approved as a correct record.

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

Due to the current pandemic and the virtual meeting, a roll call of elected members was taken, and at the same time, in accordance with the Code of Conduct, elected members declared the following interests:

Councillor Ahmad declared a personal interest at Item 10 Motion 2 and Item 11 Motion 3 by virtue of his membership of a union.
Councillor Akhtar declared a personal interest at Item 10 Motion 2 and Item 11 Motion 3 by virtue of his membership of UNITE.
Councillor Ali declared a personal interest at Item 10 Motion 2 and Item 11 Motion 3 by virtue of his membership of the GMB union.

Councillor Alyas declared a personal interest at Item 10 Motion 2 by virtue of his membership of a union.

Councillor Ball declared a personal interest at Item 10 Motion 2 and Item 11 Motion 3 by virtue of her membership of UNITE.

Councillor M Bashforth declared a personal and pecuniary interest at Item 10 Motion 2 and Item 11 Motion 3.

Councillor S Bashforth declared a personal and pecuniary interest at Item 10 Motion 2 and a personal interest at Item 11 Motion 3 by virtue of his membership of the GMB union.

Councillor Briggs declared a personal interest at Item 10 Motion 2 and Item 11 Motion 3 by virtue of his membership of a union.

Councillor Brownridge declared a personal interest at Item 10 Motion 2 by virtue of her membership of a union.

Councillor Chadderton declared a personal interest at Item 10 Motion 2 by virtue of her membership of a union.

Councillor Chauhan declared a personal interest at Item 9d by virtue of his appointment to the MioCare Board and a personal interest at Item 10 Motion 2 and Item 11 Motion 3 by virtue of his membership of a union.

Councillor Cosgrove declared a personal interest at Item 10 Motion 2 and Item 11 Motion 3 by virtue of her membership of UNITE.

Councillor Curley declared a personal interest at Item 11 Motion 3 by virtue of being a member of education staff.

Councillor Davis declared a personal interest at Item 10 Motion 2 and Item 11 Motion 3 by virtue of his membership of UNITE.

Councillor Dean declared a personal interest at Item 10 Motion 2 and Item 11 Motion 3 by virtue of his membership of GMB.

Councillor Fielding declared a personal and pecuniary interest at Item 10 Motion 2 and Item 11 Motion 3.

Councillor Garry declared a pecuniary interest at Item 9d by virtue of her husband's employment with Greater Manchester Police.

Councillor C Gloster declared a personal interest at Item 9d by virtue of his receipt of an occupational pension from Greater Manchester Police.

Councillor H Gloster declared a personal interest at Item 9d by virtue of her husband's receipt of an occupational pension from Greater Manchester Pension Fund.



Councillor Goodwin declared a personal interest at Item 10 Motion 2 and Item 11 Motion 3 by virtue of his membership of UNITE.

Councillor Hamblett declared a personal interest at Item 9d by virtue of his appointment to the MioCare Board.

Councillor Haque declared a personal interest at Item 10 Motion 2 and Item 11 Motion 3 by virtue of his membership of a trade union.

Councillor Harkness declared a personal and pecuniary interest at Item 10 Motion 2 and a personal interest at Item 11 Motion 3.

Councillor Hewitt declared a personal interest at Item 10 Motion 2 and Item 11 Motion 3 by virtue of his membership of UNITE and GMB.

Councillor Hulme declared a personal interest at Item 10 Motion 2 and Item 11 Motion 3 by virtue of his membership of GMB.

Councillor F Hussain declared a personal interest at Item 10 Motion 2 and Item 11 Motion 3.

Councillor Ibrahim declared a personal interest at Item 10 Motion 2 and Item 11 Motion 3 by virtue of her membership of UNITE.

Councillor Iqbal declared a personal interest at Item 10 Motion 2 and Item 11 Motion 3 by virtue of his membership of CWU.

Councillor Jabbar declared a personal interest at Item 10 Motion 2 and Item 11 Motion 3 by virtue of his membership of trades unions.

Councillor Jacques declared a personal and pecuniary interest at Item 10 Motion 2 by virtue of her membership of Unison and being employed in education and a personal interest at Item 11 Motion 3 by virtue of her membership of the Unison.

Councillor Leach declared a personal interest at Item 10 Motion 2 and Item 11 Motion 3 by virtue of her membership of UNITE.

Councillor Malik declared a personal interest at Item 10 Motion 2 and Item 11 Motion 3 by virtue of his membership of UNITE.

Councillor McLaren declared a personal interest at Item 11 Motion 3 by virtue of his membership of NEU.

Councillor Moores declared a personal interest at Item 10 Motion 2 and Item 11 Motion 3 by virtue of his membership of UNITE.

Councillor Mushtaq declared a personal interest at Item 10 Motion 2 and Item 11 Motion 3 by virtue of his membership of UNITE.

Councillor Phythian declared a personal interest at Item 10 Motion 2 and Item 11 Motion 3 by virtue of his membership of GMB.

Councillor Roberts declared a personal interest at Item 10 Motion 2 and Item 11 Motion 3 by virtue of her membership of GMB.

Councillor Shah declared a personal interest at Item 10 Motion 2 and Item 11 Motion 3 by virtue of her membership of a trade union.

Councillor Shuttleworth declared a personal interest at Item 10 Motion 2 and Item 11 Motion 3 by virtue of his membership of GMB.

Councillor Stretton declared a personal interest at Item 10 Motion 2 and Item 11 Motion 3 by virtue of her membership of GMB.

Councillor Taylor declared a personal interest at Item 10 Motion 2 and Item 11 Motion 3 by virtue of her membership of GMB.
Councillor Toor declared a personal interest at Item 10 Motion 2 and Item 11 Motion 3 by virtue of her membership of Unison.
Councillor Ur-Rehman declared a personal interest at Item 10 Motion 2 and Item 11 Motion 3 by virtue of his membership of UNITE.

Councillor Harrison declared a personal interest at Item 11 Motion 3 by virtue of her membership of NEU.

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

There were no items of urgent business.

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

The Council was informed that several Members had indicated they would be retiring at the end of the current Municipal Year.

Councillors Sheldon, McLaren, Sykes, Byrne and Hobin paid tribute to the work of Councillor Hudson.

Councillors Brownridge, Sykes and Sheldon paid tribute to the work of Councillor Haque.

Councillors Dean and C Gloster paid tribute to the work of Councillor Price.

Councillors Leach, Al-Hamdani and Sheldon paid tribute to the work of Councillor Hewitt.

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

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

People and Place

Reference 2020-14: Petition requesting Don't Build on Greenbelt Land received 2 April 2019 with 467 signatures

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

8 **YOUTH COUNCIL**

The Youth Council **PROPOSED** the following **MOTION**:

During 2020 we were able to consult over 8,600 young people for the UK Youth Parliament's consultation 'Make Your Mark', although lower than previous years due to the pandemic restrictions it represents a 34% turnout (the highest in the UK). The top issue that came out from this ballot, with more than a quarter of all votes, was Free University: Investing in young

people by providing free university; This will help more young people reach their full potential without suffering financial hardship. With young people now reported leaving university with upwards of £45,000 worth of debt, it is no surprise that young people must seriously consider this cost before even applying to university. For some young people in Oldham, fees plus the cost of living and other financial requirements will implicate their decision to apply and continue into higher education regardless of their passion or ability. This in turn may restrict or hinder their prospects to gain a full-time job in equal measure of pay and opportunity compared to that of their peers who attend university.

At the time of running Make Your Mark over 3,000 young people aged 18-24 were unemployed, a youth unemployment rate of 15.2%, the highest rate across Greater Manchester and higher than the national rate of 9.2%. With unemployment rising due to the pandemic it is likely that youth unemployment will rise further and stay high for longer than for adult unemployment. We know that the reality is that not all young people may want to attend university even if it is free. However, if we can give every opportunity to those who wish to be socially mobile then it will free up space within the labour market.

Oldham Council is committed to providing quality educational opportunities for all it's young people.

We ask that the Chief Executive writes to the Prime Minister, Boris Johnson and the Minister of State for Universities, Michelle Donelan to show the Council's support of it's young people and support of scrapping University Fees.

Councillor Mushtaq MOVED and Councillor H Gloster SECONDED the RESOLUTION as outlined in the MOTION presented by the Youth Council.

Councillors Moores, Hulme, Leach, Mushtaq and H Gloster spoke in support of the Youth Council Motion.

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

9

QUESTION TIME

a Public Questions FIELD_PAGE_RANGE

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 agreed to suspend Council Procedure Rule 10.4 so that the questions would be shared on the screen rather than be read out.

The following questions were submitted:

1. Question received from Anita Lowe:
Why did O.M.B.C/Legal Services feel the need take it upon

themselves to personally attempt an injunction on a citizen of Oldham - Mrs Deborah Barrett-Cole on 11th December 2020 at Manchester Civil Justice Centre.

Please could you explain the reasons for serving this injunction?



Councillor Fielding, Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Economy and Skills, responded that it was considered appropriate to issue legal proceedings in this matter to prevent harassment and disturbance of individuals affected by the conduct.

2. Question received from Lewis Quigg:

I would like to ask the Council and relevant cabinet member:

- That Oldham is open to all businesses and employers whether foreign or domestic?
- That the Council condemns attacks on local businesses that involve criminal damage and in particular on the Elbit factory in Clarksfield?
- Does the Council agree that attacks on businesses sends the wrong message to employers, and in particular the defence industry which employs many skilled workers in the United Kingdom and in a Borough such as Oldham where we should be looking to increase employment?
- Will the Council ask Greater Manchester Police to provide all necessary support to local businesses to make sure they are safe and secure employment spaces for their workers?

Councillor Fielding, Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Economy and Skills, responded that the Council welcomed investment from all businesses into the Borough and strived to be a place where businesses and enterprise could thrive. As could be seen within the Oldham Plan, the Council promoted an inclusive economy and would continue to stimulate inward investment.

The Council condemned any form of criminality and would encourage businesses and employers to report such behaviours to Greater Manchester Police at the earliest opportunity. All businesses and individuals in Oldham should feel safe and secure and the Council worked in partnership with Greater Manchester Police and other enforcement authorities to ensure offenders were brought to justice. Should any employer require any further information on business security, they could contact Greater Manchester Police for support and advice on 101 or via www.gmp.police.uk

3. Question from Mick Harwood:

I would like to ask a question on behalf of Friends of Tandle Hill Country Park.

Visitors to Tandle Hill Country Park are becoming increasingly worried about an increasing amount of litter, not just there but also in other local parks.

I feel that an effort to encourage people to take their rubbish home would help

Would the council be willing and supportive of a “take your rubbish home” campaign?



Oldham
Council


Councillor Brownridge, Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods and Culture responded that the Council was aware of the significant increase in visitors to the parks and with the noticeable increase in litter. With this in mind, Tandle Hill park was now receiving attention 7 days per week and hopefully a significant improvement would have been seen. This week the council agreed to plans to install new wheeled bin type street bins that could also be used for dog waste. These bins had almost three times the capacity of the older style bins and gave people no excuse but to dispose of their litter in the correct manner. However if bins did get full, which it was appreciated would happen from time to time, people were encouraged through the 'Love Where you Live' campaign to respect their environment and if needs arose take their litter home with them. The Council was always happy to discuss with residents any campaigns that aimed to improve the local environment, as long as resources permitted.

4. Question from Glynn Williams:
A figure of £68million was recently quoted in the press regarding the level of intended spend on projects relating to Spindles. Can the relevant Cabinet Member advise if this figure is correct, where the money is coming from, and clear up why spending on Spindles does not come at the expense of frontline services and jobs in Oldham?

Councillor Fielding, Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Economy and Skills, responded that the proposal to redevelop the Spindles and Towns Square Shopping Centre formed part of the Council's £285m Creating a Better Place programme, which provided a strategic framework for economic recovery by creating homes, jobs and skills development opportunities for residents.

The Council was working hard to ensure the borough's town and district centres could reopen safely after what had been an horrendous twelve months for our communities and local businesses. A variety of options were currently being considered for the redevelopment of the Town Centre, to help bring forward brownfield sites for development of much needed homes and to ensure there were places for people to work, visit and enjoy family time in open green spaces. There was no specific approval for the figure of £68m that had been quoted in the press - as the redevelopment options were still being considered following the recent engagement activity, with a view to including as many of the great ideas submitted by our communities as possible. The final cost to the Council would depend on which redevelopment option was selected and the outcome of bids for external grant funding.

As this project was a key part of the Creating a Better Place programme, this would complement the Council's plans for wider regeneration linked to rationalising the Council's



corporate estate. This programme had been tested and reviewed to ensure alignment with economic recovery after the CV19 pandemic, and it would contribute to the achievement of significant budget savings that were approved as part of the Revenue Budget 2021/22 and Medium Term Financial Strategy 2021/22 to 2023/24.

5. Question from Dave Arnott:

I have been approached by a number of concerned residents regarding litter and the general state of maintenance of Tandle Hill Country Park.

I'm sure that you would agree that the park could be considered a "jewel in the crown" of our Borough, and as such, should be maintained to the highest possible standard for the benefit of visitors from across Oldham and residents of the local area.

Concerns range from a build up of litter at the approach to the park, a shortage of large litter bins, very little tree management, limited toilet facilities, paths and steps in a dangerous condition etc.

I understand that a Council employee is now present in the park to collect litter on Fridays, Saturdays and Sundays, but given the thousand of visitors that are using the area, this is proving to be insufficient to address the litter problem itself, let alone other issues.

Would the Leader of the Council undertake to ask the relevant Council Member to investigate the maintenance of the park, and explore the possibility of utilising some of the grants and funding that have been made available to local government for the improvement of communities, to carry out some much needed upgrades and improvements to one of our most pleasant and popular parks.

Councillor Brownridge, Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods and Culture responded that further to the complaint from Mr Arnott, he should be reassured that the Council understood the current pressures being faced at the majority of the greenspaces it provided and Tandle Hills was no different. The park was now covered 7 days a week to deal with the litter that had become an issue during the restrictions currently in place and it was hoped that this had been noticed. There were a number of bins in Tandle Hill park and they continued to be emptied as frequently as possible, but it was also the responsibility of the public not to pile waste upon waste when a bin was full.

The Council had just approved a replacement bin programme which over the coming months would see the introduction of wheelie bin type street bins which held approximately 3 times the capacity of existing bins, a significant investment in what were very challenging financial circumstances.

The trees in Tandle Hills were regularly inspected and work was programmed in to ensure they remained as safe as possible.

The increased wear and tear had created issues with paths

in the park and these would continue to be addressed alongside all other paths across Oldham in a timely manner. At this stage there were no immediate plans to increase the number of toilets in the park, but all facilities were continually reviewed and where opportunity and funding arose improvements were sought. Mr Arnott should be reassured that the Council sought additional funding at every available opportunity and would continue to do so.

6. Question from Eamonn Keane

This question relates to the proposed admission arrangements for the new Brian Clarke academy. Depending on where in Oldham you live, you can be ineligible for up to 90% of the places available, unless your parents profess a faith, and they are vouched for by a religious minister.

Does the Council support this discriminatory policy?

Councillor Mushtaq responded that it was not a question of whether the Council supported what was described as a discriminatory policy, the Bryan Clarke Academy was a faith-based school and was lawfully allowed to select on faith, like a grammar school could select on ability. The Section 10 consultation was currently ongoing and parents were encouraged to take part in this and contribute their views. The Bryan Clarke Academy had worked closely with the Council to ensure it would not be a mono-cultural school and would be open to the local community as much as possible. The best option for parents at this time was to take part in the consultation and make their views apparent.

At this point in the meeting the Mayor advised that all of the submitted questions had received a response.

RESOLVED that the questions and responses provided be noted.

b Questions to Leader and Cabinet FIELD_PAGE_RANGE

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

Question 1:

For my first question to the Leader tonight, I would like to return to the redevelopment of the Spindles and Town Square shopping centres.

At the November 2020 Council meeting, just after the purchase had been completed, I asked the Leader whether this represented a 'risky purchase' and pointed up the 'significant sums of money' that will be involved in repurposing and refurbishing these two shopping centres.

I am sure that many people will have been shocked to recently hear that the 'significant sum of money' this Administration has earmarked to repurpose and refurbish these shopping centres

amounts to £68 million over five years.



Oldham
Council

Not for nothing did the Liberal Democrats brand it 'Spindles'.

This truly is a whopping sum of money.

We all want to see a vibrant, viable town centre in the heart of our borough – and for our part Liberal Democrat Councillors also want to see vibrant and well-used district centres in Failsworth, Chadderton, Royton, Shaw, Uppermill, and Lees as well – but at what eventual cost?

My real fear is that we shall see the same cost and time overruns and abortive costs on this project that have dogged this Administration's previous so-called ambitious town centre projects:

- the abandoned Hotel Futures plan;
- the abandoned Coliseum plans – plural;
- the bankrupted My House;
- the much delayed and costly 'game changer' at Princes Gate;
- the over-budget town centre digital hub;
- and lastly the town centre flagship, the Old Town Hall project, delivered at four times the original cost.

So can the Leader please tell me tonight how he will ensure that this project will be rigorously managed from start-to-finish, to ensure that it is delivered on time and to the current assigned budget or, for the sake of our hard-pressed tax payers, preferably much less?

Councillor Fielding, Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Economy and Skills, responded that the £68M figure quoted was not what it was intended to spend on Spindles and the plans for it had not yet been finalised. More than 2000 people had responded to the consultation and provided their ideas. External funding would be sought to reduce the overall cost to the Council.

Whilst the Opposition pointed to projects that had not come in on time or on budget, many projects had come in on budget and in time, or even better, including schools and leisure centres. The Administration was committed to regeneration and improving the Oldham economy and the Council was the only body that would do that. It would require taking a risk and being prepared to invest in the place and the people.

Question 2:

My second question to the Leader tonight references the sad anniversary yesterday of the first COVID-19 Lockdown in the United Kingdom.

This past year we have seen so much sacrifice and so much suffering.

Many of us have had COVID-19 or have seen loved ones, friends and family, die from this relentless, ruthless disease.

But we have also seen a great deal of courage and selflessness.

We are all too aware of the incredible professionalism, fortitude, and, yes, bravery displayed by our wonderful NHS staff in their care for those afflicted by COVID-19.

But we should also remember the many others who have helped save lives and keep our society functioning during this unprecedented crisis.

Members of our emergency services, including the volunteers of our local Mountain Rescue Service; our care workers; our schools, education and nursery staff; our postal workers; our power, water and telecoms workers; bus, tram and train drivers; delivery drivers and warehouse staff; supermarket and shop workers; the many volunteers who support our communities, and of course our hardworking council staff, who like their colleagues in the NHS have found this time especially testing.

My question to the Leader concerns how we will mark this sacrifice, suffering, courage and selflessness in our borough in the future.

Oldham has been hit especially hard by COVID-19 and it will take a significant effort and a lot of time to recover.

A large part of this recovery will revolve around the collective need for the people of this borough to grieve, to reflect and to remember.


I would suggest to the Leader that we need to commit as a borough to creating a bespoke collective space where that might happen – a memorial to our COVID-19 victims and its heroes.

I am not seeking to prescribe what this memorial might be or where it might be, nor would now be the right time to establish it as we are not yet at the end of this tragedy.

But I am confident that Oldham's great people would get behind such a proposal, so could the Leader join me in making a commitment in principle tonight to make such a memorial a reality?

Councillor Fielding, Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Economy and Skills, responded that Councillor Sykes' suggestion was welcomed. Many people across the borough had made great sacrifices, many loved ones had been lost and consideration should be given to an appropriate way to mark them. When the time was right, he suggested a cross-party group be drawn together to consider how this could be marked and he committed to doing this.

Councillor Sheldon, Acting Leader of the Conservative Group asked a question about the length of the full Council meetings. It should be remembered that Oldham Council was not the government. Suggestions were put forward including declarations of interest being made on the "chat" function, the main and opposition parties be restricted to one motion per meeting, ward questions should only relate to items where enquiries though



officers had been exhausted. The final item on this agenda was one of the most important matters for a long time and had needed to be brought forward on the agenda to give the opportunity for full debate. Could the Leader give consideration to the timing of future meetings and ask all Councillors to share their thoughts? A quick and timely meeting could be far more productive than many hours of debate.

Councillor Fielding, Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Economy and Skills, responded that he understood the points raised, particularly in relation to the roll calls and declarations of interest required to conduct a remote meeting. Most Members had their own views on issues and this was the place they could debate them with people who may not share those views. He would be happy to look again at the agenda for the Council meeting to see if it could be improved. Group members were encouraged to feed their thoughts to their Group Leaders for consideration in the next municipal year.

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

1. Councillor Shuttleworth asked the following question: Manchester United and England footballer Marcus Rashford. Rashford's campaign to extend free school meals successfully forced a government u-turn, with Prime Minister Boris Johnson confirming that his administration would commit to ensuring meals were available to children during the Christmas break. Could the Cabinet Member, please advise us what funding is being made available to the Council and what plans are in place to ensure that all families entitled to free school meals receive the help they need?

Councillor Mushtaq, Cabinet Member for Education, responded that The LA were in receipt of funding from Government of nearly £1million to support vulnerable families with children and young people over the winter. We were currently working with schools, colleges and early years settings to ensure food vouchers get to families with children entitled to income based free school meals before schools finished for the Christmas holidays.

This would ensure that those eligible for free school meals on the grounds of low income received a £30 voucher to cover the two-week Christmas holiday at £15 per week per child. This support would also be offered in the February 2021 half term. In order that families received the vouchers that could be used in the Oldham supermarket of their choice we were obtaining vouchers via a third-party online hub – known as Wonde. These vouchers would also be available for Asylum Seeker Families with no recourse to public funds.

The funding would also allow the LA to top up a range of



Oldham
Council

other financial schemes to support the vulnerable. This included:

- Warm Homes Grant – money available for people who need help with fuel bills or to fix heating
- Support for Care Leavers from age 18 up to 25 with food vouchers

Families were also being signposted to

<https://www.oldham.gov.uk/wecanhelp> where they could obtain further details of the help and advice available.

The Council would receive an additional £1.35m of funding to provide Holiday Activities and Food programme over the Easter, summer and Christmas school holidays. The purpose of the grant funding was to provide healthy food and enriching activities to disadvantaged children. The Easter programme of activities and food was being collated at present and would be promoted to eligible families shortly.

The offer would be published on the Family Information Activities and Leisure Council webpage

<https://www.oldham.gov.uk/hsc/services/categories/1>

2. Councillor Leach asked the following question:
Can the Cabinet Member for Finance explain why the Tory Government has stopped giving councils Council tax freeze grants? Doesn't this amount to yet another Tory stealth tax increase and can he explain what has been the impact on the people of Oldham?

Councillor Jabbar, Cabinet Member for Finance and Corporate Green, responded that the Council Tax Freeze Grant was available to Local Authorities if they chose not to implement a Council Tax increase during the financial years 2011/12 to 2015/16. The grant received compensated Authorities for the Council Tax that would otherwise have been generated.

The impact of discontinuing this grant for the Government was a reduction in the level of grant provided to Councils. The impact for the Council was a loss of a funding stream which, if not made good, would require budget cuts to be made. The removal of the grant meant the Council was therefore forced to increase Council Tax in order to maintain funding for services and to deal with new spending pressures.

It was important to note that, from 2016/17, the Government changed policy. The Adult Social Care Precept was introduced aimed at specifically funding Adult Social Care, an area significantly underfunded by Government for many years – thus shifting the burden of financing this vital service to Council Tax payers.

Government also introduced the concept of Core Spending Power. This was the Government's assumption about the overall revenue funding available for Local Authority Services. This was published with the Local Government Finance Settlement. This was based on assumptions, including that Councils raise Council Tax by the maximum allowable (including the Adult Social Care Precept) before being required to hold a referendum on the level of the

increase. In addition, from 2016/17, which increased Council Tax even more.

Therefore Oldhamers had seen their Council Tax increase as a result of changing Government Council Tax policy. However, although the financial position was challenging, the Council had chosen not to increase the Council Tax to the maximum level for both this year 2020/21 and for 2021/22. For 2021/22 Oldham's Council Tax increase of 2.99% was the lowest in Greater Manchester.

3. Councillor Toor asked the following question:
Many schools generate income through before and after school clubs, (although in many cases these will only breakeven), however, during lockdown these facilities did not operate. Could the Cabinet Member for education please tell us were schools able to furlough before and after school staff, and also give us some idea of the impact on school budgets?

Councillor Mushtaq, Cabinet Member for Education, responded that the DfE did not, in general, expect schools to furlough staff. However, they understood that, in some instances, schools may have a separate private income stream and, where this income had either stopped or been reduced and there were staff paid from those private income streams, it may be appropriate to furlough staff. Staff could only be furloughed if they did not have any other job in the school.

The Council was aware of 5 maintained schools who had furloughed before/after school staff. In total these schools would receive income from the Government of £62k to the end of February and estimated this would be 68k by the end of the financial year

4. Councillor Harkness asked the following question:
Information recently received from officers by my colleague, Councillor Sykes, has revealed that no new money has been found to provide much-needed disabled parking bays for the last three years and that work to progress the applications made for such bays has been placed on hold as there is no money to carry out any work even when approved.
To get about some disabled people in this borough are reliant upon being able to access a vehicle adapted for their use at a space that is near to their home. If they own the vehicle, they also need to park it there.
Three years is an awful long time to wait. Many of these applicants have been completely trapped at home throughout the COVID-19 Lockdown and tragically it is likely some applicants may die or be no longer able to drive by the time their applications are approved.
Can the Cabinet Member please tell me when this Administration will finally allocate more money from the budget to process and action these applications so that these needy people can finally be able to leave home and get about?



Councillor Brownridge, Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods and Culture, responded that the applications received for disabled parking bays were currently being reviewed against the recently revised Disabled Bay policy, in line with the overall revised Council Blue Badge policy – provision had been made next financial year 2021/22 to continue to review and prioritise applications for action – the intention was to continue this process as an annual programme.

5. Councillor Garry asked the following question:
The recent investment into the play area and sports courts at Lower Memorial Park in Failsworth West is welcome and makes it a genuine family friendly park. I am sure the new homeowners at the family homes on the Lancaster Gardens estate will make good use of it when weather permits. Could the Cabinet Member responsible confirm the total investment into this park and the source of the funding?

Councillor Brownridge, Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods and Culture, responded that the funding totalling £93,643 for the playscape and refurbished Multi Unit Games Arena in Lower Memorial park was funded through section 106, Failsworth and Hollinwood District and Environmental services Greenspace Development budget and brought with it much needed improvements to the park that would be welcomed by existing residents and those now occupying the recently constructed properties by Bellway Homes

6. Councillor Hulme asked the following question:
During the Chancellor's budget announcement details were released of towns which had been successful in securing funding from the "Town Deal Fund". I am aware that Oldham has bid for £41million for projects including, office space, a performance space, northern roots and a district heat network but was not included in the published list of successful bids. Does the Cabinet Member responsible have an update on Oldham's bid?

Councillor Fielding, Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Economy and Skills, responded that on 11th December 2020, the Oldham Town Deal Board that existed to support the local delivery of the Towns Fund submitted a Town Investment Plan (TIP) bid for £41 million towards five projects, as part of Cohort 2a. The Government's Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) had announced Cohort 2a at the start of October 2020, thereby giving Town Deal Boards four submission options:
Cohort 1: 31st July 2020
Cohort 2: 30th October 2020
Cohort 2a: 11th December 2020
Cohort 3: 29th January 2021
By submitting the TIP in December 2020, after Oldham Council had purchased Spindles Town Square Shopping Centre in October 2020, the Board could specify the



shopping centre as the preferred location for three of the five projects and strengthen the overall narrative.

Official guidance from MHCLG had previously confirmed that a TIP with a value exceeding £25 million would be subject to a greater level of scrutiny around value for money and the capacity and capability of the lead local authority to deliver a larger deal.

The Chancellor's Budget on 3rd March 2021 listed 45 new Town Deals based on TIPs submitted in Cohorts 1, 2 and 2a. Oldham was not included because MHCLG had that week requested additional information on three of the five proposed projects in the TIP.

On 17th March 2021, Oldham Council submitted the additional information relating to projects, however we were still awaiting confirmation of when MHCLG would announce the outcome of the TIP assessment. The delay in receiving a funding offer could be attributed to assessors scrutinising bids for above £25 million in greatest detail – as expected.

7. Councillor Jacques asked the following question:
A serious violent incident at Hollinwood tram stop was recently covered in the press. Many residents have raised concerns with me about safety at and around this stop. There is a particular problem with the blind corners on the main pedestrian route between the stop and Manchester road which contribute to people feeling unsafe. Could the Cabinet Member responsible advise how we may improve the quality of the environment at the tram stop to make it feel more welcoming to public transport users?

Councillor Chadderton, Cabinet Member for HR and Corporate Reform responded that the Council worked closely with Greater Manchester Police and Transport for Greater Manchester to ensure people feel safe whilst accessing/using public transport. TfGM was committed to ensuring all tram stops were safe spaces. A number of crime prevention measures had been undertaken previously at Hollinwood Tram Stop and there was ongoing work in response to the recent issues which had occurred.

The particular concerns highlighted in relation to the blind corners on the main pedestrian route between the stop and Manchester Road would be looked into and where appropriate and feasible to do so, further works considered to improve perceptions of safety and to build confidence in the location as a safe space.

8. Councillor Williamson asked the following question:
The new MyHR computer software system has recently come online and into use by Council staff and HR managers. This replaced the A1 system introduced only four years previously which frankly proved itself to be a bit of a failure, being significantly delayed, over budget, and prone to making errors in salary payments and the calculation of working hours to the disgruntlement of many staff. A1 apparently cost our financially struggling Council-Tax Payers



over £2 million of their hard-earned money and MyHR will undoubtedly have cost them many more. Can the Cabinet Member please tell me how much MyHR cost; what guarantees we have that MyHR will actually deliver for our staff and their managers, unlike its predecessor; and whether this Council has any means to recover any of its abortive costs in relation to the A1 system from its developers?

Councillor Chadderton, Cabinet Member for HR and Corporate Reform, responded that the approved budget for the implementation and the cost of licencing, support and maintenance for the new ITrent HR and payroll system - MyHR was £2.295m. MyHR was replacing both the A1 and Selima payroll systems.

There was immense confidence in this new system by the payroll team who used it on a day to day basis; it was a highly regarded HR and Payroll (HRP) system that was in use with over 180+ LA's across the country including most GM authorities. It was known as market leading and a public sector reputable product that was built specifically for the purpose of HRP.

There was already evidence that it was excellent, easier to use and more robust payroll accuracy following the go-lives; the specialist officer checks and feedback from managing 26 payrolls for almost 7000 employees across Team Oldham had supported this.

There was improved Resilience expected from a hosted cloud product with planned, regular maintenance and upgrades included within the annual maintenance cost. Access to service desk to resolve any issues and escalation process was available if required.

Feedback from staff and customers had been very positive to date.

The costs of A1 were not abortive as the system was in use and delivering payroll from its implementation in April 2017 until January 2021.

Whilst the system had many issues and required the Council to implement many manual processes to improve accuracy, it did provide the core ability to pay employees every month. The system had reached a point where it required a major upgrade that would have cost a significant sum, on top of the regular costs required to continue the manual processes and regular upgrades.

RESOLVED that the questions and responses provided be noted.



c Questions on Cabinet Minutes

Council were requested to note the minutes of the Cabinet meetings 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 25 January 2021 and 22 February 2021 were submitted.

Members raised the following questions:

1. Councillor H Gloster asked the following question in relation to Page – Cabinet 14/12/20 – Schools National Funding Formula
“With all pupils returning to schools from 8th March, many schools are already reporting significant budget shortfalls. Please can the Cabinet Member responsible explain what is the situation faced by our local schools and how we will ensure they are not adversely impacted financially due to Covid-19?”

Councillor Mushtaq, Cabinet Member for Education, responded that Schools/Academies had continued to receive all core funding and grant payments during 2020-21.

There had been instances where schools had faced additional costs as a result of the coronavirus (COVID-19) outbreak and were not able to cover these from their existing resources. Financial assistance was available to schools where maintained schools were unable to meet these additional costs for Free School Meals, premises and cleaning costs.

Mainstream schools would also receive additional funding of £80 for each pupil from reception to year 11 inclusive through the catch-up premium for the 2020-21 academic year. This was for specific activities to support pupils in catching up for lost teaching, in line with the curriculum expectations for the next academic year.

There were currently 2 maintained schools forecasting a deficit at the end of the 2020-21 financial year. However, this could change once the final outturn for the 2020-21 financial year had been agreed.

A budget review had suggested that there were a small number of other maintained schools who may have a budget deficit for 2021-22. Again, this would not be confirmed until the final outturn was established and the 2021-22 budget had been finalised. The indications were that this was mainly due to reducing pupil numbers or high staff numbers and not as a result of Covid 19.

2. Councillor Williamson asked the following question in relation to Page 94 – Cabinet 21/01/21 – Item 9 – Scrutiny Referral – Council Motion – Ban on fast food and energy drink advertising
“I was glad to see that Cabinet agreed to allow Health Scrutiny Committee to progress actions internally and that it was agreed to

escalate the aspirations of the motion for a ban to the Greater Manchester Combined Authority and the Greater Manchester Mayor externally.



Oldham
Council

Can the relevant Cabinet Member please tell me whether this matter has now been tabled at a meeting for discussion by members of the GMCA, and if this has not yet happened whether we know the timescale by which we expect this to happen?

Councillor Chauhan, Cabinet Member for Health and Social Care, responded that it was currently being actioned and an update would be provided to the Health Scrutiny Committee and Councillor Williamson.

RESOLVED that:

1. The minutes of the Cabinet meetings held on 25 January 2021 and 22 February 2021 be noted.
2. The questions and responses provided be noted.

d Questions on Joint Arrangements FIELD_PAGE_RANGE

Council was 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 Joint Authorities and Partnerships were submitted as follows:

Greater Manchester Combined Authority	27th November 2020 18th December 2020 29th January 2021
Greater Manchester Transport Committee	11th December 2020
Commissioning Partnership Board	22nd October 2020 28th January 2021
GM Police, Fire and Crime Panel	16th November 2020
Health and Wellbeing Board	10th November 2020
AGMA	11th December 2020
Greater Manchester Waste and Recycling Committee	14th October 2020
Miocare	22nd October 2020
National Park Authority	13th November 2020

Members raised the following questions:

1. Councillor Hamblett asked the following question in relation to page

114 - Greater Manchester Combined Authority 27/11/20 – Item GMCA 188/20 – Bus Reform

“I would question the wisdom on investing huge sums of money on improving bus stops when there are less-and-less bus services using them; surely we need investment in more bus services first, especially as we emerge from Lockdown, before we invest in bus stops.

Can the relevant Cabinet Member tell me how much the recent improvements to local bus stops have cost the hard working council tax payers of this borough? And can I also ask who decided that these ‘improvements’ required the removal of the sensory tactile paving which assists the sight-impaired to access public transport?

Councillor Fielding, Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Economy and Skills, responded that Transport for Greater Manchester (TfGM) secured funding through Growth Deal 3 for a ‘Bus Passenger Access Enhancements Project’ which would upgrade 505 existing bus stops across Greater Manchester with the aim of improving the passenger experience and delivering improved journey times for buses, whilst ensuring facilities were compliant with accessibility standards.

The chosen delivery method for this work in Oldham was for our own Highways Operations service to deliver these works on behalf of TfGM and therefore the available funding of £232,000 came into the transport capital programme. By the end of the project (due to complete in May 2021) it would have upgraded 46 bus stops within Oldham. The bus stop upgrades would include: raising kerb heights; footway treatment; the provision of a bus stop clearways; and the replacement of bus stop poles/plates.

As part of these works Oldham had not removed any tactile surfacing to the bus stops. The bus stop improvements were designed and constructed to TfGM guidelines, which were developed from GMPTA guidance used in Greater Manchester since at least 2007.

2. Councillor Harkness asked a question in relation to Page 131 – Greater Manchester Combined Authority 27/11/20 – Item GMCA 211/20 – No Child goes Hungry

“Now that the Chancellor has decreed in his recent budget that the £20 weekly uplift in Universal Credit payments will only be extended until the end of September, what will the leaders of the ten GMCA authorities be doing to continue to put pressure on government ministers to change their minds and make the uplift permanent? And will that include seeking the support of those Conservative MPs who now represent Greater Manchester constituencies?”

Councillor Fielding, Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Economy and Skills, responded that the Council was developing an Anti Poverty Strategy and clear action plan and was working with communities and partners on this at the moment. One of the key strands of the plan focussed on lobbying national government for

permanent change on issues such as the £20 Universal Credit uplift, sustainable funding for the Local Welfare Provision scheme to support residents in crisis and to reduce food poverty, particularly for our children and young people over the holiday periods.



The Council would to liaise with GM authorities and GMCA on poverty issues to get the best outcome for residents across the region and where it could speak across party political boundaries to speak as one voice for Greater Manchester, it would.

3. Councillor Sykes asked a question in relation to Page 165 – GM Police, Fire and Crime Panel 16/11/20 – Item PCFP/18/20 – iOPS Update
“I first raised the deficiencies of the iOPs Integrated Operating Policing System over two years ago. This system was meant to seamlessly replace three existing police computer systems to provide enhanced capacity to Police officers and criminal prosecutors. The reality has proven vastly different.

I have written to or met with the Greater Manchester Mayor and senior police officers to complain about it several times. Quite simply it has never been fit for purpose – and it has led to crimes not being properly recorded, victims not receiving a prompt and professional service, and prosecutors being unable to proceed with court cases. Even Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Constabulary reported that police officers had ‘very little confidence’ in it and were ‘frustrated’ by a system that does not always return ‘accurate results’.

Yet the Mayor and Deputy Mayor as our Police and Crime Commissioners keep insisting that the system will eventually prove its worth. Two years on can the Council’s representative on the panel provide us with any real reassurance when this system will eventually work, or has it in fact proven to be just a blackhole into which public money has been poured, wasted on a system that was never fit-for-purpose?”

Councillor Williams responded that going live with iOPS in July 2019 was a huge challenge for GMP. The old legacy systems were failing and end of life - they simply had to be replaced. It was also necessary to introduce new technologies which allowed GMP to build for the future and to be more 'mobile' with our technology. Despite the scale of that challenge much of the new iOPS platform had worked well and was supporting staff in delivering a good service to communities.

iOPS Mobile and iOPS Dashboard were already working well with further updates coming very soon to both these products. There would be a new iOPS Dashboard next month and it was hoped to soon introduce 'mapping' to the dashboard so that demand could be in different ways. This year iOPS Mobile would also be upgraded making it easier to submit crime, intelligence and other events while 'out and about.'

GMP was also pleased with iOPS ControlWorks, the Command and Control system. It was used by several Police Forces and was a stable

system which was serving the needs well. GMP had deliberately chosen not to upgrade ControlWorks for a period of time following go live, to allow the system to bed in, a decision which had reaped benefits during Covid-19. They were upgrading to the latest version however, over the next 12 months.

iOPS Cognos was the data warehouse. Cognos was a popular tool used by many others and GMP had some good reports and products that allowed the service to interrogate the data. But the data warehouse was only as good as the data put into it and there was work to do to improve data quality.

It was with iOPS PoliceWorks, the Records Management System where there were the most problems and the most feedback had been received. This was the newest of the iOPS products and was the one that had been the most challenging. GMP had worked hard to fix many of the bugs in PoliceWorks since it went live, and a number of planned upgrades with additional features had already been delivered. The most recent version upgrade in January delivered significant search enhancements, which was something end users were keen to see. But there was still much to do, and there was a packed programme of works to improve it even further over the next 12 months. This work included:

- Short medium and long term work to further improve the speed and performance of PoliceWorks
- Further enhancements to search, crime (allowing us to address some of the issues highlighted during the recent HMICFRS victim services assessment), intelligence and safeguarding
- PoliceWorks version upgrades - 6 planned between now and June 2022
- Data quality work, prioritising duplicate nominals in the system

The iOPS training and communication plan had also recently been refreshed, to ensure that staff were well supported in their use of the various iOPS products.

All of this work had taken place within a well-organised project management team, which was rightly subject to scrutiny and governance both within GMP and from key local and national stakeholders.

In relation to some of the Councillors specific examples - quite simply it had never been fit for purpose – and it had led to crimes not being properly recorded, victims not receiving a prompt and professional service, and prosecutors being unable to proceed with court cases. Even Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary reported that police officers had 'very little confidence' in it and were 'frustrated' by a system that does not always return 'accurate results'.

Crime recording - iOPS was not specifically referenced in the HMICFRS victim service assessment, and the issues highlighted by the Inspector went back several years before iOPS. That said, making it easier for staff to record and manage crime was clearly crucial, and iOPS had a real part to play in that. GMP had prioritised fixing remaining crime bugs and delivering further enhancements. The iOPS Mobile upgrade later this year for example, would make it easier for staff to record crimes



while out and about, and keep victims updated

Service to victims - iOPS Mobile was actively supporting the victim service work. A recent example was the Making a Difference platform delivered in conjunction with Victim Services. It allows staff to access via their mobile devices, local support directories to signpost those in need. This included the ability to send pre-formatted texts and emails. The team were also looking at electronic victim contact cards, to further improve the service.

Case files - The complexities of the various partner systems involved meant that there would always be isolated failures, as there were with GMP's legacy case file system. However, there were issues following iOPS go live, where too many cases failed the electronic transfer to CPS and the Courts, which impacted on justice delivery and confidence. This was a priority for the team throughout Autumn 2019 and into early 2020, and the issues had been much improved.

4. Councillor Chadderton asked the following question in relation to Question on GMCA minutes 18th December 2020 item GMCA215/20 page 134 of the Green Book

"I welcome the announcement from Transport for Greater Manchester and the Greater Manchester Mayors office, that Royton has chosen for investment as part of the Bee Network programme and that the Rochdale Road corridor, currently served by the 409 bus, has been identified as a Quality Bus Transit scheme. Both of these things will bring welcomed investment into Royton Centre, making Royton more accessible for walkers and cyclists and recognising that Royton is in need of improved public transport and improved connectivity links. Can the Leader advise what the timescales for both of these are?"

Councillor Brownridge, Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods and Culture, responded that the Bee Network improvements for pedestrians and cyclists in Royton would be delivered by March 2022. There would also be investment in Royton through the Government's Active Travel Fund with a scheme on Sandy Lane-Rochdale Lane, which would be delivered in the new financial year once the public had been consulted. In addition, the new Toucan crossing in the centre of Royton would be finished in the next couple of weeks.

In terms of the Quality Bus Transit proposals for the Rochdale-Oldham-Ashton corridor, these were being investigated by TfGM. GM had allocated £10 million of its Transforming Cities Fund 2 to deliver early measures on northern and orbital Quality Bus Transit Corridors, which could include this corridor, although no decisions had yet been made on where the £10 million would be invested. The funding deadline was March 2023.

5. Councillor Hulme asked the following question in relation to page 114 - Greater Manchester Combined Authority 27/11/20 – Item GMCA 188/20 – Bus Reform



“Yesterday, GMCA announced it had voted to recommend the implementation of a franchising model for Greater Manchester’s bus network. Please could the Leader explain what this change would mean for the people of Saddleworth North and Oldham as a whole, who had seen services cut back and been let down by private companies for too long”

Councillor Fielding, Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Economy and Skills, responded that the mayor was due to make his decision imminently and GMCA leaders had voted in favour of the recommendations to franchise. Saddleworth had been subject to early cuts in service along with Diggle and Greenfield. More recently, cuts had extended to parts of the Borough nearer the city centre eg Woodhouses, which had no bus service other than at peak times. Services had been withdrawn from all over Oldham when operators were not making the profit they wanted. Franchising would bring services back under the control of locally elected and accountable politicians, who would be able to set routes, fares, vehicle standards, timetable and even the colour buses were painted. This model had always been in place in London. It was hoped the Mayor would take the decision and bring responsibility for services back locally.

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.

10

NOTICE OF ADMINISTRATION BUSINESS

Motion 1

Councillor Shah MOVED and Councillor Chadderton SECONDED the following MOTION:

Islamophobia

Oldham has a rich history of people from different backgrounds and cultures living and working together. However, we know that there are groups of people that are marginalised, who are more likely to face inequality and discrimination than others. We believe the people of Oldham want to live in a place that is committed to fairness and equality of opportunity, a borough that tackles discrimination and prejudice, helping communities come together and celebrating our differences.

As champions of inclusivity, we take a no-tolerance approach to hate crimes. Hate crime victims are more likely to suffer repeat victimisation, more likely to suffer serious psychological impacts, and are less likely to report these crimes to the police. Hate crime can limit people’s opportunities and can lead to isolation and segregation. It is also damaging to the community,

undermining integration and cohesion, and eroding shared values of acceptance and respect for others.

The Council adopted the working definition of Anti-Semitism as set out by the International Holocaust remembrance Alliance in 2017 and recognises the need additionally to recognise the working definition of Islamophobia set out below.



A study by the Muslim Council of Britain found that 59 percent of headlines in the British Press portray Muslims in a negative light, with Islam being misinterpreted and utilised by racists to create fear and promote hatred. Following an extensive consultation, the All-Party Parliamentary Group (APPG) for British Muslims has formulated a working definition of Islamophobia as:

"ISLAMOPHOBIA IS ROOTED IN RACISM AND IS A TYPE OF RACISM THAT TARGETS EXPRESSIONS OF MUSLIMNESS OR PERCEIVED MUSLIMNESS."

Contemporary examples of Islamophobia in public life, the media, schools, the workplace, and in encounters between religions and non-religions in the public sphere could, considering the overall context, include, but are not limited to:

- Calling for, aiding, instigating or justifying the killing or harming of Muslims in the name of a racist/fascist ideology, or an extremist view of religion.
- Making mendacious, dehumanizing, demonizing, or stereotypical allegations about Muslims as such, or of Muslims as a collective group, such as, especially but not exclusively, conspiracies about Muslim entryism in politics, government or other societal institutions; the myth of Muslim identity having a unique propensity for terrorism and claims of a demographic 'threat' posed by Muslims or of a 'Muslim takeover'.
- Accusing Muslims as a group of being responsible for real or imagined wrongdoing committed by a single Muslim person or group of Muslim individuals, or even for acts committed by non-Muslims.
- Accusing Muslims as a group, or Muslim majority states, of inventing or exaggerating Islamophobia, ethnic cleansing or genocide perpetrated against Muslims.
- Accusing Muslim citizens of being more loyal to the 'Ummah' (transnational Muslim community) or to their countries of origin, or to the alleged priorities of Muslims worldwide, than to the interests of their own nations.
- Denying Muslim populations, the right to self-determination e.g., by claiming that the existence of an independent Palestine or Kashmir is a terrorist endeavor.
- Applying double standards by requiring of Muslims behavior's that are not expected or demanded of any other groups in society, e.g. loyalty tests.
- Using the symbols and images associated with classic Islamophobia.



- Holding Muslims collectively responsible for the actions of any Muslim majority state, whether secular or constitutionally Islamic.

This list is not exhaustive but forms guidelines to recognise markers of Islamophobia in today's context.

Oldham Council resolves:

1. To formally adopt the working definition of Islamophobia as formulated by the APPG for British Muslims.
2. To ask the Leader and Chief Executive of the Council to write to government ministers asking them to listen to Muslim communities and the cross-party group of MPs and peers and to adopt this definition of Islamophobia which classifies discrimination against Muslims as a form of racism.

Councillor Mushtaq spoke in support of the Motion.

Councillor Al-Hamdani spoke in support of the Motion.

Councillor Hamblett spoke in support of the Motion.

Councillor Akhtar spoke in support of the Motion.

Councillor Shah exercised her right of reply.

On being put to the vote, Members voted unanimously in FAVOUR of the MOTION. The MOTION was therefore CARRIED.

Motion 2

Councillor Stretton MOVED and Councillor Goodwin SECONDED the following MOTION:

Fully funded and proper pay rise for council and school workers

This council notes:

Local government has endured central government funding cuts of more than 50% since 2010. Between 2010 and 2020, councils lost 60p out of every £1 they have received from central government. Over the last year, councils have led the way in efforts against the Covid-19 pandemic, providing a huge range of services and support for our communities. Local government has shown more than ever how indispensable it is. But the pandemic has led to a massive increase in expenditure and loss of income, and the Government has failed to provide the full amount of promised support. Local government workers have kept our communities safe through the pandemic, often putting themselves at considerable risk as they work to protect public health, provide quality housing, ensure our children continue to be educated, and look after older and vulnerable people. Since 2010, the local government workforce has endured years of pay restraint with the majority of pay points losing at least 23 per cent of their value since 2009/10. At the same time, workers have experienced ever-increasing workloads and persistent job insecurity. Across the UK, 900,000 jobs have been lost in local

government since June 2010 – a reduction of more than 30 per cent. Local government has arguably been hit by more severe job losses than any other part of the public sector. The funding gap caused by Covid-19 will make local government employment even more precarious. There has been a disproportionate impact on women, with women making up more than three-quarters of the local government workforce. Recent research shows that if the Government were to fully fund the unions' 2021 payclaim, around half of the money would be recouped thanks to increased tax revenue, reduced expenditure on benefits, and increased consumer spending in the local economy.

This council believes:

Our workers keep our communities clean and safe, look after those in need and keep our towns and cities running, without the professionalism and dedication of our staff, the council services our residents rely on would not be deliverable. Local government workers deserve a proper real-terms pay increase. The Government needs to take responsibility and fully fund this increase; it should not put the burden on local authorities whose funding been cut to the bone and who have not been offered adequate support through the Covid-19 pandemic.

This Council resolves to:

1. Support the pay claim submitted by GMB, Unison and Unite on behalf of council and school workers, for a substantial increase with a minimum of 10 per cent uplift in April 2021.
2. Call on the Local Government Association to make urgent representations to central government to fund the NJC pay claim.
3. Ask the Chief Executive to write to the Chancellor and Secretary of State to call for a pay increase for local government workers to be funded with new money from central government.
4. Meet with local NJC union representatives to convey support for the pay claim and consider practical ways in which the council can support the campaign.
5. Encourage all local government workers to join a union

Councillor C Gloster spoke in favour of the motion.

Councillor Williamson spoke in favour of the motion.

Councillor Jabbar spoke in favour of the motion.

Councillor Stretton exercised her right of reply.

On being put to the vote, 44 votes were cast in FAVOUR of the MOTION and 1 vote was cast AGAINST with 1 ABSTENTION. The MOTION was therefore CARRIED.

Councillor Sykes MOVED and Councillor Williamson
SECONDED the following MOTION:



A Tax on Excess Online Profits

Council notes that whilst smaller High Street non-food retail outlets have been forcibly closed, and are facing business failure, because of the COVID-19 Lockdown, larger national businesses and multi-national businesses offering on-line products have thrived, reporting bumper profits.

Council notes that recent proposals from the UN and the EU are working to establish an international consensus on business taxation, to minimise profit-shifting for the purpose of avoiding corporation tax, but that these proposals are not likely to be introduced in time to have any impact on the excess online profits that some companies have made off the back of the coronavirus epidemic.

Raising a bespoke tax on excess online profits has precedent in the UK, and Council expresses its disappointment that the Chancellor has not yet introduced such a tax and believes that if we are, as the Prime Minister claims, 'all in this together', then the excessive profits of such on-line businesses should be subjected to a greater level of tax, and that the revenue raised employed to support our hollowed out public services (local government, schools and health) and the financial recovery of our High Street retailers.

Council resolves to ask the Chief Executive to write to:

- The Chancellor of the Exchequer, The Rt Hon Rishi Sunak MP, urging him to introduce such a tax as soon as possible as one means to ensure that we are 'all in this together'.
- Our three local MPs, the Greater Manchester Mayor and the Leaders of the other nine AGMA authorities to seek their support for such a tax.

Councillor Harkness spoke in support of the Motion.

Councillor Ahmad spoke in support of the Motion.

Councillor Fielding spoke in support of the Motion.

Councillor Sykes exercised his right of reply.

On being put to the vote, Members voted unanimously in FAVOUR of the MOTION. The MOTION was therefore CARRIED.

Motion 2

Councillor Al-Hamdani outlined the proposed amendment, which was seconded Councillor C Gloster. The amendment was agreed without discussion.

Councillor Al-Hamdani MOVED and Councillor C Gloster
SECONDED the following MOTION:



Consultation on the UK Shared Prosperity Fund

Council notes that:

- The Conservative Party Manifesto for the 2017 General Election contained the following commitment: 'We will use the structural fund money that comes back to the UK following Brexit to create a United Kingdom Shared Prosperity Fund, specifically designed to reduce inequalities between communities across our four nations. The money that is spent will help deliver sustainable, inclusive growth based on our modern industrial strategy. We will consult widely on the design of the fund, including with the devolved administrations, local authorities, businesses and public bodies.'
- The Conservative Government promised to publish a UK Shared Prosperity Fund Consultation Paper in 2018.
- Successive Secretaries of State in the Department of Housing, Communities and Local Government when responding to several questions in Parliament in both 2018 and 2019 confirmed that a consultation would take place.
- The promised consultation is now three years late.
- In the last round of European funding (2014-2020), Greater Manchester received £322.75m, split across European Regional Development Funding (ERDF) (£176.78m) and European Social Funding (ESF) (£145.97m), equivalent to an annual allocation of £53.8m.
- The Conservative Party website claims that 'We will introduce the UK Shared Prosperity Fund when EU Structural Funds start to taper off from 2020-21...from April 2021'.

Council resolves to ask the Chief Executive to:

- Write to the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government requesting the promised public consultation commence prior to the end of this financial year when EU structural fund allocations begin to taper off.
- Copy in our local Members of Parliament and the Mayor of Greater Manchester on this correspondence and ask for their assistance by making similar representations to the Government".

On it being moved that the matter be put to the vote, it was unanimously agreed that the matter be put to the vote without further discussion.

On being put to the vote, 42 votes were cast in FAVOUR of the MOTION and 0 votes were cast AGAINST with 3 ABSTENTIONS. The MOTION was therefore CARRIED.

Motion 3

Councillor Harkness MOVED and Councillor H Gloster
SECONDED the following MOTION:



Oldham
Council

Thanking our Schools and Education Staff

Council shares the delight of children, parents and guardians that pupils and students have finally been able to return to their schools and colleges during the week commencing 8 March. Children and young people will be glad to be back with their teachers and their friends after a year of home schooling and distance learning that has been very difficult for everyone involved.

Council recognises that teachers and other school and college staff across the whole of the United Kingdom, whether employed at primary, secondary or tertiary level, have demonstrated extraordinary professional commitment and dedication in continuing to deliver an excellent education, whether at the chalk-face or online, to our children and young people in the face of great uncertainty and despite the most adverse conditions faced by such professionals since 1945.

Council further recognises that in schooling the children of other 'key workers' teachers and other school staff have enabled their parents to carry on doing their essential duties that have saved our lives, supplied us with our daily bread and kept our nation functioning, all the while knowing that their children are safe and being nurtured and cared for.

Council recognises that Oldham has sadly been very hard hit by the COVID-19 pandemic and operational difficulties in education have been especially challenging.

Consequently, Council wishes particularly to praise those school and college staff who have been working at schools, academies and colleges across the Borough of Oldham. Such staff include teachers, teaching assistants, catering, cleaning, and caretaking staff, midday supervisors, office support staff, head teachers, child care club staff, volunteers, and anybody else who has helped to keep our educational establishments open for key workers or who has supported distance learning.

Council believes that parents, guardians and siblings involved in supporting their children and young people in their distance learning will have developed a deeper appreciation of the work that our professional educators do on a day-to-day basis, particularly in these challenging times.

Council therefore resolves to ask the Chief Executive to write to the local representatives of the professional bodies and trades unions for the teaching and ancillary professions to pass on these sentiments and our thanks for a job well done after one year of Lockdown.

AMENDMENT

Councillor Mushtaq MOVED and Councillor Goodwin
SECONDED the following AMENDMENT:

Paragraph 5

Sentence 1

Insert *a//* between praise and school



Oldham
Council

Insert *all early years settings* between colleges and across
Add at end *and such staff that work outside the borough but
reside in Oldham*

Add new sentence at end: *It is also important to acknowledge
and thank all those that were in the seriously vulnerable group,
therefore shielding, but continued to teach and support from
home via online.*

Paragraph 7

Insert *and to all schools, colleges and Early Years settings*
between professions and to pass

Add at end:

*Council, with partners, will endeavour to thank the sector
through more substantive means once circumstances allow.*

Revised motion to read:

Motion 3 – Thanking our Schools and Education Staff

Council shares the delight of children, parents and guardians
that pupils and students have finally been able to return to their
schools and colleges during the week commencing 8 March.
Children and young people will be glad to be back with their
teachers and their friends after a year of home schooling and
distance learning that has been very difficult for everyone
involved.

Council recognises that teachers and other school and college
staff across the whole of the United Kingdom, whether employed
at primary, secondary or tertiary level, have demonstrated
extraordinary professional commitment and dedication in
continuing to deliver an excellent education, whether at the
chalk-face or online, to our children and young people in the
face of great uncertainty and despite the most adverse
conditions faced by such professionals since 1945.

Council further recognises that in schooling the children of other
'key workers' teachers and other school staff have enabled their
parents to carry on doing their essential duties that have saved
our lives, supplied us with our daily bread and kept our nation
functioning, all the while knowing that their children are safe and
being nurtured and cared for.

Council recognises that Oldham has sadly been very hard hit by
the COVID-19 pandemic and operational difficulties in education
have been especially challenging.

Consequently, Council wishes to praise all school and college
staff who have been working at schools, academies, colleges
and all early years settings across the Borough of Oldham and
such staff that work outside the borough but reside in Oldham.
Staff include teachers, teaching assistants, catering, cleaning,
and caretaking staff, midday supervisors, office support staff,
head teachers, child care club staff, volunteers, and anybody
else who has helped to keep our educational establishments
open for key workers or who has supported distance learning. It
is also important to acknowledge and thank all those that were
in the seriously vulnerable group, therefore shielding, but
continued to teach and support from home via online.

Council believes that parents, guardians and siblings involved in
supporting their children and young people in their distance
learning will have developed a deeper appreciation of the work
that our professional educators do on a day-to-day basis,
particularly in these challenging times.

Council therefore resolves to ask the Chief Executive to write to the local representatives of the professional bodies and trades unions for the teaching, ancillary professions and to all schools, colleges and Early Years settings to pass on these sentiments and our thanks for a job well done after one year of Lockdown. Council, with partners, will endeavour to thank the sector through more substantive means once circumstances allow.

A vote was then taken on the AMENDMENT, which was CARRIED and became the SUBSTANTIVE MOTION.

On being put to the vote, Members voted unanimously in FAVOUR of the MOTION. The MOTION was therefore CARRIED.

12

OLDHAM'S COVID-19 RESPONSE - UPDATE

Councillor Shah MOVED and Councillor Fielding SECONDED a report which provided an update on how the Council and its partners continued to monitor and manage the impact of COVID-19 in Oldham.

COVID-19 was still circulating across the UK and new cases continued in Oldham every day. The report provided a summary of activity and demonstrated how the Council collectively managed and prevented the spread of COVID-19 across Oldham's communities.

The report detailed the four key themes which were: Test and Trace; Vaccination; Enforcement and Compliance; and Community Engagement and Communications.

In relation to Test and Trace, on the 18th January 2021, Oldham had begun targeted testing at scale for those that could not work from home, setting up 4 large tests sites for twice-weekly routine testing. This utilised lateral flow devices with rapid results in approximately 30 minutes, ensuring that positive cases were identified at the earliest opportunity. This programme had been extended until the end of June 2021, and was moving towards a different model to significantly increase the number of testing sites at smaller venues that were better suited to meet the needs of residents. In relation to symptomatic testing, the network of local test sites (LTS) operated by NHS Test and Trace continued to operate to provide testing to people with coronavirus symptoms. Three LTS were currently in operation with plans underway for a 4th site in Failsworth. The 3 static sites were situated in:

- Southgate Street Car Park, Centre of Oldham OL1 1DN
- Peel Street in Chadderton, OL9 9JX
- Honeywell Centre, Hadfield Street. Hathershaw, OL8 3BP

Although there was a national booking portal, Oldham continued to work with DHSC to make the process as flexible as possible for residents to ensure that lack of digital access was not present a barrier to being able to access testing. With regards to Contact Tracing and the Local Tracing Partnership (tier2), when an individual tested positive for COVID-19 they were first notified

by text or email instructing them to isolate. The national contact tracing tier 2 team received information about all positive cases and attempted to contact to ensure that isolation requirements were understood and to acquire a list of contacts that the positive case had been in contact with 2 days prior to symptom onset (or test date if there were no symptoms). If after 48 hours, the national team had failed to make contact or been unable to acquire the contacts, the cases were securely passed to the Local Authority. Oldham Council only received details of cases who were Oldham residents.

In relation to vaccination, the original Government plan included a vaccination programme comprising 1) mass vaccination sites run by Regional NHS Teams and 2) local sites run by Primary Care Networks under nationally agreed Directly Enhanced Service contracts. A mass vaccination centre had been organised at Greater Manchester level at the Etihad Stadium. Uptake by Oldham residents of the Etihad facility was only just starting to become known to the Oldham system as this was a nationally run programme. The local Oldham vaccination programme was set up as operational from 6 sites within the five Primary Care Networks. During the course of February and early March additional 'pop-up' clinics had also been held at Greengate Street Mosque, the EIC Centre and Millennium Centre, all of which had been targeted at encouraging greater levels of uptake in our BAME communities. The next phase of rollout would continue to move down the Cohort list and focus on supplementing PCN clinics with additional clinics run in hyper-local community facilities such as Mosques. In addition, in March, second doses were being administered as well as first.

Enforcement and compliance included support to businesses, support grants and the Coronavirus Job Retention Scheme. The Enforcement Team (Environmental Health, Licensing, Community Safety and Greater Manchester Police colleagues) were working seven days a week visiting premises, responding to complaints, attending gatherings and serving fixed penalty notices. Prohibition notices had been issued where appropriate to prevent businesses from continuing to trade when instructed to close as part of the national restrictions. The Enforcement and Compliance partnership had commissioned the provision of COVID marshals to attend locations where there were incidents of heavy footfall such as Dovestones Reservoir and other open spaces, where potential social distancing breaches could occur due to sheer numbers.

With regards to Support to Business, the Chancellor had announced the continuation of business support schemes in the March Budget. Locally, the Council had launched the Discretionary Business Grants for Taxis scheme to help drivers across the borough. The scheme would see eligible drivers receive a one-off payment and was aimed at hackney carriage and private hire taxi drivers who were licensed by Oldham Council. Under the scheme every taxi driver in Oldham could receive £1,000 to help them get over the impact of coronavirus

after Oldham Council agreed a potential funding package of more than £1.3million.



Oldham
Council

Community engagement and communications had been key to the Covid-19 response in Oldham; to ensure residents and businesses were aware of the restrictions and public health advice and were also signposted towards the range of support and advice available from the council and partner organisations. This work had focused on all aspects of the Covid-19 response, including encouraging take-up of the vaccination; signposting towards testing provision; providing public health advice; and publicising support available to residents and businesses. A wide range of communications channels were used to ensure as many people in Oldham as possible, from all communities, were engaged with. This had included out of home (OOH) billboards and digital screens; social media; video; newsletters; communication through the traditional media; leaflets; community television programmes; and direct engagement with communities; as well as the engagement teams going door-to-door in specific areas to speak with residents and deliver important information.

The Liberal Democrat Group indicated they would be content with written responses to their submitted questions.

Question received from Councillor Sykes:

"I would like to ask a follow-on question from the one I asked at the December Council.

As I said then 'in this pandemic, one of the greatest tragedies has been seeing the forced separation of the residents of our care homes from their loved ones. For the residents of the care homes in our borough who have waited many months to finally meet up with family a visit cannot come soon enough'.

I was delighted then to hear that from 8 March care home residents will be able to receive visits, albeit from one relative only and subject to the requirement that physical contact be limited to holding hands and that the visitor pass a lateral flow test and PPE. It is far from ideal, but it is a start, and it is my hope that we will do everything in our power to enable such visits to happen on a regular basis.

At the start of February, the Government announced that all residents and staff in care homes have received their first COVID-19 vaccination and promised a second round of vaccinations in coming weeks. Given that over one-third of all COVID-19 deaths have involved the residents of care homes achieving this would be great news.

However, I was informed on 4 March that in Oldham 91% of residents and just 75% of staff had received their first vaccination, with many refusals amongst staff. My concern is that if staff refuse to be vaccinated then we shall still see outbreaks of COVID-19 in the future in our care homes.

Can the Cabinet Member please update me on the current situation, specifically I would appreciate answers to the following questions: Have all residents now received their first vaccination? When will the second phase of vaccination be completed? How is the vaccine being promoted to staff to

increase take-up? And finally, could the Cabinet Member please give me the good news that vaccination and the introduction of testing for relatives has enabled regular visits to resume?"



Oldham
Council

Councillor Shah, Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Covid-19 Response responded that as at 16th March 2021, 90.9% of care home residents in Oldham had received their first vaccination. It was worth noting that the care home population was not fixed. New residents were admitted and existing residents left. In addition, care home residents could make the decision not to receive the vaccination. Therefore it was very unlikely that we would reach a point where we saw 100%. As part of the Standard Operating Procedure, GP's were reviewing each care home at least every 4 weeks to identify residents or staff who had not yet received their first vaccination and offering to vaccinate.

The second doses were planned to be completed for the vast majority of care home residents by early April, and these had already commenced. Due to outbreaks at the time the first dose was planned, which resulted in its delay, a small number of care home residents would receive their second dose at the beginning of May.

We had a wealth of information, guidance and FAQ's that had been developed nationally, and by GM. These had been shared with care home managers and they had been requested to promote the vaccine with their staff. We hold regular meetings with all care homes in Oldham, and this included representation from clinicians, nurses and infection prevention leads, to provide support and answer any questions or concerns. These discussions also helped us to understand any reasons for vaccine reticence so that we could tailor information to support. Care home managers also received a phone call from our Quality Monitoring Officers three times a week, and uptake of the vaccine was also discussed on these calls. The current uptake amongst care home staff was 76.6%, which placed Oldham 3rd in Greater Manchester. As with care home residents, staffing complement changed so we were unlikely to reach 100%.

Indoor visiting (one named visitor only) commenced on 8th March in line with national and local guidance, which required the wearing of appropriate PPE during the visit and a lateral flow test in the 24 hours prior. Pod and outdoor visiting also continued, enabling residents to see more than one visitor in total. A meeting was held with care home managers on 15th March to assess how the first week of visiting had been and the response was positive. Any queries, questions or issues regarding visiting were being dealt with as they arose with support from the Commissioning and Quality service, Infection Prevention and Control Team and social work colleagues as required.

It was agreed that a written response would be provided to all the other questions that had been submitted prior to the meeting.

Councillor Sheldon asked whether there was anything the Council could do to improve the levels of vaccination uptake?



Oldham
Council

Councillor Shah, Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Covid-19 Response responded that pop-ups across the borough had hugely increased take-up and work was ongoing to improve levels.

RESOLVED that the report be noted.

13

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 those meetings.

Due to the limited time remaining in the meeting, Councillor Fielding agreed to provide a written response to a question submitted by Councillor Al-Hamdani.

RESOLVED that the actions taken regarding motions and actions from previous Council meetings be agreed and correspondence and updates received be noted.

14

WARDING ARRANGEMENTS

The Council gave consideration to a report which asked Members to consider proposed new warding arrangements in response to the electoral review of the Council as detailed within the report.

The Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) had announced in 2019 an electoral review for the Council. In 2020, the LGBCE concluded, after consultation that it was minded to proceed with 60 elected Members for the borough. That decision concluded stage 1 of the review. Subsequently, the LGBCE launched stage 2 of the review- a public consultation exercise on new warding arrangements for which the deadline for submission was the 29th March 2021. A cross-party group of elected Members had considered the matter and various mapping models developed by officers from within the Strategy and Performance Service.

Members were informed that the LGBCE criteria included balancing the projected 2026 electorate in each proposed ward as equally as possible, usually keeping within 5% of the average. The 2026 electorate had been projected in an earlier submission required by the LGBCE and had been disaggregated to household level to allow flexibility in where boundaries were drawn. In line with LGBCE recommendations, officers had worked from the edges of the borough towards the centre. Officers first established broader, well-defined areas such as Saddleworth and Failsworth, where borough boundaries and other features such as Parish areas and the motorway, limited the scope for change. In this way a variety of models were initially produced, and eventually reduced to one consensus model.

The LGBCE would review warding proposals against statutory criteria and all proposals must demonstrate how they meet the requirements.

The consultation was open to all interested parties and members of the public. The LGBC had emphasised that all submissions carried equal weight and all Members or groups could submit an individual submission.

Once the LBCE had considered all the proposals received during this phase of consultation, it would publish draft recommendations for new electoral arrangements. This was scheduled to take place between June and August 2021. Once the Commission had considered the representations and evidence as part of that consultation, it intended to publish final recommendations in November 2021.

New electoral arrangements for the borough were scheduled to come into effect at the borough council elections in 2023.

Councillor Fielding **MOVED** and Councillor Sykes **SECONDED** the recommendations set out in the report.

On being put to the vote, Members voted unanimously in **FAVOUR** of the **RECOMMENDATIONS**.

RESOLVED that:

1. The model of warding arrangements attached at Appendix 1 to the report be approved.
2. The model of warding arrangements be submitted to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE).

15

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS

Consideration was given to a report which asked the Council to approve amendments to its Constitution.

Members were informed that a refresh of the Council Constitution had been undertaken with two principal objectives in mind. Firstly, to ensure that all legislative and procedural references were current and up to date, including cross referencing from descriptive content to more detailed procedures and, secondly, to look to simplify content so far as was possible in what would always be a complex procedural document, in order to aid both understanding and application to practical circumstances.

The report looked to progress changes to employment-related decision making arrangements that had been noted by the Council in June 2020 as recommended by the Members' Constitutional Working Group, subject to the submission of further detail; refreshed terms of reference for the Health and Wellbeing Board; and have a commencement date determined for the Council's revised Overview and Scrutiny arrangements that had been agreed by Council in June 2020.

Councillor Fielding MOVED and Councillor Sykes SECONDED the recommendations set out in the report.

On being put to the vote, Members voted unanimously in FAVOUR of the RECOMMENDATIONS.

RESOLVED that:

1. The suggested amendments to Part 3 (Responsibility for Functions) as part of the refresh of the Council's Constitution arising from the review of employment related decision making and the refresh of the Health and Wellbeing Board terms of reference be agreed;
2. The Employment Committee be requested to further consider the procedures and arrangements for the operation of the established Sub-Committees of the Committee;
3. The review of the revised employment related decision making arrangements in 12 months time be agreed;
4. It be agreed that the Council's revised employment related decision making arrangements and Overview and Scrutiny arrangements be implemented with effect from the date of Annual Council, 19th May 2021;
5. The dates for meetings of the Council's revised Overview and Scrutiny arrangements as proposed in paragraph 4.2 be agreed;
6. Any consequential amendments to the Council's Constitution arising from the amendments as presented in the report be delegated to the Director of Legal.

16 **CONSEQUENTIAL AMENDMENTS**

Consideration was given to a report which highlighted on grounds of good governance, consequential amendments that were made to the Council Constitution during 2020 by the Director of Legal/Monitoring Officer under delegated powers.

RESOLVED that the report be noted.

17 **MEMBER ANNUAL REPORTS 2020**

Members gave consideration to a report which presented their Annual Reports for 2020.

As part of the ongoing work to strengthen accountability to local people and their role as a Councillor in a co-operative borough, Elected Members were asked to produce an annual report presenting factual information of their work in the community over the last 12 months. Individual reports included ward priorities, work in the community in particular during Covid-19 pandemic and contact information.

Members were informed that their Reports were available to view under the Councillors' section on Oldham Council's website.

RESOLVED that the Member Annual Reports be noted.

18 **ADOPTION OF REVISED LICENSING ACT 2003 POLICY**

Consideration was given to a report which proposed a Statement of Licensing Policy for approval.

The Licensing Act 2003, the primary piece of legislation which regulated the alcohol, entertainment and late-night refreshment industry, required licensing authorities to prepare and publish a statement of their licensing policy every five years. The Policy must be kept under review and the licensing authority may make such revisions to it, as it considers appropriate. The Policy was underpinned by four licensing objectives, comprising the prevention of crime and disorder; the prevention of public nuisance; public safety; and the protection of children from harm, which must be considered by both operators and regulators.

The submitted proposed revised Policy was presented to the Council with principal areas of change or update being highlighted in the text. These areas particularly addressed –

- protection of children from harm where advice had been received from the Safeguarding Children Board, for example in updating definitions;
- Child Sexual Exploitation and Child Criminal Exploitation where a number of recommendations or encouragements were being made to licence holders and operators of licensed premises;
- alcohol delivery services which had developed in recent years;
- boxing, particularly in the consideration of ‘White Collar Boxing’, often undertaken for charity and involving non-boxers;
- considerations following the inclusion of a Local Authority’s ‘Public Health’ department as a responsible Authority; and
- pavement licences, the application for and issue of which had been encouraged during the Covid pandemic.

Councillor Brownridge **MOVED** and Councillor Fielding **SECONDED** the recommendations set out in the report.

On being put to the vote, Members voted unanimously in **FAVOUR** of the **RECOMMENDATIONS**.

RESOLVED that:

1. The report be noted;
2. The new Statement of Licensing Policy be approved with immediate effect.

19

ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE PREPARATION OF 'PLACES FOR EVERYONE': A PROPOSED JOINT DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT ON BEHALF OF NINE GREATER MANCHESTER DISTRICTS

Councillor Roberts **MOVED** and Councillor Fielding **SECONDED** a report which sought approval to the arrangements necessary to formulate and prepare the joint development plan document (DPD) ‘Places for Everyone’, including the establishment of a joint committee to represent Oldham Council and the eight other GM districts (Bolton, Bury, Manchester, Rochdale, Salford, Tameside, Trafford, Wigan).

Members were informed that, on 11 December 2020, following the withdrawal of Stockport Council from the production of the Greater Manchester Plan for Jobs, Homes & the Environment (the Greater Manchester Spatial Framework), the Association of Greater Manchester Authorities (AGMA) Executive Board had agreed in principle to the a joint Development Plan Document (DPD) for the nine remaining Greater Manchester (GM) districts, to cover strategic policies including housing and employment land requirements and, as appropriate, strategic site allocations and Green Belt boundary amendments and associated infrastructure.

A report was taken to AGMA Executive Board on 12th February 2021 setting out the next steps in relation to the Joint DPD of the nine GM districts, to be known as 'Places for Everyone', including the required decisions by individual Districts to initiate this process as set out in the recommendations in the report.

Approval to establish the new Joint Committee was a decision for each district according to their own Constitutional arrangements and approval to delegate the formulation and preparation of the Joint DPD to the Joint Committee was a Cabinet function.

A recorded vote was requested by Councillor Sykes and agreed.

Councillor Sykes, Councillor Curley and Councillor Sheldon spoke against the recommendations.

A recorded vote was then taken on the recommendations as follows:

Councillor		Councillor	
Ahmad	FOR	Hulme	FOR
Akhtar	FOR	Hussain, A.	FOR
Al-Hamdani	AGAINST	Hussain, F.	FOR
Ali	FOR	Ibrahim	FOR
Alyas	FOR	Iqbal	FOR
Ball	FOR	Jabbar	FOR
Bashforth, M.	FOR	Jacques	FOR
Bashforth, S.	FOR	Leach	FOR
Briggs	FOR	Malik	FOR
Brownridge	FOR	McLaren	FOR
Byrne	AGAINST	Moores	FOR
Chadderton	FOR	Murphy	AGAINST
Chauhan	FOR	Mushtaq	FOR
Cosgrove	FOR	Phythian	FOR
Curley	AGAINST	Price	ABSENT
Davis	FOR	Roberts	FOR
Dean	FOR	Salamat	ABSENT
Fielding	FOR	Shah	FOR
Garry	FOR	Sheldon	AGAINST
Gloster, C.	AGAINST	Shuttleworth	FOR
Gloster, H.	AGAINST	Stretton	FOR

Goodwin	FOR	Surjan	ABSENT
Hamblett	AGAINST	Sykes	AGAINST
Haque	FOR	Taylor	FOR
Harkness	AGAINST	Toor	FOR
Harrison	FOR	Ur-Rehman	FOR
Hewitt	FOR	Williams	FOR
Hobin	AGAINST	Williamson	AGAINST
Hudson	ABSENT	Alexander	ABSENT



On a recorded VOTE being taken, 41 VOTES were cast in FAVOUR of the RECOMMENDATIONS with 12 cast AGAINST and 0 ABSTENTIONS.

RESOLVED that:

1. The making of an agreement with the other 8 Greater Manchester councils (Bolton, Bury, Manchester, Rochdale, Salford, Tameside, Trafford, Wigan) to prepare a joint development plan document to cover strategic policies including housing and employment land requirements and, as appropriate, strategic site allocations and Green Belt boundary amendments and associated infrastructure across the nine districts be approved.
2. It be agreed that Oldham Council's lead Member for the joint committee be Leader of the Council and that the Cabinet Member for Housing be nominated as deputy, to attend and vote as necessary.
3. It be noted that the Cabinet would be asked to delegate the formulation and preparation of the draft joint development plan document to a joint committee of the nine GM authorities.
4. It be noted that a further report would be brought to full Council seeking approval to submit the joint development plan document to the Secretary of State for independent examination.
5. It be recommended that the Cabinet
 - i. Note that full Council has approved the making of an agreement with the other 8 Greater Manchester councils (Bolton, Bury, Manchester, Rochdale, Salford, Tameside, Trafford, Wigan) to prepare a joint development plan document to cover strategic policies including housing and employment land requirements and, as appropriate, strategic site allocations and Green Belt boundary amendments and associated infrastructure across the nine districts.
 - ii. Delegate to a Joint Committee of the nine Greater Manchester councils the formulation and preparation of the joint development plan document to cover housing and employment land requirements including, as appropriate, strategic site allocations and Green Belt boundary amendments and associated infrastructure across the nine Greater Manchester districts insofar as such matters are executive functions.
 - iii. Note that the following are the sole responsibility of full Council:
 - a. Responsibility for giving of instructions to the Cabinet to reconsider the draft plan submitted by the Cabinet for the Council's consideration.

- b. The amendment of the draft joint development plan document submitted by the Cabinet for the full Council's consideration.
- c. The approval of the joint development plan document for the purposes of submission to the Secretary of State for independent examination.
- d. The adoption of the joint development plan document.



The meeting started at 6.21 pm and ended at Time Not Specified