COUNCIL
15/12/2021 at 6.00 pm

Present: The Mayor – Councillor Harrison

Councillors Abid, Ahmad, Akhtar, Al-Hamdani, G. Alexander, Ali, Alyas, Arnott, Birch, Brownridge, Byrne, Chadderton, Chauhan, Cosgrove, Curley, Davis, Dean, Garry, C. Gloster, H. Gloster, Goodwin, Hamblett, Hindle, Hobin, Hulme, A Hussain, Ibrahim, Islam, Jabbar, Lancaster, Leach, McLaren, Moores, Murphy, C. Phythian, K Phythian, Roberts, Salamat, Shah, Sheldon, Surjan, Sykes, Taylor, Wilkinson, Williamson, Williams and Woodvine

1 **TO RECEIVE APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors M Bashforth, S Bashforth, Briggs, F Hussain, Iqbal, Kenyon, Malik, Mushtaq, Sharp, Shuttleworth, Stretton and Toor.

2 **TO ORDER THAT THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COUNCIL HELD ON 3RD NOVEMBER 2021 BE SIGNED AS A CORRECT RECORD**

RESOLVED – That the minutes of the Council meeting held on 3rd November 2021 be approved as a correct record.

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

Councillor Garry declared a disclosable pecuniary interest at Item 8d by virtue of her husband's employment with Greater Manchester Police.
Councillor Chris Gloster declared a non-registerable interest at Item 8d by virtue of his receipt of an occupational pension from Greater Manchester Police.
Councillor Hazel Gloster declared a non-registerable interest at Item 8d by virtue of her husband's receipt of an occupational pension from Greater Manchester Police.
Councillor Wilkinson declared a non-registerable interest at Item 8d by virtue of his receipt of an occupational pension from Greater Manchester Police.
Councillor Hamblett declared an other registerable interest at Item 8d in relation to MioCare, by virtue of being a Council nominee on the Board.
Councillor Chauhan declared an other registerable interest at Item 8d in relation to MioCare, by virtue of being a Council nominee on the Board.
Councillor Hobin declared a disclosable pecuniary interest at Item 9 Motion 1 by virtue of his employment by Stagecoach.

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

There were no items of urgent business.

5 **TO RECEIVE COMMUNICATIONS RELATING TO THE**

BUSINESS OF THE COUNCIL

There were no communications

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

There were no petitions received to be noted.

7 **YOUTH COUNCIL**

The Youth Council PROPOSED the following MOTION:

Mental ill-health amongst young people

Council recognises that poor, and declining, mental health has been identified by young people in the borough as one of the biggest issues they face, especially after the adverse impact upon their health caused by the COVID-19 pandemic.

In the most recent annual Make Your Mark Ballot (a UK wide consultation of 11–18-year-olds), mental ill-health received 1,250 votes of the 8,700 cast, constituting the 2nd biggest issue of concern to young people in Oldham. This was reinforced by the findings of an online survey by the Oldham Youth Service in July 2021.

Research by the Children's Society shows that 75% or young people with mental health problems are not getting the help they need and that 34% of those people referred to NHS services are not accepted.

Although the budget for mental health support rose from £4.5 billion in 2016 to £10.5 billion in 2021. As 75% of all mental health conditions manifest in young adults before the age of 24 we believe that more money needs to be invested in treating mental ill health in young people.

Council resolves to ask the Chief Executive to write to the Secretary of State for Health and Social Care, The Rt Hon Sajid Javid MP, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, The Rt Hon Rishi Sunak MP, and to the Prime Minister, The Rt Hon Boris Johnson MP, to express the concerns of the young people of Oldham, and to seek an adequate share of the £79M set aside for mental health care to meet the needs of our young people.

Councillor Moores spoke in support of the Motion.
Councillor H Gloster spoke in support of the Motion.
Councillor Arnott spoke on the Motion.
Councillor Shah spoke in support of the Motion.

Councillor Moores MOVED and Councillor H Gloster SECONDED the MOTION as presented by the Youth Council.

A recorded vote was requested and taken on the MOTION as follows:

COUNCILLOR		**COUNCILLOR**	
Abid, Sahr	ABSTAIN	Ibrahim, Nyla	FOR
Ahmad, Riaz	FOR	Iqbal, Javid	ABSENT
Akhtar, Shoab	FOR	Islam, Mohammed Nazrul	FOR
Alexander, Ginny	FOR	Jabbar, Abdul	FOR
Al-Hamdani,	FOR	Kenyon, Mark	ABSENT

Sam			
Ali, Mohon	FOR	Lancaster, Luke	FOR
Alyas, Mohammed	FOR	Leach, Valerie	FOR
Arnott, Dave	ABSTAIN	Malik, Abdul	ABSENT
Bashforth, Marie	ABSENT	McLaren, Colin	FOR
Bashforth, Steven	ABSENT	Moores, Eddie	FOR
Birch, Ros	FOR	Murphy, Dave	FOR
Briggs, Norman	ABSENT	Mushtaq, Shaid	ABSENT
Brownridge, Barbara	FOR	Phythian, Clint	FOR
Byrne, Pam	FOR	Phythian, Kyle	FOR
Chadderton, Amanda	FOR	Roberts, Hannah	FOR
Chauhan, Zahid	FOR	Salamat, Ali Aqeel	FOR
Cosgrove, Angela	FOR	Shah, Arooj	FOR
Curley, Jamie	FOR	Sharp, Beth	ABSENT
Davis, Peter	FOR	Sheldon, Graham	ABSTAIN
Dean, Peter	FOR	Shuttleworth, Graham	ABSENT
Garry, Elaine	FOR	Stretton, Jean	ABSENT
Gloster, Chris	FOR	Surjan, Ruji Sapna	FOR
Gloster, Hazel	FOR	Sykes MBE, Howard	FOR
Goodwin, Chris	FOR	Taylor, Elaine	FOR
Hamblett, Louie	FOR	Toor, Yasmin	ABSENT
Hindle, Neil	FOR	Wilkinson, Mark	FOR
Hobin, Brian	FOR	Williamson, Diane	FOR
Hulme, George	FOR	Williams, Steve	FOR
Hussain, Aftab	FOR	Woodvine, Max	FOR
Hussain, Fida	ABSENT	Harrison Jenny	FOR

On a recorded VOTE being taken, 44 VOTES were cast in FAVOUR of the MOTION with 0 VOTES cast AGAINST and 4 ABSTENTIONS. The MOTION was therefore CARRIED.

RESOLVED that the Chief Executive be asked to write to the Secretary of State for Health and Social Care, The Rt Hon Sajid Javid MP, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, The Rt Hon Rishi Sunak MP, and to the Prime Minister, The Rt Hon Boris Johnson MP, to express the concerns of the young people of Oldham, and to seek an adequate share of the £79M set aside for mental health care to meet the needs of our young people.

8 **QUESTIONS TIME**

9 **PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

1. Question received from Duncan Breeze
   Why has millions been spent on Alexander Park, but many others now represent derelict wastelands included Failsworth Park. Will there be any work done to improve Failsworth park so the residents of Failsworth can exercise and take there family's there etc?

Councillor Chadderton, Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods responded that the millions that were spent on Alexandra park were a result of a successful lottery bid which brought in just over £2.6 million. This was not recent money and had come in between 1997 and 2004. Bids had been put forward for other park and only one of the other parks, Dunwood Park in Shaw, had received lottery funding. Investment was and continued to be made in all parks with Section 106 money earmarked for Higher Memorial Park (Failsworth Park) and, if the local housing developments went ahead, would see an investment of around £65,000 into improvements to the hard service games area and general improvements to the parks landscape. When this money was received, she would ensure that a consultation exercise took place with Ward Members and the public prior to the commitment of the funding.

2. Question received from Matthew Smith
It's become apparent in recent months that Mr Neil Wilby (Press) has much better access to Oldham Council and specifically the leader of the council than most of the constituents in the town. I recently emailed labour councillors on a number of issues and never got a reply, however Mr Wilby seems to have a hotline directly to the leader especially. May I remind Labour councillors & the leader of the council this is the same Journalist who has tweeted a number of offensive/abusive tweets about Labour MPs including Angela Rayner. Does the leader think it's right that 1) A member of the press has better access to the council than most of the citizens of the town and
2) How do you expect the citizens of the town to take the leader seriously when she's speaking about bullying & harassment, when she is happy to be in communications with a journalist, thanking him on a number of occasion, when he has made a number of offensive tweets regarding your female Labour colleagues?

Councillor Shah, Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Economic and Social Reform replied that she was glad he asked that question. She welcomed the opportunity to make the facts clear on a subject that was a matter of much online speculation. She had worked hard to improve the accessibility and transparency of the Council. She had introduced the Big Oldham Conversation, which involved holding public events across the borough, so the public could ask questions of her and the Chief Executive about the borough. A consultation had been launched on the town centre plans and ramped up engagement with local businesses. Local people could also ask questions at full Council and other meetings, and could contact their Councillors or the Council to ask questions and find out information, and they often did. Mr Wilby was an accredited journalist and

his queries were managed through the Council's Press Office, as any other journalist. The local media played an important part of holding the Council to account, so they did have fair and appropriate access to information and could ask questions at any point. The relationship with journalists was managed by Council officers and not by the Leader. In terms of her personal engagement with people on social media, she responded positively to a wide range of people, to talk about local issues and the borough on twitter and elsewhere. She thanked people would made useful comments and were positive about the town, and this should not be taken as an endorsement for everything that was said by those she engaged with. Although she strived to be accountable and open, whether with journalists or members of the public, engagement happened using the proper Council processes. It had come to her attention that there were a number of allegations of leaks and/or breaches of data sharing that did concern her. It was not acceptable for anyone in the Council to be sharing information inappropriately. Due to the speculation about this issue, she had asked for a thorough, robust investigation into where information which appeared to be leaked was coming from, which should conclude by the end of the week. Robust action would be taken against anyone found to be breaching the Council's processes and procedures. She had made it very clear at the start of her leadership that she took her role and responsibility very seriously and she would ensure robust action would be taken to protect democracy and public confidence in Councillors and the Council.

3. Question received from Robert Barnes
   Following on from last month's question regarding the issue of giving the public a right of reply to Public Questions, would the Council Leader give serious consideration to suspending Standing Orders when there is no Youth Council business? This would allow for an extension of Public Questions to 30 minutes. A right of reply of two minutes for the public could then be built in to Public Questions. Why does the Council Leader not believe that the people of our town should have a right of reply to answers to questions they have raised? In the interests of transparency, accountability, democracy and trust in our Elected Members, would the Council Leader now look again at extending Public Questions to include time for members of the public to reply?

   Councillor Shah, Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Economic and Social Reform replied that, as confirmed at the last meeting she had committed to reviewing the approach taken to public questions, including the time allocated to them. This review would be considered by the cross-party Constitution Working Group who could then make recommendations to Council. The objective would be to ensure that residents

had as much opportunity as they could to engage with the Council, whilst still allowing time for other important business.

4. Question received from Paul Shilton
Community centers are vital hubs of each community that they serve, and their futures must be secured for generations to come. Short term leases of up to 25 years are only offered to these facilities, when a more permanent lease could ensure community investment was not raised or donated in vain. After over 2 years, the 25 year lease for Grotton Pavilion is still to be confirmed. Can the Council assure this community that their community hub will not be sacrificed for the profits of developers in 25 years time, by providing a 100 year lease to ensure its future?

   Councillor Chadderton, Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods replied that the Council valued its community facilities and was always keen to work with community groups to retain and develop their services in Council premises in accordance with its Council policy. The Council and the Grotton Residents Association had agreed terms for their continued occupation of their premises. This agreement was approved on 6th October 2021 and was now with the respective parties solicitors to formalise the matter.

5. Question received from Roland Smith
It's good to see the council has volunteered Oldham to accommodate asylum seekers, however I have a big concern that Oldham Council is doing this without improving facilities in the town. My doctors takes typically 3 weeks for a face to face appointment. My granddaughter struggled to get in her first chose of school, which was the closest to her home. Oldham A&E is at busting points both financially and resources. I have a real fear the town is taking too much of the responsibility when it comes to asylum seekers, especially when you see the Tory run councils which take zero to little in terms of asylum seekers. Whilst it's helpful to take these people it can't be done at the detriment of the current population. Can you reassure me if we are to take more asylum seekers, then these areas are massively improved?

   Councillor Shah, Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Economic and Social Reform replied that the Council had not volunteered to accommodate more asylum seekers. The Home Office informed Oldham Council that they intended to use the hotel due to the significant pressures currently in the national asylum system. Decisions regarding where asylum seekers were placed were taken by the Home Office. The regional provider Serco produced a list of hotels for the Home Office, which then decided which hotels to use. The

Council did not receive any funding for this and she echoed the concerns about this and also about the inequity of the current asylum dispersal system. Decisions on placements were made by the Home Office based on cost, with people placed where cheap accommodation could be found. As a result, places with higher levels of poverty were taking more asylum placements than more affluent areas and the areas with higher numbers of placements were also the areas hardest hit by the impact of cuts to public service funding over the last ten years. This same issue had been raised, time and again, with the government. The previous Home Secretary, Sajid Javid, made a commitment in 2018 to address this but there has been no change and she had raised this exact same issue again in a recent letter to the Home Secretary, Priti Patel, and was awaiting a response.

6. Question received from Peter Roberts
Oldham has the highest youth unemployment rate, could the relevant cabinet member please inform the Council what support is available for young people to support them into employment or training.

Councillor Akhtar, Cabinet Member for Employment and Enterprise replied that the youth unemployment rate in Oldham had been dramatically impacted by Covid. Youth Unemployment peaked in March 2021 at 16.4%. In November this had dropped to 10.9%, a 34% reduction over that 8 month period. The re-opening of the economy was having an impact and reducing youth unemployment. A year ago there were just 5,000 jobs posted across Greater Manchester and this had now more than doubled to almost 11,000 vacancies. The Council was working hard with partners to promote access to a range of schemes such as Kickstart, GMCA ESF NEET's Youth Employment programme, work was ongoing with Get Oldham Working, Job Centre Plus, Princes Trust, Positive Steps, Rio Ferdinand Foundation and Oldham Enterprise Trust to provide support to 12 projects that were in place to support unemployed residents. He would urge unemployed and NEET young people to get in touch with the Council or the job centre, who would put them in touch with the relevant scheme for support. Get Oldham Working had supported 9,000 Oldham residents into employment over the last 8 years.
However, there was gap for emerging for some 18 year olds. Some of this would be addressed by the Community Renewal programme that Positive Steps and Northern Roots were successful in winning. The economy was improving, there was a growth in new business start ups and a great demand for business space in Oldham. The Council and Partners would be launching a campaign in the new year to make sure that the young people of Oldham knew what support was available over the next year and beyond.

7. Question received from Peter Scoltock
Just recently the Council promoted the Oldham Business Growth Fund to Businesses across the Borough and invited bids from the manufacturing, creative and digital sectors. Could the relevant Cabinet Member please update on how many Businesses have been supported through this Fund, the number of anticipated jobs created and the amount of Private Sector Contributions.

   Councillor Akhtar, Cabinet Member for Employment and Enterprise responded that the Council was finalising the approval of the grant agreements and it was expected that the Business Growth Grant (value £345,045) would support 26 companies to create 120 jobs and leverage a further £555,815 private sector investment/contribution.

8. Question received from Janet Hargreaves
Could the relevant cabinet member please share what plans the council has to engage with small businesses across the borough and explain how the GM clean air zone charge will affect small businesses in Oldham.

   Councillor Jabbar, Cabinet Member for Finance and Low Carbon replied that small businesses had been engaged around the GM Clean Air Plan and the Clean Air Zone that would be operational from 30th May 2022. The Council had already been actively engaging with small businesses via press releases and social media posts as well as promoting the Clean Air Plan via the weekly business newsletter which had 5,000 subscribers. Information had also been posted recently regarding the grant funding available to owners of non-compliant HGVs so they could be helped to replace prior to May 2022. Details of other grant funding focussed towards owners of non-compliant Light Goods vehicles (LGVs) and Taxis who had an exemption to any charges in the Zone until 1st June 2023. This grant funding would be made available at the end of January 2022 and the Council had committed with all GM Authorities to continue engagement with the affected business owners.

10 **QUESTIONS TO LEADER AND CABINET**

Councillor Sheldon, Leader of the Conservative Group:

Question 1 – <u>Music Licence Refund</u>

Council will be aware that businesses and places of worship currently hold a music licence. This used to be two licences from the Performing Rights Society (PRS) and the Phonographic Performance Limited (PPL). This licence enables all types of businesses to play live, recorded music and music heard on a television to their customers in their place of business. The cost of these licences varies depending on the size of venue and how the music is played in the venue. I would like to bring to your attention that all businesses can apply for a credit if the

venue is closed during lockdown and they are unable to play television or background music. One of my constituents has waited three months for a credit note but I thought it was important to remind the businesses in Oldham town centre and in the area in general, that a refund is available in these difficult financial times.

Councillor Shah, Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Economic and Social Reform, replied that she was grateful Councillor Sheldon had highlighted the availability of this refund and she would meet with him afterwards to discuss how best to communicate this to businesses.

Question 2 – Personal Responsibility for Raising Safeguarding Concerns

We are all seeing on the television in the last few days with utter disbelief the tragic circumstances following the death of a little boy and a baby girl that were killed and tortured by their parents and guardians. We need to raise awareness that, if anyone has a concern, they personally need to raise that concern and call our Safeguarding Team. I know the Team at the borough has an excellent record and I would like everyone to have the number 0161 770 7777. Please do not expect others to call. If you have a concern or suspect anything untoward is happening, you need to make that call. The Safeguarding Team will then decide to take any necessary action. Council is asked to consider whether a review is necessary and whether our laws and the penalty for such horrendous and evils acts should be revisited. Finally, I need to reiterate that safeguarding is everyone's responsibility and tragedies like these must not happen.

Councillor Shah, Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Economic and Social Reform, responded that all Councillors were aware of the recent tragic cases. There had been a lot of public concern about the effectiveness of safeguarding arrangements arising from these cases and that was something she completely understood. She was also aware that the government had announced two reviews in response to these highly-concerning cases - a review of both cases by the National Child Safeguarding Practice Review Panel and a joint targeted area inspection to look at the effectiveness of safeguarding arrangements in Solihull. They had also appointed a Commissioner to conduct and independent review of safeguarding practice in Bradford and this additional scrutiny was welcome so we could all learn the lessons from these very sad cases. We could never be in a position to say we have got this right because we have not and there was always learning to be done. It was unfortunate that sometimes that was triggered by such tragedies. In Oldham we were committed to a strong Safeguarding Service to protect children and it was always deeply concerning when such a tragedy occurred. She wished to give her support to Councillor Sheldon and say we should communicate helplines and build public confidence in services. She was aware the work of social workers was extremely hard and there should be a constant review of the support they

received whilst always holding the Council to the highest standards.

Councillor Sykes, Leader of the Liberal Democratic Group:

Question 1 – Hospital Car Parking

For my first question to the Leader tonight I want to look at car parking at the Royal Oldham Hospital.
The complaints that both I and my Liberal Democrat colleagues receive regularly from constituents, who are either outpatients or visitors to the hospital, is the difficulty they encounter in finding a car parking space.
Sometimes residents, myself included, drive around for an age to find a space as the minutes tick away for their appointment. Frankly the stress is just not needed, especially when you are awaiting life- saving treatment for cancer or rushing to visiting a sick relative.
In addition, car parking spaces are sometimes some way from the relevant ward or outpatient's department, and visitors who are infirm or in ill-health can struggle to make the distance between their car and the building.
Can I ask the Leader, and through her the Cabinet Member for Health, if an appeal could be made to the hospital authorities to look again at visitor parking spaces to create more spaces in future development plans?
Can they also be asked to ensure that patient and visitor spaces, rather than staff spaces, are located closer to the wards and outpatient departments?
We also receive complaints about car parking charges. I have carried out some research about car parking charges at our hospital and there are a surprising number of concessions that would allow many patients to park for free or at a much-reduced rate – if only they knew about them and could find a parking space.
So, in a third part to my question can I ask if the Leader and Cabinet Member will work with the health authority and with relevant agencies, such as Healthwatch and cancer charities, to raise the public's awareness of these concessions?

Councillor Shah, Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Economic and Social Reform, responded that she shared Councillor Sykes' concerns and frustrations around this. She was aware conversations were already happening between the Cabinet Member for Health and Social Care and the hospital. She would support working with the relevant agencies to effectively raise awareness of concessions.

Question 2 – Exploring Crowdfunding

My second question relates to Crowdfunding.
For councils up and down the country, it is becoming increasingly difficult to afford capital projects or provide for services or events that are outside statutory provision.
One innovation that more and more councils, from Manchester to Lewisham, are using is Crowdfunding.

Crowdfunding provides a new model for local authorities to connect with communities and residents.
It is a means by which local people become empowered to help deliver a capital project, service, or event that they want to see in their community by making an online financial contribution without the bureaucracy of funding bids.
Sometimes this contribution is made altruistically, sometimes in the expectation of personal gain such receiving an interest payment or an invitation to a launch event.
Plymouth Council was the first who launched Crowdfund Plymouth in 2015. Within 12 months, this initiative raised over £430,000 to back more than 100 projects in the city where 4,550 members of the public had themselves raised one-quarter of the money.
Several local authorities have used crowdfunding specifically to finance renewable energy projects. This is the number one area Oldham needs to look at in my opinion.
Swindon Borough Council raised £4.3m from the public to fund two solar parks; Warrington and West Berkshire Councils £1 million each through Community Municipal Bonds; and Islington Council is just currently doing the same.
Back in 2019, a report from the University of Leeds, titled 'Financing for Society' concluded that crowdfunding has 'huge, untapped potential' for public sector infrastructure finance with finance accessible at a comparable rate to loans from the Public Works Loan Board.
My question to the Leader is therefore that if we are indeed a Co-operative Council intent on engaging our communities in our work and in getting 'everyone to do their bit', especially in helping to make our borough carbon-neutral by 2030, shouldn't we as a Council be at least investigating the merits of crowdfunding?

Councillor Shah, Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Economic and Social Reform, replied that she agreed entirely and would ask officers to undertake a piece of work to explore the crowd-funding opportunities. She would also volunteer the Cabinet Member for Finance and Low Carbon, who was very passionate about this area to have a conversation with Councillor Sykes about this. She welcomed the idea and recognised the need for innovation, especially as it was known that the government would not be giving more and Councils would need to do more for themselves.

Councillor Hobin, Leader of the Failsworth Independent Party:

Question 1 – <u>Leaks of Information</u>

The Leader will be aware that my colleague Councillor Wilkinson has experienced leaks against him going out to the public and to a malicious blogger, who received details about a Committee before Councillor Wilkinson. This blogger had admitted in tweets that he had received information through leaked documents from this Council. This goes to the heart of what we do here and it should worry all Members if information goes outside that

should not do, especially if it goes to people that are going to use it against us. Confidentiality should be paramount in this place, we should be able to trust one another. I know we are building bridges with each other, with the Leaders and other Members, and trying to work together at the Council as never before. Surely items like this and leaks like this will cause friction, and are being put out there for the very reason, to cause division and scupper the relationships we have. Even more concerning for me was that we recently found out that it was not just Members of this Chamber who were being leaked against, but a member of the public has had matters leaked against them to this malicious blogger, who has used them against him. This is private information. The Council itself has admitted that the leak has taken place. It is very concerning and surely an issue of GDPR. I know that Councillor Shah has made a statement on this during the earlier question but I would like assurance that the source of these leaks will be found, will be dealt with severely, with criminal action taken if necessary, and that contact with any malicious blogger from any Member in this Chamber should be condemned.

Councillor Shah, Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Economic and Social Reform, replied that she did think this was important and she shared Councillor Hobin's concerns. The issue of confidential information being shared outside the organisation had been brought to her attention. Local people should be able to trust that the Council would manage their data when they contacted us and manage confidential information in appropriate ways and keep it as safe as possible. That was the Council's responsibility and duty. She had already asked officers to undertake an urgent review into the particular issue referred to and investigate who, if anyone, was inappropriately sharing confidential information. This review would conclude by the end of the week and the strongest possible action would be taken against anyone found to be leaking or sharing inappropriately. She was just as appalled as Councillor Hobin and promised that, if this was found to be happening, immediate action would be taken.

1. Councillor McLaren asked the following question:
   Even before the pandemic, food poverty was on the rise nationally. Here in Oldham the Council recognised the problem and worked closely with its partners to tackle hunger amongst young children., unfortunately the pandemic made a bad situation worse, and many Oldham families will be worried about how they will cope during the summer. Could the relevant Cabinet Member please advise us what help and support was available for children, young people and their families during October half-term and what are the plans for Christmas school holidays?

   Councillor Moores, Cabinet Member for Children and Young People responded that Oldham Council recognised it needed to tackle hunger amongst young children during school holidays. The Department for Work

and Pensions (DWP) recently announced new funding, the Household Support Grant fund, which covered the period October 2021 to March 2022, the Council chose to use some of this funding during the October half term holiday to issue food vouchers for families with children eligible for means tested Free School Meals, families on low incomes with pre-school children, support for college students eligible for Free School Meals and vouchers for care leavers under 25. This funding will also be used to support children and young people in the same way over the Christmas holiday and during eh half term holiday in February next year.
In addition to this, Oldham Council, with the support of the wider voluntary sector, for these periods, are utilising the Holiday Activity Fund, to provide free holiday provision, including healthy food and enriching activities, for school-aged children who receive benefits-related free school meals.

2. Councillor Davis asked the following question:
Now the public consultation on the Oldham planning local plan has finished, which I encouraged members of the public to take part in as well as commenting myself, to request an Article 4 Direction which would remove the permitted rights to be able to convert properties in Oldham in to Houses of multiple occupancy (HMOs)
I have noticed a lot of these developments changing the make up of areas including my own area in Failsworth and the loss of family homes which there is a need for!
Can I rely on the Council's backing for my suggestion?

   Councillor Roberts, Cabinet Member for Housing replied that following the close of the recent public consultation on the Oldham Local Plan, the Council continued work on this. One of the matters the Council would address through the Local Plan was how best to manage the conversion of properties to HMOs across the borough. This would involve assessing whether an Article 4 Direction, to remove permitted development rights on the conversion of homes to HMOs for up to six people, could be justified in certain parts of the borough most affected by a proliferation of HMOs. It would also involve introducing a policy in the Local Plan for the Council to use when making decisions on planning applications for the conversion of non-residential properties to HMOs and the conversion of residential properties to HMOs of more than six people.

3. Councillor Goodwin asked the following question:
Recent figures from the Department for Levelling Up, Housing & Communities have shown that a total of 194,060 new build homes were constructed between April 1 2020 and March 31 2021 - a five-year low, and down more than 11% on the previous year. A contributing factor for this decline has been stated as being as a result

of council approvals being slowed by staff working from home.
May I ask the responsible Cabinet Member to confirm:
How many homes have been built within the Borough, or are in progress, during the same 12 month period?
How this figure compares with the previous 12 months?
How many planning applications have been granted for housing developments in the Borough over the last three years?
How many such approved developments are yet to commence?

Councillor Roberts, Cabinet Member for Housing replied that she could clarify that the reduction in the number of new homes built both nationally and in Oldham between 1 April 2020 and 31 March 2021 was not related to council staff working from home. Homes built between 1 April 2020 and 31 March 2021 would have been granted planning permission before March 2020. Council staff, both nationally and in Oldham, only moved to home-working with the introduction of the first national COVID lockdown on 23 March 2020.
In reality, the reduction in the number of new homes built in 2020/21 was due to the fact that the vast majority of construction sites stopped work for at least part of that first national lockdown and, when they were able to re-open, had to introduce additional COVID safety measures that slowed construction compared to normal practices.
In answer to Cllr Goodwins's specific questions:
The number of homes built in Oldham between 1 April 2020 and 31 March 2021 was 373. The number of homes built in Oldham between 1 April 2019 and 31 March 2020 was 728, and that was the highest number for several years. The number of planning applications granted for housing developments in Oldham between 1 April 2018 and 31 March 2021 was 254 sites granted planning permission, providing a total of 1,886 homes. The number of those planning applications granted for housing developments in Oldham between 1 April 2018 and 31 March 2021 that had not yet started as at 30 September 2021 was 148 of those sites (providing a total of 1,034 homes). However, it should be noted that 81 of those sites (730 homes) were only granted planning permission in the last year. This lag between granting permission and commencing development was not unusual, given that there was often much pre-commencement work (including the discharge of pre-commencement planning conditions) to be done between getting planning permission and starting building.

4. Councillor H Gloster asked the following question:
Although asbestos has been banned, it can still be found in 80% of British schools, meaning our teachers continue to work and our children often continue to study in buildings containing this toxic material. Since 2001, at

least 305 teachers and other education professionals have died of mesothelioma after exposure.
The campaign Airtight on Asbestos believes that the situation could be much improved if routine air monitoring takes place in our classrooms and if the CLASP and system-built schools of the 1950's can be replaced.
Can the Cabinet Member for Education please tell me what checks are routinely carried out in our older schools to monitor air quality for asbestos particles, and what action is taken if these are found to be at an unacceptable level?
And can the Cabinet Member please tell me how many CLASP or system built schools we have in our borough and what is the current timescale to replace them?

Councillor Ali, Deputy Cabinet Member for Education and Skills replied that Oldham Council complied fully with Regulation 4 of the Control of Asbestos Regulations 2012, which obliged all organisations to effectively and proactively manage the risk from asbestos. From 2002, asbestos surveys had been commissioned to all Council Schools, to identify, as far as is reasonably practicable, the presence and extent of any Asbestos Containing Materials in the premises and to assess their condition in relation to the immediate environment.
The Unity Partnership's BOHS registered asbestos competent consultants under the current Building Maintenance - Service Level Agreements, were regularly carrying out the necessary asbestos condition inspection and priority risk assessment works to ensure compliance with the Regulations. Asbestos installations remaining in-situ in occupied areas of the schools were in good condition and sealed and were recorded on the schools live asbestos register. Schools that did not buy into the SLA were monitored by the Council's Health and Safety service.
As part of this work, site specific asbestos management plans had been created for each premise. The purpose of the plan was to set out how the risks from any asbestos found during the survey were to be managed and therefore to prevent accidental exposure to asbestos fibres.
This work by the Unity Partnership was repeated on an annual basis to assist in updating the Asbestos Site Management Plans. In addition to the annual reviews, the school site managers carried out a weekly condition inspection check of the asbestos material.
Previously identified CLASP or system built schools had now been demolished and new schools built. The same management protocols were in place for these buildings prior to demolition.
The ongoing monitoring of the asbestos management plans, demonstrated the Council's on-going commitment to a strong and effective health and safety culture. The primary objective was to ensuring the safety and welfare of pupils, staff and anyone else who visit the schools

5. Councillor Arnott asked the following question:
On 24 November, The Oldham Evening Chronicle published an extremely disturbing article in relation to allegations of bullying and sexual assault (by a fellow pupil) at the Radclyffe School in Chadderton.
Three members of this Council are members of the Board of Governors at the school.
Although for obvious reasons, many details of the harrowing events that led to a pupil attempting to take her own life cannot be published, it is clear that there were significant failings in the processes and procedures that should have been followed.
Please could the Council Leader or appropriate cabinet member, reassure parents that all schools in the Borough have been contacted and reminded of their responsibilities and obligations when it comes to the physical, emotional and mental wellbeing of the children who are in their care.

Councillor Ali, Deputy Cabinet Member for Education and Skills replied that the Headteacher of Radclyffe School issued a statement saying: " We have acknowledged and apologised where failings have occurred, and we will be learning from this in the future".
I can reassure parents that school leaders in the Borough were regularly reminded of their responsibilities for safeguarding of children in their care, through regular communications from the Portfolio Holders for Childrens' Services and Education and from the Director of Childrens' Services and Education. In addition, Headteachers and Chairs of Governors received a weekly update on pertinent safeguarding matters through the Education and Early Years briefing.
Oldham Safeguarding Children Partnership had an engagement model which was used to communicate with settings, schools, academies and colleges regarding keeping children safe in education matters. There was representation on the strategic safeguarding partnership from senior leaders in all education sectors and designated safeguarding leads were on key safeguarding groups. Termly network meetings were held to ensure information was shared from the partnership. Within the partnership business unit, there was a dedicated safeguarding advisor for education who was the link with schools on safeguarding matters and a training officer who worked with schools and colleges offering training and support on relationships and sex education topics.
A number of Council services were tasked with supporting schools on emotional well-being and mental health.
The Mental Health in Education team worked with schools to embed universal support for all pupils and all staff. Each school had an allocated advisor to address their needs through consultation, curriculum planning or training. The team worked with stakeholders to ensure

that there was a consistent approach to Mental Health in schools and across the health sector. They offered bespoke support based on the needs identified through self-assessments and action plans. The core training offer enabled staff to have a wellbeing conversation, look beyond behaviour and support staff wellbeing.

6. Councillor Leach asked the following question:
It is more important than ever that young children are in school or in early years provision according to their age. Providers of early childhood development services in schools, in private and voluntary organisations' settings, childminders, all are facing cost pressures. Claims against government COVID funds will no longer be available, but staffing absences continue and official staffing ratios must still be adhered to and so costs of temporary staff must be incurred or services closed. Providers are also reporting difficulties in recruiting staff and wage rates are rising. Given these staffing and cost pressures, can the Cabinet Member let us know what is the impact on the numbers of children attending early childhood development services?

   Councillor Moores, Cabinet Member for Children and Young People replied he had a lengthy response that he would keep brief and ensure the full response was circulated later. Providers of early years education and childcare were facing a very challenging time as they strived to maintain quality services amid multiple operational and financial pressures. These included:
   - Changing patterns of parental demand as a result of new ways of working;
   - Additional operational demands associated with need for infection control;
   - Staff absences due to illness and isolating.
   - Staff recruitment difficulties due to unattractive wages.

   With regard to attendance in Early Years Settings, the DfE estimated that current attendance was approximately 86% of the usual daily level.
   The take-up of places in Oldham showed a slight dip from the levels of take-up of places pre-pandemic.
   There were a number of financial implications. Providers would continue to face further pressures on their running costs. These included a legacy of slightly lower levels of funding in Oldham compared to other similar authorities, inflation standing at 5.1%, and a 6.6% increase in the living wage. Where the problem really lay was in the government's failure to invest in early years provision. In the autumn budget, they announced a 3.8% increase in the hourly rate of funding to be paid to local authorities for free early education from April 2022, which was too little too late.

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

RESOLVED that the questions and responses provided be noted.

11 **QUESTIONS ON CABINET MINUTES**

The Council was requested to note the minutes of the Cabinet meetings held on the undermentioned dates, 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 20th September 2021 and 18th October 2021 were
submitted.

Members raised the following questions:-

Councillor Lancaster asked the following question in relation to Cabinet 20/9/21, Item 7, p41 OPOL Interim Planning Paper
Following the different Greater Manchester-wide spatial development plans – the GMSF and now 'Places for Everyone' – there is understandably a great deal of mistrust amongst residents of our Borough about the Council's willingness to stand up and protect our precious green spaces for future generations to enjoy.
Unfortunately, on our current course, this feeling of mistrust will only deepen further, with five of the present Other Protected Open Land (OPOL) sites set to be de-designated and not recommended for succession to the new Local Green Spaces (LGS) model.
Two of these sites are situated in Saddleworth, one of which at Rumbles Lane, Delph, being in my Saddleworth North ward. In both instances, the Council's own assessment acknowledges that the land adds to our area's attractiveness.
Can I please ask the Cabinet Member for Housing for reconsideration to be given to these sites with a view to them being designated under LGS?
I would also like to welcome the addition of a new site at Sholver Lane in the St. James' ward, and ask as well that further efforts are invested into finding new sites across the Borough which would benefit from LGS protection.

Councillor Roberts, Cabinet Member for Housing responded that potentially de-designating OPOL sites and potentially designating new local green spaces was something that would be dealt with in the new local plan for Oldham. The reason for moving from a locally-set designation like OPOL to designations such as local green space was intended to reinforce the protection from development, to try and give stronger protection to those areas designated as a local green space and the criteria for this were different. In identifying which sites should be designated as local green space, the Council had put forward an initial view based on the assessment of OPOL sites against green space criteria, but no final decision had yet been made. If Members or local residents wished to put forward further

evidence why any OPOL sites should be designated as local green spaces, or why any other new sires should be considered for designation, the Council was listening to those suggestions as it prepared the new local plan. Some local residents had put forward responses to the issues and options and, if any Members wished to put forward more suggestions, they should do so. Green space was referable as the land would be better protected.

Councillor Woodvine asked the following question in relation to Cabinet 18/10/21, Item 8, page 51 Waste collection vehicles
I am pleased the Cabinet have chosen to replace the waste collection vehicles, but I'm surprised there are only five to cover the Borough.
In Saddleworth, and I suppose the Borough, we do have an ageing population and as such increasing single households and houses with older couples only.
For these people three weekly collections are more than enough, however, I have had concerns brought to me by families that fortnightly collections would be better.
In a perfect world we would have weekly collections although with Budgetary constraints I realise this isn't possible in a Borough this size.
Some of those families are happy, however, to take their own waste to the tip - saving the Council money.
But the restrictions on the tip mean they cannot go as often as they may need to, especially if they drive pick-ups for domestic purposes.
Therefore, did the Cabinet consider that reducing restrictions on the tip may mean people are happier to dispose of their own waste, and did they consider increasing the number of collection vehicles to in turn increase collection frequency?

Councillor Chadderton, Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods replied that 5 vehicles were not enough to cover a borough of Oldham's size. Oldham Council operated a fleet of over 25 waste collection vehicles.
The procurement process of new vehicles was staggered to reduce the financial requirement and risk to the service of replacing all the vehicles at the same time.
The 3-weekly collections implemented over four years ago had delivered savings in the millions towards the cost of disposing of general rubbish and improved recycling performance as well.
Although restrictions had been made to the number of visits to the tip these were in line with restrictions which had been imposed across the UK. Each household could visit the tip once every week and reduced visits only applied to larger vehicles.
At this time there were no considerations being made to increase the domestic collection frequencies or limit any further the restriction around the tips.

Councillor C Gloster asked the following question in relation to Cabinet 20/9/21 Item 6, p41
Alexandra Park Depot Contract – Construction Contract and final business case approval

Whilst broadly welcoming the reconstruction of the Alexandra Park Depot which should provide a better and more efficient service to the communities of The Borough. This project received Cabinet approval almost 12 months ago however the construction phase has only just begun. Since approval, costs in the building trade have spiralled. Can the cabinet member assure us that this project will be completed on time and within the budget set for this project?

Councillor Jabbar, Cabinet Member for Finance and Low Carbon replied that in January this year, Cabinet approved the scope of the project and the commencement of the contractor procurement process. Following the completion of the designs and a robust tender process, the preferred contractor submitted an initial cost on 7th July 2021.
This was followed by a detailed tender negotiation to ensure price certainty and a fixed price lump sum, culminating in Cabinet approval on 20th September 2021. The final contract sum was signed off by the Chair of CIPB on 3rd November 2021 and included approval for an adjustment in the contractor's costs recognising material inflation.
Since then, the contractor has commenced work on site on 6th December 2021 and, as with other Council capital projects, comprehensive contract management and change control processes were in place to manage the project as it progressed. These processes would be managed by an experienced team of professionals who would monitor the contract and the work. he was hopeful that the contract would be delivered on budget and on time.

Councillor Murphy asked the following question in relation to Cabinet 20/9/21, Item 7, p41 OPOL Interim Planning Paper
I note that finally, we have something that resembles Oldham's stance on Other Protected Open Land (OPOL), which to note the Liberal Democrats have been asking for a long time.
If a proper OPOL policy was in date when planning applications like Cowlishaw and Denbigh Drive were submitted, then residents would have or would be in a better position to keep the area where they live as it is.
The Administration has used the lack of policy as a backdoor way to sneak in housing numbers to achieve Tory housing targets.
Cabinet resolved that "the Other Protected Open Land Interim Planning Paper be adopted. The Interim Planning Paper would be used as a material consideration to assess the significance of each Other Protected Open Land."
Could I ask the Cabinet member how exactly will the Council "assess the significance of each Other Protected Open Land"?
And would the Cabinet Member please explain why we are behind other local authorities and do not have a proper OPOL policy and why did we not update it sooner?

Councillor Roberts, Cabinet Member for Housing responded that the Council had, and had always had since 2011, a "proper" policy on Other Protected Open Land (OPOL) in the form of Policy 22 of the adopted Joint Core Strategy and Development

Management Policies DPD. The question fails to acknowledge that Local Plan policies can be rendered out of date under paragraph 11(d) of the National Planning Policy Framework where the Council was unable to demonstrate a five-year housing land supply. The only way to bring that policy up to date was to demonstrate either a five-year supply or to adopt an entirely new policy through a review of the Local Plan.
Where the Council did not have a five year housing land supply, and so policies like that for OPOL were considered "out of date", under national planning policy, the weight that the Council could give to those policies in decision-making on planning applications was reduced, and the weight given to the fact that an application would provide much-needed new housing was given greater weight. This meant the Council was less able to resist applications for housing development on OPOL sites, such as that referred to at Cowlishaw. (It should be noted that the application for Denbigh Drive had not yet been determined).
The Interim Planning Paper, was designed to be used as a "material consideration" in determining planning applications. A material consideration was any matter which, while possibly not adopted policy, was relevant to consider in deciding planning applications. The Interim Planning Paper set out how the OPOL sites in the borough met Local Green Space criteria – a national designation that would provide stronger protection to such sites.
The suggestion that the Council "are behind other local authorities and do not have a proper OPOL policy and why did we not update it sooner?", this was entirely misleading. We could not be "behind other local authorities" in relation to an OPOL policy, as it was a locally-set policy unique to Oldham. As already said, the Council had a "proper" OPOL policy. Updating it to use a Local Green Space designation instead could only be done through adopting a new Local Plan. The Council were already preparing said new Local Plan, as councillors were aware.

Councillor Williamson asked the following question in relation to Cabinet 20/9/21, Item 8, page 42 Education Contributions Interim Planning Paper
This paper focuses solely on education contributions. Could the Cabinet member responsible please tell me why there has not been a matching Health Contributions Interim Planning Paper, particularly when there is considerable pressure to provide new healthcare facilities in a number of wards across the borough?

Councillor Roberts, Cabinet Member for Housing, replied that it had been standard practice in Oldham for some time to collect contributions towards education improvements from a new development, where it would create a need for additional school places in the local area. The latest Education Contributions Paper was an update to the existing formula for calculating those contributions. Where a new development was adding significantly to the burden of existing health infrastructure it was also possible to ask for a health contribution
However, the majority of new developments in the borough struggled to be viable, due to the low market values for housing in many areas and the costs of developing many sites in the

borough. This meant that many developments simply could not afford to make contributions secured towards provision of all of things asked for and remain viable. All too often one or more of these policy requirements was reduced or removed entirely from a development. Asking for a health contribution in addition would make this situation worse.
Nonetheless the overall policy on developer contribution would be reviewed as part of the Local Plan and if necessary a Health Contributions policy would be developed.

Councillor Hamblett asked the following question in relation to Cabinet 20/9/21 Item 11, p44 GM Streets for all Strategy
To the relevant cabinet member: Will this mean our footpaths will finally be sorted and not be lumpy for the future?

Councillor Shah, Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Economic and Social Reform responded that Streets for All did not offer specific funding for highway repairs and the Council had invested to improve roads and footpaths. It was also working hard to maximise government funding for highways improvements.

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

RESOLVED that:

1. The minutes of the Cabinet meetings held on 20th September 2021 and 18th October 2021 be noted.
2. The questions and responses provided be noted.

12 **QUESTIONS ON JOINT ARRANGEMENTS**

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:

GMCA	24th September 2021 29th October 2021
Police, Fire and Crime Panel	22nd July 2021
National Peak Park Authority	3rd September 2021
Health and Wellbeing Board	14th September 2021
Commissioning Partnership Board	29th April 2021

Members raised the following questions:

Councillor Hamblett asked the following question in relation to GMCA 165/21
Education, work and skills activity update
Point 3 records that: That the progress made to date on the European Social Fund Skills for Growth Programme be noted.
Could I ask what funding has been made available to replace

the European Social Fund Skills for Growth Programme since our departure from the EU?

Councillor Ali, Deputy Cabinet Member for Education and Skills replied that under the exit agreement, there was a continuation of existing commitments from the European Social Investment Framework until December 2023.The replacement fund was the Shared Prosperity Fund worth £2.6bn (£0.4bn in 2022-23, £0.7bn in 2023-24 and £1.5bn in 2024-25).
The Government as part of its levelling up commitent created the Shared Prosperity Fund which should have seen £3m being targeted at Oldham but locally projects managed to just access c. £0.5m. GM in total only benefited to the value of c. £4.5m from an expected £12m. The Council remained concerned that the government was not concerned in investing in Levelling up the North.

Councillor Al-Hamdani asked the following question in relation to GMCA 168/21 Greater Manchester Gender Based Violence Strategy
The minutes note that "it was important that Government also recognised the seismic issue and stepped up their level of support". The Law Commission recently published its recommendation to create a new crime of Public Sexual Harassment – in line with the Liberal Democrat motion agreed universally by this Council – but declined to recommend making misogyny a hate crime. Does the member responsible feel that this is going far enough? Would they agree with me that it is important that the Government sends out a stronger message against misogyny, and that more work needs to be done with a view to adopting misogyny as a hate crime?

Councillor Shah, Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Economic and Social Reform responded that this was an easy question to answer because yes, she absolutely believed that misogyny should be a hate crime, and unlike our Prime Minister, she believed that the scale of the issue was more of a reason to address it.
In Oldham we recognised and understood the harmful impact of misogyny and there was a wealth of ongoing work to raise awareness and respond.
We supported the introduction of any legislation which held perpetrators to account for their targeted behaviour toward people on the basis of protected characteristics, and which recognised aggravating factors that needed to be considered during sentencing.
This included the Law Commission’s recommendation to extend the existing offence of stirring up hatred to include doing so on the grounds of sex and gender. This would make it a criminal offence to promote misogynistic views and this was vital.
Introducing new offences was not enough. It was also critical that new measures resulted in meaningful enforcement action.
The government needed to ensure that there were both the resources available and a willingness to prosecute new offences. The message from the government about misogyny needes to be seen to result in action.

Councillor Williamson asked the following question in relation to GMCA 172/21 GMCA, Environment Agency and United Utilities Memorandum of Understanding
There have been an increasing number of instances of United Utilities disputing whether repair works in the borough are their responsibility. Could the cabinet member responsible tell me if any data is being kept on the number of cases where this has happened, and if this Memorandum of Understanding will help the Council reduce the number of occasions on which this is happening?

Councillor Chadderton, Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods, replied that she agreed it felt like United Utilities were trying to pass the buck and the reality was that Oldham Council and its residents would continue to be affected as a result of these ongoing disputes.
The issue had been raised at a North West and also GMCA level. It was disappointing that there had only been a slight improvement to the service provided so far.
The Council kept a log with information of all the incidents and disputes that came in that involved United Utilities, however concerns remained and the Council was not convinced that the Memorandum of Understanding will reduce the number of occasions that this was happening.
These type of issues were always subjective and each issue was investigated on a case by case basis so it was very hard to conclude who exactly was responsible for the issue on many occasions.
The Council had recently been allocated specific personnel to deal with at United Utilities, so there was now a very specific point of contact for when issues arose. However, faced with the number of historic and ongoing cases it remained a concern as to how this could be resolved.

Councillor Sykes asked the following question in relation to GMCA 202/21
Greater Manchester Brownfield Housing Fund – Reallocation of Tranche 2 additional 10% monies
What is Oldham's share of the £96.9M the minute refers to, and bearing in mind the amount of brownfield land in Oldham, is that a fair and equitable share or, as usual, are we being short changed?

Councillor Roberts, Cabinet Member for Housing, replied that the figure of £96.9m, in the minute referred to, was the total amount of Brownfield Housing Land Funding secured by GMCA from government to date, for allocation on qualifying residential development schemes across the whole of the GM City Region. Oldham had secured a total of £8.1 Million Brownfield Housing Fund Grant to support the delivery of up to 500 new homes across 4 sites. The Council had secured provisional allocations of £2 M and £4.5 M for proposed developments at Derker and Southlink respectively. First Choice Homes had secured £1 M to deliver the redevelopment of Westvale and Countryside

Properties secured £0.6 M to help deliver new homes at Bullcote Lane, Royton.
The Council would of course continue to closely monitor whether any further opportunities to deliver the quality new affordable homes that were needed came forward and if so would bid accordingly, doing everything possible to ensure that Oldham received its fair share of any funding opportunities that were on offer.

Councillor Al-Hamdani asked the following question in relation to GMPCFP/25/21 iOPS
The minutes state that the Chief Constable aimed to be in a position by the end of the year (2021) to know whether the current system was fit for purpose. We are now in our final meeting of the year, and no decision yet appears to have been taken on whether the system is fit for purpose. At a cost of £27 million and rising, can the member responsible give me a yes/no answer as to whether a decision is going to be taken in the next three weeks?
The minutes also note that the Panel noted the difficulties that are faced in introducing any new software system into a large-scale organisation. Could the member responsible give me a simple list of other police forces have faced similar problems to those in Greater Manchester?

Councillor Williams responded that other police forces had experienced difficulties but not to the same extent. GMP had experience issues others had not. In relation to the first part of the question, he had checked today and been told there may be an answer by the end of next month. If iOPS was to be replaced, it would take at least two years and iOPS would have to be used for that time. The other option would be to stick with it and fix it. There were may meetings taking place with a range of people involved in iOPS and there should be a decision by the end of January. Whatever the decision, it needed to be absolutely right.

Councillor H Gloster asked the following question in relation to Commissioning Partnership Board, p97
Does the member response think it is satisfactory from minutes of this important body from April 21, 8 months ago are only now being presented to the Council? I for one do not!

Councillor Chauhan, Cabinet Member for Health and Social Care, replied that minutes sent to Full Council must have been approved at the following meeting of the relevant Committee or Board before being part of the Council agenda. Since the meeting in April 2021, the next meeting of the Commissioning Partnership Board was held on the 21st October, where the minutes from April were approved.
Members were able to view the minutes online before they went to the following meeting and Full Council and Members could also attend the meeting.

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.

13 **NOTICE OF ADMINISTRATION BUSINESS**

Motion 1
Councillor Hulme MOVED and Councillor Chadderton SECONDED the following MOTION:

Motion 1 - Levelling down transport in Greater Manchester

This Council notes:

1. The recently published Integrated Rail Plan (IRP)scales back the Northern Powerhouse Rail (NPR) project to such an extent it has effectively been scrapped. The lack of a dedicated highspeed line between Liverpool and Leeds will impact the service at Greenfield and other towns and villages on the Huddersfield Line. The lack of any funding for electrification on the Rochdale line reduces capacity and reliability.
2. That the promise of an underground station at Manchester Piccadilly has been scrapped by the Government, potentially cutting billions from the local economy. This also raises concerns about the route of the new line running from Manchester to Marsden and how it may impact Oldham.
3. The difference in transport costs between London and Greater Manchester. In London, someone can make as many bus journeys as they like in an hour for only £1.55 whereas a single bus journey in Oldham can cost at least double that.
4. The excellent work of Mayor Andy Burnham in taking back control of our buses in Greater Manchester. The Government has shown support for The Mayor's vision for travel in Greater Manchester with a £1bn package, however this does not make up for the billions now cut from transport in GM in the IRP.

This Council believes that the Government has reneged on its pledge to level up the economies of the north and the south: the difference in transport investment between London and the North is stark. Figures from the IPPR show the North has an £86bn deficit in Treasury transport spending compared to London. The North has received just £349 per person in transport spending since 2009/10 compared with £864 in London. The IPPR has also stated that to meet the challenge of the climate crisis, an extra £12bn a year must be invested. The Government promised repeatedly that they would build NPR and HS2 in full. This promise has been broken and the people of the north betrayed.

This Council resolves to ask the Chief Executive to write to

1. Mayor Andy Burnham supporting his efforts to secure the future of Northern Powerhouse Rail and the additional investment needed to provide a modern, efficient and integrated public transport system in Greater Manchester
2. Secretary of State for Transport Grant Shapps demanding that the Government revisits the IRP to

ensure that Oldham, Greater Manchester and the North West receive a fair share in transport spending in comparison to London and that key projects such as the underground station at Manchester Piccadilly, HS2 and rail electrification are reinstated.

AMENDMENT

Councillor Hindle MOVED and Councillor Wilkinson SECONDED the following AMENDMENT:

Motion 1 – Note 4
To remove first sentence of above Note 4 “The Council notes the excellent work of Mayor Andy Burnham, in taking back control of our buses in Greater Manchester”.

The amended motion to read:

This Council notes:

1. The recently published Integrated Rail Plan (IRP)scales back the Northern Powerhouse Rail (NPR) project to such an extent it has effectively been scrapped. The lack of a dedicated highspeed line between Liverpool and Leeds will impact the service at Greenfield and other towns and villages on the Huddersfield Line. The lack of any funding for electrification on the Rochdale line reduces capacity and reliability.
2. That the promise of an underground station at Manchester Piccadilly has been scrapped by the Government, potentially cutting billions from the local economy. This also raises concerns about the route of the new line running from Manchester to Marsden and how it may impact Oldham.
3. The difference in transport costs between London and Greater Manchester. In London, someone can make as many bus journeys as they like in an hour for only £1.55 whereas a single bus journey in Oldham can cost at least double that.
4. The Government has shown support for The Mayor’s vision for travel in Greater Manchester with a £1bn package, however this does not make up for the billions now cut from transport in GM in the IRP.

This Council believes that the Government has reneged on its pledge to level up the economies of the north and the south: the difference in transport investment between London and the North is stark. Figures from the IPPR show the North has an £86bn deficit in Treasury transport spending compared to London. The North has received just £349 per person in transport spending since 2009/10 compared with £864 in London. The IPPR has also stated that to meet the challenge of the climate crisis, an extra £12bn a year must be invested. The Government promised repeatedly that they would build NPR and HS2 in full. This promise has been broken and the people of the north betrayed.
This Council resolves to ask the Chief Executive to write to

1. Mayor Andy Burnham supporting his efforts to secure the future of Northern Powerhouse Rail and the additional investment needed to provide a modern, efficient and integrated public transport system in Greater Manchester
2. Secretary of State for Transport Grant Shapps demanding that the Government revisits the IRP to ensure that Oldham, Greater Manchester and the North West receive a fair share in transport spending in comparison to London and that key projects such as the underground station at Manchester Piccadilly, HS2 and rail electrification are reinstated.

A vote was then taken on the AMENDMENT, which was LOST.

Councillor Woodvine spoke against the motion.
Councillor Sykes spoke in favour of the motion.
Councillor Shah spoke in favour of the motion.

Councillor Hulme exercised his right of reply.

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

RESOLVED that the Chief Executive be asked to write to

1. Mayor Andy Burnham supporting his efforts to secure the future of Northern Powerhouse Rail and the additional investment needed to provide a modern, efficient and integrated public transport system in Greater Manchester
2. Secretary of State for Transport Grant Shapps demanding that the Government revisits the IRP to ensure that Oldham, Greater Manchester and the North West receive a fair share in transport spending in comparison to London and that key projects such as the underground station at Manchester Piccadilly, HS2 and rail electrification are reinstated.

Motion 2
Councillor Moores MOVED and Councillor Ali SECONDED the following MOTION:

Motion 2 - Supporting Oldham's children with SEND

This Council acknowledges the incredible work done by teachers, parents, and carers in supporting and nurturing children with Special Education Needs and Disabilities (SEND). SEND comes in many forms, early identification and intervention are vital in ensuring we deliver the best possible outcomes for children with SEND. In Oldham we work tremendously hard to ensure that children with SEND are offered the best opportunities to thrive and develop in our education system. This is not easy task when schools are required to fund the at least first £6,000 of support for a child with SEND in the face of cuts to schools General Budgets, local authorities are also struggling

with increasing demand, increasing cost and a failure by Central Government to adequately fund SEND provision.
One area of particular concern is the lack of investment) Speech Language and Communications (SLC) needs, this is just one of the many classification categories and children can be identified as having SLC needs as a primary SEND need, but we know that children in the majority of the other SEND categories will have associated SLC need.
This Council notes:

- There are around 7800 children and young people in Oldham who have Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND).
- 2634 children and young people have an Education, Health and Care plan (EHCP).
- Demand for SEND services is increasing rapidly and services are also responding to more complex needs. During 2020 - 2021 we saw a 100% increase in the number of EHC needs assessment requests between May and September.
- Oldham received Government SEND funding of £33,043,000 in 2019/20, but it spent more than £37m on services and in 2020/21 it received £39,189,000 and spent in excess of £40m
- The funding from Government has failed to keep pace with rapidly increasing costs, leaving big gaps in budgets for both the Council and schools.
- The Local Government Association estimated that councils in England would face a SEND funding gap of up to £1.6 billion by 2021.
- The requirement on schools to fund the at least first £6,000 of support for children with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities, making caring for children with Special Education Needs and Disabilities a financial burden on schools in the face of cuts to schools General Budgets.
- Speech and Language Therapy (SALT) services for children with SLC needs requires significant investment at a national level.

  This Council believes:

  1. We face a national crisis in high needs funding, but this crisis is hitting towns like Oldham harder than other parts of the country.
  2. The Government have failed to invest in services to children at risk of not being able to speak or understand language at an age-appropriate level.
  3. The Government is failing to fund SEND services properly and it's falling to local councils and schools to plug the gaps.
  4. That while the additional £6,146m of Government funding is welcome, it doesn't even cover the gap we already face.
  5. Children and young people with special needs and disabilities are some of the most vulnerable in our society and it's vital that the services that support them are funded fairly and properly.

This Council resolves to ask the Chief Executive to write to the Secretary of State for Education urging him to urgently invest SEND services and ensure that Government funding keeps pace with rising demand complexity of need, including Speech and Language Therapy Services and to end the requirement on schools to fund at least the first £6,000.

Councillor H Gloster spoke in favour of the motion.
Councillor Williams spoke in favour of the motion.

Councillor Moores exercised his right of reply.

On being put to the vote, the MOTION was unanimously CARRIED.
RESOLVED that the Chief Executive be asked to write to the Secretary of State for Education urging him to urgently invest SEND services and ensure that Government funding keeps pace with rising demand complexity of need, including Speech and Language Therapy Services and to end the requirement on schools to fund at least the first £6,000.

14 **NOTICE OF OPPOSITION BUSINESS**

Motion 1
Councillor Arnott MOVED and Councillor Lancaster SECONDED the
following MOTION:

Motion 1 - Oldhams Roads Are Not Racetracks For Criminals.

In 2020, close to 680m vehicle miles were travelled in Oldham. Given the sheer number of vehicle miles travelled, it is sadly inevitable that collisions and accidents will occur, even when drivers are law abiding and drive considerately.
On average 681 people are killed or seriously injured on the roads of Greater Manchester each year. Of all reported collisions, 58% involved a driver aged between 17 and 35 and a staggering 80% of all fatal incidents involved a male driver.
However, there is a dangerous group, of mostly young men and women, who consider the roads of Oldham as their own personal racetrack, and routinely and recklessly speed on our roads with no regard for the safety of themselves or others, putting other drivers, cyclists, and pedestrians in real danger of serious injury or worse.
A number of these vehicles are not taxed or insured and have been modified to increase speed and performance at the expense of safety and security. Speed cameras are sadly not enough as, our roads have become the plaything of these people with some using stolen vehicles and plates to race each other and then abandon those same vehicles also. Several vehicles are used in crimes such as burglaries, carjacking's, transportation of narcotics, get away driving, prostitution, and illegal street racing.
This Council resolves :

- That the Chief Executive of Oldham Council, on behalf of the people of this Borough, write to the Division

Commander of Oldham and Greater Manchester Police (GMP) to demand that they take these vehicles off the road and target these groups of “boy racers” who consciously and deliberately set out to drive at speed, with reckless abandon putting the lives of others at risk.

- That the Council work with and give full use and access to GMP of cameras, buildings, and offices in implementing a crackdown.
- That Oldham Council share its records with GMP on reports of incidents which residents have reported and look to build a database which they can then target criminals with.
- That the Chief Executive of Oldham Council recommend that GMP should look to seize and crush vehicles that partake in these dangerous acts of driving as well as cash fines and points on their licence.
- That the Chief Executive of Oldham Council recommend that GMP look to deploy a team to patrol some of the worst highways from the evening to the early hours of the morning when many of these crimes take place.
- That Oldham Council takes a zero-tolerance approach to all crimes that involve narcotics and will support GMP in their efforts to test and arrest those driving whilst under the influence of narcotics.

AMENDMENT

Councillor Chadderton MOVED and Councillor Williams SECONDED the following AMENDMENT:

Delete Paragraph 3 and insert:
We acknowledge that the majority of Oldham residents are responsible drivers, who do not as a matter of course, drive in a way that would endanger themselves or anyone else. However, there are a minority of residents that continue to speed and drive in a dangerous manner and this isn’t acceptable.
Over recent years, Oldham Council has deployed a combination of evidence based, date led Engineering, Enforcement and Engineering initiatives. This has been successful and in recent years we have seen a steady decrease in the number of road traffic injury collisions in line with national targets.
We currently undertake a range of initiatives designed to reduce dangerous driving and teach young people about road safety as part of our Road Safety Education and Training which is delivered in schools and the local community.
However, Oldham Council can only do so much on its own. The responsibility for catching and taking action against dangerous drivers falls to Greater Manchester Police and we would welcome a more proactive approach from GMP on dealing with these drivers, particularly in some our ‘hot spot’ areas.
Bullet point 1 – delete ‘…to demand that they take these vehicles off the road and target these groups of “boy racers” who consciously and deliberately set out to drive at speed, with reckless abandon putting the lives of others at risk’

And insert ‘to ask for clarity on what is Greater Manchester Police’s policy in seizing cars that are involved in dangerous driving, causing a nuisance or organised crime and how many cars have been seized in Oldham over the past five years’.
Delete bullet points 2 & 3
Delete bullet point 6 and insert

- Ask how much money and resource GMP deploy in Oldham to tackle speeding and dangerous driving and how this compares with the other nine Greater Manchester Authorities.

The amended motion to read:

In 2020, close to 680m vehicle miles were travelled in Oldham. Given the sheer number of vehicle miles travelled, it is sadly inevitable that collisions and accidents will occur, even when drivers are law abiding and drive considerately.
On average 681 people are killed or seriously injured on the roads of Greater Manchester each year. Of all reported collisions, 58% involved a driver aged between 17 and 35 and a staggering 80% of all fatal incidents involved a male driver.
We acknowledge that the majority of Oldham residents are responsible drivers, who do not as a matter of course, drive in a way that would endanger themselves or anyone else. However, there are a minority of residents that continue to speed and drive in a dangerous manner and this isn’t acceptable.
Over recent years, Oldham Council has deployed a combination of evidence based, date led Engineering, Enforcement and Engineering initiatives. This has been successful and in recent years we have seen a steady decrease in the number of road traffic injury collisions in line with national targets.
We currently undertake a range of initiatives designed to reduce dangerous driving and teach young people about road safety as part of our Road Safety Education and Training which is delivered in schools and the local community.
However, Oldham Council can only do so much on its own. The responsibility for catching and taking action against dangerous drivers falls to Greater Manchester Police and we would welcome a more proactive approach from GMP on dealing with these drivers, particularly in some our ‘hot spot’ areas.
A number of these vehicles are not taxed or insured and have been modified to increase speed and performance at the expense of safety and security. Speed cameras are sadly not enough as, our roads have become the plaything of these people with some using stolen vehicles and plates to race each other and then abandon those same vehicles also. Several vehicles are used in crimes such as burglaries, carjacking’s, transportation of narcotics, get away driving, prostitution, and illegal street racing.
This Council resolves :

- That the Chief Executive of Oldham Council, on behalf of the people of this Borough, write to the Division Commander of Oldham and Greater Manchester Police (GMP) to ask for clarity on what is Greater Manchester Police’s policy in seizing cars that are involved in

dangerous driving, causing a nuisance or organised crime and how many cars have been seized in Oldham over the past five years.

- That the Chief Executive of Oldham Council recommend that GMP should look to seize and crush vehicles that partake in these dangerous acts of driving as well as cash fines and points on their licence.
- That the Chief Executive of Oldham Council recommend that GMP look to deploy a team to patrol some of the worst highways from the evening to the early hours of the morning when many of these crimes take place.
- Ask how much money and resource GMP deploy in Oldham to tackle speeding and dangerous driving and how this compares with the other nine Greater Manchester Authorities.

Councillor Al-Hamdani spoke to the amendment.
Councillor Hobin spoke against the amendment.

Councillor Arnott exercised his right of reply.

Councillor Chadderton exercised her right of reply.

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

Councillor C. Gloster spoke in favour of the motion.
Councillor Woodvine spoke in favour of the motion.

Councillor Arnott exercised his right of reply.

On being put to the vote, the MOTION as amended was CARRIED.

RESOLVED that:

- That the Chief Executive of Oldham Council be asked, on behalf of the people of this Borough, to write to the Division Commander of Oldham and Greater Manchester Police (GMP) to ask for clarity on what is Greater Manchester Police's policy in seizing cars that are involved in dangerous driving, causing a nuisance or organised crime and how many cars have been seized in Oldham over the past five years.
- That the Chief Executive of Oldham Council recommend that GMP should look to seize and crush vehicles that partake in these dangerous acts of driving as well as cash fines and points on their licence.
- That the Chief Executive of Oldham Council recommend that GMP look to deploy a team to patrol some of the worst highways from the evening to the early hours of the morning when many of these crimes take place.
- That the Chief Executive asks how much money and resource GMP deploy in Oldham to tackle speeding and dangerous driving and how this compares with the other nine Greater Manchester Authorities.

Motion 2
Councillor Al-Hamdani MOVED and Councillor Williamson SECONDED the following MOTION:

Motion 2 - Time for the Fair Game manifesto in football

Council believes that football, the national game in the UK, is currently in crisis.
COVID-19 has devastated the revenue of many lower-league clubs, with the loss of some notables, and dozens more clubs teetering on the brink of survival. Frequently bad management has gone unnoticed or ignored and clubs are run unsustainably, putting at risk all the history, heritage, and economic benefit they bring to an area – often in pursuit of short-term gain.
Council believes that football clubs are not ordinary businesses; they are historic sporting institutions that are both a civic and community asset, and a source of pride and unity, in their hometown or city.
Council therefore supports Fair Game, a national campaign that seeks radical reform of the way football is managed and run, specifically its call for:

- An independent regulator for the sport.
- A refocus on 'values' rather than profit.
- The establishment of a Sustainability Index, which will reallocate the payments made to clubs to reward those which are run well, respect equality standards and properly engage with their fans and their community.
- Fans to be given the final say on any proposed change to a club's 'crown jewels', including the club's name, nickname, colours, badge and the geographical location from where the club plays.

Council also notes that former Sports Minister Tracey Crouch MP is about to publish a Government-commissioned fan-led review into football governance and believes that some of its findings will mirror Fair Game's aspirations.
As a Co-operative Council, we would also like to see football clubs co-operatively owned by their fans, rather than owners with no connection to a town or with more interest in extracting profits from the club, rather than the team's on-pitch performance.
Council therefore resolves to:

- Declare its support for the Fair Game manifesto, 'Solutions for our National Game', and calls on other councils to join us in our support.
- Ask the Chief Executive to write to the Minister for Sport, our local Members of Parliament, and the Chair of the Local Government Association Culture, Tourism and Sport Board, asking them to support and work towards implementing Fair Game's manifesto and the findings of the fan-led review led by Tracey Crouch MP.
- Ask the Council's representative to the Co-operative Council's Innovation Network to request the CCIN investigate how best member councils can support the

registration of their local football clubs as Assets of Community Value and facilitate their future purchase and operation, when the opportunity arises, as fan-owned co-operatives.

Councillor Byrne spoke in favour of the motion.

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

RESOLVED that the Council:

- Declare its support for the Fair Game manifesto, 'Solutions for our National Game', and calls on other councils to join us in our support.
- Ask the Chief Executive to write to the Minister for Sport, our local Members of Parliament, and the Chair of the Local Government Association Culture, Tourism and Sport Board, asking them to support and work towards implementing Fair Game's manifesto and the findings of the fan-led review led by Tracey Crouch MP.
- Ask the Council's representative to the Co-operative Council's Innovation Network to request the CCIN investigate how best member councils can support the registration of their local football clubs as Assets of Community Value and facilitate their future purchase and operation, when the opportunity arises, as fan-owned co-operatives.

Motion 3
Councillor Woodvine MOVED and Councillor Byrne SECONDED the following MOTION:

Motion 3 – Earthshot Oldham

In 2020 H.R.H the Duke of Cambridge founded the Earthshot Prize, inspiring innovative ideas and incentivising change, across this country and around the world. It is ambitious and prestigious. A year on Oldham can also be inspired by the words and work of the Royal Family and these 'Earthshots' – simple but ambitious goals which, if achieved by 2030, will improve life for us all, and for generations to come.
Each Earthshot is underpinned by scientifically agreed targets including the U.N. Sustainable Development Goals and other internationally recognised measures to help repair our planet. Together, they form a unique set of challenges rooted in science, which aim to generate new ways of thinking, as well as new technologies, systems, policies and solutions.
By bringing these five critical issues together this Council can recognise the interconnectivity between environmental challenges and the urgent need to tackle them together. Like the Prize, this Council can aim to turn the current pessimism surrounding environmental issues into optimism, by highlighting the ability of human ingenuity to bring about change, and inspiring collective action.
As it is a decade of action this Council notes that:

- Species face extinction as habitats are destroyed, but destroying nature threatens our lives too. Forests and natural land are vital to human health and happiness, helping to prevent global warming and producing oxygen that we breathe.
- Thousands of children in Oldham breathe toxic air every day, causing countless deaths that could be prevented. We refuse to accept this – clean air and healthy lives are within our reach.
- Warmer temperatures, pollution, plastic and harmful fishing practices are having devastating impacts on the ocean, putting life underwater in jeopardy but this decade we can choose to make our ocean healthy.
- The world we have built is not like this; we throw everything away, and this is harming our planet but we have the power to build something better.
- Carbon in the atmosphere is making our planet warmer, to levels which threaten all life on Earth but it is not too late; if we act now, we can make the world a better, more sustainable home for everyone.

By 2030 this Council chooses to:

- Repair and preserve the habitats that our animals need to live, from forests and grasslands, to wetlands, lakes and rivers.
- End outdated transport that emits toxic fumes, remove pollution from the air using both technology and nature, and eliminate the burning of fossil fuels, choosing 100% renewable energy for everyone – from our towns to villages.
- Bring forward a new era where everyone uses the ocean sustainably and to refuse to accept a world where turtles, dolphins and coral reefs vanish from our seas.
- Eliminate food waste, single-use packaging, and inspire a new generation of people, companies, and industries to reuse, repurpose, and recycle.
- Build a system that can work forever, where people in Oldham can live safe, healthy and happy lives, without waste.
- Fix our climate so that life everywhere can thrive for generations to come.

As we must act now to protect our future this Council resolves to:

- Protect and restore nature in Oldham, ensuring that for the first time in human history the natural world around us is growing and not shrinking.
- Clean our air, ensuring that everybody in Oldham breathes clean, healthy air – at the World Health Organisation standard, or better.
- Revive our oceans, repairing and preserving our oceans for future generations.
- Build a waste-free Oldham, and world, where nothing goes to waste and where the leftovers of one process become the raw materials of the next – just like they do in nature.

- Fix our climate by cutting out Carbon and building a Carbon-neutral economy that lets every culture and community in Oldham thrive.

AMENDMENT

Councillor Jabbar MOVED and Councillor Roberts SECONDED the following AMENDMENT:

Insert as new para 2: Oldham Green New Deal Strategy sets a target of 2030 Carbon Neutrality for the borough.
Add at end of notes (after bullet point 5) For many years now, Oldham Council has been a leading council regionally, nationally and internationally in a number of key areas in climate change strategy and community energy. Further to this, in September 2019 Oldham Council declared Climate Emergency and in March 2020 adopted the UK's first local authority Green New Deal Strategy
Delete: From by 2030 …to …generations to come
Insert As at the beginning of we must act now
Add at end of bullet point 1 - by amongst other policies delivering the Northern Roots Country Park and bio-diversity net gain through the planning process
Add at end of bullet point 2 - through, for example, our commitment at a Greater Manchester level and in Oldham to the Bee Network, Bus Franchising and the Clean Air Plan.
Insert at beginning of bullet point 3 Support work to and add at end continue to implement our plan to reduce the use of single use plastics.
Insert at beginning of bullet point 5: Do out bit to f (delete capital F) and add at end – including using the policies in Places for Everyone - Chapter 5 of the Places for Everyone (PfE) Publication Plan 2021 is on Sustainable and Resilient Places and includes a section on Addressing Climate Change which is set within Greater Manchester's vision to be at the forefront of action on climate change by becoming a carbon neutral city region by 2038.
Add new bullet point 6

- Deliver the vision, Objectives and Pledges in the in the Oldham Green New Strategy, including the 2030 carbon neutrality target for the borough

Add new bullet point 7

- Ask the Chief Executive to write to the Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy, inviting him to visit Oldham to discuss our innovative and leading-edge Green New Deal plans and proposals, and to identify how the Government can help us to meet our ambitious carbon neutrality targets for both the Council and the Borough, and secure jobs and training opportunities for Oldham residents in the key growth Green Technology and Services sector.

Revised motion to read:
In 2020 H.R.H the Duke of Cambridge founded the Earthshot Prize, inspiring innovative ideas and incentivising change, across this country and around the world. It is ambitious and

prestigious. A year on Oldham can also be inspired by the words and work of the Royal Family and these 'Earthshots' – simple but ambitious goals which, if achieved by 2030, will improve life for us all, and for generations to come.
Oldham Green New Deal Strategy sets a target of 2030 Carbon Neutrality for the borough.
Each Earthshot is underpinned by scientifically agreed targets including the U.N. Sustainable Development Goals and other internationally recognised measures to help repair our planet. Together, they form a unique set of challenges rooted in science, which aim to generate new ways of thinking, as well as new technologies, systems, policies and solutions.
By bringing these five critical issues together this Council can recognise the interconnectivity between environmental challenges and the urgent need to tackle them together. Like the Prize, this Council can aim to turn the current pessimism surrounding environmental issues into optimism, by highlighting the ability of human ingenuity to bring about change, and inspiring collective action.
As it is a decade of action this Council notes that:

- Species face extinction as habitats are destroyed, but destroying nature threatens our lives too. Forests and natural land are vital to human health and happiness, helping to prevent global warming and producing oxygen that we breathe.
- Thousands of children in Oldham breathe toxic air every day, causing countless deaths that could be prevented. We refuse to accept this – clean air and healthy lives are within our reach.
- Warmer temperatures, pollution, plastic and harmful fishing practices are having devastating impacts on the ocean, putting life underwater in jeopardy but this decade we can choose to make our ocean healthy.
- The world we have built is not like this; we throw everything away, and this is harming our planet but we have the power to build something better.
- Carbon in the atmosphere is making our planet warmer, to levels which threaten all life on Earth but it is not too late; if we act now, we can make the world a better, more sustainable home for everyone.

For many years now, Oldham Council has been a leading council regionally, nationally and internationally in a number of key areas in climate change strategy and community energy. Further to this, in September 2019 Oldham Council declared Climate Emergency and in March 2020 adopted the UK's first local authority Green New Deal Strategy.
As we must act now to protect our future this Council resolves to:

- Protect and restore nature in Oldham, ensuring that for the first time in human history the natural world around us is growing and **not** shrinking by amongst other policies delivering the Northern Roots Country Park and bio-diversity net gain through the planning process.
- Clean our air, ensuring that everybody in Oldham breathes clean, healthy air – at the World Health

Organisation standard, or better through, for example, our commitment at a Greater Manchester level and in Oldham to the Bee Network, Bus Franchising and the Clean Air Plan.

- Support work to revive our oceans, repairing and preserving our oceans for future generations and continue to implement our plan to reduce the use of single use plastics.
- Build a waste-free Oldham, and world, where nothing goes to waste and where the leftovers of one process become the raw materials of the next – just like they do in nature.
- Do our bit to fix our climate by cutting out Carbon and building a Carbon-neutral economy that lets every culture and community in Oldham thrive including using the policies in Places for Everyone - Chapter 5 of the Places for Everyone (PfE) Publication Plan 2021 is on Sustainable and Resilient Places and includes a section on Addressing Climate Change which is set within Greater Manchester's vision to be at the forefront of action on climate change by becoming a carbon neutral city region by 2038.
- Deliver the vision, Objectives and Pledges in the in the Oldham Green New Strategy, including the 2030 carbon neutrality target for the borough.
- Write to the Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy, inviting him to visit Oldham to discuss our innovative and leading-edge Green New Deal plans and proposals, and to identify how the Government can help us to meet our ambitious carbon neutrality targets for both the Council and the Borough, and secure jobs and training opportunities for Oldham residents in the key growth Green Technology and Services sector.

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

On being put to the vote, the MOTION as amended was CARRIED.

RESOLVED that:

- The Council would protect and restore nature in Oldham, ensuring that for the first time in human history the natural world around us is growing and **not** shrinking by amongst other policies delivering the Northern Roots Country Park and bio-diversity net gain through the planning process.
- The Council would clean our air, ensuring that everybody in Oldham breathes clean, healthy air – at the World Health Organisation standard, or better through, for example, our commitment at a Greater Manchester level and in Oldham to the Bee Network, Bus Franchising and the Clean Air Plan.
- The Council would support work to revive our oceans, repairing and preserving our oceans for future

generations and continue to implement our plan to reduce the use of single use plastics.

- The Council would build a waste-free Oldham, and world, where nothing goes to waste and where the leftovers of one process become the raw materials of the next – just like they do in nature.
- The Council would do our bit to fix our climate by cutting out Carbon and building a Carbon-neutral economy that lets every culture and community in Oldham thrive including using the policies in Places for Everyone - Chapter 5 of the Places for Everyone (PfE) Publication Plan 2021 is on Sustainable and Resilient Places and includes a section on Addressing Climate Change which is set within Greater Manchester's vision to be at the forefront of action on climate change by becoming a carbon neutral city region by 2038.
- The Council would deliver the vision, Objectives and Pledges in the in the Oldham Green New Strategy, including the 2030 carbon neutrality target for the borough.
- The Chief Executive be asked to write to the Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy, inviting him to visit Oldham to discuss our innovative and leading-edge Green New Deal plans and proposals, and to identify how the Government can help us to meet our ambitious carbon neutrality targets for both the Council and the Borough, and secure jobs and training opportunities for Oldham residents in the key growth Green Technology and Services sector.

Motion 4

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

Motion 4 – Increasing and promoting the Warm Home Discount

This Council notes:

- The Warm Home Discount Scheme, a Government initiative administered by energy suppliers, provides eligible households with a £140 discount on their electricity bill between September and March each year which has remained fixed for over 9 years.
- Energy prices have increased significantly in recent years, with the costs of energy increasing by 40% in the last year alone.
- Additionally, Ofgem has recently set an unprecedented price cap hike, a measure which the End Fuel Poverty Coalition has predicted will propel a further 1.2 million people into fuel poverty (up from 4.1 million to 5.3 million).
- Following a consultation earlier this year, the government has pledged to increase the rebate in England and Wales and to expand the scheme so

that an additional 780,000 households become eligible.

Council believes:

- That the Warm Home Discount is vital in helping to tackle fuel poverty.
- The £10 increase is wholly inadequate given price inflation over the last nine years and the increases proposed in the future.
- That many eligible households are not aware of the discount or how to apply for it.

This Council resolves

- To ask the Chief Executive to write to the Minister of State at the Department for Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy to urgently increase the value of the Warm Home Discount Scheme to reflect price inflation and future increases and to identify new ways to promote the rebate so many more eligible households are aware of it and apply.

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

RESOLVED that the Chief Executive be asked to write to the Minister of State at the Department for Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy to urgently increase the value of the Warm Home Discount Scheme to reflect price inflation and future increases and to identify new ways to promote the rebate so many more eligible households are aware of it and apply.

15 **COVID 19 UPDATE**

Councillor Shah MOVED and Councillor Chauhan 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.

In moving the report, Councillor Shah thanked local health and Council staff and the voluntary sector who would be doing their utmost to meet the government's vaccine promises at the time they most needed a break. There would be over 400,000 NHS workers and the Council's Social Care workers who would be working through Christmas, and the work of the community and voluntary sectors had to be acknowledged, all of whom would not be spending Christmas the way they would have expected.

Members noted that COVID-19 was still circulating across the UK and there continued to be new cases in Oldham every day. The report summarised activity, demonstrating how the spread of COVID-19 across communities would be collectively managed and prevented.

In the winter months, there were multiple risks ahead associated with COVID-19, its direct and indirect impact on people and services, as well as the impacts of other winter pressures. Whilst many aspects of life had begun to see a return to pre-pandemic times, the transmission and impact of COVID-19 still required careful management, and if rates continued to rise, further

measures to mitigate the impact on individuals, society and economy might be required.

On 26th November 2021 the World Health Organisation designated the Covid variant B.1.1.529 a variant of concern, named Omicron. First identified in South Africa, Omicron had been identified in several other countries, including the UK. Work was ongoing to understand the virulence of the new variant, its transmissibility and how effective the vaccines were at combatting it.

The Government has reintroduced various measures to combat the spread of COVID-19 in England. These measures included:

- Compulsory face coverings on public transport and in shops
- Pupils strongly advised to wear face coverings in communal areas in secondary schools
- Contacts of suspected Omicron cases to self-isolate for 10 days, regardless of age or vaccination status
- Travelers to the UK to take PCR or lateral flow tests prior to departure, and to take a PCR test within 48 hours of arrival in the UK, isolating until they had a negative result.

Members were informed that there was still considerable uncertainty about the future course of the pandemic, funding and government policy. In this context the local response needed to remain agile. Given Oldham's experience of COVID-19 to date the response was well established and wide in scope and as such was well placed to be able to adapt as needed.

As of 27th November 2021, there had been 44,813 cases of COVID-19 identified in Oldham; the weekly infection rates were currently running at around 308 cases per 100,000 people. This remained the lowest in Greater Manchester and lower than the England rate of 434 per 100,000.

Increasing vaccination uptake remained the primary focus of the local response. Over 162,000 Oldham residents had received their first doses (74.7% of Oldham's eligible population) and over 148,000 had received second doses (72.9% of Oldham's eligible population), with an additional 52,000 booster shots or third doses delivered.

As the vaccination programme had evolved in Oldham, the number and range of settings where vaccination clinics were provided had widened substantially, informed by feedback from residents. Current clinics included GP surgeries, pharmacies, the hospital and community venues. In addition, vaccinations for 12-17 year olds had been offered in education settings.

The borough had a wide-ranging testing offer, including lateral flow testing for people who did not have symptoms, and PCR tests for people with symptoms and those who had been close contacts of a confirmed case.

A multi-channel communications and engagement plan was in place to support the COVID-19 response, including social and digital media, print and out of home advertising, video and direct mail/newsletters to specific groups.

The current focus of communications activity was on increasing vaccination uptake and reminding residents that “Covid is still here”, meaning that standard infection, prevention and control measures were still important.

Councillors asked the following questions:

Councillor Sykes asked:
I fully support the Governments vaccination programme and in particular its booster vaccination programme.
However, I am really concerned by the recently announced acceleration of that booster programme will have a devastating impact on other NHS preventive services and treatments. When even the Prime Mister says these will be cancelled, delayed or need to be rescheduled we all need to be very worried.
As we all know Oldham’s population is not a healthy one – delays in such services will impact on the live expectancy of many of our citizens and have massive impacts on tens of thousands of others. What steps can we take, with our health partners, to reduce this risk for our residents?

Councillor Chauhan, Cabinet Member for Health and Social Care responded that choices had to be made between addressing Covid and routine care. Health inequalities would not be corrected in the coming weeks and months, however the next two to three weeks would be crucial to get people vaccinated and it was necessary to use resources to ensure this. Routine care would be affected but there needed to be a balance to preserve lives.

Councillor Williamson asked:
Given the unprecedented level of remote learning over the last 18 months due to COVID 19, it is clear that as we approach exams season in the new year that pupils will be at a disadvantage to their former peers in relation to learning and in particular relevant subject knowledge. Is the cabinet member aware of any steps that have been taken to ensure that these pupils are not disadvantaged for life in relation to ensuring they are exam ready?

Councillor Chauhan, Cabinet Member for Health and Social Care responded that the Council needed to ensure that pupils education and prospects were not damaged, which was why vaccination was so important. He would send Members the detailed response and sincerely hoped all the provisions in place collectively would help pupils to catch up and that all the steps taken with regard to prevention would help them return to school normally after Christmas.

Councillor Hamblett asked:

Given the unprecedented level of remote calls and very few face to face appointments, can the cabinet member now reassure residents of Oldham that more face to face appointments with their GP is now being offered to residents especially to those who struggle to communicate through telephony or online systems as this would be crucial to help ease the pressure from our hospital colleagues during the winter period?

Councillor Chauhan, Cabinet Member for Health and Social Care replied GP's were regulated by national policies, not by Oldham Council, but he could confirm face to face appointments in Greater Manchester were up to 60% of pre pandemic levels and still rising. They may go down in the next few weeks because of the new variant. It was best to negotiate with the patient as to what suited them as most people would say face to face was not needed and they were happy with a different appointment. The issue was whether this was a shared decision with the patient and the clinician as the best way forward.

Councillor Byrne asked:
If you looked at the wards and percentages that had received their first Covid injection, some wards were much higher than other wards. Perhaps the lower wards were where people did not have cars and could not easily get to centres. What could the Council do about that? There had been pop-up vaccination centres but the figures showed the lowest areas were where people may want to be vaccinated but were not able to the vaccination centre.

Councillor Chauhan, Cabinet Member for Health and Social Care replied that he would get a detailed response on that. He had been someone who had spoken on vaccine accessibility and there had been much work nationally. Locally, people had gone door to door and street to street and opened local centres and pop-up clinics to try to reach areas based on high infection rates. Comparing where Oldham was two years ago and where it was now, with one of the lowest infection rates in England, this must have been the right thing to do. Pharmacies and community centres were still delivery vaccinations and, whilst this was not perfect, this was why the Council was a community leader, to have essential intelligence on the issue and be able to deliver accessibly.

Councillor H Gloster asked:
Can the relevant Cabinet member assure the people of Oldham that much needed access to dentistry and orthodontics appointments will not be limited even if further restrictions apply?

Councillor Chauhan, Cabinet Member for Health and Social Care responded that he shared her concerns this was a directly commissioned responsibility of NHS England. He had been lobbying for the last twelve months to Greater Manchester to ask how we could increase that access to dentistry for residents and he would continue to do this to make sure all residents got the right care.

Councillor Sheldon asked:
I still note the number of people, especially in shops who do not wear a face mask. Not everyone can do, but there were still a lot of people who simply did not want to. The Prime minister and Labour Leader had both encouraged vaccination. What more could be done to convince those that could do to be vaccinated and recognise we were all in this situation together?

Councillor Chauhan, Cabinet Member for Health and Social Care responded that there were a number of things that could be done as a Council such as increasing Covid marshals and the use of the voluntary and community sectors. People could not be forced to comply, it was a case of addressing concerns and that was where social media had a place. Councillors collectively spoke to residents and provided leaflets which spread the educational element. They had put real physical effort into collectively spreading the message.

Councillor Hobin asked:
He was aware Councillor Chauhan had worked very hard over the last two years battling this and it was great that the Council had a medical expert to help the Council. He appreciated having received a clear message rather than the confused statements that came from elsewhere.

Councillor Chauhan, Cabinet Member for Health and Social Care responded that he was grateful for the appreciation.

RESOLVED that the content of the report be noted.

16 **UPDATE ON ACTIONS FROM COUNCIL**

Councillor Shah MOVED and Councillor Sykes SECONDED a report of the Director of Legal Services, which informed members of actions taken following the meeting of the Council on 3rd November 2021.

RESOLVED that the actions regarding motions and issues from the meeting of the Council on 3rd November 2021 be noted.

17 **PUBLIC SPEAKING AT TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER PANEL**

Councillor Shah MOVED and Councillor Sykes SECONDED a report of the Director of Legal Services, which sought the introduction of a formal procedure for public speaking at meetings of the Traffic Regulation Order Panel.

Members were informed that, under the Council's Constitution, the Traffic Regulation Order Panel was responsible for considering any representations made in respect of a proposed traffic regulation order and deciding whether or not to make the order and determining proposed public spaces protection orders. Unlike the position with planning applications being considered by the Planning Committee, there was currently no formal procedure for permitting public speaking at meetings of the Traffic Regulation Order Panel.

To ensure consistency with the Planning Committee procedures and to enhance public participation in decision making it was recommended that a formal procedure to allow public speaking at meetings of the Traffic Regulation Order Panel be introduced. The proposed procedure was included at Appendix 1 to the report and was based on the protocol for public speaking at meetings of the Planning Committee. The procedure would allow speaking by one supporter and one objector who had made representations. As with the procedure at Planning Committee, the public would be restricted to 3 minutes to make representations. Ward Members would also be permitted to speak for up to 5 minutes.

RESOLVED that the procedure for public speaking at meetings of the Traffic Regulation Order Panel detailed in Appendix 1 be adopted and be included in the procedure in Part 8 Appendix 3 of the Constitution.

18 **2020/21 ANNUAL STATEMENT OF ACCOUNTS**

Councillor Jabbar MOVED and Councillor Shah SECONDED a report of the Director of Finance which advised Council of the recently approved 2020/21 audited Statement of Accounts and the External Auditor (Mazars LLP) Audit Completion Report (ACR).

Members were informed that OldhamCouncil was among the 9% of Councils that had complete their accounts for last year by the statutory dealine and thanks were offered to all concerned.

The report presented the Council's Statement of Accounts for the financial year 2020/21 as considered by the Audit Committee on 29 July 20201. Delegated authority was given to the Vice Chair of the Audit Committee after consultation with Director of Finance to approve the accounts, pending the completion of the outstanding work on the Council's group accounts, IT audit and the receipt, by the External Auditor, of assurances with regard to the audit of the Greater Manchester Pension Fund (GMPF).

The accounts were subsequently approved on 30 September 2021 within the statutory deadline. There were no changes to the Statement of Accounts presented and accepted at the Audit Committee on 29 July 2020.

The report highlighted:

- The overall revenue outturn position for 2020/21 was a surplus of £2.153m;
- The year-end variances that were attributable to each Portfolio;
- The level of grants received in relation to the COVID-19 Pandemic;
- Schools balances at 31 March 2021 were £9.306m
- The Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) deficit was £3.560m which is now held in an unusable reserve rather than

being netted off the Schools balances (as presented in the accounts in previous years);

- The final Housing Revenue Account (HRA) balance was £21.370m;
- The balance on the Collection Fund was a deficit of £27.213m;
- The revenue account earmarked reserves at £113.512m, other earmarked reserves at £29.452m (Revenue Grant Reserves of £20.145m plus School Balances as above) and an increase in the General Fund balance of £2.153m to £17.263m, reflective of the revenue outturn position;
- Expenditure on the Council's Capital Programme for 2020/21 was £73.227m which is an increase on the month 9 forecast expenditure of £71.012m. The increase in expenditure required funding allocated to future years to be re-profiled to fully finance the Capital Programme in 2020/21;
- The significant items in each of the primary financial statements;
- The preparation of Group Accounts incorporating the Councils two wholly owned companies – the Unity Partnership Ltd. and MioCare Community Interest Company;
- The Annual Governance Statement;
- The performance of the Finance Team in closing the accounts

The presentation of the audited Statement of Accounts provided Council Members with the opportunity to review the Council's year-end financial position (following completion of the audit by the Council's External Auditors, Mazars LLP).

RESOLVED that:

1. The Council's final accounts position for 2020/21, the audited Statement of Accounts, the draft Audit Completion Report and subsequent letter entitled Completion of Pending Matters – Audit Completion Report be noted.
2. It be noted that the audit of the accounts for 2020/21 by the External Auditors Mazars LLP could only be finalised once the Value for Money (VFM) opinion was provided and Whole of Government Accounts (WGA) audit was completed and that a further report outlining the VFM and WGA final positions would be presented.

19 **PROCUREMENT OF THE COUNCIL'S EXTERNAL AUDITORS 2023/24 TO 2027/28**

Councillor Jabbar MOVED and Councillor Shah SECONDED a report of the Director of Finance which set out proposals for appointing the external auditor to the Council for the accounts for the five-year period from 2023/24.

Council was informed that the current auditor appointment arrangements covered the period up to and including the audit of the 2022/23 accounts. The Council, as with the vast majority

of other Council's, had opted into the 'appointing person' national auditor appointment arrangements which were established by Public Sector Audit Appointments (PSAA) for the period covering the accounts for 2018/19 to 2022/23.

PSAA was undertaking a procurement exercise for the next appointing period, covering audits for the 2023/24 to 2027/28 financial years. During Autumn 2021 all Local Government bodies needed to make important decisions about their external audit arrangements from 2023/24. The other options for the procurement were to arrange their own procurement and make the appointment themselves or, in conjunction with other bodies, they could join and take advantage of the national collective scheme administered by PSAA.

The report concluded that the sector-wide procurement conducted by PSAA was the best option for the Council because:

- collective procurement reduced costs for those submitting bids and for individual authorities compared to a multiplicity of smaller local procurements;
- if the Council did not use the national appointment arrangements, the Council would need to establish its own auditor panel with an independent chair and independent members to oversee a local auditor procurement exercise and ongoing management of the audit contract;
- it was the best opportunity to secure the appointment of a qualified, registered auditor - there are only nine accredited local audit firms, and should the Council undertake its own procurement exercise, the Council would be drawing from the same limited supply of auditor resources as PSAA's national procurement, and;
- supporting the sector-led body helped to ensure there was a continuing and sustainable public audit market into the medium and long term.

Members noted that, if the Council wished to take advantage of the national auditor appointment arrangements, it was required, under the Local Audit Regulations, to make the decision at full Council. The opt-in period started on 22 September 2021 and closed on 11 March 2022. To opt into the national scheme from 2023/24, the Council needed to return completed opt-in documents to PSAA by 11 March 2022.

RESOLVED that the PSAA invitation to opt into the sector-led option for the appointment of external auditors to principal Local Government and Police Bodies for five financial years from 1 April 2023 be accepted.

20 **MUNICIPAL CALENDAR 2022-2023**

Councillor Shah MOVED and Councillor Sykes SECONDED a report of the Director of Legal Services which sought approval of

the draft Calendar of Meetings for the 2022/2023 Municipal Year.

RESOLVED that:

1. The Council's Calendar of Meetings for the Municipal Year 2022/23 as set out in Appendix 1 of the report be approved.
2. Approval of any outstanding dates be delegated to the Chief Executive in consultation with Group Leaders.

21 **COUNCIL GAMBLING POLICY REVIEW**

Councillor Chadderton MOVED and Councillor Shah SECONDED a report of the Director of Environmental Services which updated Members on the recent review of the Council's Gambling Policy and sought approval of a revised policy to take effect from 1st January 2022.

Members were informed that the Council, acting in its a position as Licensing Authority, had a statutory duty to uphold the licensing objectives within the Gambling Act 2005. In setting its local policy the Council must show how it would seek to promote the licensing objectives under the Act which were:

- Preventing gambling from being a source of crime and disorder, being associated with crime or disorder or being used to support crime;
- Ensuring gambling is conducted in a fair and open way; and
- Protecting children and other vulnerable people from being harmed or exploited by gambling.

RESOLVED that the proposed Gambling Policy be approved.

22 **TREASURY MANAGEMENT MID YEAR REVIEW REPORT 2021/22**

Councillor Jabbar MOVED and Councillor Shah SECONDED a report of the Director of Finance which advised on the performance of the Treasury Management Function of the Council for the first half of 2021/22 and provided a comparison of performance against the 202`/22 Treasury Management Strategy and Prudential Indicators.

Members noted that the Council was required to consider the performance of the Treasury Management function in order to comply with the Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy's (CIPFA) Code of Practice on Treasury Management (revised 2017). The report set out the key Treasury Management issues for Members' information and review and outlined:

- An economic update for the first six months of 2021/22;
- A review of the Treasury Management Strategy Statement and Annual Investment Strategy;
- The Council's capital expenditure, as set out in the Capital Strategy, and prudential indicators;
- A review of the Council's investment portfolio for 2021/22;

- A review of the Council's borrowing strategy for 2021/22;
- Why there had been no debt rescheduling undertaken during 2021/22; and
- A review of compliance with Treasury and Prudential Limits for 2021/22.

A version of the report was presented to the Audit Committee on 2 November 2021 to enable it to have the opportunity to review and scrutinise the 2021/22 Treasury Management Mid-Year Review report prior to its presentation to Cabinet. The Committee was content to commend the report to Cabinet. The report was considered by Cabinet at its meeting of 15 November 2021. Cabinet was content to commend the report to Council.

RESOLVED that:

1. The Treasury Management activity for the first half of the financial year 2021/22 and the projected outturn position be approved.
2. The Amendments to both Authorised Limit and Operational Boundary for external debt as set out in the table at Section 2.4.5 of the report be approved.
3. The Amendments to the Capital Financing Requirement (CFR) as set out in the table at Section 2.4.5 be approved.

23 **ADOPTION OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH ACT 1925 CONCERNING NAMING OF STREETS**

Councillor Chadderton MOVED and Councillor Shah SECONDED a report of the Director of Environmental Services which sought the adoption by the Council of sections 17 and 19 of the Public Health Act 1925 relating to the naming of streets within the Borough.

During a review of the Council's policy on street naming and it had been
identified that no record of the adoption of sections 17 and 19 of the Public Health Act 1925 had been retained by the Council. For the avoidance of doubt and to provide greater flexibility to the process of naming of streets it was requested that the Council approve the adoption of sections 17 and 19 of the Public Health Act 1925 for the whole Borough. The updated street naming policy would then be submitted to the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods for approval.

To adopt the provisions the Council was required to publish a notice for 2 consecutive weeks in a local newspaper circulating in their area of the intention to pass a resolution applying the provisions of sections 17 and 19. The date the resolution was to take effect was not earlier than one month from the date of the resolution.

RESOLVED that the process for adopting sections 17 and 19 of the Public Health Act 1925 relating to the naming of streets within the Borough be commenced and that a further report to adopt the sections be submitted to the next Council meeting

after public notice had been given in accordance with Schedule 14 of the Local Government Act 1972.

The meeting started at 6.00 pm and ended at 9.35 pm