

**Present:** The Mayor – Councillor Harrison

Councillors Abid, Akhtar, Al-Hamdani, G. Alexander, Ali, Alyas, Arnott, M Bashforth, S Bashforth, Birch, Brownridge, Byrne, Chadderton, Chauhan, Cosgrove, Curley, Davis, Dean, Garry, C. Gloster, H. Gloster, Goodwin, Hamblett, Harrison, Hobin, Hulme, Ibrahim, Iqbal, Islam, Jabbar, Kenyon, Lancaster, Malik, McLaren, Moores, Murphy, Mushtaq, C. Phythian, K Phythian, Roberts, Salamat, Shah, Sharp, Sheldon, Shuttleworth, Stretton, Surjan, Sykes, Taylor, Toor, Wilkinson, Williamson, Williams and Woodvine

1 **TO RECEIVE APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies were received from Councillors Ahmad, Briggs, Hindle, A Hussain, F Hussain and Leach.

2 **TO ORDER THAT THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COUNCIL HELD ON 14TH JULY 2021, 28TH JULY 2021 AND 25TH AUGUST 2021 BE SIGNED AS A CORRECT RECORD**

RESOLVED – That the minutes of the Council meetings held on 14<sup>th</sup> July 28<sup>th</sup> July and 25<sup>th</sup> August 2021 be approved as correct records, subject to Item 3 of the minutes of the meeting held on 14<sup>th</sup> July being amended to show Councillor Birch declared a personal interest in Item 10, by virtue of being a Member of the Greater Manchester Pension Scheme, and not in Item 8D.

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

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

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

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

Councillor Garry declared a pecuniary interest in Item 10 Motion 2 *Safer Communities: Tackling crime and anti-social behaviour* and Item 11 Motion 4 *Government funding for our overlooked emergency services*.

Councillor Hamblett declared a personal interest at Item 9d in relation to MioCare, by virtue of being a Council nominee on the Board.

Councillor Chauhan declared a personal interest at Item 9d in relation to MioCare by virtue of being a Council nominee on the Board.

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



There were no items of urgent business.

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

There were no communications.

6 **COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULES**

Councillor Shah MOVED and Councillor Sykes SECONDED a report of the Director of Legal Services which asked the Council to consider an amendment to the Council Procedure Rules relating to opposition business motions at Council, as there were two main opposition groups with the same number of members.

**RESOLVED** that paragraph 2.13(j) of the Council Procedure Rules be amended to state:-

“Where two main opposition groups have the same number of members, a motion submitted by one of those groups will be considered first, then a motion submitted by the other main opposition group (alternating in order at subsequent meetings) and then, if there is sufficient time within this section of business, a motion submitted by any other group. If a motion is not submitted by any other group and if time permits, a motion will be first considered from the main opposition group who had the right under this paragraph for their motion to be considered first at the meeting and then a motion from the other main opposition group”.

7 **YOUTH COUNCIL**

There were no items submitted by the Youth Council.

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

There were no petitions received to be noted.

9 **QUESTIONS TIME**

a Public Questions

The Mayor advised the meeting that the next item on the agenda was Public Question Time. The questions had been received from members of the public and would be taken in the order in which they had been received. Council was advised that if the questioner was not present, then the question would be read out by the Mayor.

The following questions were submitted:

1. Question received from Nye Goodwin:  
Could the relevant cabinet member please update the residents of Oldham on the future of the Tommyfield Market Hall and of any plans of moving the indoor market into Spindles or Town Square?

Councillor Akhtar, Cabinet Member for Employment and Enterprise, responded that the Council was committed to ensuring the future of Tommyfield Market and was working hard to progress and accelerate the plans for a new market in the Shopping Centre.

As many were aware, initial designs for the new market



Oldham  
Council

were shared just over a month ago.

These showed the new market being located in the Town Square side of the Shopping Centre - occupying the former TJ Hughes unit and additional space around it which would be completely redeveloped.

On the upper level, accessed directly from the mall, there would be a general market with dedicated fresh produce areas.

On the lower level, that fronted onto Parliament Square, there would be an area dedicated to supporting existing food retailers and traders with a food court area.

The Council continued to work closely with market traders listening to their ideas about stall security, importance of enhanced footfall, access to the bus station and tram stops and continued to gather feedback from them on the initial designs. The Council was delighted that they liked them and could really see the project coming to life now.

There would be wider consultation with members of the public soon as part of the commitment to meaningful engagement with our communities – this feedback would help share updates on the initial designs for both the new market as well as an events venue, workspace, and archives hub, which were also being developed in the Shopping Centre.

This feedback was important as work moved to the next phase in developing more detailed designs, ahead of a planning application being submitted later in the year.

The new market had received a boost over the summer when it was awarded £6.1million from the Town Deal Fund.

2. Question received from Robert Barnes

Will the Council Leader stand up for the workers of the Elbit factory who have the right to work in a safe and secure environment without fear of violence and intimidation.

Given that Oldham produced the likes of Sir Winston Churchill as its MP, does the Council Leader want to keep the Elbit factory open or closed?

Councillor Shah, Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Economic and Social Reform replied that everyone had the right to work in a safe and secure environment. Violence and intimidation was not acceptable inside or outside of the workplace.

Peaceful protest would be facilitated but it should not involve violence or intimidation. The Council regularly worked with the police and our partners to stop that happening and it was aware that Elbit were in regular dialogue with Greater Manchester Police.

The Council worked with and supported all businesses who wanted to provide decent, well paid jobs in Oldham.

3. Question received from Maggie Scarisbrick

Does the council have any plans for a memorial or commemoration for Oldham residents that have died of

Covid19?



Councillor Chadderton, Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods, responded that the Council would be doing something to commemorate all those that sadly lost their lives to Covid. Options were being looked at and an announcement would be made in due course.

4. Question received from Michael Warrington  
Could the relevant cabinet member provide information on how many residents have been recruited in Oldham under the Kickstart initiative?

Councillor Akhtar, Cabinet Member for Employment and Enterprise, replied that the Council noted that the Kickstart Scheme, launched by the Chancellor, was an appropriate response to supporting young people who had been the most affected by the pandemic.

This funding should have been able to support 280,000 young people into work nationally. Unfortunately DWP had not been willing to share localised performance data and so the Council had to resort to parliamentary questions to understand how effective it had been locally.

As of the 3rd June 2021, there had been nearly 138,000 opportunities advertised but only 31,200 filled nationwide. The North West region was leading the way after London, with around 13% of the Kickstart opportunities, or 17,610, being advertised, of which just 4,130 have been filled. Oldham had 3.2% of the North West Working age population, so it was estimated that, as of the 3rd June, there were around 560 opportunities that had been created, with 130 filled. Yet there was funding allocated for around 1,500 opportunities in Oldham.

Councillor Akhtar intended to write to the Minister for Employment, to request local authority data, an extension of the programme until March 2023 and devolution of the programme to local Councils to ensure that places like Oldham really could Level Up.

5. Question received from Peter Roberts  
What plans does the council have to honour Oldham's Olympic gold medal winning cyclist Matt Walls following his success at the recent Olympic Games?

Councillor Shah, Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Economic and Social Reform replied that she was delighted to confirm that, prior to the start of this meeting, the Council at a special meeting had agreed to honour Matt by bestowing him with the title of Honorary Freeman of the Borough.

His achievements at the Olympics were fantastic and she knew people across the borough thought of him as one of their own and took inspiration from what he had done.

6. Question received from Anita Lowe



Oldham  
Council

I enjoy visiting outdoor markets of all types including artisan food markets and farmers markets including the famous Bury Market which appears to continue to thrive tremendously. Also Altrincham market which also continues to be busy ...

I have recently visited Oldham indoor Market ... or sadly what is left of it. It comes across as quite poor when taken into consideration it once attracted many visitors over the years.

How can the traders be encouraged to transit into the Spindles?

I have spoken to numerous long standing traders and they fear for their business and the lack of footfall currently happening in the Town especially the indoor market. What plans if any are currently in place to help rectify this lack of footfall?

As a lifelong Oldhamer it really is sad to see.

Councillor Akhtar, Cabinet Member for Employment and Enterprise, responded that Tommyfield Market continued to be a retail and community hub in the town centre. There were 94 traders, selling everything you would expect to see on a traditional market. Over the last year, it had gained 7 new traders, including some fantastic food stalls offering Indian, Thai and Portuguese cuisine. Recently, the Oldham, Rochdale and Bury branch of CAMRA also named the micro-pub as its "Pub of the Year".

Most High Streets and markets had seen a reduction in visitors as a result of the pandemic. Traders had responded to the economic challenged by adapting and several now had online shops for sales and deliveries. The Council continued to promote Tommyfield Market and, with Covid restrictions lifting, planning was underway for Halloween and Christmas events to attract visitors back to the high streets and market hall.

The new Market in the Shopping Centre would benefit from higher footfall. It would be in the heart of the Town Centre and have better visibility, being next to the Old Town Hall as well as the main car parks. The new events venue and workspace that were being developed in the Shopping Centre would also drive footfall. The Council was working closely with traders to understand their requirements for the new Market.

Councillors understood and appreciated how difficult it was for traders at the moment. They therefore urged everyone to support the Market. When you bought from a local business, you were putting money directly into the hands of local families - so please do continue to shop local.

7. Question received from Neil Wilby  
Why is it the case that certain departments within the Council have serious difficulties in responding to emails or other communications, such as freedom of information requests. Even when there is a lawful requirement to do so? Even as a journalist, with not inconsiderable leverage, the



effort expended in persuading paid officers to respond appropriately, if at all, is disproportionate and unnecessarily stressful.

Can, therefore, the Leader of the Council and the interim chief executive, whose presence I very much welcome, assure Madam Mayor and Full Council that all necessary steps will be taken, under the new regime, to ensure that those residents of Oldham, absent of such leverage, are not being disadvantaged by either unanswered emails or unsatisfactory responses.

Councillor Stretton, Cabinet Member for Corporate Services responded with thanks to Mr Wilby for his question.

The Council was absolutely committed to responding to questions from members of the public, journalists, and any other interested party in a clear, timely, and transparent way. She was sorry if Mr Wilby felt the Council had fallen short. She could assure him that the Council took its commitment to providing fair and accurate information very seriously. It would always seek to improve where it could and provide the best possible services to the communities across Oldham.

8. Question received from Allan Townson

Dear members how can it be right for a factory which is 20 feet away from first choice homes property which is Heywood house Eldon street estate starts at 6am which is not allowed by law and can make noise which is more than 75 decibels which is also not allowed by law be allowed to continue as well as the worker's on breaks are smoking weed and allowed to drive stacker trucks and then drive home I've complained about this to the environment health in 17 and 18 but they do not care as I've had no reply since can you please discuss this and reply at your earliest.

Councillor Chadderton, Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods, replied that she was aware that, in 2017 and 2018, you complained about the noise from the factory and this was investigated and the factory owners spoken to at the time.

In order for the Environmental Health team to investigate the noise issues again they needed to ensure that they gathered the evidence of the noise being caused and assessed whether, in line with legislation, the noise was causing a statutory nuisance. There were a number of factors the assessment took into consideration including the location, time of day, frequency and loudness.

She had passed the details onto the team and asked for the investigation to commence again.

Concerning the allegations of drugs being used on the site, this was a matter for the Police and she urged the questioner to contact them.

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



**RESOLVED** that the questions and responses provided be noted.

b Questions to Leader and Cabinet

**Oldham**  
Council

**Councillor Sheldon, Leader of the Conservative Group:**

A question to Councillor Shah

“After speaking to Group members recently, I am not alone with some concerns. Requests to various departments are met in, sometimes, a less than positive way. Often the replies are excuses, often late and sometimes no reply is given. I must aver that other Council staff are very helpful.

Three examples:-

I reported a blocked grid near a lady’s house and she is fearful to go out when it rains because of flood water entering her property. The message I got back was the grids are cleaned once a year. That simply is not good enough.

I disagreed with Highways on another scheme and the reply I got from Highways was that they did not like the tone of my email. Another one is a drainage ditch in Uppermill. I have reported that for two years and we have had a team out, we are having an evaluation survey, and the resident rings me every month to ask what is going on with this.

Please could I ask you to intervene by informing all Council staff that we councillors are elected by our residents to serve their needs. We do not insist, or disagree, or challenge staff decisions unless we believe it is for the best way forward for the Borough, to gain positive results. Thank you”

Councillor Shah, Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Economic and Social Reform responded with thanks for the question. Whilst she did not know and could not point to the specific examples raised, it was absolutely not acceptable. She felt she had been very clear that this was a resident-focussed Council. She had shared her priorities with the new Chief Executive, who shared her desire to ensure that everything the Council did had residents at the heart of it. She could only apologise at this point and say she would take the matter forward and she was sure the Chief Executive would too.

A further question to Councillor Shah

“Veterans and other members of the armed forces community are much-valued citizens of our Borough and I am sure all Councillors would agree that Oldham Council ought to protect and advance their interests. Does the Council have any plans to select a successor to Cath Ball, as the elected Member Champion for armed forces issues? Also, does the Council have plans in place to improve its Defence Employer Scheme certification and fully fulfil the Forces Friendly employment practices?”

Councillor Shah, Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Economic and Social Reform, replied yes to all of those and Members would be notified of the new Champion in due course.

Question 1 - What is the future for the Tower block and civic centre building

“My first question tonight relates to the future of the Council’s estate and climate change.

Many employees across the private and public sectors have been working from home since the start of the COVID-19 pandemic, including much of the Council’s workforce and those of our partners in Unity, Miocare, and Oldham Community Leisure.

Homeworking means employees no longer must commute, and they can achieve a better work – life balance.

Given then we are likely to have less employees in our workplaces at all and see less of those that do, we shall have less need for office space.

Less buildings will need to be heated, lit, cleaned, and maintained and there will much lower bills for utilities. Many will be surplus to our requirements.

This will also mean lower carbon emissions, so we will also benefit by moving closer to our aspiration to become a carbon neutral Council.

It is likely that in the future we shall have our core staff, working mostly in public-facing roles, in the new repurposed offices in the Spindles Shopping Centre, and perhaps some here on the Rochdale Road site supporting ceremonial and Council functions, but the rest of the Civic Centre will become redundant.

Can the Council Leader please tell me tonight what is being planned to identify and dispose of the unwanted office space, especially the Civic Centre tower block, or may be the whole Tower block and Rochdale Road site?

And what is planned or the vision for this large and strategically important town centre site when it becomes vacant?”

Councillor Shah, Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Economic and Social Reform, replied that consultation was ongoing and the Chief Executive was undertaking a staff survey. The results of that would be shared and an open staff conference with the Leader and the Chief Executive was planned to ensure the balance between work and life, whilst also meeting the needs of the local economy. Carbon efficiency would be factored in. The results of the consultation would be shared with the Leaders of the Opposition and more widely.

Question 2 - Discharging untested and infected patients into care homes

“I had hoped to ask my second question tonight under the agenda



item 'COVID-19 response questions', but I see that yet again for the second time this item has been omitted from tonight's agenda.

I have received a reassurance from the Leader that this omission was a result of administrative error rather than a change in the policy of this Administration, so I look forward to seeing this item back on the agenda for November 2021 Council, as it should be on every agenda until we have seen the back of this terrible pandemic.

So here then is my question.

A response to a recent Freedom of Information request revealed that the Pennine Acute Hospital Trust – part of the Northern Care Alliance – discharged 152 patients to care settings between March 19 and April 15 last year. 96 of these patients were untested and of the 56 tested, 18 tested positive for COVID-19.

It seems to me a gross dereliction of the 'duty of care' that patients were discharged from hospital to care homes when they were untested or tested positive with a deadly disease.

Sadly, a significant number of care home residents died during the COVID-19 pandemic, and undoubtedly some instances of transmission occurred because of transfers into care homes from hospitals.

Can the Leader please provide me with assurance that revised procedures are now in place to ensure that in future all patients will be tested for COVID-19 before being discharged from hospital to care settings, so that never again will a situation arise where patients testing positive or not tested at all are discharged from hospital to unwittingly, and sometimes fatally, infect their fellow residents and staff in care homes?"

Councillor Shah, Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Economic and Social Reform, responded that the Covid-19 Response Item had been omitted by oversight and would be on future agendas.

Councillor Chauhan, Cabinet Member for Health and Social Care, responded that it was impossible not to agree with Councillor Sykes' views. It was a national policy and was a wrong policy. He had openly challenged that policy and said it was unacceptable, putting not only those vulnerable people's lives at risk, but also the staff, who had moved into care homes to care for the residents. Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) had not been provided by the government and the Council had been one of the first in the country to set up a PPE collection point. He had personally visited care homes to ensure there was adequate cover. He could assure the meeting that the national policy had been changed and appropriate arrangements were now made to separate residents who were Covid-positive from those who were Covid-negative.

**Councillor Hobin, Leader of the Failsworth Independent Party:**



“I know the Leader of the Council is keen to make this administration inclusive and is happy to work with all Councillors to the benefit of the Borough. Does she think it is appropriate that present and past District Leads in Failsworth have refused and still refuse to hold District meetings with Councillors? Where else are elected Members supposed to raise issues or discuss improving the area we represent? Can she assure me that this will not be the case going forward and, as we are talking about inclusivity, could we also cascade something down to constituents and will she consider re-introducing public District Executive meetings which her predecessor scrapped?”

Councillor Shah, Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Economic and Social Reform, replied that District meetings were a really important part of local democracy and the Council reformed how they functioned before the pandemic to ensure that they were being used to discuss important local issues rather than being an unnecessarily bureaucratic exercise. She was happy to look into the matter raised and would encourage Councillors of all parties to work with their District Teams to engage with residents. District meetings had not been scrapped and had been held prior to the pandemic. She would look into the circumstances in Councillor Hobin’s district.

1. Councillor Goodwin asked the following question:  
Could the Cabinet Member for Health and Social Care outline what we know, and don’t know, about the impact on the health of children of Covid. What proportion of them, by age group - say pre-secondary and secondary school age - are affected by illness as a result of infection, how severely? How likely are they to suffer from long Covid?

Councillor Chauhan, Cabinet Member for Health and Social Care responded that the Covid update on children and young people was as follows:

- Infection rates of children in Oldham mirror the national picture
- Many children have/have had covid-19 without any symptoms
- Long covid can have a life long impact on childrens’ life chances, partly due to missed education.
- Evidence suggests pre-school children rarely have long covid symptoms but those in the 6-18 age groups are significantly more affected, particularly teenagers
- Long covid in children can present differently than in adults.
- Approximately 200 symptoms associated with children and young people long covid and include rash, stomach ache, swollen fingers & toes, brain fog, chronic fatigue, headaches, dizziness, chest pain
- Childrens’ mental health and wellbeing is affected as a result of the covid pandemic and the number of mental health referrals is increasing nationally and locally
- There has been an increase in children and young

people attending acute services with Eating Disorders, Self-Harm, Suicidal Ideation, Anxiety & Hopelessness and depression, with a subsequent increase in admission to acute paediatric inpatients services (Paediatric bed base across GM has reduced due to infection control measures)

- GM Long covid service spec in place. Paediatric Assessment Clinics now set up with a multi-disciplinary team approach. Children can be referred into the MDT clinic at Royal Manchester Children's Hospital if DGH unable to meet need. MDT provides broad range of specialists and can tailor care to meet need.
- Some CYP suffer post covid complications such as Paediatric Inflammatory Multisystem Syndrome (PIMS-TS) and many have required critical care across GM. Over 120 children and young people to date with PIMS-TS in GM.
- Increased number of CYP presenting with Type 1 Diabetes, however this requires further study
- 1 child in Oldham has died as a result of hospital admission due to covid
- Lifelong health/economic impact of long covid in children not known and studies were ongoing.

At this point, the Mayor requested that the full response be sent to all Councillors as it was a complicated matter and could not be fully responded to in the two minutes allowed

2. Councillor Hulme asked the following question:  
I am pleased to have been told that the new residents' parking in Diggle is nearly ready – it would be very helpful to look again at the diversion in place and see whether it can be safely removed or changed once the parking is useable. Can the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods ask for a review to take place and let me and the other ward Councillors know the outcome?

Councillor Chadderton, Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods, responded that the works near Huddersfield Road, in terms of access for the new school, which would open next year and constructing the car parks were progressing well.

The next phase of the works would require construction on the Huddersfield Road itself where, at that point, the one way diversion was even more critical as this would provide the necessary working room for the construction activities to be completed safely keeping the operatives and the general public safe.

The one way system was an essential public safety requirement which needed to stay in place until the works were complete, which would be by the end of December this year.

It was appreciated this was a point of consternation in the local community and a source of annoyance to resident in Diggle, but it was vital this work was carried out in terms of the construction and opening of the new school next year.

3. Councillor Toor asked the following question:  
We regularly hear complaints from residents regarding the way the Council deal with issues including planning, standards of conduct, highways etc. Could we please be advised how many cases over the last 2 years have been referred to the ombudsman and how many of these complaints were upheld?

Councillor Stretton, Cabinet Member for Corporate Services replied that for the year 2019/2020, the Council received a total of 1,102 complaints. 71 of these complaints were reviewed by the Ombudsman. Of those 71 cases, only 13 (18.3%) were investigated and 7 (9.9%) upheld. Of the 7 upheld cases, the Ombudsman recognised that the Council had already determined fault and offered a suitable remedy in 2 (29% of cases) prior to their investigation.

When calculating the upheld rate, the Ombudsman used the number of cases taken forward for investigation and the number of these cases that were upheld. The Ombudsman calculated the Council's upheld rate for 2019/2020 as 54% and this positively compared to an average upheld rate of 67% in similar authorities nationally.

For the year 2020/21, the Council received a total of 911 complaints, 55 of these complaints were reviewed by the Ombudsman. Of those 55 cases, 15 were investigated and 10 were upheld. The percentage of cases upheld in 2020/21 was 67% compared with the average upheld rate of 72% in similar authorities nationally.

4. Councillor Murphy asked the following question:  
Ward members were made a promise that they would be consulted on the location of new bins prior to a final decision being made. We have now recently found out that this promise amounted to a load of rubbish as we have been informed by officers that we shall be invited to a 'drop-in session to go through proposed locations in each ward'. Once again it appears that promises made have not amounted to promises rendered.

Please can I ask the Cabinet Member to give a commitment that the 'drop-in session' which we are each to be invited to will not in fact amount to a roll out of a fait accompli? Can I ask that instead it be an opportunity for members to not only challenge the locations proposed by officers, but to also suggest our own, and that this should include looking to replace those bins that have been removed over the last two years since the start of the bin review?

Councillor Chadderton, Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods responded that she knew as a Councillor how important bins were to members of the public and all 60 Councillors. A lot of residents believed they paid a lot of their Council Tax to have bins emptied on time and it would be unwise to meddle with the Council's bins. With regards to the consultation, an initial mapping process had been undertaken by officers within the



street cleansing services. This was based on the existing locations of current street litter bins, and included officers recommendations on any changes, with their aim to provide a more widespread placement within each ward. These were recommendations only and subject to member consultation. Members through consultation were free to challenge any proposed locations and could recommend alternate placements, suggest new locations, including any bins previously removed. All these points however needed to meet certain criteria on placement, which would be shared with members in advance of consultation. Members could then recommend locations within the criteria, taking into account factors of demand, footfall, bin size and pavement space, accessibility for servicing and the safety of the public & staff servicing them. She would be arranging dates with the District Co-ordinators over next few weeks and sending out the list of criteria for members on placement. If Councillor Murphy wished to challenge the placement of bins in Shaw and Crompton, he would have his opportunity to have them placed where he considered necessary.

5. Councillor Lancaster asked the following question:  
At this time when our local economy is wanting to get back on its feet, small businesses in Diggle are facing an additional level of disruption with the diversionary routes in place adversely affecting footfall. Having made the case to the Council for financial support for these struggling small businesses, I have now been told that compensation will not be rewarded as it is not a 'statutory function' to do so. Will the Council reconsider their position of only abiding by the lowest standard, and make assurances that they will provide adequate financial support for Diggle's small businesses?

Councillor Akhtar Cabinet Member for Employment and Enterprise responded that the Council was business friendly and had worked hard to support as many as possible over the last 15 months through the pandemic supporting access to over £100m of grants. As the Borough came out of lockdown the Council was keen to help businesses get back on their feet. However, the Council had needed to make budget reductions in this financial year of £8.920m and, based on current estimates had a very challenging budget reduction target for both 2022/23 and 2023/24. The Saddleworth School was an investment in the future of the area and would support families and citizens in the area, which would have a benefit for the businesses in the long term. The new school building scheme was managed by the Department for Education and they did not, in any circumstance, award funds for disruption during new school developments. The Council had no such scheme and no recourse to public funds due to disruption created or loss of income. The Council had looked at providing business rate relief but majority of small businesses that would have relied on footfall would have received business rate relief either through the Small Business rate relief or Expanded Retail discount schemes. The Highways

department were implementing the best solution they could find to support the development of Saddleworth School whilst minimising the impact on the local community. This was truly difficult, especially as the economy began to bounce back from the various lock down measures.



6. Councillor C Phythian asked the following question:  
Manchester Council supplies free biodegradable bags to encourage the recycling of food waste in the Borough. Could OMBC do the same to encourage residents to recycle their food waste?

Councillor Chadderton, Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods responded that the Council currently subsidised the majority of bags supplied within the Borough, sold from local community stockists and libraries etc. The Council constantly reviewed its position and it would remain under review.

7. Councillor Shuttleworth asked the following question:  
As members continue to hear complaints about the absence of police from our streets, perceived or otherwise, as well as comments being made on social media, may I ask the appropriate Cabinet member to confirm the number of police officers of all ranks engaged in Oldham prior to the general election on 6 May 2010 as against 6 May 2021?

Councillor Chadderton, Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods replied that Greater Manchester Police had provided the requested information with confirmation that staffing figures are produced monthly. In the last week of April 2010 there were 442 warranted Police Officers allocated to Oldham. In the last week of April 2021, 407 warranted Police Officers were allocated to Oldham. The figures included Officers of all ranks from Constable through to Chief Superintendent. In April 2010 there was a recruitment freeze at GMP and in April 2021, there was a recruitment drive, which was ongoing. The figures had increased significantly in the last six months. The figures for April 2021 included officers still in training who had not yet arrived in Oldham. The figures were head count numbers and included full and part time working.

8. Councillor S Bashforth asked the following question:  
The Government are proposing reform waste collection which in its current form could mean local authorities having to supply up to seven separate bins to households. Can the relevant cabinet member comment on what the consequences of this would be for the council and for residents who would have to find space for 7 separate bins?

Councillor Chadderton, Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods responded that, as a resident she hoped she would not have to find space for seven separate bins. The government was currently consulting with stakeholders before making final rulings on how waste would be collected in future. Oldham had provided a co-ordinated response through the GMCA



which was representing all GM local authorities. The preferred position put forward by GM was to keep the four bin system currently in place which had been proven to maximise collection efficiency and tonnage performance across the conurbation. The Council therefore awaited the publishing of the results of the consultation before considering and announcing any next steps.

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

**RESOLVED** that the questions and responses provided be noted.

c Questions on Cabinet Minutes

The Council was requested to note the minutes of the Cabinet meetings held on the undermentioned dates and to receive any questions on any items within the minutes from members of the Council who were not members of the Cabinet, and receive responses from Cabinet members. The minutes of the Cabinet meetings held on 21<sup>st</sup> June 2021 and 26<sup>th</sup> July 2021 were submitted.

Members raised the following questions:-

Councillor Kenyon asked the following question in relation to Cabinet 21st June 2021 – Item 7 - Council Performance Report March 2021

“I understand from the approved budget reductions and deliverability report for 21/22, that the Councils £9M spending cuts for this year are forecast to miss their target by £1.3 million. Can the Cabinet Member tell us which services are to be cut to make up the difference, and how this will affect their future performance?”

Councillor Jabbar, Cabinet Member for Finance and Low Carbon replied that at this point in the financial year, the projection was that that £1.3m of the savings were off track and would not be delivered. However, there was just over 6 months remaining in the financial year. Therefore, work was taking place with the Community Health and Adult Social Care Directorate with regard to a recovery plan so that the shortfall was reduced by the year end. The intention was that any shortfall in the savings will be made good by the Directorate and work was taking place to identify offsetting reductions in expenditure or increases in income. Until the recovery plan had been agreed, it was not possible to determine any specific impacts.

Councillor Hamblett asked the following question in relation to Item 8 – Special Education Needs (Sen) Travel Assistance Service - Contract Extension

“With regards to the contract extension, what consideration did the Cabinet Member give to whether tendering companies were based locally and / or employed people locally, and did that consideration result in contracts being awarded to local businesses?”

Councillor Mushtaq, Cabinet Member for Education and Skills responded that, with regards to the contract extension:



Oldham Council

- A dynamic purchasing system was used for procuring routes which was accessed via the Chest. Both a quality assurance score and price check were used to ensure that operators offered value for money for the local authority. Contractors were awarded routes via this process. Routes could change daily due to availability of personal assistants, change of school, change of home address and change of composition of group pick-ups.
- In accordance with the Council's Procurement regulations and European Legislation, Oldham Council put out to tender routes for home to school transport for children and young people.
- Bidders were requested to review and complete the following documents:
  - Standard Questionnaire
  - Mini Competition
- The standard questionnaire looked to assess the quality aspect of bidders and their eligibility to perform the services.
- All tender submissions had been done via the Chest and evaluated by both Procurement and Transport.
- Routes were awarded to the lowest bidder, this provided the most cost effective model for the Council. Any company could bid for a route, however they must register to qualify as a Contractor

The criteria supported local contractors, who were encouraged to come forward and a number had been successful.

**RESOLVED that:**

1. The minutes of the Cabinet meetings held on 21<sup>st</sup> June 2021 and 26<sup>th</sup> July 2021 be noted.
2. The questions and responses provided be noted.

d 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:

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

Recycling Committee	
Miocare	22nd October 2020
National Park Authority	13th November 2020



Members raised the following questions:

1. Councillor Murphy asked in relation to Page 4 GMCA56/21 Equality Panels  
 “I note from the minutes that a budget of £50,000 has been allocated to each of the seven equality panels established by the GMCA in the current financial year. £350,000 in total. Whilst I recognise the need for, and support, the GMCA’s objective of identifying and addressing inequalities within the city region, this seems an awful lot of money just to facilitate seven panels.  
 Can the Leader please explain what this money is going to be spent on?”

Councillor Shah, Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Economic and Social Reform responded that the Equality Panels helped tackle the structural and organisational prejudice and discrimination that caused inequality and injustice in society, through the advancement of equity and fairness in decisions, policies and services across all sectors and communities.

She could not do justice here to the huge amount of work the Panels did, but it varied from a nationally leading survey of disabled people, to shaping strategies to prevent violence against women and girls in GM.

The funding was used to enable the work, to provide officers from the GMCA and voluntary organisations to support the Panels, and to work with panellists to develop their skills. She would strongly encourage Councillor Murphy to read the paper that was coming to the GMCA on Friday 10<sup>th</sup> September, which set out in detail all the amazing work the panels did.

2. Councillor H Gloster asked in relation to Page 7 GMCA20/61 Covid-19 Contingency Support Measures for GM Work and Skills Programme  
 “Oldham regrettably now has unemployment levels that are the highest in Greater Manchester and twice the national average. Unemployment here has been persistently high for many years, particularly in our inner area wards and amongst our young people. Our skills base is low so our economic recovery from COVID-19 is likely to be slow and uncertain.  
 Can the Leader please explain what financial and other specialist help this Borough will be receiving from GMCA through these measures as Oldham is surely the Greater Manchester borough most in need of support?”

Councillor Shah, Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Economic and Social Reform responded that the Covid-19 Contingency Support Measures for GM Work and Skills

Programme was a timebound relaxation of contracts (April 2020 until March 2021), aimed at protecting existing programmes rather than increasing the level of delivery in the future.

As part of this, the GMCA removed payment by results clauses and replaced the contracts with a cost recovery model.

This allowed providers to focus on welfare support for vulnerable people, rather than purely focussing on jobs or skills outcomes.

The GMCA also allowed for services to invest in developing digital platforms and provide digital devices and data packages for service users.

3. Councillor Al-Hamdani asked in relation to page 119 Greater Manchester Transport Committee 18 June 2021, GMTC 30/21 Mayoral Priorities

“The minutes note that the Mayor is looking to achieve a tap-in tap-out fare structure with a daily cap. I would like to ask how much did GMCA invest in the My Get Me Here system, and does the Cabinet Member regard that as a successful investment given that it is now being targeted for immediate replacement?”

Councillor Chadderton, Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods, indicated she would provide Councillor Al-Hamdani with a written response.

4. Councillor Al-Hamdani asked in relation to page 121 GMTC 30/21 Mayoral Priorities

“The minutes note that the Greater Manchester Mayor noting the importance of community rail assets, and the Mayor prioritising that they are made accessible to all. Given that one side of the only railway station in the Borough, at Greenfield, still remains completely inaccessible to anyone in a wheelchair, and extremely problematic for anyone with a pushchair, what more will the Mayor be doing to make this priority a reality that is different to what he has been doing for the past four years?”

Councillor Chadderton, Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods replied that Network Rail was currently responsible for rail stations in Greater Manchester, with the exception of Horwich Parkway which was owned and run by TfGM on behalf of GMCA. However, Greater Manchester had ambitions for local control of all GM rail stations to ensure that they were developed in a way which supported the vision for a modern, accessible, fully integrated transport network, and that there was greater focus on rail stations as a community asset. It was not acceptable that Oldham’s only station at Greenfield was not fully accessible to all residents. Following representations to Network Rail from the Mayor and TfGM a dedicated GM Stations Accessibility Task Force had been established bringing together the Mayor, TfGM, Network Rail, and train operators. The Task Force was now

working to identify sources of funding, prioritise stations for upgrade, and identify how to efficiently deliver improvements. In the short-term the Task Force would identify 'shovel ready' schemes, ready to go as and when funding was identified. The Council was working to ensure that Greenfield was one of those schemes ready to go.

5. Councillor M Bashforth asked in relation to page 122 Greater Manchester Transport Committee 18 June 2021 GMTCC 30/21 Mayoral Priorities  
“Under Resolved the minutes state that it be noted that there was a clear consensus about the importance of delivering an integrated transport network, which was good news and it was good to hear that the Committee was supporting the delivery of an integrated network which was extremely important. Can I ask why we are still seeing some routes being withdrawn, such as the 58 service through Shaw, Heyside, and into Royton. We received a number of complaints from residents which showed this was a well-used service. Could I ask that this be brought up at the next meeting of the Transport Committee, to be discussed and looked at again?”

Councillor Chadderton, Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods responded that she would speak with Councillor Briggs, who represented the Council on the Committee, to ensure that this was brought up for discussion as soon as possible.

10

## **NOTICE OF ADMINISTRATION BUSINESS**

### Motion 1

Councillor Jabbar MOVED and Councillor Roberts SECONDED the following MOTION:

### **Motion 1 - #keepthelifeline**

This Council notes the devastating effect the Coronavirus pandemic has had on many of Oldham’s communities, laying bare the inequalities opened up by austerity policies imposed by successive Coalition and Conservative Governments.

This Council further notes that despite the introduction of the National Living Wage and record employment, poverty amongst workers and children was rising before the pandemic. The cuts and freezes in social security played a significant part in this. This Council is concerned that policies put in place to protect the most vulnerable during the pandemic are being wound down and in particular that furlough is due to end on the 30 September 2021 – the National Institute for Economic and Social research estimates 150,000 additional people will lose their jobs across the UK.

In addition, the Conservative Government has so far refused to continue the £20 a week uplift to Universal Credit and Working Tax Credit– unfairly never paid to those receiving legacy benefits. The removal of the uplift will amount to a loss of benefit

income of £1,040 per year from early October and will have the most severe impact in the North of England, Wales, the West Midlands and Northern Ireland. The Government has also reinstated the minimum income floor for self-employed earners claiming Universal Credit.

The ability of those on low incomes to pay their housing costs will be impacted by these changes at a time when the evictions ban has ended and when Local Housing Allowance rates have been frozen from April this year. These changes will result in a real terms income cut for renters receiving Housing Benefit or Universal Credit despite the cost of rents rising across the country.

This Council resolves to

1. Support the #keepthelifeline campaign to stop the planned cut to Universal Credit and Working Tax Credit
2. Urge the Conservative Government to
  - a. Keep the £20 a week uplift to Universal Credit and Working Tax Credit
  - b. Stop discriminating against families receiving 'legacy benefits', such as Employment Support Allowance, Jobseeker's Allowance and Income Support, by not giving them this uplift.
  - c. Remove the minimum income floor for self-employed earners claiming Universal Credit
  - d. Remove the April 2021 freeze on Local Housing Allowance rates
  - e. Bring forward as soon as possible legislation to end s21 no fault evictions
3. Ask the interim Chief Executive to write to the Secretary of State for Work and Pensions and Secretary of State for MHCLG respectively outlining our concerns and asking for swift action to
  - prevent the 45,000 families who are Oldham residents in receipt of Universal Credit and Working Tax Credits (69% of whom are families with children) from falling deeper into poverty because of the changes to these benefits
  - prevent the homes of the most vulnerable families in private rented accommodation in Oldham from being at risk because of the freeze in Local Housing Allowance rates and the end of the evictions ban.

#### AMENDMENT

Councillor C. Gloster MOVED and Councillor H Gloster SECONDED the following AMENDMENT:

Insert beneath the fourth paragraph ending 'Northern Ireland' a fifth paragraph reading:

'This impact will be made worse because since 2015 there has been no central government funding to local authorities for Local Welfare Provision. This was scrapped in 2015, divesting the

ongoing financial burden to provide a fund of last resort for those in need upon local government.'

Change Bullet Point 2 of the resolution to:

insert between 2. And 'Urge' 'Ask the Interim Chief Executive to write to the Prime Minister and Chancellor of the Exchequer to' in 2b. substitute the words 'and also give them' for 'by not giving them.'

insert a new '2g. Restore central government funding to local government to provide Local Welfare Provision to those in need.'

Insert a new Point 4 of the resolution to read:

'4. Actively promote the Council's current Local Welfare Provision scheme and other existing charitable funds to those in need who meet the eligibility criteria.'

The amended motion to read:

This Council notes the devastating effect the Coronavirus pandemic has had on many of Oldham's communities, laying bare the inequalities opened up by austerity policies imposed by successive Coalition and Conservative Governments.

This Council further notes that despite the introduction of the National Living Wage and record employment, poverty amongst workers and children was rising before the pandemic. The cuts and freezes in social security played a significant part in this.

This Council is concerned that policies put in place to protect the most vulnerable during the pandemic are being wound down and in particular that furlough is due to end on the 30 September 2021 – the National Institute for Economic and Social research estimates 150,000 additional people will lose their jobs across the UK.

In addition, the Conservative Government has so far refused to continue the £20 a week uplift to Universal Credit and Working Tax Credit– unfairly never paid to those receiving legacy benefits. The removal of the uplift will amount to a loss of benefit income of £1,040 per year from early October and will have the most severe impact in the North of England, Wales, the West Midlands and Northern Ireland.

This impact will be made worse because since 2015 there has been no central government funding to local authorities for Local Welfare Provision. This was scrapped in 2015, divesting the ongoing financial burden to provide a fund of last resort for those in need upon local government.

The Government has also re-instated the minimum income floor for self-employed earners claiming Universal Credit. The ability of those on low incomes to pay their housing costs will be impacted by these changes at a time when the evictions ban has ended and when Local Housing Allowance rates have been frozen from April this year. These changes will result in a real terms income cut for renters receiving Housing Benefit or Universal Credit despite the cost of rents rising across the country.

This Council resolves to

1. Support the #keepthelifeline campaign to stop the planned cut to Universal Credit and Working Tax Credit

2. Ask the Interim Chief Executive to write to the Prime Minister and Chancellor of the Exchequer to Urge the Conservative Government to
  - a. Keep the £20 a week uplift to Universal Credit and Working Tax Credit
  - b. Stop discriminating against families receiving 'legacy benefits', such as Employment Support Allowance, Jobseeker's Allowance and Income Support, and also give them by not giving them this uplift.
  - c. Remove the minimum income floor for self-employed earners claiming Universal Credit
  - d. Remove the April 2021 freeze on Local Housing Allowance rates
  - e. Bring forward as soon as possible legislation to end s21 no fault evictions
  - f. Restore central government funding to local government to provide Local Welfare Provision to those in need.
  
4. Ask the interim Chief Executive to write to the Secretary of State for Work and Pensions and Secretary of State for MHCLG respectively outlining our concerns and asking for swift action to
  - prevent the 45,000 families who are Oldham residents in receipt of Universal Credit and Working Tax Credits (69% of whom are families with children) from falling deeper into poverty because of the changes to these benefits
  - prevent the homes of the most vulnerable families in private rented accommodation in Oldham from being at risk because of the freeze in Local Housing Allowance rates and the end of the evictions ban.
  
4. Actively promote the Council's current Local Welfare Provision scheme and other existing charitable funds to those in need who meet the eligibility criteria.

Councillor Jabbar exercised his right of reply and indicated he accepted the amendment.

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

#### AMENDMENT

Councillor Sharp MOVED and Councillor Arnott SECONDED an AMENDMENT, with the amended motion to read:

This Council notes the devastating effect the Coronavirus pandemic has had on many of Oldham's communities. This Council welcomed the introduction of the National Living wage

and the record levels of employment before the pandemic hit. As set out by the BBC who quoted the office of national statistics report in April 2020 saying “UK employment was estimated at a record high in the three months to February, before the effects of the coronavirus lockdown started to hit the economy. Official figures showed 76.6% of people aged 16 to 64 were in paid work, up from 76.4% in the previous quarter.



This Council is concerned that policies put in place to protect the most vulnerable during the pandemic are being wound down and in particular that furlough is due to end on the 30 September 2021 – the National Institute for Economic and Social research estimates 150,000 additional people could lose their jobs across the UK.

This Council calls on the Government to look at ways to continue the £20 a week uplift to Universal Credit and Working Tax Credit. The removal of the uplift will amount to a loss of benefit income of £1,040 per year from early October impacting many across claimants across Oldham and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. The Government has also re-instated the minimum income floor for self-employed earners claiming Universal Credit.

We call on the Government to look carefully at any changes, especially for those on low incomes to pay their housing costs who will be impacted by these changes at a time when the evictions ban has ended and when Local Housing Allowance rates have been frozen from April this year. These changes need to take account of those in receipt of Housing Benefit or Universal Credit and the cost of rents rising.

This Council resolves to

1. Support the #keepthelifeline campaign to stop the planned cut to Universal Credit and Working Tax Credit
2. Urge HM Government to;
  - a. Keep the £20 a week uplift to Universal Credit and Working Tax Credit
  - b. Stop discriminating against families receiving 'legacy benefits', such as Employment Support Allowance, Jobseeker's Allowance and Income Support, by not giving them this uplift.
  - c. Remove the minimum income floor for self-employed earners claiming Universal Credit
  - d. Remove the April 2021 freeze on Local Housing Allowance rates
  - e. Bring forward as soon as possible legislation to end s21 no fault evictions
3. Ask the interim Chief Executive to write to the Secretary of State for Work and Pensions and Secretary of State for MHCLG respectively outlining the Councils-concerns and asking what action the respective departments of state can take and what Oldham Council can do by working with them to help take swift action to:
  - prevent the 45,000 families who are Oldham residents in receipt of Universal Credit and Working Tax Credits (69% of whom are families

with children) from falling deeper into poverty because of the changes to these benefits.

- prevent the homes of the most vulnerable families in private rented accommodation in Oldham from being at risk because of the freeze in Local Housing Allowance rates and the end of the evictions ban.

Councillor Jabbar exercised his right of reply.

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

Councillor Chauhan spoke in favour of the motion.

Councillor Shah spoke in favour of the motion.

Councillor Birch spoke in favour of the motion.

Councillor Jabbar exercised his right of reply.

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

**RESOLVED** that

1. The #keepthelifeline campaign to stop the planned cut to Universal Credit and Working Tax Credit be supported.
2. The Interim Chief Executive be asked to write to the Prime Minister and Chancellor of the Exchequer to urge the Conservative Government to
  - a. Keep the £20 a week uplift to Universal Credit and Working Tax Credit
  - b. Stop discriminating against families receiving 'legacy benefits', such as Employment Support Allowance, Jobseeker's Allowance and Income Support, and also give them by not giving them this uplift.
  - c. Remove the minimum income floor for self-employed earners claiming Universal Credit
  - d. Remove the April 2021 freeze on Local Housing Allowance rates
  - e. Bring forward as soon as possible legislation to end s21 no fault evictions
  - f. Restore central government funding to local government to provide Local Welfare Provision to those in need.
3. The Interim Chief Executive be asked to write to the Secretary of State for Work and Pensions and Secretary of State for MHCLG respectively outlining the Council's concerns and asking for swift action to
  - prevent the 45,000 families who are Oldham residents in receipt of Universal Credit and Working Tax Credits (69% of whom are families with children) from falling deeper into poverty because of the changes to these benefits
  - prevent the homes of the most vulnerable families in private rented accommodation in Oldham from being at risk because of the freeze in Local

Housing Allowance rates and the end of the evictions ban.

4. The Council's current Local Welfare Provision scheme and other existing charitable funds to those in need who meet the eligibility criteria be actively promoted to those in need who met the eligibility criteria.



## Motion 2

Councillor Chadderton MOVED and Councillor Williams SECONDED the following MOTION:

### **Motion 2 - Safer Communities: Tackling crime and anti-social behaviour**

This Council notes that:

- This Conservative Government has cut police to the lowest level in a generation and cut funding for services that prevent crime from happening. These decisions have caused a surge in antisocial behaviour leaving people afraid in their own communities.
- Anti-social behaviour has rocketed, with police forces in England and Wales recording 2,022,274 incidents of anti-social behaviour in 2020-21, up by more than 600,000 in a year and the highest rate for seven years. Analysis of the Crime Survey data lays bare the scale of the problem with over 13.6 million adults having witnessed or experienced anti-social behaviour in the last twelve months.
- Greater Manchester Police in 2020-21 have recorded a twenty four percent increase in incidents of anti-social behaviour, this more than 16,506 incidents than in the previous year 2019-20.
- The Government is failing on law and order. Since 2014-15, violent crime has more than doubled with 1,680,884 violent crimes recorded in 2019/20, while the number of suspects charged has fallen by a quarter. Furthermore since 2015-16 there has been a 90 per cent increase in police recorded domestic abuse.
- On 22nd July 2021 the Police Federation of England and Wales (PFEW) representing 130,000 officers stated they no longer had confidence in the Home Secretary The Rt Hon. Priti Patel MP.

This Council further notes that:

- Police in England and Wales are still faced with a £1.6 billion funding gap in 2021 compared with 2010.
- Cuts to policing since 2010 has led to 8,433 fewer officers, 7,633 fewer PCSOs and 7,502 fewer police staff, with 99% of cuts to the police since 2010 being from the frontline. Greater Manchester Police has lost 2,000 officers and 1,000 support staff.

This Council therefore resolves

1. To ask the interim Chief Executive to write to:

- The Home Secretary to urge the Government to do more to tackle the trouble escalation of anti-social behaviour

across the country, including putting the victims of crime first by strengthening the legal protections for victims of persistent, unresolved anti-social behaviour.

- the Prime Minister urging him to abandon his vanity national yacht project and instead redirect the over £280 million of funds on fighting crime in our communities. This additional funding could be used for surge funding of police officers and PCSOs and for helping councils fund enforcement or to pay for additional CCTV.
2. To continue supporting Mayor of Greater Manchester Andy Burnham in his goal to recruit 325 additional officers by the end of this year: this would mean an increase of 1,000 police officers since 2017.

## AMENDMENT

Councillor Arnott MOVED and Councillor Woodvine SECONDED the following AMENDMENT, with the amended motion to read:

This Council notes that:

That the failures of the Police and Crime Commissioner and Mayor of Greater Manchester Andy Burnham has overseen a surge in antisocial behaviour leaving people afraid in their own communities.

That the failures of the Police and Crime Commissioner and Mayor of Greater Manchester Andy Burnham has as a result seen Greater Manchester being put into special measures. Greater Manchester Police in 2020-21 have recorded a twenty four percent increase in incidents of anti-social behaviour, this more than 16,506 incidents than in the previous year 2019-20. This is down to the failure of the Police and Crime Commissioner and Mayor of Greater Manchester Andy Burnham, who oversaw one in five of all crimes, and one in four violent crimes, reported by the public to GMP not being recorded by the force. GMP failed to record an estimated 80,100 crimes reported to it between July 1 2019 and June 30 2020, amounting to around 220 crimes a day. As well as the continued failure by the Mayor to get a grip of the Integrated Operational Policing System (iOPS), which has been dubbed iFLOPS by many insiders.

We note with concern that since 2014-15, violent crime has more than doubled with 1,680,884 violent crimes recorded in 2019/20, while the number of suspects charged has fallen by a quarter. Furthermore since 2015-16 there has been a 90 per cent increase in police recorded domestic abuse. We call for more to be done to stamp out the despicable crime of domestic violence.

This Council further notes that:

Newly released figures show that 455 police officers have been recruited in Greater Manchester as part of the Conservative Government's pledge to put 20,000 more officers on the streets by 2023.

Across England and Wales, 9,814 police officers have been recruited since the recruitment drive was launched in September 2019 – putting the Government almost halfway to delivering on its manifesto promise. The additional police for Greater Manchester builds on the newly announced Beating Crime Plan – aimed at reducing crime, protecting victims and making the country safer.



This Council therefore resolves to

1. Ask the interim Chief Executive to write to:
  - The Home Secretary to urge the Government, Police and Crime Commissioners across England and Wales as well as the Mayor of Greater Manchester Andy Burnham to do more to tackle the trouble escalation of anti-social behaviour across the country, including putting the victims of crime first by strengthening the legal protections for victims of persistent, unresolved anti-social behaviour.
  - Support the Prime Minister in his continued efforts to reduce crime across the United Kingdom. urging him to look at other financial means to fund the national yacht project whilst acknowledging the aims to boost Britain abroad and train apprentices and skilled workers at home, and instead look to redirect the estimated £280 million of funds on fighting crime in our communities. This additional funding could be used for surge funding of police officers and PCSOs and for helping councils fund enforcement or to pay for additional CCTV.
2. Acknowledge with concern and reject any efforts made to undermine, delegitimise and unfairly criticise police officers and the work that they do in upholding law and order. Applaud the public service of our police, particularly our local teams in the wider Borough of Oldham. Strongly state our appreciation of the police for their willingness to take on unique challenges and pressures, and potentially shoulder great sacrifice, for the benefit of all citizens. Welcome the announcement by HM Government to increase the maximum prison sentence from 12 months to two years for assaulting a police officer, in a change in law that the national Police Federation has lobbied for extensively. The new law will mean that when a person is convicted of offences, including sexual assault or manslaughter, a judge must consider whether an offence against an emergency worker merits an increase in sentence. Denounce the use of the acronym 'ACAB' across social media channels, which means "All Cops Are Bastards". That this Council disagrees fundamentally with this foul, repulsive language and its statement.
3. To support the recruitment of 325 additional officers by the end of this year: this would mean an increase of 1,000 police officers since 2017.

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

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



**RESOLVED** that:

1. The interim Chief Executive be asked to write to:
  - The Home Secretary to urge the Government to do more to tackle the trouble escalation of anti-social behaviour across the country, including putting the victims of crime first by strengthening the legal protections for victims of persistent, unresolved anti-social behaviour.
  - The Prime Minister urging him to abandon his vanity national yacht project and instead redirect the over £280 million of funds on fighting crime in our communities. This additional funding could be used for surge funding of police officers and PCSOs and for helping councils fund enforcement or to pay for additional CCTV.
2. Support be continued to the Mayor of Greater Manchester Andy Burnham in his goal to recruit 325 additional officers by the end of this year: this would mean an increase of 1,000 police officers since 2017.

11

**NOTICE OF OPPOSITION BUSINESS**

Motion 1

Councillor Arnott MOVED and Councillor Byrne SECONDED the following MOTION:

**Flying the Flag**

The Council notes that.

- Saying that you are proud to be British should not be a source of shame and there is nothing wrong with Patriotism or flying our national flag. It is one of many things that binds our society together.
- That the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland is in fact a unique bastion of freedom and that we should be proud of the outstanding role it has played across the world in education, art, culture, science, engineering and in exporting democracy and the rule of law.
- We all have heroes in our communities – whether they are historical or present day, and we should properly celebrate these individuals, and their contribution to our country.

This Council resolves that:

- The Chief Executive of Oldham Metropolitan Borough Council write to the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster and Minister for the Cabinet Office and Secretary of State for Education asking them to support Oldham Metropolitan Borough Council by providing support for schools to teach the national anthem, fly the Union Flag of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, display a portrait of HM Queen Elizabeth II and teach our islands' history.
- Oldham Metropolitan Borough Council reaffirms its support for the sovereignty of the Union of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Crown dependencies and United Kingdom Overseas Territories.
- That the relevant cabinet member will request all schools in the Oldham Metropolitan Borough to:

- Teach their children to sing the national anthem.
- Fly the Union Flag all year round.
- Display a portrait of HM Queen Elizabeth II in a prominent place in schools.

- That Oldham Metropolitan Borough Council display a proper and fitting portrait of HM Queen Elizabeth II (and any future sovereign) in a prominent place within the Council chamber and at the reception of Oldham Council along with our Union Flag of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.
- This Council rejects the phenomena known as ‘Cancel Culture’ and that it holds these **truths** to be **self-evident**, that of freedom of speech and democracy. Truths which must be cherished and defended.

Councillor Mushtaq spoke against the motion.  
Councillor Al-Hamdani spoke against the motion.  
Councillor Steve Bashforth spoke against the motion.

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

<b>COUNCILLOR</b>		<b>COUNCILLOR</b>	
Abid, Sahr	FOR	Ibrahim, Nyla	AGAINST
Ahmad, Riaz	Apologies	Iqbal, Javid	
Akhtar, Shoab	AGAINST	Islam, Mohammed Nazrul	AGAINST
Alexander, Ginny		Jabbar MBE, Abdul	AGAINST
Al-Hamdani, Sam	ABSTAIN	Kenyon, Mark	
Ali, Mohon	AGAINST	Lancaster, Luke	FOR
Alyas, Mohammed	AGAINST	Leach, Valerie	Apologies
Arnott, Dave	FOR	Malik, Abdul	AGAINST
Bashforth, Marie	AGAINST	McLaren, Colin	AGAINST
Bashforth, Steven	AGAINST	Moores, Eddie	AGAINST
Birch, Ros	AGAINST	Murphy, Dave	ABSTAIN
Briggs, Norman	Apologies	Mushtaq, Shaid	AGAINST
Brownridge, Barbara	AGAINST	Phythian, Clint	AGAINST
Byrne, Pam	FOR	Phythian, Kyle	AGAINST
Chadderton, Amanda	AGAINST	Roberts, Hannah	AGAINST
Chauhan, Zahid	AGAINST	Salamat, Ali Aqeel	AGAINST

Cosgrove, Angela		Shah, Arooj	AGAINST
Curley, Jamie	FOR	Sharp, Beth	FOR
Davis, Peter	AGAINST	Sheldon, Graham	FOR
Dean, Peter	AGAINST	Shuttleworth, Graham	AGAINST
Garry, Elaine	AGAINST	Stretton, Jean	AGAINST
Gloster, Chris	ABSTAIN	Surjan, Ruji Sapna	AGAINST
Gloster, Hazel	ABSTAIN	Sykes MBE, Howard	ABSTAIN
Goodwin, Chris	AGAINST	Taylor, Elaine	AGAINST
Hamblett, Louie	ABSTAIN	Toor, Yasmin	AGAINST
Hindle, Neil	Apologies	Wilkinson, Mark	FOR
Hobin, Brian	FOR	Williamson, Diane	ABSTAIN
Hulme, George	AGAINST	Williams, Steve	AGAINST
Hussain, Aftab	Apologies	Woodvine, Max	FOR
Hussain, Fida	Apologies	Harrison, Jennifer	AGAINST

On a recorded VOTE being taken, 10 VOTES were cast in FAVOUR of the MOTION with 35 VOTES cast AGAINST and 7 ABSTENTIONS. The MOTION was therefore LOST.

### Motion 2

Councillor Kenyon MOVED and Councillor Al-Hamdani SECONDED the following MOTION:

### **Adopting ‘Permission Accomplished’ standards in planning**

This Council:

- Believes that confidence in the planning process is undermined in circumstances where the public, elected members and professionals are convinced, or simply perceive, that pre-determined bias exists, that the process is not fully transparent, or worse, that corrupt practices prevail.
- Commits that Oldham follow best practice standards in planning to provide reassurance to all parties that the process has integrity, impartiality and is transparent.
- Notes that Transparency International UK (TI-UK), part of the world’s leading non-governmental anti-corruption organisation, published a report ‘Permission Accomplished’ in July 2020 identifying best practice.

Council believes that the ‘Permission Accomplished’ report represents an excellent opportunity to benchmark our local planning procedures, so they mirror the best practice recommendations outlined by TI-UK.

Council therefore resolves to:

- Ask the Overview and Scrutiny Board to establish a task-and-finish group of senior planning and legal officers, all party representation from the Planning Committee, and a representative from TI-UK, to examine the report and identify the best practice that should be adopted in Oldham.
- Ask the Overview and Scrutiny Board to bring their report and recommendations to a future meeting of Council for adoption.

Councillor Dean spoke against the motion.

Councillor S Bashforth spoke against the motion.

Councillor Kenyon exercised his right of reply.

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

### Motion 3

The Council AGREED to the WITHDRAWAL of this MOTION.

### Motion 4

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

#### **Government funding for our overlooked emergency services**

Council notes that 9 September is annually marked as Emergency Services Day in the United Kingdom.

Council recognises, with pride and gratitude, the tremendous professionalism and commitment shown by our emergency services personnel (ambulance, fire, police and coastguard) day-in-day out, especially during the COVID-19 pandemic.

However, three of our essential emergency services currently remain almost completely unfunded by central government and largely run with financial support from the public by selfless and dedicated volunteers; these being the UK's mountain and cave rescue services; air ambulance services; and the Royal National Lifeboat Institute (RNLI).

any injured or ill residents and visitors to this borough have been beneficiaries of the services provided by the Oldham Mountain Rescue Team and North West Air Ambulance Service, and some residents will have also been assisted at sea by the RNLI, yet these services almost wholly rely upon public donations, which are uncertain, rather than having any guarantee of their costs being reimbursed by central government.

Council believes this is unfair, and that some government funding should be provided to guarantee these invaluable services a certain level of income every year.

Council resolves to ask the Chief Executive to:

- Write to the Chancellor of the Exchequer to request that the UK government provide annual funding to these services on an ongoing basis as a clear commitment in the 2022 March Budget.
- Copy in our three local MPs and the Mayor of Greater Manchester seeking their support.

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

**RESOLVED** that the Chief Executive be asked to:

- Write to the Chancellor of the Exchequer to request that the UK government provide annual funding to these services on an ongoing basis as a clear commitment in the 2022 March Budget.
- Copy in our three local MPs and the Mayor of Greater Manchester seeking their support.

12

### **UPDATE ON ACTIONS FROM COUNCIL**

Councillor Shah MOVED and Councillor Sheldon SECONDED a report of the Director of Legal Services, with amended appendices, which informed members of actions taken following the meeting of the Council on 14<sup>th</sup> July 2021.

**RESOLVED** that the actions regarding motions and issues from the meeting of the Council on 14<sup>th</sup> July 2021 be noted.

13

### **REVISED CODE OF CONDUCT**

Councillor Shah MOVED and Councillor Sykes SECONDED a report of the Director of Legal Services.

The Council was informed that the Local Government Association (LGA) had reviewed the Members Code of Conduct, which all local authorities were legally required to have, and had produced a revised Code for consideration. Whilst the principles in the draft Code were similar to the existing Code, the intention of the revised Code was to provide clarity for Members on obligations under the Code and clarify the paragraphs on Member interests.

The Council noted the Standards Committee had considered the draft and recommend the revised Code for approval.

Members were informed that guidance had been issued by the LGA which would be circulated to members. If the Code was approved, training on the new Code would be provided to all Members.

**RESOLVED** that the revised Councillor Code of Conduct be approved.

14

### **APPOINTMENT OF INDEPENDENT PERSONS**

Councillor Shah MOVED and Councillor Sheldon SECONDED a report of the Director of Legal Services, which asked the Council to appoint an Independent Person on the Standards Committee and an independent member on the Independent Remuneration Panel.

The Council was informed that a process had been undertaken to appoint an additional independent person on the Standards Committee and an independent member on the Independent Remuneration Panel.

Following advertisement for the positions, a panel comprising of members from the three largest groups and the Director of Legal Services conducted the interviews.

The recommendation from the panel to Council was to appoint Geoffrey Millard as an independent member on the Independent Remuneration Panel and Bushra Tabassum as an Independent Person under the Localism Act for the Standards Committee, both to serve for a 4 year term.

**RESOLVED** that Geoffrey Millard be appointed as an independent member on the Independent Remuneration Panel and Bushra Tabassum be appointed as an Independent Person under the Localism Act for the Standards Committee, both to serve for a 4 year term.

15

## **EQUALITY, DIVERSITY AND INCLUSION STRATEGY**

Councillor Shah MOVED and Councillor Chadderton SECONDED a report of the Strategic Director of Communities & Reform.

Members were reminded that, at the meeting of Council in June 2020, a commitment was made to develop a new Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) Strategy for Oldham Council, including the adoption of new Equality Objectives.

The report summarised how the Council currently met its duties in respect of equality in Oldham and proposed the adoption of new Equality Objectives and an Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Strategy covering 2021 – 2025.

Members noted that those subject to the equality duty must, in the exercise of their functions, have due regard to the need to:

- Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act.
- Advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.
- Foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.

The report summarised how the Council currently achieved this in Oldham, as well as what would be done to further champion equality and diversity in Oldham.

### **RESOLVED:**

1. To approve the new Equality Objectives for 2021 – 2025.
2. To endorse the proposed Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Strategy for 2021 – 2025.

16

Councillor Jabbar MOVED and Councillor Shah SECONDED a report of the Director of Finance.



The Council was informed that it was required by regulations issued under the Local Government Act 2003 to produce an annual treasury management review of activities and the actual prudential and treasury indicators for 2020/21. The report met the requirements of both the CIPFA Code of Practice on Treasury Management (the Code) and the CIPFA Prudential Code for Capital Finance in Local Authorities (the Prudential Code).

During 2020/21 the minimum reporting requirements were that the full Council should receive the following reports:

- an annual treasury strategy in advance of the year (approved 26 February 2020)
- a mid-year (minimum) treasury update report (approved 16 December 2020)
- an annual review following the end of the year describing the activity compared to the strategy (this report)

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

The Council confirmed that it had complied with the requirements under the Code to give prior scrutiny to the treasury strategy and the mid-year update. The Audit Committee was charged with the scrutiny of treasury management activities in Oldham and reviewed the content of the annual report at its meeting of 29 June 2021. The Committee was content to commend the report to Cabinet and Council (to ensure full compliance with the Code for 2020/21).

The Cabinet had approved the report on 23 August 2021 and was content to commend the report to Council.

During 2020/21, the Council had complied with its legislative and regulatory requirements. The key actual prudential and treasury indicators detailing the impact of capital expenditure activities during the year with comparators were set out in the report.

Members were informed that actual capital expenditure was less than the revised budget estimate for 2020/21 presented within the 2020/21 Treasury Management Strategy report considered at the Council meeting of 4 March 2021. The outturn position was significantly less than the £147.632m original capital budget for 2020/21 as approved at Budget Council on 26 February 2020.

It had been apparent at the beginning of 2020/21 that spending plans were not going to be realised, the COVID-19 pandemic halted works on projects and delayed the start of others. Because of this, and taking account of re-profiled expenditure, new assumptions, approvals and scheme updates the expenditure budgets and funding plans were continually reassessed throughout in year. The significant re-phasing was associated with the revised vision and strategic framework for 'Creating a Better Place' which was approved in August 2020. This placed more emphasis on economic recovery, given the impact of the pandemic. This review required several existing regeneration projects to be reviewed and rephased to align to the long-term vision of the new strategy. The final outturn position for 2020/21 of £73.227m was a significant reduction compared to the expenditure initially planned and approved at Budget Council in February 2020.

Short Term Temporary Borrowing was undertaken during the year and was detailed in the report.

Other prudential and treasury indicators were to be found in the main body of the report.

The Director of Finance confirmed that the statutory borrowing limit (the authorised limit) was not breached during the financial year 2020/21.

The financial year 2020/21 continued the challenging investment environment of previous years, namely low investment returns.

**RESOLVED** that:

1. The actual 2020/21 prudential and treasury indicators presented in the Report be approved.
2. The annual treasury management report for 2020/21 be approved.

The meeting started at 6.00 pm and ended at 8.40 pm

This page is intentionally left blank