

**COUNCIL**  
**09/11/2016 at 4.00 pm**



**Present:** The Mayor – Councillor Heffernan (Chair)

Councillors Ahmad, Akhtar, A. Alexander, G. Alexander, Ali, Ball, M Bashforth (from 6.00 pm), S Bashforth (from 6.00 pm), Bates (from 6.00 pm), Blyth (from 6.00 pm), Briggs, Brownridge (from 6.00 pm), Chadderton (from 6.00 pm), Chauhan (from 6.00 pm), Cosgrove (from 6.00 pm), Dean, Dearden, Fielding (from 6.00 pm to 8.02pm), Garry (from 6.00 pm), Gloster, Goodwin, Haque, Harkness (from 6.00 pm), Harrison, Hewitt, A Hussain (from 6.00 pm), F Hussain, Iqbal, Jabbar, Kirkham, Klonowski (from 6.00 pm), J Larkin, T Larkin (from 6.00 pm), Malik, McCann, McLaren (from 6.00 pm), McMahon (until 6.00 pm), Moores, Murphy, Mushtaq, Price, Qumer, Rehman (from 6.00 pm), Roberts, Salamat, Sheldon (from 6.00 pm), Shuttleworth, Stretton, Sykes, Toor, Turner (from 6.00 pm), Ur-Rehman, Williamson (from 6.00 pm), Williams and Wrigglesworth

1           **HONORARY FREEWOMAN CEREMONY - SPECIAL MEETING**

Councillor Stretton MOVED and Councillor Sykes SECONDED that, pursuant to Section 249(5) of the Local Government Act 1976, as nominated by Council on the 7<sup>th</sup> September 2016, Nicola White to receive the title of Honorary Freewoman of the Metropolitan Borough of Oldham as a token of the high esteem in which she was held by the townspeople and in recognition of her eminent services and inspiring achievements to the Borough and its people.

**RESOLVED** that Nicola White be admitted as a Honorary Freewoman of the Borough as agreed by at least two-thirds of members voting.

The meeting convened at 6.00 p.m. for the business of the Council meeting.

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

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

The following questions had been submitted.

1.       Question received from Catherine Birtles via email:

“I wish to ask a question ‘How can we trust this man’ Councillor Azad has been found guilty of breaking the immigration rules and falsifying paye records. How can this man be trusted to act in a morale manner when he has proved he is willing to break the law.”

Councillor Jean Stretton, Leader of the Council responded that she had responded to previous emails from Mrs. Birtles and that the Council had no powers to force Councillor Azad to stand down. A Councillor was only automatically disqualified if the offence was criminal and a sentence of more than three months was given. She had already assured Mrs. Birtles that she did not condone the breaches of HMRC and Immigration rules referred to. For that reason the Labour party had invoked its own disciplinary procedures and as the process was ongoing, the Leader was unable to provide further detail at this stage.

2. Question asked by Denis Baker:

“I wish to ask this question at Council on 9/11/16. I am not happy about the parking restriction for the houses and flats on Britannia Avenue about supposed charge to parking. Also this consultation is very restrictive in that you need a computer to make your views so I have to let you know my feelings. I do not drive or have a car it is saying I am going to have to pay so I can have Visitors Park outside my house. This is not right. I only have a few people come over the month and now they’ll not want to come because of this fear of having a ticket.”

Councillor Fida Hussain, Cabinet Member for Environmental Services responded that at this moment in time charging for passes in residents schemes was a proposal at consultation stage. The consultation would close on 18 November when all responses would be collated and considered before any final decisions were made. Comments received by letter were also being noted and the points raised by Mr. Baker would be considered as part of this process. When consultation letters were sent out, it would be followed up.

3. Questions received from Melanie Platt via email, Jackie Stanton via email and Dennis Graham via email:

“In the light of the recent announcement can the council confirm that Marks & Spencers are still intending to come to Oldham, and that the store will be opening on time in the early part of 2017? Work does not appear to have commenced on the site and M&S head office have on two separate occasions confirmed to me that they have no plans to open an Oldham store within the next two years.”

“In view of today’s announcement that Marks & Spencer intend closing stores and changing existing stores into food only outlets. How certain is the Leader of the Council and the CEO of the council that Marks & Spencer still intend to build a new store in Oldham.”

“With today’s announcement of the Marks and Spencer store closures, and movement away from clothing retail, to a more foodhall concentrated economy. Would this mean that the new M&S store scheduled for Princes Gate is now in jeopardy, and is it probable that the arrangement could be cancelled completely?”

Councillor Jean Stretton, Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Economy and Enterprise responded that the Council and Marks and Spencer had entered into a legal agreement in December 2014 for the delivery of a full range department store at Prince’s Gate. Planning approval was recently granted and tenders for the building works were due to be returned to the Council shortly. Construction was due to commence in Spring 2017 for a late 2018 opening. Officers were in regular contact with Marks and Spencer and their advisors. The Council was confident that there was currently every indication they were fully committed to Oldham. It was not believed that the Marks and Spencer’s announcement over store closures would have an impact on Prince’s Gate as Marks and Spencer were proceeding to open new full line stores in areas where they were under-represented such as Oldham.

4. Question received from Parish Councillor Paul Turner:

“Winter is here could OMBC look at introducing grit bins at key locations in Shaw & Crompton. Where grit wagons fail to get?”

Councillor Fida Hussain, Cabinet Member for Environmental Services responded that as part of the Council’s winter maintenance service the Council supplied self-help grit bins for public use on public roads and pavements. There were currently 637 grit bins throughout the Oldham borough which were located at prominent locations and potentially dangerous road junctions not already treated as part of the primary gritting network. Bins could be requested at specific locations via the Council’s website where all requests were assessed against the Council’s specific criteria.

5. Question received from Susan Butterworth via Facebook:

“Can you enlighten me as to why the refuse bins are not being emptied at the 5 bungalows on violet hill court, we

had no problems until we went to 3 weekly collections. I have had to ring up every week but still waiting.”

Councillor Brownridge, Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods and Cooperatives responded that she had asked officers to contact Ms. Butterworth to sort out the problem.



6. Question received from Diane Stokes via Twitter:

“Does the land at Cowlshaw still have OPOL classification? What was the selection criteria for the GMSF sites proposed in the draft plan? Who made the final decision on which sites in the Borough should be allocated for development in GMSF plan?”

Councillor Brownridge, Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods and Cooperatives responded that Cowlshaw remained OPOL land if or until it was amended formally by the GMSF or Local Plan process. The sites firstly had to be of strategic size for consideration as part of the GMSF consultation. Beyond this, the following was taken into account:

- Concentrated new industrial and warehousing development along or close to motorway corridors to make the best use of existing transport infrastructure;
- Choose locations adjacent to the existing urban area where possible, to minimise the effects on open countryside and the green belt;
- Where large sites were necessary, it was preferred where practical Over Protected Open Land for development rather than Green Belt or choosing areas where Green Belt conditions had changed;
- Ensured that a site would allow a range of housing sites which met a variety of different housing requirements;
- Minimised the effects on strategic green infrastructure;
- Choose sites where physical ownership and viability constraints did not rule out development; and
- Choose sites that could be served by new infrastructure if existing infrastructure was inadequate.

The decision on what would initially be put forward by Oldham was made by a combination of Planning and Regeneration Officers, Councillors and members of the Local Plan Members Group. However, it was asked to be noted that what was put forward were initial thoughts and the sites had not and would not be confirmed until the views obtained from the GMSF consultation had been properly considered.

7. Question received from Syed Maruf Ali via email:

“I am writing to you about your progress on implementing the adult autism strategy, Fulfilling and rewarding lives, in

Oldham Local Authority. The autism strategy, and accompanying statutory guidance, came about as a result of the Autism Act 2009. The strategy sets out key actions and recommendations to be taken forward by local authorities and the NHS in order to improve outcomes for adults with autism, and the support that they and their families receive. I would like to know what is happening in our local authority and what partnership work you are doing with NHS. I would like the local authority to share good practice examples, and you may want to publicise anything positive that you are doing. I would therefore be very grateful if you could answer the following points for me.

Do you have an autism lead, and if not when do you plan to appoint one?

Do you have an autism partnership board or equivalent multi-agency planning group to plan the development of local services? If so, how can People of Oldham find out more about getting involved?

Have you developed a local commissioning plan for services for adults with autism? If so, how can people of Oldham see it?

Do you have a pathway in place for diagnosis and assessment of adults with suspected autism? If not, when will this be developed?

Do you have a plan to specifically include the needs of adults with autism in the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA)?

Have community care assessors been given specific autism awareness training? If not, is there a plan for when this will happen?

Has autism awareness training been included as part of your standard equality and diversity training? If not, is there a plan for when this will happen?

Have you completed the Department of Health's local self-assessment framework?

I would be grateful if you could tell me the answers to these points."

Councillor Harrison, Cabinet Member for Social Care and Safeguarding responded that there was a Head of Mental Health, Learning Disability and Autism. Autism Way Forward was Oldham's Partnership Board and was well publicised through various parent/carer forums. More information was available by contacting Claire Hill. The final draft of the Autism Strategy was going to Cabinet for approval on 19<sup>th</sup> December 2016. Following approval, it would be published on the Council's website and shared as widely as possible. There was a diagnosis and post-diagnosis support work stream which was outlined in the strategy. This was chaired by a Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) commissioner who were the lead in the pathway and had good engagement. The JSNA were not currently included but enquiries would be made. Work

was ongoing with the GM Autism Consortium to provide training to staff. It was not confirmed what there was currently but enquiries would be made and should be embedded as part of the intention to make Oldham an Autism Aware Borough. It was confirmed that the Department of Health's local assessment framework had been completed.



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

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

1. Councillor Williams asked the following question:

“Can the relevant cabinet member provide an update as to progress on house building schemes in my Hollinwood ward?”

Councillor Brownridge, Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods and Cooperatives responded that two major residential developments were in progress in the Hollinwood Ward which included Rowan Tree Road/White Bank Road where Keepmoat were on site building 135 two, three and four bedroom homes for private sale and Durban Mill, Colenso Street where Countryside homes had received planning permission to build two, three and four bedroom houses for private rent and were due to start on site shortly.

2. Councillor Garry asked the following question:

“As Chair of the Failsworth and Hollinwood District Partnership, may I take this opportunity to congratulate our District Team on their nomination for the Pride of Oldham Award? It is wonderful to see residents taking the time and effort to thank them for their tireless work they do through out the year.”

Councillor Brownridge, Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods and Cooperatives responded by thanking Councillor Garry for highlighting the nomination. It was great to see that residents appreciated the work the District team did throughout the year and was sure that members would agree that all the District teams did a wonderful job in working with members, residents, officers and partners for the improvement of neighbourhood working across the borough.

3. Councillor Toor asked the following question:

“The winter season is approaching very fast and its getting dark very quickly. I have noticed that it is becoming very difficult to read road signs because they are not very visible due to lots of dirt on them and lack of natural light or even street lights doesn't help either. They need a good clean. There are also lots of fallen autumn leaves, they look beautiful but this time of the year that's a very dangerous beauty to admire, especially if they are wet or have a bit of frost on them, they can become very slippery and dangerous to walk or drive on them. Or even dangerous for wheel chair or push chair users as well as elderly people or people with visual problems. To avoid the possibility of any accidents, can relevant cabinet member gives us the possible time scale when this will all be actioned.”

Councillor Fida Hussain, Cabinet Member for Environmental Services responded that during the Autumn season the Council switched from a normal sweeping schedule to Operation Leaf fall which allowed for the concentration of resources on tree lined stretches of roads that had higher concentrations of detritus and leaves. Council operations continued seven days a week and would only revert back to normal schedules when the leaves were largely cleared. Road signs were designed to reflect light either by the light attached to the sign or the reflective material used to produce the sign. Councillor Hussain requested specific locations for investigation.

4. Councillor Gloster asked the following question:

“My ward colleagues and I have been contacted by local residents to say that when they are putting their bins out for collection, as per the recycling/refuse removal dates provided to them by this Council, they have found that neighbours on the same collection route have been given information that is at odds with each other i.e. grey bin/blue bin on same date. I am worried that any confusion will not help foster community co-operation in achieving the recycling rates that we all wish to see so can I ask the Cabinet Member responsible how this has occurred and how the issue is to be rectified?”

Councillor Brownridge, Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods and Cooperatives responded that with the collection change there had been one or two hiccups, but the changeover had been as smooth as it could have been. Residents could check collection dates on the website using their postal code and she asked members to pass that information along. The error had been resolved. Some residents had referred to old calendars. The Cabinet Member encouraged members that if there were any issues to get in touch with her in order for them

to be investigated. There had been a reduction in residual waste since the introduction of the new scheme.



**Oldham**  
Council

5. Councillor G. Alexander asked the following question:

“Could the relevant cabinet member look into why the contractors have not completed roads on Sholver and Derker to the standard required by the council – they have left grids protruding out of the roads?”

Councillor Fida Hussain, Cabinet Member for Environmental Services responded that he had asked officers to visit the areas where the works remained outstanding or were not completed to standards. He confirmed that appropriate action would be taken and asked for details of the affected streets.

6. Councillor McLaren asked the following question:

“Residents of Chadderton Central Ward are becoming increasingly concerned regarding the condition of the water in the Rochdale Canal, residents regularly report signs of oil and a large amount of algae. Could the relevant Cabinet Member please advise what steps are being taken to alleviate this situation?”

Councillor Brownridge, Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods and Cooperatives responded that the responsibility lied with the Canal and River Trust and that officers had reported it.

7. Councillor Moores asked the following question:

“I am sure that you will all be aware that Mr Hardial Heyer, Headteacher of The Radclyffe School, was recently presented with the Pearson’s Secondary Headteacher of the Year Award. Will the cabinet member for education join with me in congratulating Mr Heyer.”

Councillor Chadderton, Cabinet Member for Education & Early Years responded that that this was the best question ever received and took pride that Mr. Heyer had been awarded Headteacher of the Year. Mr. Heyer was the longest serving headteacher. He had taken the Ofsted report outcome personally and did not hide but had come out fighting. This was the second outstanding school in Oldham and it was an immense achievement. Chadderton members had been heavily involved. She personally offered her congratulations on the achievement.

8. Councillor Harkness asked the following question:



“Street lighting maintenance – under the PFI Street lighting scheme new street lights are now maintained by EON. I am sure the cabinet member, like all of us, is well aware of the difficulties that occurred during the installation process. The problem now turns to maintenance. Under the contract, EON claim that the new lights automatically notify of defects and then they will act upon them. Can the cabinet member confirm whether this is taking place? The action, clearly is not however because I have noticed a number of lights out in my ward and reported them yet a considerable time later they remain defective. These are not in areas where there are just sheep but residential areas. As I had feared, the transfer of maintenance seems to be leading to a less satisfactory service. Can I therefore have the assurances from the cabinet member that the company are being scrutinised closely and financial penalties are imposed against the contractor when the response time is not in accordance with the PFI contractual agreement?”

Councillor Fida Hussain, Cabinet Member for Environmental Services responded that in the month of October the service provider attended to 347 street lighting faults where it had taken an average of 2.69 days to repair and it was assured that performance was monitored, however, it was appreciated that some faults were attributed to other factors such as electrical supply faults. Although the service provider was aware, they were reliant on third parties to carry out repairs which could sometimes extend the time for the fault to be repaired. Should there be any specific faults which caused concerns, it was requested that the street lighting team be advised who would investigate and make the necessary arrangements for the repairs to be carried out or advise on the current status of the fault.

9. Councillor Haque asked the following question:

“The junction of Middleton Road, Garforth Street and Peel Street in Chadderton has been the scene of a number of road traffic accidents. Ward Councillors were previously assured that traffic lights would be installed. Could the relevant Cabinet member please update on the progress so far?”

Councillor Fida Hussain, Cabinet Member for Environmental Services, responded that funding had been allocated and a scheme had been designed which addressed the road safety issues at the Middleton Road, Garforth Street and Peel Street junction in Chadderton. The measures would be introduced as part of a larger highway improvement scheme which included the full signalisation of the adjacent Middleton Road/Lansdowne Road Junction. The measures at the Garforth Street/Peel

Street junction involve making Peel Street “One Way” away from Middleton Road thereby reducing the number of turning manoeuvres at this location. Traffic that wished to enter Middleton Road from Peel Street would be diverted toward Lansdowne Road where all turning manoeuvres and pedestrian facilities would be managed by new traffic signals. The works were programmed to start early in the New Year.

10. Councillor Roberts asked the following question:

“I am sure the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods will join me in condemning the thoughtless and selfish people who set fire to the children’s slide in Dogford Park in Royton North. Can she inform us of progress in replacing the slide so children can continue to enjoy the play area?”

Councillor Brownridge, Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods and Cooperatives responded that she also condemned those individuals responsible. In order to minimise future problems, the slide would be replaced by a metal one. The slide would be a bespoke design and additional work would be required with the manufacturer. It was hoped to have the slide replaced before the Christmas break.

11. Councillor Shuttleworth asked the following question:

“Taking into consideration the Greater Manchester Spatial Framework proposals, would the relevant Cabinet Member advise how many house building protects, given planning permission within the borough during the last three years, have yet to see a spade dug in the ground.”

Councillor Brownridge, Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods and Cooperatives responded that the total number of residential applications over the last three years was 229. The total number of these sites which had commenced was 58. Therefore, 25% of the development on sites which had residential applications approved over the last three years had commenced.

12. Councillor Sheldon asked a question which regarded the possibility of the post office in Greenfield closing due to post office reinvention. Councillor Sheldon assured members that the post office was a busy place, especially with banking services. There was a lack of alternative premises. Councillor Sheldon had spoken to the sub-postmaster and the paper shop may be able to take over. Tesco did not want it. In the event of the paper shop being unable to take over, he asked if the Council would be able to put some persuasion to speak to Tesco to take over the post office in the future?

Councillor Brownridge, Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods and Cooperatives responded that the issues had been raised by local ward members and former Councillor Richard Knowles who had made representations to the Post Office and she would do the same. She shared the concerns of the loss of the post office in the village which should be protected. She was not sure of any influence with Tesco but may have influence with the Post Office. Representations would be made to ensure a post office presence in the village.

13. Councillor Briggs asked the following question:

“I have noticed a large number of street lights which are illuminated during daylight hours, in my ward and elsewhere in the borough. I have reported many, however, the faults have not been rectified. Can the Cabinet Member responsible take action to ensure that this problem is rectified as soon as possible?”

Councillor Fida Hussain, Cabinet Member for Environmental Services responded that the Street Lighting PFI core investment program had recently been completed which had seen over 23,000 new assets installed through the Borough which had the functionality to dim the lighting which had been utilised and had seen a marked reduction in energy consumption and CO<sup>2</sup> emissions, however, there had been some technical issues on setting the apparatus on the remote monitoring system during the replacement program, the project had entered into the maintenance period where faults of this nature had been prioritised and the service provider currently had two dedicated teams rectifying the faults which had seen a significant reduction in the number of day burning lights where progress was being monitored on a weekly basis. Should there be any specific faults which caused concern, it was requested that the street lighting client team be advised who would investigate and make the necessary arrangements or the repairs to be carried out or advise on the current status of the fault and feedback on completion.

14. Councillor Malik asked the following question:

“Can the relevant cabinet member update us about any development plan for the on derelict land on Ellen Street, it has been in private ownership for considerable length of time and it is a eyesore for residents and for visitors to Oldham using the bypass.”

Councillor Brownridge, Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods and Cooperatives responded that officers had been in contact with the owners to bring the site forward for development.

15. Councillor Qumer asked the following question:

“Can the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods and Cooperatives comment on the implementation of the new bin collection rota, and in particular any issues arising in St Mary’s Ward?”

Councillor Brownridge, Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods and Cooperatives responded that the roll out of the new collection system had been as smooth as it could have been. There was good news in that there had been a drop in the grey bin waste collected of over 850 tonnes and a significant improvement in recycling. This had been demonstrated by the number of requests for bigger recycling bins. There was a commitment by the public to make this work. Householders were in the main putting bins out on the correct days. Where this was not the case, households were being communicated with through bin tags and collection calendars. This had been the pattern in St. Mary’s as well, the vast majority of residents were putting the right bins out and there were no issues of note. The Cabinet Member reiterated that if residents were unclear to check the website and if there were any issues to please report them to her.

16. Councillor Blyth asked the following question:

“Illegal containers at the Wrens Nest – can the Cabinet Member please provide me with an update on Council action to remove the illegal containers stored at the Wrens Nest site adjacent to the car wash, which has now put in a retrospective planning application for its use?”

Councillor Brownridge, Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods and Cooperatives responded that the application for the vehicle car sales use of the site did not affect the containers which were currently located on the site. However, the application proposed to place cars on display for sale on top of the containers which enabled the stock to be viewed from Milnrow Road. The containers were existing below ground level, not visually obtrusive and had been in this location for some time. It was difficult to provide grounds for the Council to justify planning enforcement for their removal. However, planning officers would make every effort to work the applicant to improve this aspect. Councillor Brownridge added that as she did not know the site, if this response was not satisfactory to let her know.

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

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

Apologies were received from Councillors Azad, Ames, Brock and Hudson.



**Oldham**  
Council

4 **TO ORDER THAT THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COUNCIL HELD ON 7TH SEPTEMBER 2016 BE SIGNED AS A CORRECT RECORD**

**RESOLVED** that the minutes of the Council meeting held on 7<sup>th</sup> September 2016 be approved as a correct record.

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

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

Councillor McCann declared a personal interest at Item 15a by virtue of his appointment to the MioCare Board and the Unity Partnership Board.

Councillor Sykes declared a personal interest at Item 15a by virtue of his appointment to the Unity Partnership Board.

Councillor Harrison declared a personal interest at Item 15a by virtue of her appointment to the MioCare Board.

Councillor Jabbar declared a personal interest at Item 15a by virtue of his appointment to the Unity Partnership Board and Oldham Leadership Board and at Item 13 by virtue of his appointment as a Governor at Oldham College.

Councillor Stretton declared a personal interest at Item 15a by virtue of her appointment to the Unity Partnership Board and Oldham Leadership Board and at Item 13 by virtue of her appointment to Oasis Academy Oldham.

Councillor Price declared a personal interest at Item 15a by virtue of her appointment to Oldham Community Leisure Board.

Councillor Chauhan declared a personal interest at Item 15a by virtue of his appointment to the MioCare Board.

Councillor Steven Bashforth declared a pecuniary interest at Item 13 by virtue of his employment at Radclyffe School.

Councillor Marie Bashforth declared a pecuniary interest at Item 13 by virtue of her employment at Royton and Crompton School.

Councillor Dean declared a personal interest at Item 15a by virtue of his appointment to the Unity Partnership Board.

Councillor Ginny Alexander declared a personal interest at Item 15a by virtue of her appointment to the MioCare Board.

Councillor Fielding declared a personal interest at Item 13 by virtue of his appointment to the Interim Executive Board of Failsworth School.

Councillor Mushtaq declared a personal interest at Item 13 by virtue of his appointment as Chair of Governors, Oldham College.

Councillor Moores declared a personal interest at Item 13 by virtue of his appointment as Chair of Governors at the Blue Coat School, Director of the Cranmer Trust and Governor at the Radclyffe School.

Councillor Fida Hussain declared a personal interest at Item 13 by virtue of his appointment as a Governor at Kingfisher Special School.

Councillor Gloster declared a personal interest at Item 13 by virtue of his appointment as a Governor at Crompton House School.

Councillor Shuttleworth declared a personal interest at Item 13 by virtue of his appointment as a Governor at Limehurst School.

Councillor Williams declared a personal interest at Item 13 by virtue of his appointment as a Governor at New Bridge School.

Councillor Rehman declared a personal interest at Item 13 by virtue of his appointment as a Governor at Hulme Grammar School.

Councillor McLaren declared a personal interest at Item 13 by virtue of his appointment as a Governor at Radclyffe School.

Councillor Ur-Rehman declared a personal interest at Item 13 by virtue of his appointment as the Chair of Governors at Hathershaw College.

Councillor Ahmad declared a personal interest at Item 13 by virtue of his appointment as a Governor at Oldham College.

Councillor Akhtar declared a personal interest at Item 13 by virtue of his appointment as a Governor at Oldham Sixth Form College.

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

There were no items of urgent business.

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

The Mayor referred to the recent death of a member of staff, Philip Buckley, who had made contributions to the Borough in a number of ways. Council expressed their sympathies to the family.

The Mayor referred to his appointment as a Champion of Peace and a report had been prepared for circulation for members to make Oldham a more peaceful borough and the international interest gained.

The Mayor referred to the success of the Council in the Northwest in Bloom event he had attended with the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods and Co-opeartives. Oldham Council had been successful in the City Category, Best Town Centre, Environmental Award for Local Authorities and the Britain in Bloom Gold Award. The Council had now been nominated to take part in the Champion of Champions Competition in 2017.

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

The Deputy Chair was in the Chair for this item.

The Deputy Mayor advised that three petitions had been received for noting by Council:

Economy, Skills and Neighbourhoods

Collapse of Building on King Street (Coldhurst Ward) (received 26 Sep 2016) (80 signatures) (Ref 2016-13)

Petition Against Proposed Parking Permit Charges (Royton South Ward) (received 20 October 2016) (125 signatures) (Ref 2016-14)

Petition against Licensing Application (Alexandra Ward) (received 28 October 2016) (221 signatures) (Ref 2016-15)

**RESOLVED** that the three petitions received since the last meeting of the Council be noted.

9

**OUTSTANDING BUSINESS FROM THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

The Mayor informed the meeting that there were two items of outstanding business from the previous meeting.

Motion 1

Councillor Dearden MOVED and Councillor Ur-Rehman SECONDED the following motion:

“The U.K. has the highest level of obesity in Western Europe, with one third of children overweight or obese by the time they leave primary school.

Local councils now have responsibility for health and wellbeing, health promotion and prevention of ill health, so it is incumbent upon us to debate this and make our views known.

We note with great disappointment this government’s long awaited Obesity Strategy, published in August 2016, during parliamentary recess and in the midst of the Rio Olympics, and the lost opportunity to improve our health and wellbeing.

Medical experts and campaigners have criticised the strategy as ‘weak and embarrassing’ and accused policy makers of throwing away the chance to tackle our culture of unhealthy eating that is crippling the NHS.

The government proposals, centred on the sugar tax announced by George Osborne in May 2016, rely on voluntary action by the food and drink industry and contain no restrictions on junk food marketing and advertising. The sugar tax will not be introduced for another two years.

This Council recognises that local campaigning and awareness raising programmes are most successful when backed by legislative changes, as with the ban on smoking in public places.”

Councillors Mushtaq spoke in support of the motion.  
Councillor Bates spoke in support of the motion.

Councillor Dearden did not exercise her right of reply.

A vote was taken on the MOTION.

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

**RESOLVED that:**

1. Oldham Council, led by our Public Health officers, and the Health and Wellbeing Board (which included partners such as Housing, Doctors, Hospitals, Oldham Community Leisure, Voluntary Groups), would campaign to ban all high sugar foods and drinks available in our buildings and would encourage schools, community organisations and local employers to do the same.
2. Oldham Council would continue to promote healthy lifestyles and healthy eating through our local campaigns such as “Get Oldham Working, Feeding Ambition”, “Go for a Walk”, Oral Health, Breastfeeding and other initiatives.
3. The Chief Executive be requested to write to the borough’s three MPs to inform them of our actions and to ask them to campaign for stronger legislation.

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

Motion 2

Councillor Roberts MOVED and Councillor J. Larkin SECONDED the following motion:

“Speed kills: speed is one of the main factors in fatal road accidents. A pedestrian is four times more likely to die if hit at 40mph than at 30mph. In 2014, 282 people were killed in crashes in the UK involving someone exceeding the speed limit and a further 126 people died when someone was travelling too fast for the conditions.

Residents, including those who attend Community Forums, regularly express their concern about speeding traffic both on main roads and also in residential areas.

Councillors have responded by supporting speed measurement measures, changes to road and junction layout to improve safety, improvements to pedestrian crossings and most recently by funding Vehicle Activated Signs.

However, motorists continue to speed and drive too fast for road conditions and local circumstances.”

**RESOLVED** that the further item of the outstanding business from the last meeting fall.



## YOUTH COUNCIL

The Youth Council attended the meeting and addressed the Council on the following motion:

“Every year the United Kingdom Youth Parliament (UKYP) holds a UK-wide ballot called ‘Make Your Mark’. Make Your Mark allows all young people to express which issues are most important to them and vote on what they think Members of the Youth Parliament should campaign on for the year ahead. In Oldham we have 2 MYPs in Amber Powell and Georgia Loynds. On the 11<sup>th</sup> November 2016 Members of Youth Parliament will come together, at the UKYP House of Commons sitting, to debate the top 5 issues from ‘Make your Mark’ then decide and vote the most important issues to campaign on for the year ahead. This year the Make Your Mark ballot papers included:

- **Votes at 16.** Give 16 and 17 year olds the right to vote in all public elections
- **A Curriculum to prepare us for life.** Schools should cover topics including finance, sex and relationships and politics in the curriculum.
- **First Aid Education for All Young People.** All young people should learn basic First Aid, on a regular basis, including CPR, and all schools in the UK should have a defibrillator.
- **Mental health.** Services should be improved with young people’s help and mental health education should be compulsory and challenge stereotypes.
- **Transport.** Make public transport cheaper, better and accessible for all.
- **Stop cuts that affect the NHS.** Funding that affects the NHS shouldn’t be cut. We must keep up vital services to protect young people.
- **Fund our youth services, don’t cut them.** Youth services provide us with vital support, development opportunities and positive activities.
- **Body Image.** More needs to be done to raise awareness on body image issues, particularly the effects of negative body image on mental health. Bullying connected to body image should be challenged and reduced.
- **Raising Awareness of Sexual Harassment in schools.** Let’s raise awareness of sexual harassment in schools so that young people affected don’t suffer in silence and can get support from schools and teachers.
- **Tackling racism and religious discrimination, particularly against people who are Muslim or Jewish.** All young people should work together to combat racism and other forms of discrimination, and ensure we know the dangers of such hatred.

Make Your Mark in Oldham was co-ordinated by Oldham Youth Council with our Youth Councillors and support staff contacting the schools and asking them to complete ballots in form time or assemblies. The Youth Councillors then took the ballot papers



**Oldham**  
Council

to youth groups and organisations to capture those young people not educated in Oldham or whose school did not participate.

Make Your Mark 2016 was, once again, a success in Oldham. Out of the 16 mainstream secondary schools and colleges, Make Your Mark was delivered in 15 of them. While not all schools had great turnouts it was good to see schools recognising the need for democracy and political education for their students. We would also like to make special mention for North Chadderton School, Saddleworth School and The Hathershaw College all who balloted over 1000 of their students. The Radclyffe School also took Make Your Mark to heart asking their students, during their PHSE lessons, to write speeches on the issue they had chosen. We were lucky enough to have Radclyffe students present the top 5 speeches at our youth council meeting. So the suspense is now over, how many young people took part in Make Your Mark? It total, across the UK, Make Your Mark got the opinions of 978,216 young people just missing the 1 million target given to the UKYP. The North West was again the best region, balloting 194,091 young people more than any other region and the turnout of 31.9% was also the highest across the country.

In Oldham this year, it is my pleasure to announce that we were able to consult with 14,013 young people (approximately 200 more than last year) which represents a turnout of 58.7%. We believe this is the Biggest ever youth consultation held in Oldham! This is the second highest turnout, behind Manchester, across the 23 North West authorities and 7<sup>th</sup> highest turnout across the 224 UK authorities and districts. We also have 2 amazing Youth Councillors Alex Robinsons who personally got 2691 votes and Andrew Shillito who got 2117 votes, 24<sup>th</sup> and 28<sup>th</sup> highest in the UK respectively.

Now the important bit – the results for Oldham.

The top 3 issues for Oldham, identified by Oldham young people are:

- 'Mental Health' with 1535 votes
- 'Curriculum to Prepare us for Life' with 1677 votes
- 'Tacking racism and religious discrimination' with 2487 votes

These issues are all covered by the priorities currently being undertaken by Oldham Youth Council for this term of office, showing that we definitely have the finger on the pulse of what young people are thinking in Oldham today.

The young people of Oldham have spoken! What we need to do now is act on what young people have told us. We need to work with Oldham Council and our partners to look at how we can address these 3 priorities by young people. With over half the youth population participating in this it is vital we respond.

We ask Full Council to note the results of the consultation and to work with us to explore how we can address these priorities within Oldham.”

Councillor Stretton, Leader of the Council responded by noting the results. It was fantastic that the Youth Council were punching above their weight and thanked them for the report.

Councillor Chauhan commented on the motion and referred to the Obesity Motion. The Youth Council responded that a top priority was health and aimed to tackle oral hygiene.

Councillor Williamson commented on the motion. She referred to the First Aid Education in the Curriculum and congratulated the Youth Council on the fantastic job.

**RESOLVED** that the Youth Council motion be noted.

11

## **LEADER AND CABINET QUESTION TIME**

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

Question 1:

“My first question to the Leader this evening concerns the recently launched public consultation on the Greater Manchester Spatial Framework.

Not a very catchy title I am sure you will agree, but nonetheless a document that should command the attention of every member in this Chamber – and particularly any with an interest in the future of our Borough’s Green Belt.

The ten local authorities in Greater Manchester have drawn up plans to meet the projected future need for 227,000 new homes in the county, some 13,700 in this Borough.

This may seem an awful lot for Oldham, but Shaw & Crompton and Royton is really being targeted by the developers and may be even Oldham Council as we shall be expected to accommodate almost three thousand new homes plus vast tracks of land for industrial development.

These plans represent a massive land grab in our area and the devastation of our local Green Belt as new properties will be built at Cowlshaw, in the Beal Valley, Rushcroft, the Whitefield Farm area over to Newhey and around Gravelhole and Low Crompton.

Oldham Liberal Democrats firmly believe that our precious Green Belt should be protected.

Our Green Belt and open spaces are one of the things that makes us unique in Greater Manchester. Some of us are old enough to remember those posters ‘Oldham A town in the country’ – it was true 20 odd years ago and is even truer now. New homes should be built on former industrial Brownfield sites. Existing planning permissions need to be actioned.

We should first look to build on derelict and unloved sites in our town centres and districts, convert every empty mill and factory into housing, force developers to build on sites already given planning permission, and bring Empty Homes back into use. Only when all of these things have been done should we even consider developing vast tracks of our Green Belt.

We miles away from that stage yet.

And we also need to take account of the massive additional burden this will place on our local services and infrastructure. These new houses will mean a lot more cars on our busy roads, many more children needing local school place, more demand for medical centres, shops, and leisure facilities.

I recognise that everyone has the right to live in their own home and be adequately housed but the local burden seems to have been placed disproportionately on Shaw and Crompton and to be fair Royton.

So can the Leader tell me tonight what this Council will be doing to fight to protect our precious Green Belt from wanton development and what representations will be made to press the demand that there will be sufficient advanced investment to meet the increased demand placed onto our facilities and infrastructure in Shaw and Crompton and elsewhere in our Borough?"

Councillor Jean Stretton, Leader of the Council, responded that the Greater Manchester Strategic Framework (GMSF) was about addressing for decades to come the issue of housing and industrial provision and if the issue was not addressed now there would be consequences in the future. It was necessary to provide homes for people in the borough or they would go out of the borough. It was necessary to provide for the fact that the Revenue Support Grant was going away and the Council would be dependent on Council tax and business rates raised for the provision of services. The Leader shared concerns about the infrastructure needing to be in place before any large scale developments were begun. The Leader had raised this at Greater Manchester level that if a developers undertaking larger developments they would need to make a contribution to the infrastructure. The Leader stated that there was not a choice, she agreed the developments which already had planning permission should be encouraged and to get rid of eyesore mills such as Hartford Mill. It was also important to not build Band A and B homes but also aspirational homes. In terms of the green belt, the loss of green belt may have to be accepted. In the proposals in the GMSF would affect 3% which was below average of other boroughs. The Leader agreed this would be difficult. If the provision of homes was not taken seriously for people in the borough, it would be a shame.

Question 2:

"My second question relates to an issue that I have raised with the Leader and her predecessor on many occasions – the education of this Borough's young people.

This time I want to address the proposed merger between Oldham College and Stockport College. The proposed marriage with Tameside College is seemingly now off, Oldham and Stockport Colleges are apparently now the only two dancers still on the floor.

The key question is how is this in the best interests of our young people and Oldham's potential students? Just one of my worries is the inconvenience that such a merger will cause to local students without access to private transport.

Here are two examples:

Joe travelling from Denshaw to Stockport College faces a two hour journey there and a similar journey back. He starts college at 9am. He catches the 407 Stotts bus from the Junction Inn at 6.36 and is just fortunate to connect with the 6.49 83 service operated by First Manchester from Mumps.

This gets him on time to Piccadilly by 7.45 and he is able to connect with the 192 Stagecoach service 10 minutes later. This drops him off on Wellington Road near Stockport College for 8.40 am.

As Joe needs to use three bus services – all run by different operators he needs to buy a System One Student Bus Saver ticket. This costs £13.10 a week or £45.50 for a month.

If cost were not an issue, Joe could roughly halve his journey time if he caught the Metrolink tram from Mumps to Piccadilly Station, via Victoria (£3.40 return, half-hour approx.) and then caught the train to Stockport (£5.30 return, 10 mins followed by a 10 min walk).

If he were aged 16 to 19 he could get a Scholars Permit to enable him to travel for half the single fare each way.

Emma travelling from Oozewood, Royton to Stockport College, also starting at 9am. Emma's journey is about as long as Joes. She walks to Rochdale Road (10 mins) and catches the 6.48 am 24 First Manchester Bus to Manchester.

This gets her there on time at 7.44, which is unusual as the bus is generally delayed by peak traffic approaching the city centre. Emma joins Joe in catching the 192 bus and they sit together on the Stagecoach Service, both alighting on Wellington Road. Emma would also need to buy a System One Student Bus Saver ticket. Emma would probably not save any time going into Oldham to catch a tram as she would have to catch a 409 bus and then wait at a tram stop.

However she could join Joe in getting the train from Piccadilly to Stockport and back (£5.30 return, 10 mins followed by a 10m walk).

This is surely a far from ideal arrangement in a Borough where we aspire to drive up educational attainment and make the best choices available to all of our students.

Can the Leader tell me tonight, what is being done to ensure that the vocational courses that remain on offer in Oldham will remain attractive to local students and relevant to the needs of our local employers? And what help and support will this Council seek to put in place for those students who are forced to travel to Stockport because of the merger and struggle to do so?"

Councillor Jean Stretton, Leader of the Council, responded that a meeting had taken place between Cabinet Members and the Colleges to discuss the issues. The Leader clarified that the decision was not the Council's and at some point in the future a

position would need to be decided. It was clear that the proposals would be for a provision up to Level 3 across the curriculum at any college in the merger. There were ongoing conversations between the colleges on the final configuration. The Leader shared the concerns of provision not being at a local college. The colleges had been asked to address Overview and Scrutiny Board. There would also be a meeting in early December for a discussion on business plans and more detail could then be provided on proposals.

Councillor Sheldon, in the absence of the Leader of the Conservative Party, asked a question regarding the Greater Manchester Spatial Framework and the necessity to build more homes. He sought reassurance that the register on Tree Preservation Orders and Footpaths was being kept up to date. He referred to his question at the previous meeting and raised another query related to new homes being built across footpaths and the footpath being diverted.

Councillor Stretton, Leader of the Council responded that the Council had a dedicated tree officer and dedicated footpath officer who were consulted on planning applications when they were received with regard to any implications for trees and footpaths. The Leader asked Councillor Sheldon to provide specific details to ensure that the appropriate officer responded.

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

1. Councillor Fielding asked the following question:

“Will the cabinet member for education join with me in congratulating Mather Street Primary school in Failsworth West for achieving 'GOOD' in it's most recent Ofsted report? Will the cabinet member further join me in celebrating that the result of this most recent inspection means that all seven mainstream Failsworth primary schools are now rated 'GOOD' or 'OUTSTANDING'; further proof, not that any was needed, that Failsworth is a fantastic place to live and raise a family?”

Councillor Chadderton, Cabinet Member for Education and Early Years responded that all seven mainstream schools to be rated as good or outstanding was an outstanding achievement. The dedication of the headteachers was acknowledged for this achievement. There had also been an improvement at Failsworth School following two years of an unfavourable situation.

2. Councillor Ali asked the following question:

“As people in this chamber are aware, Central Government year on year is taking away Revenue Support Grant from Oldham resulting in this Council having to make some tough choices to achieve savings in order to balance the budget. The impact nonetheless is being felt within our communities. We can only hope this government comes to its senses and does not continue to put undue pressure on towns like Oldham.

We are where we are due to no choice of our own. It is going to be expected of Councils like Oldham to generate its own income. To generate the level of income to match the Revenue Support Grant is not going to be an easy matter. We will require an income growth strategy that is second to none. My question to the leadership is what action has been put in place so far to increase income generation for this town?”

Councillor Jabbar, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Finance and HR responded that the Council relied on three forms of grants: Revenue Support Grant, Council Tax and Business Rates. The Revenue Support Grant had been cut by £10m and these cuts were set to continue and it was difficult to replace the income. Councillor Jabbar referred to the GMSF and new housing being built to generate income. There had been a number of sites approved but not acted upon. The Council was working to increase the housing supply to generate income from council tax and business rates. Councillor Jabbar referred to the Old Town Hall which had been brought back into use to generate business rates and the work to bring Marks and Spencers to Mumps for the increase in the retail offer and generation of business rates. There had also been an improvement in the collection of council tax and business rates.

3. Councillor Haque asked the following question:

“I would like to congratulate all those involved in the refurbishment of the Old Town Hall and the transformation into the cinema complex. Can the Cabinet Member responsible for Employment and Skills please update us on how many local residents have been recruited for jobs in the development?”

Councillor Akhtar, Cabinet Member for Employment and Skills responded that the opening of the Oldham Town Hall was a monumental day for Oldham with 115 jobs created with 82 filled by Oldham residents. A breakdown was provided as follows:

- Odeon Cinema/Costa/Cleaning Company: 70 jobs created; 55 filled with Oldham Residents
- Molino's: 20 jobs created, 15 filled with Oldham residents



- Gourmet Burger Kitchen: 25 jobs created; 12 filled with Oldham residents

There was no information available from Nando's.

4. Councillor Murphy asked the following question:

“Research by the Federation of Small Businesses has recently revealed that complaints over potholes across Greater Manchester have exceeded 16,000 in a year, and that Oldham recorded the highest number of potholes of any of the Greater Manchester authorities between April 2014 and April 2015, with 3,594 being reported. It is interesting to contrast this to neighbouring Rochdale which only had 295 in the same period. Now it may well be that Oldham motorists are particularly observant of potholes, or particularly less-inclined to tolerate them, leading to more reports but being the pothole capital of Greater Manchester is not I am sure an accolade that any of us would aspire to in this chamber. Can the Cabinet Member please tell me how many potholes were reported in the period April 2015 to April 2016, and what is being done to improve our standing in this pothole league of shame?”

Councillor Fida Hussain, Cabinet Member for Environmental Services, responded that the information was misleading in that it heavily relied on each authority's definition and recording of pothole service requests. The Cabinet Member confirmed that the number of complaints regarding potholes during the 2015-16 financial year was 2293 being a significant reduction from 3.594 the previous year. This improvement was a reflection on the investment which had been made over the last few years both in inspections and new equipment to undertake cost efficient repairs.

5. Councillor Dearden asked the following question:

“With winter and the flu season approaching, could the cabinet member responsible for Public Health please update us on the current situation regarding implementation of the national Childhood Flu programme and also Immunisation of the high risk adult population?”

Councillor Moores, Cabinet Member for Health and Wellbeing responded that reducing flu transmission particularly in children (who were known to 'super spreaders') would avert many cases of severe flu and flu related deaths in older adults and people at high risk. Therefore, extending flu programmes to children especially the 2 – 7 year olds was key. The Children's Flu immunisation programme delivered by Intrahealth commenced in October. Uptake figures indicated that over 50% of Schools were meeting the PHE target of



40% and over. To address schools which may need more support in the promotion of this programme to parents, news articles had been submitted to the Oldham Evening Chronicle and Asian Leader to raise public awareness. Also, the PHE Screening and Immunisation team had developed strategies which included meeting headteachers to address any concerns parents may have. In support of the high risk adult population to keep them healthy during the winter months, GP practices, who were central to this programme were offering flu clinics during the evenings and weekends and texted reminder messages to ensure attendance. The PHE Screening and Immunisation Team had commissioned road shows throughout the month of November to increase the profile of the flu vaccine. In Oldham, this initiative would take place at Tesco and free soup and leaflets would be handed out to shoppers. Also, the local authority had launched a social media campaign which included the use of Facebook and Twitter and had success in reaching nearly 31,000 people who had seen the flu promotion online and 11,500 people who watched the video clips. The performance monitoring of both Flue programmes were led by the CCG which involved other key stakeholders including the Council. The results for the first quarter would be published in 2 weeks time.

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.

12

**TO NOTE THE MINUTES OF THE MEETINGS OF THE CABINET HELD ON THE UNDERMENTIONED DATES, INCLUDING THE ATTACHED LIST OF URGENT KEY DECISIONS TAKEN SINCE THE LAST MEETING OF THE COUNCIL, AND TO RECEIVE ANY QUESTIONS OR OBSERVATIONS ON ANY ITEMS WITHIN THE MINUTES FROM MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL WHO ARE NOT MEMBERS OF THE CABINET, AND RECEIVE RESPONSES FROM CABINET MEMBERS**

The minutes of the Cabinet meetings held on 26<sup>th</sup> August 2016 and 19<sup>th</sup> September 2016 were submitted.

Members raised the following questions:

1. Councillor McCann – Cabinet Meeting, 22<sup>nd</sup> August 2016, page 49, Item 9: Revenue Monitor and Capital Investment Programme 2016/17 Quarter 1, June 2016. Councillor McCann asked about the comparison on the use of reserves for the introduction of new self-financing to give adult services the help it needs. The service was always under pressure and was demand led with a projected overspend. He also asked for confirmation of

the 2% increase allowed by the Government which did not yield enough in Councils such as Oldham.



Councillor Jabbar, Cabinet Member for Finance & HR responded that the pressure on adult social care related to in-year demand of the service. He had sat with colleagues to look at the issues in detail and everything was being done to manage the pressure. The service was based on demand which could not be controlled, reserves had been earmarked for the service to relieve the pressure. This was reviewed on a regular basis with the Director of Finance. In terms of the 2% precept, this provided £1.5m, in Stockport the precept had provided £2.5m which was a cumulative difference and comes back to the question of growing the council tax base. The living wage had also been introduced. Councillor Jabbar said the situation was being addressed. Councillor Jabbar agreed to meet separately with Councillor McCann.

2. Councillor Williamson – Cabinet, 22<sup>nd</sup> August, page 46, Item 7: Home to School Transport Consultation and Review. Councillor Williams asked that as she had done a few Home to School Transport appeals recently, and asked about mobility benefits and asked if this had had an impact on Home to School Transport appeals?

Councillor Chadderton, Cabinet Member for Education & Early Years responded that the changes just came into practice in September. This would be reviewed in six months and she would be able to provide a full answer at that time.

3. Councillor Bates – Cabinet, 19<sup>th</sup> September 2016, page 51, Item 6: Oldham Council Efficiency Plan for FY 16/17 to 19/20. Councillor Bates drew attention to the emergency fund released by government whereby Surrey would get £24m. How could Oldham qualify?

Councillor Jabbar, Cabinet Member for Finance & HR, responded that the Council had to accept the government settlement for the next four years and put forward a proposal to accept projected grants. He was not aware of any emergency fund and would look into if anything was available.

Members raised the following observations:

1. Councillor Steven Bashforth, Cabinet, 19<sup>th</sup> September 2016, page 53, Item 9: Priority School Build Programme Phase 2 (PSBP2) – Royton and Crompton School. Councillor Bashforth commented on how hard it was to get a new school up and running, linked with the GMSF and the situation where the Council could build in

additional places. The Council needed to find the money to make up the difference. There was the potential for 1600 new homes in Beal Valley, the dilemma was the need for housing but developers were not able to provide millions for infrastructure.

**RESOLVED that:**

1. The minutes of the Cabinet meetings held on 26<sup>th</sup> August 2016 and 19<sup>th</sup> September 2016 be noted.
2. The questions and responses on the Cabinet minutes be noted.
3. The observation on the Cabinet minutes be noted.

13

**NOTICE OF ADMINISTRATION BUSINESS**

Motion 1

Councillor Steven Bashforth and Councillor Marie Bashforth declared a pecuniary interest in this item. They left the Chamber and did not participate in the discussion or vote thereon.

Councillor Chadderton MOVED and Councillor J. Larkin SECONDED the following motion:

“Council notes recent announcements from both the Prime Minister Theresa May and Secretary of State for Education Justine Greening, that this government intends to reintroduce grammar schools and allow academic selection based on ability as measured at the age of 11.

The evidence is clear that the reintroduction of Grammar Schools would be a retrograde step. Grammar schools do not aid social mobility, they do not raise standards across the board and they inhibit the progress of able students from less affluent backgrounds.

A further consequence of the introduction of grammar school may be the rise of the old secondary moderns, leading once again to a system where children will be divided into academic and non-academic at the age of 11.

Raising education standards for every child in Oldham is a key priority for Oldham Council, this can be seen in our commitment to the Oldham Education & Skills Commission and the subsequent recommendations from the commission. We do not wish to see a return to selective education and believe this would be to the detriment to a significant number of Oldham’s children.

The reintroduction of Grammar Schools was not featured anywhere in the Conservative party election manifesto presented to electors prior to the 2015 general election and we urge the government to abandon these plans.”

**AMENDMENT**

Councillor Turner MOVED and Councillor Harkness  
SECONDED the following amendment.



“Insert as a new Paragraph Two:

‘Furthermore, Council is concerned for the future education of its disabled pupils. In the consultation paper, ‘Schools that Work for Everyone’, there is not a single mention of disabled pupils and the Department for Education has failed to carry out an equality impact assessment of its proposals as required under the Equality Act 2010.’

And insert as a new Paragraph Five:

‘In addition, the Alliance for Inclusive Education has claimed that the policy of increasing selective schools is contrary to new guidance from the United Nations which urges the replacement of segregated education with ‘inclusive classroom teaching in accessible learning environments with appropriate supports’ and that it may constitute a breach of the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities.’

The original Paragraph Four now becomes Paragraph Six.

The original Paragraph Five now becomes Paragraph Seven.

The original Paragraph Six now become Paragraph Eight.

Insert as a new Paragraph Nine:

‘Council welcomes the recent abandonment of Government plans to force schools to become academies and to abolish parent governors after local authorities and teaching unions made clear their opposition to these proposals. Council is therefore confident that concerted and co-ordinated pressure may also force this Government to abandon plans for grammar schools.’

The final paragraph containing the resolution is to be amended to include a new third bullet point:

‘Ask the Chief Executive to write to the Alliance for Inclusive Education supporting their campaign opposing grammar schools’

The now Fourth Bullet Point is to be amended by inserting the following additional words at the end:

‘and also make a submission in response to the public consultation on the document ‘Schools that Work for Everyone’ outlining this Council’s objections to the proposal to create more grammar schools.’

Insert a Fifth Bullet Point:

‘Ask the Chief Executive to send a copy of this submission to the Local Government Association and to ask for its support for this Council’s position.’



Amended motion to read:

“Oldham Council notes recent announcements from both the Prime Minister Theresa May and Secretary of State for Education Justine Greening, that this government intends to reintroduce grammar schools and allow academic selection based on ability as measured at the age of 11.

Council also further notes that this policy is outlined in the document ‘Schools that Work for Everyone’ which is currently subject to public consultation and that there is still time for bodies such as local authorities to make submissions in response to the consultation.

The evidence is clear that the reintroduction of Grammar Schools would be a retrograde step. Grammar schools do not aid social mobility, they do not raise standards across the board and they inhibit the progress of able students from less affluent backgrounds.

Furthermore, Council is concerned for the future education of its disabled pupils. In the consultation paper, ‘Schools that Work for Everyone’, there is not a single mention of disabled pupils and the Department for Education has failed to carry out an equality impact assessment of its proposals as required under the Equality Act 2010.

In addition, the Alliance for Inclusive Education has claimed that the policy of increasing selective schools is contrary to new guidance from the United Nations which urges the replacement of segregated education with ‘inclusive classroom teaching in accessible learning environments with appropriate supports’ and that it may constitute a breach of the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities.

A further consequence of the reintroduction of grammar school may be the rise of the old secondary moderns, leading once again to a system where children will be divided into academic and non-academic at the age of 11.

Raising education standards for every child in Oldham is a key priority for Oldham Council, this can be seen in our commitment to the Oldham Education and Skills Commission and the subsequent recommendations from the commission. We do not wish to see a return to selective education and believe this would be to the detriment to a significant number of Oldham’s children.

The reintroduction of Grammar Schools was not featured anywhere in the Conservative party election manifesto presented to electors prior to the 2015 general election and we urge the government to abandon these plans.

Council welcomes the recent abandonment of Government plans to force schools to become academies and to abolish parent governors after local authorities and teaching unions made clear their opposition to these proposals. Council is

therefore confident that concerted and co-ordinated pressure may also force this Government to abandon plans for grammar schools.”



Councillor Roberts spoke against the amendment.

Councillor Chadderton exercised her right of reply.  
Councillor Turner exercised her right of reply

A vote was then taken on the AMENDMENT.

On being put to the vote, 9 votes were cast in FAVOUR of the AMENDMENT and 44 votes cast AGAINST and 0 ABSTENTIONS. The AMENDMENT was therefore LOST.

Councillor Mushtaq spoke in support of the ORIGINAL MOTION.

Councillor Chadderton did not exercise her right of reply.

A vote was taken on the ORIGINAL MOTION.

On being put to the vote, 50 votes were cast in FAVOUR of the ORIGINAL MOTION and 3 VOTES cast AGAINST and 0 ABSTENTIONS. The ORIGINAL MOTION was therefore CARRIED.

**RESOLVED that:**

1. Council would continue to invest in world class facilities for all of our children.
2. The Chief Executive be asked to write to the Shadow Education Secretary Angela Rayner pledging our support for the 'Education not Segregation' campaign.
3. The Chief Executive be asked to write to the Education Secretary, the Right Honourable Justine Greening MP, setting out our opposition to her plans.

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

Motion 2

Councillor Briggs MOVED and Councillor Ali SECONDED the following motion:

“This Council welcomes the continuing development of the Metrolink network and the increasing numbers of visitors it brings to Oldham, but is concerned at proposals which will see Oldham deprived of a direct service to and from Piccadilly station and the proposed Piccadilly 'Hub'.

Anything less than a direct connection to the Piccadilly 'Hub' would leave Oldham disadvantaged in terms of access to and from main line train services, the proposed HS2, Manchester

Airport and employment opportunities in the regional centre such as the proposed Mayfield Development.”



Councillor Briggs MOVED and Councillor Ali SECONDED that the motion be put to the vote.

A vote was taken on the MOTION.

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

**RESOLVED** that relevant officers be instructed to pursue the Council’s concerns with Transport for Greater Manchester (TfGM) as a matter of urgency.

### Motion 3

Councillor Moores MOVED and Councillor Harrison SECONDED the following motion:

“The Motor Neurone Disease (MND) Association has launched a Charter to gain support as the Association works towards their vision of securing the right care, at the right time and in the right place for those who suffer with MND, and their carers. Achieving quality of life, dignity and respect for people with MND and their carers must be something we strive for, and adopting the Charter will help us to understand and support these people.”

**RESOLVED** that the Motion be rolled over to the next Council meeting scheduled on 14<sup>th</sup> December 2016.

14

## **NOTICE OF OPPOSITION BUSINESS**

### Motion 1

Councillor Blyth MOVED and Councillor Sykes SECONDED the following motion:

“This Council notes that:

- Over many months, residents in this borough, particularly residents in Shaw and Crompton have experienced noise and disturbance from large agricultural tractors pulling large trailers containing spoil on public highways from early in the morning until late at night
- In addition, these vehicles are at times driven recklessly and at speed, posing a danger at danger to other road users and pedestrians
- If these tractors and trailers were HGV’s they would be covered by a commercial vehicle operator’s licence and other legislation that would control their environmental impact on local residents
- At present they are exempted from licensing requirements

- Council believes that tractors used for the purpose of road haulage should be covered by the same licensing requirements as apply to other goods vehicles.”

Councillor Steven Bashforth spoke in support of the motion.

Councillor Gloster spoke in support of the motion.

Councillor Shuttleworth spoke in support of the motion.

Councillor Blyth exercised his right of reply.

A vote was taken on the MOTION.

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

**RESOLVED that:**

1. The Chief Executive be asked to write to the Secretary of State asking the Government to sponsor a change in the Goods Vehicle (Licensing of Operators) Act to make tractors used for this purpose subject to the same licensing and legislative requirements as apply to other goods vehicles.
2. The Chief Executive be asked to copy in the Local Government Association and the three Members of Parliament for this borough and request that they also make representations to the Secretary of State on this matter.
3. The Chief Executive be asked to write to the Chief Executive of the Driver & Vehicle Standards Agency asking for any assistance they can provide in carrying out road side checks to make sure operators in Oldham are operating safe and road worthy vehicles.
4. A meeting be convened for Shaw & Crompton and Royton Councillors.

Motion 2

Councillor Turner MOVED and Councillor Sykes SECONDED the following motion:

“This Council notes with dismay that:

- Puppy farming (unlicensed dog breeding) is rife in the UK with only 1 in 10 puppies bred by licensed breeders.
- The Government has yet to act upon the challenge issued one year ago today by Liberal Democrat Defra Spokesperson, Baroness Kate Parminter, to outlaw puppy farming.
- The Government has yet to bring forward the necessary legislation to prohibit the sale of puppies and kittens from pet shops where the mother is not present.

Councillor Bates spoke in support of the motion.



Councillor Fida Hussain MOVED and Councillor Jabbar SECONDED the MOTION be put to the vote.

Councillor Turner exercised her right of reply.

A vote was taken on the MOTION.

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

**RESOLVED that:**

1. Council work in partnership with the RSPCA and other animal welfare agencies to:
  - Investigate any reports, adverts in local papers or websites that offer puppies for sale in the area, alerting other local authorities and agencies, as appropriate.
  - Find and prosecute puppy farmers and other unlicensed breeders.
2. Council support and promote on the Council's website and its publications:
  - The Pup Aid campaign 'Where's Mum?'
  - The Dogs Trust Campaign against 'battery farmed dogs'
  - The Kennel Club Assured Breeder scheme.
3. Residents be advised at public events, especially in the run up to Christmas, on best practice for buying puppies or dogs, encouraging them not to buy puppies or dogs from anyone selling in suspicious circumstances; to report such incidents immediately to the Council's Animal Health and Welfare Service; and to consider purchasing puppies and dogs from rescue organisations or to support the work of the Cinnamon Trust and other re-homing services.
4. The local authority look to adopt the model license conditions for dog breeding and boarding kennels published by the Chartered Institute of Environmental Health in January 2014.
5. The local authority look to maintain our ban on the sale of puppies and kittens by pet shops in this Borough.
6. The Council work with other social landlords in the Borough to include a ban on puppy farming in tenancy agreements.
7. The Chief Executive be asked to write to the Government Minister responsible outlining the view of this Council that the Government should introduce the necessary legislation to:
  - Make licensing for dog breeding more effective, to make the funds from licences available to local authorities to monitor the activities of dog breeders, and to impose stiffer financial and custodial penalties on dog breeders found to be operating illegally and without regard for animal welfare.

- Introduce greater consumer protection when a member of the public purchases a puppy or dog from a breeder or dealer.
  - Prohibit the licensing of pet shops or retail outlets to sell puppies or kittens where the mother is not present.
8. The Chief Executive be asked to copy in the three Members of Parliament for this Borough with a request that they make similar representations to the Minister.

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

### Motion 3

Councillor Gloster MOVED and Councillor Blyth SECONDED the following motion:

“This Council notes:

- The £170million reduction in NHS funding for community pharmacies announced on December 17<sup>th</sup> 2015 which could put many out of business.
- The announcement made by the Government on September 5<sup>th</sup> 2016 of the delay to the cuts which were generally due to be introduced in October 2016
- The scrapping of plans to introduce a ‘hub and spoke’ model for community pharmacies

This Council believes that:

- The Government’s plans threaten patient access to pharmacies and pharmacy services in the Metropolitan Borough of Oldham and that the recent announcements are causing uncertainty about future investment in pharmacy services
- Our local pharmacies are at risk of closure or being forced to cut services such as free delivery of prescription drugs, family planning advice and advice on medicines
- This will put more pressure on GPs and hospitals and impact social services and is at odds with the local Clinical Commissioning Group’s desire to increase the use of pharmacists to ease pressure on GPs.

Councillor Gloster MOVED and Councillor Blyth SECONDED the motion be put to the vote.

Councillor Gloster did not exercise his right of reply.

A vote was taken on the MOTION.

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

### **RESOLVED that:**

1. The Chief Executive be requested to write to the Secretary of State responsible calling for the Government

- to abandon these cuts, rather than just simply to postpone them, and to make a commitment to maintaining a fully-funded community pharmacy service
2. The Chief Executive also be requested to write to the Borough's three Members of Parliament and to the Chair of the NHS Oldham Clinical Commissioning Group asking them to make similar representations on this matter to the Secretary of State.

- 15a To note the Minutes of the following Partnership meetings and the relevant spokespersons to respond to questions from Members

The minutes of the Partnership meetings were submitted as follows:

Health and Wellbeing Board	21 <sup>st</sup> June 2016
Unity Partnership Board	28 <sup>th</sup> June 2016
MioCare	11 <sup>th</sup> July 2016
Oldham Leadership Board	22 <sup>nd</sup> September 2016

Question from Councillor Harkness, Health and Wellbeing Board Minutes, Item 15 – Manchester Single Hospital Review and his question related to North Manchester General Hospital and sought clarity if the hospital were to close or transferred to the Central Manchester Trust, how would this impact on the Pennine Acute Trust?

Councillor Dearden, Chair of the Health and Wellbeing Board, responded that this was still under consultation and no decision had yet been made.

There were no observations on the minutes.

**RESOLVED that:**

1. the minutes of the Partnership meetings as detailed in the report be noted.
2. the question and response on the Partnership meetings be noted.

- 15b To note the Minutes of the following Joint Authority meetings and the relevant spokespersons to respond to questions from Members

The minutes of the Joint Authorities were submitted as follows:

Transport for Greater Manchester	15 <sup>th</sup> July 2016
Greater Manchester Fire and Rescue Authority	23 <sup>rd</sup> June 2016
Greater Manchester Combined Authority (GMCA)	8 <sup>th</sup> September 2016
2016	26 <sup>th</sup> August 2016
Joint GMCA/AGMA Executive	30 <sup>th</sup> September
National Park Authority	26 <sup>th</sup> August 2016
Greater Manchester Waste Disposal	1 <sup>st</sup> July 2016
	10 <sup>th</sup> June 2016



Question from Councillor Chauhan – Greater Manchester Fire and Rescue Service, 23<sup>rd</sup> June 2016, Item 22 – Quarter 4 Performance Review 2015/16 – could the spokesperson explain the reasons for the increase in special service costs?

Councillor Williams responded that a Memorandum for Understanding had been signed with North West Ambulance Service on turning out for cardiac arrests. Life expectancy reduced by 10% over certain periods of time, in Greater Manchester services can respond in a short period of time. From 15 September, GMFRS had responded to 35 cardiac arrests and had attended over 3000 calls which had saved 63 lives and 77 other neuro outcomes.

Question from Councillor Brownridge – Greater Manchester Fire and Rescue Service, 8<sup>th</sup> September 2016, Item 43 – Chief's Activity Report 2016/17 – reference was made to hostilities towards firefighters. Could the spokesperson comment on the experiences over the Halloween weekend which had been referenced in the press?

Councillor Williams responded that he had been in attendance with the crews when responding to dangerous and controlled burning and said the hostility towards the crews was immense. CCTV was in place on the fire service appliances and community safety may need to offer advice.

Councillor Gloster observed that this sort of behaviour should be condemned towards any part of the emergency services.

**RESOLVED that:**

1. The minutes of the Joint Authorities as detailed in the report be noted.
2. The questions and responses on the Joint Authority minutes be noted.
3. The observation on the Joint Authority minutes be noted.

16

**UPDATE ON ACTIONS FROM COUNCIL**

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

Councillor Sykes raised the response received from Royal Mail and stated that it was inaccurate and bore little resemblance to what reality was.

Councillor Stretton responded and asked for the full details and a letter would be sent to Royal Mail with the inaccuracies. It was

unacceptable for Council to be provided with inaccurate responses.



**Oldham**  
Council

**RESOLVED that:**

1. the update on the actions report be noted.
2. a further letter be sent to Royal Mail which set out the inaccuracies of the first response.

17

**BOUNDARY COMMISSION REVIEW RESPONSE**

Consideration was given to a report of the Leader of the Council which outlined a proposed alternative option in response to the Boundary Commission for England's review of Parliamentary Constituencies.

The Boundary Commission for England (BCE) announced the review and was required to report back to Parliament in September 2018. The Parliamentary Voting System and Constituencies Act 2011 had been introduced which required a fixed number of 600 constituencies for the whole of the United Kingdom and 501 had been allocated to England. Every constituency in England was to have an electorate no smaller than 71,031 and no larger than 78,507.

The BCE proposals for the constituencies for Oldham were outlined in the report. The proposed Littleborough and Saddleworth constituency did not take into account physical geographical considerations and presented difficulties in affording all constituents the ability to have reasonable access to their MP. The proposed Failsworth and Droylsden constituency drew from four existing constituencies and was geographically incoherent. The proposed three new constituencies would be drawn from four local authority areas. This brought administrative challenges, in particular for elections and election counts. The BCE proposals also ignored strong local ties. This included the separation of the two Royton Wards and the separation of Saddleworth West and Lees from Saddleworth North and Saddleworth South.

An alternative proposal was proposed which allowed for two parliamentary constituencies whole contained within Oldham Metropolitan Borough. This allowed for the retention of the existing constituency names and kept the electoral size limit and involved minimum disruption. The proposal addressed geographical considerations, local government boundaries as they existed in May 2015, boundaries of existing constituencies and local ties. The proposal included bringing the Failsworth East and Failsworth West wards into the Oldham West and Royton Constituency and moving Medlock Vale ward into Oldham East and Saddleworth Constituency.

The options considered were:  
Option 1 – Do Nothing.

Option 2 – For Full Council to make a submission to the BCE making the case for the alternative Parliamentary Boundaries as set out in the report.



Councillor Stretton in moving the report requested that full Council agree an amendment to the report for the retention of existing Constituency names and should read “Oldham East and Saddleworth” and “Oldham West and Royton”.

**RESOLVED** that the alternative option proposal as outlined in the report be approved with the amendment at Figure One which should read “Oldham East and Saddleworth” instead of “Oldham East” and “Oldham West and Royton” instead of “Oldham West”.

18

### **OLDHAM DISTRESS FUND FINANCIAL STATEMENT**

Consideration was given to a report regarding the annual accounts for the Oldham Distress Fund for 2015/16. The Oldham Distress Fund was a registered charity operated by Oldham Council with the terms of reference to relieve poverty and hardship of people living in the Borough of Oldham. In 2012 it was used in response to the gas explosion in Shaw.

**RESOLVED** that the Oldham Distress Annual Report which included the Financial Statement for year ended 31<sup>st</sup> March 2016 be noted.

19

### **COUNCIL CALENDAR 2017/2018**

Consideration was given to a report of the Director of Legal Services which set out the draft Calendar of Meetings for the 2017/2018 Municipal Year.

**RESOLVED that:**

1. The Council’s Calendar of Meetings for the Municipal Year 2017/18 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.

The meeting started at 4.00 pm and ended at 9.17 pm