

ADULT SOCIAL CARE & HEALTH SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Meeting: 9 September 2021
At: 6.00 pm

PRESENT

Councillor Keith Holloway (Chair) in the chair; Councillor John Wright (Vice-Chair);
Councillors Angie Clark, Dickie Davies, Dean Fitzpatrick, Helen Foster-Grime,
Janet Mobbs, Dena Ryness and Aron Thornley.

1. MINUTES

The Minutes (copies of which had been circulated) of the meeting held on 17 June 2021 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

2. COVID-19 UPDATE

The Director of Adult Social Care provided a verbal update to the Committee relating to the Covid-19 Pandemic Update.

The Cabinet Member for Adult Care and Health (Councillor Jude Wells) attended the meeting to respond to members' questions and provided an update on the Covid-19 pandemic and the vaccination programme.

The following comments were made/issues raised:-

- Clarification was sought regarding the 30-60 year old age band that had been vaccinated/not vaccinated and were there any trends in terms of gender, race etc. In response, it was confirmed that there had been a slow but steady rise in the Covid cases but the majority within the age band were likely to be vaccinated, however, there were no case by case data available.
- Clarification was sought regarding whether any evidence or journals had been published relating to the risks associated with Covid-19. In response, it was reported that the minutes from the Joint Committee for Vaccination & Immunisation (JCVI) was the best place for information.
- It was commented that there was some confusion in the messaging relating to the 16-17 year olds. It was stated that the recommendation from JCVI was still a single dose only for that age group with no immediate plans to offer a second dose.

The Chair informed the Committee that an item relating to the Covid-19 Update would be on the agenda for the next meeting.

RESOLVED – That the update be noted and thanks be expressed to all the team for their hard work and continued support.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillors and officers were invited to declare any interests they had in any of the items on the agenda for the meeting.

The following interest was declared:-

Personal Interests

<u>Councillor</u>	<u>Interest</u>
Aron Thornley	Agenda Item 4 – Integrated Care System and Agenda Item 5 - One Health and Care Plan by virtue of being employed in the NHS.

4. CALL-IN

There were no call-in items to consider.

5. INTEGRATED CARE SYSTEM

A representative of the Director for Adult Social Care submitted a report (copies of which had been circulated) providing a proposal for establishing a shadow locality board to oversee the development of the locality arrangements in Stockport that would be fit for purpose to operate from 1 April 2022 within the Constitution of the Greater Manchester Integrated Care Board, and as part of the Greater Manchester Integrated Care System.

The Cabinet Member for Adult Care and Health (Councillor Jude Wells) attended the meeting to respond to Members' questions.

The following comments were made/issues raised: -

- It was noted that the report reflected streamlining services and local care and health forward locally which was a good thing.
- Clarification was sought regarding the budget that would be available across the Greater Manchester (GM) area and whether it would be enough. In response, it was stated the budget available would be based upon the need and the money allocated to Stockport would meet the priorities identified with assurance and that the money would be spent well with the right outcomes for the people.
- It was noted that the "Shadow Board" was intentionally kept small and focused for April 2022. There were 10 Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCGs) which would now be reduced to one main Board with everything being delegated to a local level through the Locality Board and the Sub Groups.
- Concern was expressed regarding the positions on the Locality Board and those involved in the structure e.g. providers and involvement of the Secretary of State and GM and whether there would be a loss of control locally. In response, it was stated there would be a strong strategic voice at the GM level, together with the partnerships and representations by other bodies including the Council to support the Integrated Care System (ICS) and the model which has been voiced by the other ten GM Boards.
- It was noted that there had been a number of challenges relating to the pandemic response, but had a very strong approach from the commissioners and built very good relationships with the care sector to respond to the challenges in the future including the funding and responding to the longer term strategy.

- Enquiries were made relating to who the Executive Directors would be on the Board and would the positions be new or re-purposed. In response, it was stated that the Board Members would already be in position and would already exist as system leaders e.g. the Chief Executive of Stockport.
- Clarification was sought regarding reference in the report to “optimising the workforce and sites”. In response, it was noted that the reference related to working together and not in ‘silos’ and how working together could be effective.
- It was commented that the ambition behind the ICS was good and that it would improve the lifestyle for the staff and patients across the borough. It was stated that Stockport was not a locality, but a very large borough that was polarised and it should be reported as such.

The Chair commented that it was a bit disappointed that the report did not reflect the role of scrutiny in the process and would need to be included as scrutiny plays a key role through the governance process.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

6. ONE HEALTH AND CARE PLAN

A representative of the Director for Adult Social Care submitted a report (copies of which had been circulated) providing a final draft of Stockport’s One Health and Care Plan with Members which had been developed over the course of the past 8 months and was one of a suite of documents that would support the delivery of the One Stockport Borough Plan.

The Cabinet Member for Adult Care and Health (Councillor Jude Wells) attended the meeting to respond to Members’ questions.

The following comments were made/issues raised: -

- It was commented that Stockport in comparison to other authorities usually gets appropriate funding, but concern was expressed regarding the assurance relating to the levels of inequality across the borough and whether the residents would get a fair deal across the borough. In response, it was commented that evidence would be gathered from across the borough relating to health outcomes and people’s happiness to measure the outcomes. It was also stated that inequalities were advocated for and it was regularly highlighted and compared to other boroughs.
- Clarification was sought regarding the funding from Government to Stockport and the impact this would have if the funding was not forthcoming. In response, it was stated that Stockport would do its best to advocate for the people of Stockport and the plan itself provides the opportunity to maximise the benefit of the funding envelope. It was also stated that it was important to get the right systems in place to invest the money in the areas where it was needed most and to work around the inequalities for the best outcomes for the people of Stockport.
- It was noted that the report references ‘doing the best for the young people’ although there are young people across the borough who are dis-affected especially over the last 18 months which has now resulted in a spike in anti-social behaviour.
- Comments were made relating to the importance of open and green spaces across the borough and the impact on mental health and wellbeing and the use and maintenance of these spaces. In response, it was stated that the points raised were important and

this plan encompasses a number of themes including the crossover with the borough plan and links with the priorities.

- It was commented that work was underway to focus on the response to both the Inequalities Commission report and the GM Marmot recommendations and how it was tangibly being delivered through boards, actions and the plans, all of which were integral to the inequalities across the borough.
- Clarification was sought regarding the person being employed to work with the Director of Public Health and what their remit would be. In response, it was stated that their remit would include building on the different plans and working on evidence-based findings to make the difference and put those findings into the plan and providing actions to address the inequalities.
- It was commented that the plan was great and that the best should be done to give the residents the best.

The team were thanked and applauded for the report and its contents relating to its use of language and proposed plans.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

7. SCRUTINY REVIEW TOPIC SELECTION

A representative of the Strategic Head of Service & Monitoring Officer (Legal & Democratic Governance) invited the Scrutiny Committee to choose a Scrutiny Review topic for inclusion in the 2021/22 scrutiny work programme.

RESOLVED – That the Council Meeting be recommended to include “Access to Health Services” (to include waiting lists for GP’s and hospitals) within the 2021/22 Scrutiny Work Programme.

8. AGENDA PLANNING

A representative of the Strategic Head of Service & Monitoring Officer (Legal & Democratic Governance) submitted a report (copies of which had been circulated) setting out the planned agenda items for the Scrutiny Committee’s next meeting and any Forward Plan items.

There was a discussion relating to remote meetings and returning to ‘face to face’ meetings in the future.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

The meeting closed at 7.55 pm