

## **ADULT SOCIAL CARE & HEALTH SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

Meeting: 6 March 2025  
At: 6.00 pm

PRESENT

Councillor Wendy Wild (Chair) in the chair; Councillor Karl Wardlaw (Vice-Chair);  
Councillors Rachel Bresnahan, Laura Clingan, Dean Fitzpatrick, Mike Newman,  
Catherine Stuart, Pete West and Dominic Hardwick.

### **1. ELECTION OF CHAIR**

RESOLVED – (1) That Councillor Wendy Wild be elected Chair of the Scrutiny Committee for the period until the next Annual Council Meeting.

(2) That Councillor Karl Wardlaw be appointed Vice-Chair of the Scrutiny Committee for the period until the next Annual Council Meeting.

### **2. MINUTES**

The Minutes (copies of which had been circulated) of the meeting held on 23 January 2025 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

### **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 interests were declared:-

#### **Personal Interests**

Councillors	Interests
Karl Wardlaw	Agenda Item 4 – ‘Update on Stepping Hill Foundation Trust’ as an employee of Stepping Hill Foundation Trust
Dominic Hardwick	Agenda Item 4 – ‘Update on Stepping Hill Foundation Trust’ as a member of Stockport NHS Foundation Trust
Mike Newman	Agenda Item 4 – ‘Update on Stepping Hill Foundation Trust’ by virtue of spouse being employed in Emergency Medicine at Stepping Hill Foundation Trust
Rachel Bresnahan	Agenda Item 8 – ‘Scrutiny Review – Understanding the Inequalities of Health Outcomes Across the Borough’ as a facilitator of the Stockport Food Network

#### **4. CALL-IN**

There were no call-in items to consider.

#### **5. UPDATE ON STEPPING HILL FOUNDATION TRUST**

The Chair informed the Committee that an email communication had been circulated to members in advance of the meeting informing the Committee that there would be no update from the Trust at this meeting.

Councillor Holloway noted that David Wakefield had been appointed as the new Joint Chair of the Stockport NHS Foundation Trust and Tameside and Glossop Integrated Care NHS Foundation Trust.

The Chair requested that Mr David Wakefield be invited to attend the meeting.

It was commented that it was unfortunate and disappointing that the Trust could not provide any update to the Committee. It was noted that the Chair would write to the Trust to ask for an update.

RESOLVED – (1) That an update be requested from the Stepping Hill Foundation Trust.

(2) That Mr David Wakefield as the new Joint Chair of the Stockport NHS Foundation Trust and Tameside and Glossop Integrated Care NHS Foundation Trust be invited to a future meeting of the Scrutiny Committee.

#### **6. ANNUAL RESIDENTIAL/ NURSING, HOME CARE AND OTHER CARE MANAGEMENT SERVICES FEE SETTING 2025/26**

A representative of the Director for Adult Services submitted a report (copies of which had been circulated) outlining the fee setting recommendations for externally commissioned services within Adult Social Care.

The Cabinet Member for Health and Adult Social Care, Councillor Keith Holloway also attended the meeting and answered questions of the Committee.

The following comments were made/issues raised:-

- Clarification was sought regarding the ethical rate and whether this was in reference to the Care Act 2014 or the Real Living Wage and whether the contributions to the 46% increase in costs was following the introduction of the Real Living Wage. In reply, it was noted that the ethical rate was a historical piece of work on guaranteeing conditions with contracts to external providers preceding the introduction of the Real Living Wage. In regard to the rising costs query, it was highlighted that staff costs was a big element of this cost alongside affordability which needed to be demonstrated and accounted for through the Medium Term Financial Plan.
- It was noted that care at home compared to permanent residential care, was more sustainable and alongside ensuring the retention of staff is high.
- It was noted that the recent Employers National Insurance increases would be an additional burden on care providers.

- It was highlighted that one of the key risks was regarding the passing on of the Real Living Wage and how this could be stipulated and insisted upon in the contract. It was noted that some contracts like home care could be mandated to include this, but residential care contracts would require further engagement and quality assurance with the care facilities in order to set expectations around the Real Living Wage being provided to employees.
- It was asked regarding the difference between nursing and residential care for Care Quality Commission ratings. and if this was a local or national trend. It was noted in reply that nursing care had challenges regarding agency staff which would affect the ratings but there was work ongoing to improve this.
- Members enquired if modelling had been done to assess take-home pay for employees and if this was being done to ensure that employees weren't losing out due to the withdrawal of other benefits. It was noted in reply that this type of modelling had not been done, but that the fee setting for providers would be done to ensure that providers could give employees a Real Living Wage as a minimum base. However, it was noted that this would be looked into to see if there was any national modelling on this.
- It was asked if there was a current percentage for the amount of money spent on adult social care. It was highlighted that it was around 45% of the overall budget of the Council and this was expected to increase in future.
- There was a question relating to the brokerage service for commissioning care and if there were any outcome or benefits for people using the service and if this could be received in a future meeting. It was noted that this would be a useful thing to report back to the committee at a future meeting.

The Chair requested that thanks be passed on for the report provided to the Committee.

RESOLVED – (1) That the report be approved for submission to the Cabinet.

(2) That a report regarding the brokerage service for commissioning care services be brought to a future meeting of the Committee.

## **7. ALCOHOL RELATED HARM**

A representative of the Director of Public Health submitted a report (copies of which had been circulated) to provide an overview of the progress to date for the alcohol-related harm subgroup of Stockport Locality's Provider Partnership.

The Cabinet Member for Health and Adult Social Care, Councillor Keith Holloway also attended the meeting and answered questions of the Committee.

The following comments were made/issues raised:-

- Clarification was sought regarding the environmental impacts section being marked as 'not applicable'. It was noted that discarded cans and bottles were often seen in wards during litter picks and that this was arguably an environmental concern. This was confirmed to be the case.
- There was a comment regarding the level of service provided by Stockport NHS Foundation Trust for alcohol related harm than the other GM boroughs, and it was asked what the 'Audit C' was in reference to. In reply, it was noted that there was currently 1 alcohol care nurse, but that there was work ongoing towards meeting the target of developing a 7-day alcohol care team. It was further noted that 'Audit C' was a

way to help determine level of alcohol consumption and helping to identify people who were likely to suffer from alcohol harm. It was noted that there was an understanding of the gaps in the service from the assessments done.

- It was noted that there were assumptions that people would be more honest online but this was being done in-person at Stepping Hill.
- Members enquired about whether 'Audit C' data provided on alcohol dependents on different areas of the borough and were there links to deprivation indices and being close to off-licences. It was noted, that in areas of deprivation, alcohol related harm was higher but universal action was being taken across the borough with the licencing team to look into this. It was noted that 'Audit C' data could be looked at, but this would be a large piece of work across a variety of different sources.
- There were questions asked regarding the work of public health and the impact on licencing applications. It was noted that the team would work to help measures be put in place to reduce harm with licence applications such as shorter opening hours. It was highlighted that Public Health was a responsible authority and had reviewed 64 licencing applications so far, but there were limits to this work within the licencing objectives.
- It was noted that there were three Peer Support groups that had been set up to help those suffering from alcohol dependency.
- There was a question on the launch of the Alcohol Related Harm Working Group and the work already done. It was noted that the Trust had launched the group, and this would help feed into the Board and the Provider Partnership. There was also working being done in the A&E departments and the hospital wards to drive the work forwards.

RESOLVED - That the report be noted.

## **8. DRUGS AND ALCOHOL NEEDS ASSESSMENT ACTION PLAN**

A representative of the Director of Public Health submitted a report (copies of which had been circulated) to provide an overview of the findings of the drug and alcohol needs assessment and in addition, the action plan following these findings to deliver a more effective treatment offer for residents.

The Cabinet Member for Health and Adult Social Care, Councillor Keith Holloway also attended the meeting and answered questions of the Committee.

Liz McCoy from the Stockport Drug and Alcohol Treatment Service and the Addiction Lead at Pennine Care as the provider also attended the meeting.

The following comments were made/issues raised:-

- It was asked how Stockport was in the position compared to other areas. It was confirmed that this was largely down to the level of funding which Stockport in comparison to other local areas as well as demographics. It was noted that additional substance misuse funding had been received last year around 670k which had helped to reduce caseloads to ensure more time with clients.
- It was noted that an annual report would be submitted to the Health & Wellbeing Board to update them on progress
- Clarification was sought regarding the annual report and if it could also be submitted to the Scrutiny Committee. It was noted in reply that this would be picked up as an action

as part of the scheduling of items, to ensure the Committee is kept informed of progress.

- On raising awareness of treatment services, it was asked what progress had been made on a communication plan for those seeking support. It was commented in reply that whilst the communication plan had not been written yet, stakeholders had been engaged on how awareness could be raised on treatment services for drugs and alcohol issues.
- It was noted that there was also a focus on referrals from criminal justice and hospital pathways to the treatment services which were identified as being lower than other pathways.
- There was a further question on criminal justice referrals and what work was being done to improve this. It was highlighted that the teams were working with the probation service to ensure that support is given to those who need it. It was noted however generally that the cases within Stockport were complex, especially some users who presented with complex health challenges as a result from drugs such as Heroin.
- It was highlighted that housing is an issue for those with complex needs and was this an issue for Stockport. In reply, it was stated that Stockport Homes had been supportive with this problem. It was noted that there was work ongoing to support those who were homeless to provide them with sustainable shelter.
- It was noted that the report did not state any environmental impact but was highlighted that used needles and the strong aromas from drugs like marijuana had an impact on non-users in other flats and houses could be considered as environmental impacts. It was accepted in reply that this was the case.
- It was commented that there was a financial value added through this work which shouldn't be overlooked, particularly for those areas like public health where resources are stretched.

RESOLVED – (1) That the report be noted the report.

(2) That further updates be provided to the Committee on progress against the Action Plan as part of the work programme.

## **9. SCRUTINY REVIEW - UNDERSTANDING THE INEQUALITIES OF HEALTH OUTCOMES ACROSS THE BOROUGH**

A representative of the Director of Public Health submitted a report (copies of which had been circulated) providing the final report from the Scrutiny Review Panel on the 'Inequalities of Health outcomes across the Borough' with a focus on two groups who may face a higher risk of poor health outcomes.

The following comments were made/issues raised:-

- It was noted that the recommendations were to help the Council and system partners to address these issues and inform the strategic review.
- There were thanks given to all those who participated in the review and provided their lived experience. In addition, it was noted for the record thanks given to all those officers who were involved in the review.
- It was asked whether those with different occupations and how this could affect health outcomes. It was noted that this was not considered as there was a focus on those groups who would potentially be at a higher risk from poorer health outcomes.

- Recommendation 1a was noted in terms of the use of neighbourhood profiles and it was asked whether a recommendation should be added to improve or expand data collection. It was highlighted that the recommendation 1a was to note the aspiration to better understand the population of the borough through better data collection.
- It was asked whether people knew what information is out there to support people. It was noted that this was a point that is heard often beyond the groups focussed upon, and the One Stockport Local Directory was important to promote to provide the information needed.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted and the recommendations be endorsed to be submitted to Cabinet for approval.

## **10. CABINET RESPONSE: SCRUTINY REVIEW – ADULT SOCIAL CARE IT SYSTEMS & DATA**

The Director of Adult Services submitted a report (copies of which had been circulated) regarding the Cabinet Response to the Adult Social Care IT Systems & Data Scrutiny Review which provided an update on the actions taken following the review.

The following comments were made/issues raised:-

- The number of actions that had been implemented was welcomed.
- It was asked whether the technical difficulties with mobile working had been resolved. It was highlighted that the provider had not fully fixed the technical issue but this aspect was under review with the supplier.
- It was also noted that the upload of data function affected would still happen once the device reconnects with a WiFi area.

RESOLVED - That the report be noted.

## **11. SCRUTINY WORK PROGRAMME**

A representative of the Assistant Director for Governance submitted a report (copies of which had been circulated) setting out planned agenda items for the Scrutiny Committee's next meeting and Forward Plan items that fall within the remit of the Scrutiny Committee.

RESOLVED - That the report be noted.

The meeting closed at 7.43pm.