

MANCHESTER CITY COUNCIL SCRUTINY COMMITTEE MEETINGS JUNE 2015

I attended MCCs Neighbourhoods Scrutiny Committee on 23rd June and Health Scrutiny Committee on 25th June respectively. As usual, I'm happy for material in it to be forwarded to other interested parties, with the proviso that it's my interpretation of events and details may not necessarily be completely accurate.

The **NEIGHBOURHOODS SCRUTINY COMMITTEE (ESC)** was led by the Chair Cllr Daniel Gillard. Other attendees included Cllr Kate Chappell, Executive Member for the Environment.

Matters arising from the last meeting.

Cllr Watson reported that the citizen who had initiated the plastic bags petition, discussed at the last meeting, had asked for a second legal opinion on the decision reached at that meeting (i.e. that a local by-law was not possible). Cllr Austin agreed that a second opinion should be sought, but Cllr Longsdon was against. Another Councillor suggested the Council's own solicitor's opinion. The item was left with the Chair undertaking to find out if a second opinion was appropriate and to report back to the meeting.

Item 5 Local Plan Review.

This was an item seeking approval for review of several local planning documents, which will be an updating of the council's planning policy to ensure it is consistent with the emerging Greater Manchester Spatial Framework (GMSF). The officer presenting the report noted that the changes in planning documents themselves will be a long drawn out process and will include special plans for district centres. There was no presentation as such and the item moved quickly to questions. In response to a question from Cllr Watson, the officer stated that the budget for the initial work, being done by MCC Officers, will be funded from the AGMA budget.

Other points emerging as a result of questions were:

- Executive Members for individual LAs will have a veto over the GMSF;
- the plan is a statutory process so it is not possible to say when it will come to the Council for approval, because of possible planning inspector involvement (RV note – as in the last MCC major planning review);
- enabling legislation for the GMSF is currently going through the House of Lords.

Discussion then moved on to how much public consultation there would be. Cllr Watson was concerned about the imposition of a plan that affects neighbourhoods that citizens will have no say in. Cllr Shone was also concerned on this point and pointed out that the Northenden neighbourhood forum has residents working on their own local plan. The discussion briefly diverted to local concerns about shisha bars and betting shops.

The meeting agreed the recommendations put forward in the report and the Chair undertook to ask for annual or more frequent updates on the progress of the GMSF.

(Point made by Joe Clough: councillors were very concerned re consultation on the plan, but apparently not concerned about lack of consultation on DevoManc and an elected mayor!).

Item 6 Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy and Stakeholder Implementation Plan.

The report for this item ran to over 70 pages and it was introduced by Cllr Chappell. The original document came to the Committee earlier this year and Cllr Chappell reported that the latest report is the draft of an implementation plan developed by a range of stakeholders (not specified) across

the City. The plan covers green spaces and waterway corridors (hence 'green and blue'). There was no presentation and the meeting moved straight to questions. From these, some points emerged:

- some Cllrs see a problem interacting with Network Rail (embankments) and United Utilities (small brooks). Cllr Chappell said those stakeholders need to be at the centre of the strategy;
- Officers admitted the Highways Agency had not been contacted yet as part of the strategy, but they will do so;
- Cllr Igbon was not happy with the consultation with respect to her ward, Hulme – it appears ward maps had not been forwarded to newly elected Councillors;
- The current tree strategy is out of date and poor (Cllr Watson) – this will be discussed at the September meeting, although Cllr Chappell was looking to move this to the Environment Scrutiny Committee;
- Cllr Noor was unhappy with the maintenance of Council green spaces generally – Cllr Chappell undertook to pass this on the Cllr Murphy, who is responsible for this issue;

Finally, the Committee members agreed to endorse all 4 recommendations in the report.

Item 7 Update on the Recommendations of the Task and Finish Group into the role of Managing Agents and Letting Agents in the Private Rented Sector (PRS).

There was no presentation on the 26 page tabled report of this group and councillors had only received a copy of it at lunchtime(!), so the Chair adjourned the meeting for 5 minutes to allow them to read it (RV - not long enough!).

In response to questions some points emerged:

- there is an empty property team on the Council to deal with issues related to neglected empty property e.g. vermin.
- The Tenants Charter, endorsed by most agents, is voluntary, but not quality checked because of the large size of the PRS;
- Council officers aim to target the small minority of agents who are a problem;
- the number of agents signed up to the Tenants Charter covers about one third of the private rented property in the City (400 agents signed up, representing 15,000 properties I think);
- Council officers assured Councillors that the problems of 'hard core' properties, derelict or with missing landlords, are not being 'kicked into the long grass';
- Officers undertook to look into how they can work together with residents and neighbourhood groups;
- Cllr Igbon (Hulme) was concerned with how rental prices can be stopped increasing 2 or 3 times a year in some areas;
- It was agreed a workshop on the issues would be run for new Councillors;
- The Association of Rental and Letting Agents (ARLA) have been involved in the development of standards and have been promoting the Tenants Charter to their members.

Recommendations in the report were agreed and the Chair asked for a 6 monthly update on progress.

Item 8 **Overview Report** was agreed without discussion.

The meeting closed at 1535hrs.

The **HEALTH SCRUTINY COMMITTEE** was chaired by Cllr Craig. Also in attendance was Cllr Andrews, MCC Executive Member for Adult Health and Wellbeing.

Matters arising from the last meeting.

One outstanding item was noted – a visit to an A and E department has not been arranged yet.

Item 5. Community Nursing in South Manchester.

The report on this was presented by Claudette Elliot, Deputy Chief Officer of S. Manchester Clinical Commissioning Group(CCG), Mandy Bailey, Chief Nurse, University Hospital of South Manchester, and A.N. Other. It mainly concerned the plan to change the way District Nursing (DN) services in S Mcr are delivered. A pilot model of delivery has been trialled initially in 2 neighbourhoods, then 4. Following the success of this, it has been decided to go forward with 4 community care schemes, each with an integrated team comprising three specialities. However, 2 nurses who addressed the meeting were concerned that the new scheme will mean the loss of 1 in 5 nursing posts in the DN service, and will increase the number of people with chronic diseases attending A and E departments. They said it will also increase the case load of the remaining DNs and will actually result in an increase in overall costs to the Trust.

Several Cllrs were concerned that the quality of service delivery to patients will go down and the proposal is all about saving money. Cllr O'Neill asked Mandy directly if the proposal will be better for patients. She answered yes, because of better integration of care. In answer to another question, she said that nurses will be joined by other allied health professionals in the new system and there will be set specifications for care work. Some Cllrs were concerned about lower level workers i.e. below professional level. Mandy mentioned care qualifications which all workers will be trained to. The Chair asked about the practical increase in time allocated per patient with fewer staff – presenters said this will be achieved by better IT reporting systems to reduce travel time and getting the right staff to the right patients i.e. less admin, more clinical work. There were other questions on the use of agency staff, which presenters admitted would be necessary occasionally, and unpaid carers, which the DNs and other staff will aim to support.

The Chair summed up by recording the Committee's concerns on the plan and asked for a future update on the integration of community services and staff numbers (including bank contracts) with respect to the forthcoming guidelines (to be circulated to all Committee members).

Item 6. One Team – Place based care.

The report for this item was presented by Ed Dyson, of Central Manchester CCG and Hazel Summers, Interim Strategic Director for Adults, Health and Wellbeing(!). It followed on from the previous item in that the proposal aims to provide more co-ordinated care, based on 12 teams across the city. The areas covered by each team have a population of about 40-50,000 each. There are 4 areas in the North of the City, 4 in the Centre and 4 in the South. The item quickly moved to questions:

- Cllr Newman pointed out that some Council wards have more needs than others – how will this work? Ed Dyson commented will any ward need less than one twelfth?
- A Cllr asked if the time scale of implementation by April 2016 is realistic. The presenters were sure it was and added they already have the new teams working in some areas.
- Cllr Andrews commented that the proposed arrangements are not set in stone – they may be modified as experience is gained.
- Cllr Swannick asked about the possible conflict in boundaries between NHS Trusts, CCGs, ward boundaries and, in some cases, cross Local Authority issues.

The Chair asked how GP practices are involved in the process. Presenters said there is enthusiasm within the primary care sector for the proposed model, and there are some GP 'champions'. Finally, the Committee approved the two recommendations in the report.

Item 7. North Manchester General Hospital - oral report.

After the Chair had commented that some of the Committee's N.Mcr members were not present, Nadine Armitage, Head of Partnerships, Pennine Acute Trust, gave her report. This was not particularly illuminating. Among the points she mentioned were: increased demand for urgent care; an ageing Estate (buildings); and an ageing population.

Item 8. Additional membership of Learning Disability Services Task and Finish Group.

The Committee approved the composition of this group.

Item 9. Health and Wellbeing Update.

Part 1 of the report (not tabled) was intended to provide Committee members with an overview of developments across Health and Social Care. Brain Gillespie from the MCC Public Health Team and his colleague Julie talked about the report. Julie spoke about the Health bus, which has been used to do screenings locally. She revealed that 75% of those screened had pre diabetes indicators (!). However, the Health bus has been discontinued due to the age of the bus and cost, but the model has shifted to free of charge community venues.

Part 2 of the report was an update on health issues from Manchester's CCGs, presented by Nick Gomm, Head of Corporate Services – North, Central and South Manchester CCGs.

There was some discussion after questions from Councillors about the take up and provision of 7 day access to primary care. Cllr Newman commented that some GPs are not doing it, and some are not publicising it, so it is not uniformly available on (his) anecdotal evidence.

There were further questions and considerable discussion on the 'Healthier Together' section of the report, concerning the recent consultation on which GM hospitals would be 'specialist' and which 'general'. Cllr Newman appeared to be making an appeal for his local, Wythenshawe Hospital, because of its proximity to the Airport and motorways. However, he did point out that 75% of respondents to the consultation were in favour of 5 specialist hospitals, but only 4 have been designated as such. Cllr Judge supported him and commented that he thought the consultation questionnaire was very difficult to understand and complete sensibly.

The Chair asked Nick Gomm for information about the choice of 4 specialist hospitals rather than 5. Nick said the main factor was clinical expertise in relation to **Greater** Manchester, rather than Manchester itself. Another factor was the time taken to get emergency patients to an appropriate hospital. He apologised for the lack of information on the results of the consultation and will provide more in future. There was a positive vote on Cllr Newman's proposal to keep Wythenshawe as a specialist hospital, with Cllr Swannick abstaining.

Item 10. Overview Report.

On item 3, CQC Reports, Cllr Swannick asked for a report back on one of the care homes (I Care solutions, Egerton Road South) that had received a 'requires improvement' assessment. Hazel Summers underook to report back.

RV note – disappointingly there was almost no mention of Health Promotion in the meeting.
Dick Venes, 4th July 2015.