

Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee

Meeting held 15 November 2018

PRESENT: Councillors Denise Fox (Chair), Ian Auckland, John Booker, Ben Curran, Douglas Johnson, George Lindars-Hammond, Pat Midgley, Mick Rooney, Ian Saunders, Steve Wilson, Cliff Woodcraft and Andrew Sangar (Substitute Member)

.....

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

1.1 An apology for absence was received from Councillor Penny Baker, with Councillor Andrew Sangar attending as her substitute.

2. EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC AND PRESS

2.1 No items were identified where resolutions may be moved to exclude the public and press.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

3.1 There were no declarations of interest.

4. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

4.1 The minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 18th October, 2018, were approved as a correct record and, arising therefrom, further to a response to a question raised under Item 7 – 2019/20 Revenue Budget, relating to the South Yorkshire Pension Fund, and speaking as a Council representative on the South Yorkshire Pensions Authority, Councillor Andrew Sangar reported that the actuarial valuation of the Fund would still be dated 31st March, 2019, and that the contribution rates for the subsequent three years would be determined based on that valuation.

5. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS

5.1 Andrew Benson queried what the Council's plans were for the webcasting of Council meetings.

5.2 The Chair stated that a written response to this question would be provided to Mr. Benson.

6. BUDGET 2019/20 - HEALTH AND SOCIAL CARE UPDATE

6.1 The Committee received a joint presentation from Eugene Walker (Executive Director, Resources) and Greg Fell (Director of Public Health) on the current Council budget position, specifically with regard to health and social care services. Also in attendance for this item were Councillor Olivia Blake (Cabinet Member for

Finance), Councillor Chris Peace (Cabinet Adviser for Health and Social Care), John Doyle (Director of Business Strategy, People Services) and Eleanor Rutter (Consultant in Public Health).

- 6.2 Eugene Walker provided a summary of the overall position, highlighting the fact that the pressures reinforced by increased demand for health and social care represented one of the biggest issues facing this, and other Councils, for several years. He stressed that the position was not sustainable in the long-term, and that it was almost certain that all Councils would run out of funding at some stage in the future. Greg Fell reported on a number of imbalances in the local healthcare system, which included (a) higher rates of hospital admissions than other areas, (b) people spending too long in hospital; thereby having higher needs when they leave, (c) the increasing numbers of people being admitted to hospital, resulting in increasing numbers being discharged, thereby placing a rising demand for adult and social care services, (d) changes in the cohort of looked after children and an increase in out of city placements, resulting in a lack of ability to meet demand locally at times of crisis and (e) benchmarking showing that other health and social care systems elsewhere in the country were driving better use of resources, highlighting the need for the Sheffield system to be rebalanced.
- 6.3 Eugene Walker referred to the Council's present financial position, highlighting the current budget gap, service pressures from 2019/20 to 2022/23, the social care pressures in comparison to Government funding and a breakdown of social care pressures, indicating that such pressures were increasing faster than budget increases. Mr. Walker also referred to the growing overspends, Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) contributions and investments in respect of the Council's social care costs, and referred to the Chancellor's recent budget update. Greg Fell concluded the presentation by reporting on what the budget pressures meant in practice for the Council, the next steps, focusing on the preferred approach of integrated commissioning a need to support localities and neighbourhoods to reduce avoidable emergency hospital admissions and a need for a comprehensive approach to prevention.
- 6.4 Councillor Chris Peace stated that the Council was now seeing the results of the huge budget cuts made to local government funding over the past eight years and the apparent lack of will from successive Governments to help meet the crisis being faced by local authorities. She stated that, whilst the proposed changes with regard to integrated commissioning appeared ambitious, such changes were needed in order to sustain services in the long-term.
- 6.5 Councillor Olivia Blake stated that she was working very closely with Councillor Peace and relevant Council officers in terms of looking for a suitable solution. She stressed that people needed to understand how badly the lack of Government funding had impacted on the Council's ability to provide an effective social care service.
- 6.6 Members of the Committee raised questions, and the following responses were provided:-
- One of the main reasons as to why the system of having a single

commissioning organisation, such as in Manchester, had been successful, was due to the level of Government funding provided. It was hoped that Sheffield could develop and deliver a single commissioning plan to manage demand more effectively across the system, as well as ensuring a positive experience for users of health and care services across the City.

- It was considered that the extra demand in health and social care was not necessarily due to the aging population, but more to do with how ill people were.
- Joint commissioning was being pursued for Children's as well as Adults' Services, but the resource focus in the system was biased towards Adults.
- The reason why there were more hospital admissions in Sheffield than in other areas was believed to be simply due to the fact that we have two large hospitals, with more bed space. In order to slow down the rate of hospital admissions, there was a need to create alternative provision.
- The Council and the CCG was constantly learning from good practice in terms of health care all over the world. One example of good practice included Wigan, where £10m had been invested in voluntary and community sector organisations to look at, and deliver, alternative health provision, which was now resulting in financial benefits in terms of less hospital admissions.
- In terms of the provision of urgent care, the health system had dis-invested in out of hospital primary and community care, which had resulted in there being less capacity for people to be seen quickly which, in some cases, could result in people's health deteriorating even further.
- The Better Care Fund was successful in that it had secured half the required budget savings at the time, but this had only been achieved through funding from the CCG. It was accepted that the Council was the unviable element of the partnership and, if the Council was not able to provide services, this would have an adverse impact on acute care, thereby resulting in an increase in hospital admissions. Bolton had already moved, and Leeds was in the process of moving, away, from a health system of "payment by results", which both areas considered purely a medium term financial saving. It was imperative that the promised additional funding of £20bn from the Government was spent correctly, and for the benefit of the people of Sheffield.
- The purpose of the presentation was solely to provide an update in terms of the Council's budget, and not the NHS budget. Efforts would be made to arrange a meeting where officers of the CCG could attend, and update Members on the Group's budget.
- With regard to Learning Disabilities pressures, a number of services/resources passed to the Council five/six years ago, therefore there was not as much NHS input as there used to be, apart from via Continuing

Health Care packages.

- Although it had yet to be confirmed, there was a possibility that Sheffield could benefit from an additional, one-off payment of £7m in 2019/20, following the Government's recent budget announcement. Whilst this was welcomed, it was not deemed to be a long-term funding solution, and it was planned that it would be allocated towards prevention and home care.
- Mental Health Services had seen significant progress in a jointly commissioned approach to savings that had also included a three-way financial risk share, including the Provider Trust. As a result, a £4m overspend on a £6m budget around two/three years ago was now showing a much improved position. This was the kind of tripartite approach that was needed in the rest of the health and social care sector.
- The funding received from the Better Care Fund was still being allocated for the same purpose – prevention, which resulted in more money being sucked into acute care.
- It was accepted that reducing hospital admissions by just 15% would make a huge difference to the Council's adult social care budget position.

6.7 RESOLVED: That the Committee:-

- (a) notes the information reported as part of the presentation, together with the responses to the questions raised;
- (b) thanks Councillors Olivia Blake and Chris Peace and Eugene Walker, Greg Fell, John Doyle and Eleanor Rutter for attending the meeting, and responding to the questions raised; and
- (c) requests the Policy and Improvement Officer (Emily Standbrook-Shaw) to arrange for officers of the Clinical Commissioning Group to attend a future meeting of the Committee to provide an update on the Group's budgetary position.

7. THE ROLE OF THE LORD MAYOR

7.1 The Committee received a report of the Director of Legal and Governance on the role of the Lord Mayor. The report attached, as appendices, an extract from the Council's Constitution, setting out the Lord Mayor's ceremonial role and what was expected in his/her role in chairing Council meetings, and notes of guidance for the Lord Mayor. The Committee had received a request from Full Council to consider the profile of the role of Lord Mayor, the extent of the role, whether the Lord Mayor was accessible to all and whether the present protocols were fit for purpose. In attendance for this item were Gillian Duckworth (Director of Legal and Governance), Jason Dietsch (Head of Member Services) and Kate Sheldon (Member Support and Civic Manager).

7.2 Members of the Committee raised questions, and the following responses were

provided:-

- There was a list, albeit not exhaustive, of duties the Lord Mayor was expected to attend, which were listed in the notes of guidance appended to the report. Whilst there was no official requirement, either legally or otherwise, for the Lord Mayor to attend, it was expected, in line with tradition, that they should attend such events.
- It was believed that there was already guidance in place, in terms of requiring the Lord Mayor to attend such events, although it would be possible to look at implementing a Lord Mayor's Code of Conduct as a way of strengthening such guidance. The Lord Mayor remained a Councillor during his/her term of office, therefore was bound by the Members' Code of Conduct.
- The Lord Mayor would be advised by the team of supporting officers and the Director of Legal and Governance, when required. The Council would always want to provide its Lord Mayors with an element of flexibility whilst undertaking their role. However, it was acknowledged that their primary role was to promote the City and, in connection with this, there should be a level of respect for such tradition. Imposing specific sanctions could be viewed as being subjective, and the purpose of this report was for the Committee to look at what it wanted to see in terms of the role of the Lord Mayor going forward.
- The only way a Lord Mayor could be removed from office is if they were disqualified as a Councillor.
- Efforts had been made to obtain information from other local authorities on what they wanted from their Lord Mayors, but this had proved difficult. It was accepted that further support could be offered to Lord Mayors. The budget for the Lord Mayor had reduced considerably over the past few years, therefore any plans/proposals needed to be proportionate.
- It was accepted that the primary role of the Lord Mayor was to be a spokesperson for the City, and if it was determined that a Lord Mayor was not undertaking their role to the required standard, this could be considered through the Standards process, and ultimately by the Audit and Standards Committee.
- Some of the views expressed on social media, and referred to local Councillors with regard to the behaviour of the current Lord Mayor, could be seen as being subjective. The Committee needed to give consideration to whether it considered that the current guidance was appropriate for a Lord Mayor in the 21st century.
- It was agreed that the role of the Lord Mayor should be non-political, on the basis that they were representing the whole Council, and the Lord Mayor received guidance on this.

- In previous years, the Council moved away from supporting the Lord Mayor's charity, and made it clear to Lord Mayors that they were expected to take responsibility for fund-raising, collection of funds and the events that support the fund-raising. At the request of recent Lord Mayors, the Council was setting up a registered charity, on the Lord Mayor's behalf, representing a more formal arrangement and an improved system of auditing/checking.
- Whilst it was acknowledged that the current Lord Mayor had relatively little experience of being a Councillor, having only been elected as a Councillor in May 2016, his appointment had not been based on experience. A points-based system, which determines which political group nominates the next Deputy Lord Mayor, had been in place since 2002.

7.3 RESOLVED: That the Committee:-

- (a) notes the contents of the report now submitted, together with the responses to the questions raised; and
- (b) in reporting back to Full Council, requests that the Director of Legal and Governance, in consultation with the current and former Lord Mayors, (i) produces revised guidance in terms of the role of the Lord Mayor and (ii) prepares a Code of Conduct for Lord Mayors, to be incorporated in the Council's Constitution, for consideration by the Audit and Standards Committee, and subsequent referral, for approval, to Full Council.

8. ISSUES TO REPORT FROM SCRUTINY COMMITTEES

- 8.1 The Chairs of the Scrutiny and Policy Development Committees in attendance, updated the Committee on the respective Committee's work.
- 8.2 The Chairs raised the issue of workload and capacity, including whether additional officer support for scrutiny should be found within current resources.
- 8.3 The Chair stated that it was important to ensure greater co-ordination between the Scrutiny Committees, and suggested regular meetings between the four Chairs.
- 8.4 RESOLVED: That the Committee:-
 - (a) notes the information now reported; and
 - (b) requests the Policy and Improvement Officer to investigate the two issues raised, and report back on possible outcomes to the next meeting.

9. PRESENTATION TOPICS FOR THE JANUARY 2019 COUNCIL MEETING

- 9.1 The Policy and Improvement Officer (Emily Standbrook-Shaw) stated that the Leader of the Council (Councillor Julie Dore), at the Council meeting held on 3rd October, 2018, had requested the Committee to consider agreeing Community Safety as the presentation topic for the January 2019 Council meeting.

- 9.2 RESOLVED: That the Committee notes the information now reported but, given the timing and importance of Brexit, (a) requests that the presentation topic for the January 2019 Council meeting should be Brexit, looking at how the Council was preparing for Brexit, and its likely impact on the City and (b) suggests that a presentation on Community Safety, comprising a joint presentation between the Council and the Police, and which would also look at the Community Safety Partnership, be arranged at a future meeting of the Safer and Stronger Communities Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee.

10. WORK PROGRAMME 2018/19

- 10.1 The Committee received a report of the Policy and Improvement Officer, which set out its Work Programme for 2018/19.
- 10.2 Councillor George Lindars-Hammond questioned the timing of the meeting at which the Committee scrutinises the budget for the forthcoming year, indicating that the current timing - on the morning prior to the Cabinet meeting at 2.00 p.m., at which the budget was determined – gave the Committee little, or no, opportunity to recommend any changes.
- 10.3 RESOLVED: That the Committee:-
- (a) notes the information now reported; and
 - (b) in light of the comments now made, requests the Policy and Improvement Officer to look into how the format or the date of the meeting could be changed.

11. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

- 11.1 It was noted that the next meeting of the Committee would be held on Wednesday, 13th February, 2019, at 10.00 a.m., in the Town Hall, which, given the discussion in the previous item, could be changed.

This page is intentionally left blank