

The **HEALTH OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE** met at **WARWICK** on the **19th JULY, 2006**

Present:-

Members of the Committee:

County Councillors: Jerry Roodhouse (Chair)
Anne Forwood (Vice Chair)
John Appleton
George Atkinson
Sarah Boad
John Haynes
Marion Haywood
Bob Hicks
Frank McCarney
Helen McCarthy
Raj Randev
John Ross

District Councillors: Anthony Dixon (Stratford-on-Avon District Council)
Bill Hancox (Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Council)
Michael Kinson (Warwick District Council)
Richard Meredith (North Warwickshire Borough Council)
Bill Sewell (Rugby Borough Council)

Other County Councillors:

Bob Stevens (The Deputy Leader of the Council)

Officers:

Graeme Betts – Strategic Director of Adult, Health & Community Services
Jane Pollard – Scrutiny Manager
Alwin McGibbon – Health Scrutiny Officer

Also Present:-

Mrs. Joan Hughes – President of League of Friends at Shipston on Stour Hospital
Michael Vincent – Member of the Patient and Public Involvement Forum – South Warwickshire PCT

1. **General**

(1) **Apologies for absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Helen King, Director of Public Health, Rugby Primary Trust and Paul Hooper (Regional Tobacco Lead, South Warwickshire PCT) had indicated that he would be unable to attend.

(2) **Members Declarations of Personal and Prejudicial Interests**

Personal interests were recorded in respect of the following members by virtue of being members of the Borough/District Council indicated:-

Councillor John Appleton – Stratford-on-Avon District Council.
Councillor Anthony Dixon – Stratford-on-Avon District Council.
Councillor Bill Hancox – Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Council.
Councillor Michael Kinson – Warwick District Council.
Councillor Richard Meredith – North Warwickshire Borough Council
Councillor Jerry Roodhouse – Rugby Borough Council.
Councillor John Ross – Nuneaton & Bedworth Borough Council.
Councillor Bill Sewell – Rugby Borough Council
Councillor Bob Stevens – Stratford-on-Avon District Council.

(3) **Minutes of the meeting held on 10th May 2006**

(i) **Minutes**

Resolved:-

That the minutes of the Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee's 10th May 2006 meeting be approved and be signed by the Chair.

(ii) **Matters arising**

(a) **Minute 7(1) – Stratford Hospital – Nicol Ward**

It was noted that no reply had been received from South Warwickshire PCT on this issue but Alwin McGibbon confirmed that she would keep this under review.

(b) **Minute 9 – Future of Patient and Public Involvement Fora**

The Chair referred to the Department of Health document "A stronger local voice: A framework for creating a stronger local voice in the development of health and social care services" that had been circulated to members that morning. The Committee agreed his proposal to appoint Councillor John Appleton as the Committee's Champion on this issue. The Chair then thanked Councillor Appleton for agreeing to undertake this role.

2. Public Question Time (Standing Order 34)
Review of Scrutiny

Mrs. Joan Hughes, President of League of Friends of Shipston-on-Stour Hospital introduced the following question she had about the review of scrutiny (see the next item):-

“A number of things have happened since the report was prepared on 21 June 2006

- (a) a Commissioning framework for the Acute Services was produced on 13 July and there will be a Health & Well-Being & Community Commissioning Framework produced later in December 2006
- (b) Government has announced they are to abolish the PPI forums and replace them with LINxs.

It seems we are getting more and more complicated in terms of one body being involved with another body.

Question is whether the Overview and Scrutiny Committee is going to consult the public or voluntary groups over any change in role?”

The Chair said that there was no formal consultation as the review was about the County Council’s internal scrutiny arrangements. However, any suggestions submitted to the Council would be fed into the review process.

3. Review of Scrutiny

The report of the Strategic Director of Performance & Development was considered.

Jane Pollard introduced the report and said that the County Council would consider proposals for any changes on the 31st October. There had been 36 questionnaires returned from Members to date. Paragraph 2 of the report set out the key questions.

The following points were raised during the discussion:-

- (1) O & S Committees did not have “teeth”, needed more powers to convince NHS bodies to change their plans.
- (2) The O&S Coordinating would give initial consideration to the issues at a meeting that afternoon.
- (3) It was suggested that Members should receive refresher training, particularly in the case of the Health O&S that had different functions. Normally overview and scrutiny committees were inward looking while Health was outward looking.
- (4) There was a sense that the Overview and Scrutiny function so far was more about scrutiny than overview.

- (5) It was noted that initially the county had scrutiny panels and separately established policy advisory groups but these had been overtaken by the legislative arrangements for overview and scrutiny committees.
- (6) Overview work had been completed about the dentistry review. Overview in panels worked quite well, select committees had been successful.
- (7) There should be greater involvement of the public and better publicity over what items were coming up on the agenda.
- (8) It was noted that the agenda of the Health O&S Committee had been diverted by the reconfiguration proposals within the NHS.

Jane Pollard said that there were currently proposals before Parliament to extend the County Council's overview and scrutiny responsibilities to include crime and disorder in the same way as for Health.

4. Final Report of the Dentistry Scrutiny Panel

The report of the Strategic Director of Performance & Development was considered.

Councillor Sarah Boad, Chair of the Panel, thanked Victoria Cook and Louise Denton for their work in connection with the Panel. The Panel had learnt a lot about dentistry provision in the county. Ian McIntyre (Consultant in Dental Public Health, South Warwickshire) had been extremely candid in the information he gave the Panel. He had worked extremely hard to get the dentists to sign up to the new contract and to fill any gaps in provision caused by dentists who declined to sign. He had subsequently resigned.

She then paid tribute to the Anita Macaulay who had been passionate about special needs dentistry and had been able to bring her knowledge of that area of dentistry provision to the Panel.

The following points were then raised during the discussion:-

- (1) There was concern that the inflexibility in the contract system had led to some dentists who were already meeting their contracted Units of Dental activity having to ration the number of NHS patients they saw in a day.
- (2) Although provision had been made with a dentist in Henley in Arden to take NHS patients from Studley where all dentists were now private, there had been no communication about this to the people of Studley.
- (3) There was a lack of clarity in some areas and it was felt that the Panel should review the service in six months rather than leave it for twelve months.
- (4) The imposition of parking charges of £3 minimum was costly.
- (5) The implications of not providing hoisting and sedation facilities at Stratford-upon-Avon should also be reviewed in six months rather than twelve.

- (6) There was concern that George Eliot hospital had not been able to supply the details of the emergency dentist.
- (7) The PCT provided a card containing contact numbers and the dentist emergency number should be on it, if it was not, the PCT should be asked to add this.
- (8) It was suggested that one emergency dentist for the county was not enough and that there should be one for each district.
- (9) It was noted that the Rugby PCT had the best record of working with dentists in the county.
- (10) Children only contracts had been allowed for a short time to ensure continuance of NHS dental treatment for children.

It was then Resolved:-

- (a) That the members of the Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee note the findings of the final report of the Dentistry Scrutiny Panel.
- (b) That the Dentistry Scrutiny Panel reconvenes in six months time to reassess the provision of, and access to, NHS dentistry in Warwickshire.
- (c) That the implications of the relocation of Stratford Dental Clinic for special needs patients be reported to the Dentistry Scrutiny Panel in six months time.

5. Terms of Reference for Childhood Obesity Panel

The report of the Strategic Director of Performance & Development was considered.

The Chair suggested a membership of seven councillors, five county councillors and two district/borough councillors. Councillor Sarah Boad had indicated that she wished to serve on the Panel. Councillor Anne Forwood nominated Councillors Bob Hicks and Raj Randev. Councillor Marion Haywood said that she would nominate the two members from the Conservative group as soon as possible. [Administrative note: Councillor Marion Haywood subsequently nominated herself and Councillor George Atkinson.] Councillor Tony Dixon offered to sit on the panel. It was left for the other district/borough councillors to e-mail Alwin McGibbon if they wished to serve on the panel.

The following points were raised:-

- (1) Scope should include formulating advice for parents on a good diet.

- (2) The reference in paragraph 3 to an age range of 2-10 was only an example and the actual age range covered by the review would be wider.
- (3) The County Council had a corporate responsibility in respect of obesity when children were at school.
- (4) It would be left to the panel to decide whether to invite PPIF representation.

It was then Resolved:-

That the Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee agreed the terms of reference for the scrutiny of childhood obesity and that the membership of the Childhood Obesity Panel comprise five County Councillors and two District/Borough Councillors drawn from the membership of the Committee.

6. Acute Services Review

The project plan for the review was circulated to Members.

Alwin McGibbon said that most of the papers were for information but Members needed to look at the programme for the two-day event on the 31st August and 1st September 2006 at Manor Hall, Leamington Spa. She had booked the main hall (capacity 70) and conference room (capacity 100) with a video link. It was expected that there would be a lot of public questions and, if that were so, they would be themed. She asked Members to let her know if there was anything that was missing from the arrangements.

The Chair said that although the two-day event would be open to the public, it was not part of the NHS public consultations and members of the public would not have a right to put questions direct.

The following points arose during the discussion:-

- (1) Questions would be themed and Members would feed them into the debate.
- (2) Questions should be concise and not speeches.
- (3) There was a lot of work planned for the two days and it was essential to keep to the programme timing.
- (4) The questions would be made available to the NHS representatives prior to the meeting.
- (5) In the list of people attending, the reference to 20 people from the Southam Forum should have read Stratford CVS.
- (6) Invitations had been sent to All PPIF.

- (7) Neighbouring local authorities had been informed, as some residents in their areas close to the Warwickshire boundary would use Warwickshire hospitals.
- (8) Financial information was needed. There was an inequality of investment.
- (9) Graeme Betts suggested that it might be helpful for Members to receive before the meeting a copy of the report that had been submitted to County Council.
- (10) The Strategic Health Authority should be asked to address the growing concerns among the public that the proposed changes in Acute Services were inextricably linked to the new Coventry Hospital.
- (11) The County Communications team was being kept informed.
- (12) It was essential that the event should not be treated as a political forum.

The Chair thanked Alwin McGibbon for all the work she had put into preparing for the event.

7. Member Involvement with Local Hospitals

The briefing paper was considered and it was agreed that the following Members be the Committee's points of contacts with the hospitals indicated:-

George Eliot Hospital	Councillors Anne Forwood, John Haynes and John Ross
UHCW	The Chair and Councillor Frank McCarney
Warwick Hospital	Councillors Sarah Boad, Marion Haywood and Raj Randev.

8. Grayson Day Unit, The Avenue Clinic, Nuneaton

Councillors Anne Forwood, Marion Haywood and Richard Meredith gave feedback on a meeting that was held on the 17th July 2006 with representatives of the North Warwickshire Primary Care Trust about the Grayson Day Unit.

The Unit was attached to the Avenue Clinic, Nuneaton and was used for:-

- A site where persons with mental health problems who needed regular treatment could attend to receive injections.
- Therapy work.
- A drop-in centre

The meeting had been called following a report that the unit would close. In fact this was only at the consultation stage. There was no longer an assumption that mental illness lasted a lifetime. The PCT was looking at the possibility of carrying out treatment in the Community on a one to one basis. There were twenty people who used the unit regularly, ten of whom had long-

term problems and attended to receive injections. Members would monitor the situation.

9. South Warwickshire – Maternity Services

The Committee Noted the e-mail concerning changes that meant all women would be asked to attend Warwick Hospital for their initial booking appointment with the midwife. These appointments would take place only at the weekends. Also the charge for a photograph of the scan of the mother's unborn baby had increased to £10.

Councillor Sarah Boad said that a mother living on benefits in her division could not afford the £10. Those relying on public transport at weekends would also find it very difficult and expensive to travel to Warwick Hospital. She asked whether it was possible for women on benefits to receive help towards meeting the cost of the photograph.

Councillor Helen McCarthy was concerned about the shortage of staff at Warwick Hospital, as women from her division would have to go to Warwick Hospital because the facility they used at the moment might close.

Helen Walton, Head of midwifery, said that the proposals were put forward to keep the rest of the service safe. If more patients came to Warwick, the money would come with them under the payment by results system.

Councillor Frank McCarney said that there was an underlying problem of underinvestment that needed addressing.

The Chair said that the Trust would be written to about the question of help to women on benefits. The wider question would be picked up during the Acute Services Review.

10. Update on the Implementation of the recommendations arising from the review (first phase) into Adult Mental Health Services in Warwickshire

The Chair said that this item had been withdrawn.

Alwin McGibbon explained that 5 of the 11 recommendations had been implemented but there was more information needed about those recommendations that had not been implemented.

11. Coventry and Warwickshire Breastfeeding Review - Responses

The Committee noted the responses.

12. Correspondence – Questions from Councillor Copping – Patient Choice/Choose & Book – Response from the South Warwickshire General Hospitals NHS Trust

The Committee noted the response.

13. Future meetings and work programme to date

The programme was noted.

**14. Any other Items
A Stronger Local Voice**

Councillor John Appleton said that work arising out of this document should be incorporated into the work programme. There was a proposal for local authorities to bid to administer the funding arrangements for the new LINKs.

Graeme Betts said that he would be feeding this into Committees in the autumn.

.....
Chair

The Committee rose at 12. 44 p.m.