

HEALTH SCRUTINY SUB-COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held at 4.30 pm on 15 October 2014

Present:

Councillor Pauline Tunnicliffe (Chairman)
Councillor David Jefferys (Vice-Chairman)
Councillors Ruth Bennett, Mary Cooke, Ian Dunn,
Judi Ellis, Terence Nathan, Charles Rideout and
Melanie Stevens

Maureen Falloon, Linda Gabriel, Justine Godbeer and
Peter Moore

Also Present:

Councillor Robert Evans, Councillor Diane Smith and
Councillor Stephen Wells

40 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Hannah Gray, Catherine Osborne and Rosalind Luff, Stewart Tight (who was replaced by Peter Moore) and Joanna Frizelle (who was replaced by Justine Godbeer.)

Apologies for lateness were received from Councillor David Jefferys and Dr Angela Bhan. Apologies for leaving before the end of the meeting were received from Councillor Ian Dunn and Peter Moore.

41 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Mary Cooke declared an interest as she was previously employed by Bromley Healthcare and had been responsible for the provision of urgent healthcare in Bromley.

42 QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS AND MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC ATTENDING THE MEETING

Questions had been received from Susan Sulis, Secretary of the Community Care Protection Group. These are attached as appendix 1. The Chairman added that she had written to Mrs Sulis thanking her for her interest in services in the borough.

43 MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF HEALTH SCRUTINY SUB-COMMITTEE HELD ON 9TH APRIL 2014

In relation to minute 35 (NHS 111 Update), Maureen Falloon asked whether there was an intention to consult with stakeholders. A response would be sought from Dr Angela Bhan after the meeting.

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 9th April 2014 be confirmed.

44 TERMS OF REFERENCE

The Sub-Committee noted its terms of reference. Members commented that as health and social care were merged it would be necessary to review how scrutiny was carried out – this would be discussed with officers.

45 PRUH PERFORMANCE REVIEW - ONE YEAR ON

The Sub-Committee received an update on performance at the Princess Royal University Hospital (PRUH) one year on from when the Kings College Hospital Trust had acquired the sites and services of the now dissolved South London Healthcare Trust. Representatives from Kings, Sue Field, Head of Capacity Planning and Service Development and Sally Lingard, Director of Communications, attended the meeting to present the report and answer questions.

The Sub-Committee had a number of questions relating to staffing. Kings had put in place a recruitment plan and the PRUH was supported by bank and agency staff and staff from the Denmark Hill site; in September, 182 Band 5 nurses had started, and the Trust was on-track to deliver an extra 500 nurses in post by Christmas. In response to a question about over-reliance on agency staff in certain areas, such as for night-time services, it was confirmed that this was not the case, and that some agency staff were on long term contracts. Members requested further information about the numbers of bank and agency nurses used at the PRUH, if possible by the number of shifts covered compared to permanent staff.

Members also asked about retention of existing nursing staff. It was acknowledged that there had been a period of uncertainty the previous autumn, but the position was now far more stable. More matron posts had been put in across all sites as well as a number of specialist nursing posts. Staff now felt more developed and more involved.

Linda Gabriel reported that Healthwatch had reviewed maternity services the previous year and found that there was significant pressure on midwives at peak periods. Recruitment was being carried out and levels of demand were being investigated. It was clear that patients were being drawn in from areas well beyond Bromley and the priority had to be serving the local catchment area. The representatives offered to provide more information on midwives after the meeting.

Questioned about patient transport, the representatives confirmed that immediate transfers between sites were arranged when needed, but that it was not the intention to move patients from Orpington to Denmark Hill. The Denmark Hill site was under significant pressure and it was important to keep patients close to home where possible and to use the facilities at sites within the borough. For example, some neurology services were now provided at Orpington.

Maureen Falloon commented that good quality food was important for recovery, and there appeared to be inconsistency around issues such as providing support for older people to eat and lack of choice. It was acknowledged that there were some quality issues that needed addressing. The representatives also offered to provide information on the dementia care initiative.

The Trust representatives described the efforts that had been made to change the culture of the PRUH and improve staff morale. The sites at Denmark Hill and the PRUH had historically worked very differently, but the Kings vision was for there to be one organisation across all sites. Directors had responsibility for their services at all sites and all Divisions had been expanded and integrated. The most senior manager, clinician and nursing posts were filled by people with long-standing knowledge of Kings and key roles further down the organisation had been filled and posts back-filled at Denmark Hill as necessary. Team building was important and a series of staff events and roadshows had been held. A staff survey in November 2013 had identified issues which needed addressing, including the need for managers and clinicians to work closely together and the need for staff to have more responsibility and feel more empowered, without the need to always refer issues up the management chain for approval. Reporting of incidents had gone up at the PRUH – this was seen as a positive sign, that staff now felt more able to raise issues of concern.

It was acknowledged that the financial challenges for Kings in taking over the PRUH were greater than had been anticipated. This was due to low levels of staffing and funding for bank and agency staff being too high, and the levels of equipment found to be not fit for purpose.

The Sub-Committee discussed the issues around patient discharge and patients being kept in hospital too long. The PRUH was at 93% occupancy levels when closer to 90% was needed to cope with peaks and troughs of emergency admissions. It was estimated that around 80 patients were being kept at the PRUH when medically they did not need to be there. Often these were people with complex needs, and the biggest problem was putting in place care packages to enable them to leave hospital. It was estimated that about half of these patients would be from Bromley.

Progress was being made towards achieving the four hour maximum wait for emergency care, and the 95% target had been reached on nine days during August. The service was still on trajectory to hit 95% by March 2015.

Asked about what the Sub-Committee could do to help the Trust, the Trust representatives responded that Councillors could encourage residents to use the urgent care centres, to go the PRUH rather than Denmark Hill, where they would receive exactly the same quality of service, and inform the Trust if they were unable to attend appointments.

A Member raised the issue of patients who rang up for appointments being told that they would have to wait to receive a letter with a suggested date and time. The representatives responded that there was a major transformation project on these issues which should eliminate this. It was also acknowledged that the waits for blood tests were too long and this was being looked at.

The Committee discussed Referral to Treatment (RTT) waiting times. Patients were entitled to choose a hospital close to home or with a shorter waiting list. The number of patients who had waited longer than 52 weeks had been reduced to 2, and would be none by the end of October. The two week maximum waiting time for suspected cancer had been achieved in September – increased outpatient and diagnostic capacity had been provided.

The Chairman thanked the representatives from Kings for the excellent progress that had been made and for their expert update to the Sub-Committee.

46 UPDATE ON NHS S.256 FUNDS APPROVAL - BROMLEY NHS HEALTH CHECKS PROGRAMME

The Sub-Committee received an update on two projects supported from Public Health monies moved from Bromley PCT to the Council under a section 256 agreement in March 2013. The two projects were –

- To evaluate the NHS health Check against pan-London standards. It was found that the majority of the pan-London standards had been either fully or partially achieved, and areas for improvement had been identified.
- To improve the diabetes element of the NHS Health Checks by conducting a diabetes prevention audit. The aim was to perform a baseline audit for those people identified as meeting the criteria for the Diabetes Filter at the NHS Health Check between April 2011 and March 2013.

The health checks were mainly provided by GP practices, but also by community pharmacies and by a community outreach company. A number of areas where the scheme needed to be improved had been identified; one issue was monitoring, and it was intended that a “dashboard” would be implemented. Members noted that take up was disappointing in some practices, and officers confirmed that they were providing support to raise this up. They were also using the community interest company to focus on areas where take up was low.

A Member queried whether the figures for advice offered could be relied on; it was confirmed that a new system had been introduced which allowed for better monitoring, and there was feedback to GP practices including on what data was missing.

Members asked about the plans to introduce a discount card for health related products (such as fruit and vegetables.) A similar scheme was working well in Southwark. Officers were working with Trading Standards and the Town Centre Managers on this; the scheme was not means tested and also aimed to help small businesses. It depended on shops and traders offering a discount in the hope of improved footfall.

Members considered that outcome measures were needed to assess the real effectiveness of the health check. The Chairman added that some outcome measures were not sufficiently robust- for example, abstinence from alcohol for three months did not involve a sufficiently long period to prove that treatment had been effective.

RESOLVED that the progress made with these projects be noted.

**47 PROCUREMENT OF AN URGENT CARE CENTRE SERVICE AT
 BECKENHAM BEACON**

At its meeting on 9th April 2014 the Sub-Committee had scrutinised plans to commission a new Urgent Care Centre at Beckenham Beacon. Bromley CCG had since undertaken a competitive procurement exercise and a preferred bidder, Greenbrook Healthcare, had been identified. The new service was due to commence on 14th December 2014.

RESOLVED that the Sub-Committee is satisfied that Bromley CCG's procurement and ratification process used to select a preferred provider for the Urgent Care Centre at Beckenham Beacon was fair and transparent, involving members of the public.

**48 WORK PROGRAMME 2014/15
 Report CSD14147**

The Sub-Committee noted its work programme, and the Chairman invited Members to suggest any additional issues that should be scrutinised. Councillor David Jefferys suggested that an update on Academic Health Services Networks would be useful.

The Meeting ended at 5.55 pm

Chairman

This page is left intentionally blank

HEALTH SCRUTINY SUB-COMMITTEE

15th October 2014

Minute 42: QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

From Susan Sulis, Secretary, Community Care Protection Group

(1) ACCESSIBILITY OF AGENDA DOCUMENTS UNDER THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE EQUALITIES ACT 2010, AND GOOD PRACTICE.

- (a) Has the Council adopted a Policy &/or Protocols to maximise the accessibility of Agenda information to members of the public?
- (b) Does it have any responsibility to do so?
- (c) If so, who is the Nominated Officer?
- (d) If a policy/protocol exists, what is its title, and where is it found?

Reply:

The Council does not have a specific policy/protocol document. In common with all other Councils, Bromley is required to publish agenda papers for its meetings at least five clear working days before the meeting (this excludes the day of the meeting and the day of publication). Paper copies are made available at the Civic Centre and the Central Library, and all agendas are published on the Council and Democracy pages of the Council website. Advance notice of meetings is given in local libraries and on the website. In addition, agenda papers are posted out to various interested third parties. The Council always complies with and exceeds the legal requirements in this area.

(2) TIME ALLOWED FOR MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC TO SCRUTINISE THE AGENDA PAPERS, RESEARCH, AND FORMULATE PUBLIC QUESTIONS FOR THE COMMITTEE.

Often, the time allowed for this is less than a day, and, makes it impossible for many people, especially those who are visually impaired, to even read through the Agenda before the 5pm deadline for submission of Questions.

Will the Committee take steps to improve this unsatisfactory situation?

Reply:

The deadline for submitting questions (which applies to Members of the Council as well as to the public) is 5pm four days before each meeting. This was agreed by all Members of the Council to allow sufficient time for the answers to questions to be prepared and agreed before the meeting. This allows a minimum of two days between the latest publication time and the deadline for submission of questions.

It should be noted that questions need to be relevant to the responsibilities of the meeting concerned, but not necessarily directly related to the content of particular reports.

We do try to publish agendas promptly as soon as all the reports are ready, rather than waiting until the legal deadline. However, it is accepted that publication of the agenda for this current meeting was delayed until fairly close to the deadline, reducing the time available to ask questions about details in the reports, particularly for people who are not able to look at the agenda on-line. We will review our deadlines to ensure that in future agendas are published several days before the legal deadline.

(3) PROVISION OF FREE SCHOOL MEALS IN BROMLEY AND PATTERNS OF INEQUALITY. (Ref. CCPG Public Questions to 9th April 2014 HSSC item 4 Minutes, Appendix A, p. 12-14).

2013 Data was provided by school, but not by ward, as requested.

To reveal patterns of deprivation, will the Council provide the July 2014 data by school and ward, rather than requiring the questioners to ascertain the addresses of 95 schools, and attempt to identify which ward they are in?

Reply:

The data for July 2014 is set out below. It is not meaningful to present this data by the ward in which the school is situated. This is primarily because the characteristics of the school population contains pupil data from outside the immediate area of the school and so will not reflect the true demographic for that area.

Therefore, set out in a separate table is the number of children receiving free school meals by the ward in which they reside, as at January 2013. This data will not be updated again until 2015.

<u>School Name</u>	<u>Eligible on Census Day</u>	<u>Pupils on Roll</u>
<u>Primary</u>		
Alexandra Junior School	40	253
Alexandra Infant School	25	197
Balgowan Primary School	29	653
Bromley Road Infant School	65	247
Churchfields Primary School	52	378
Hawes Down Juniors	11	269
Hawes Down Infant School	8	222
Hillside Primary School	135	356
Marian Vian Primary School	34	618
Gray's Farm Primary School	133	442

Oak Lodge Primary School	42	626
Stewart Fleming Primary School	84	413
Wickham Common Primary School	17	422
Worsley Bridge Junior School	44	251
Burnt Ash Primary School	124	422
Harris Primary Academy Kent House	130	432
Pickhurst Infants' School	26	361
Pickhurst Junior School	42	518
Princes Plain Primary School	104	542
Southborough Primary School	82	430
Harris Primary Academy Crystal Palace	106	344
Valley Primary School	70	476
Mead Road Infant School	9	85
Red Hill Primary	122	689
St John's CE Primary School	58	262
Mottingham Primary School	129	334
Castlecombe Primary School	72	263
Dorset Road Infant School	20	72
Chelsfield Primary School	16	92
Crofton Infant School	41	557
Darrick Wood Junior School	29	385
Darrick Wood Infant School	25	350
Downe Primary School	11	83
Farnborough Primary School	20	219
Green Street Green Primary	24	440
Pratts Bottom Primary School	6	72
St. Mary Cray Primary School	87	199
The Highway Primary School	33	217
Warren Road Primary School	33	842
James Dixon Primary School	128	425
Leesons Primary School	73	210
Midfield Primary School	72	326
Edgebury Primary School	13	225
Scotts Park Primary School	42	467
Oaklands Primary School	82	466
Clare House Primary School	9	272
Perry Hall Primary School	43	424
Poverest Primary School	70	204
Bickley Primary	24	390
Manor Oak Primary School	58	204
Keston C.E. Primary School	15	251
Parish C.E. Primary School	57	521
St George's CE Primary	33	306
Unicorn Primary	15	341

Cudham CE Primary School	15	103
St Paul's Cray CE Primary	94	242
St Mark's C.E. Primary School	35	425
Chislehurst (CofE) Primary	4	211
St Joseph's R.C.Primary School	14	206
St Vincent's Catholic Primary	21	226
St Philomena's RC Primary	24	207
St.Anthony's R.C Primary	35	168
St Peter & St Paul R.C.	35	211
St James' RC Primary School	3	218
Blenheim Primary	90	217
Biggin Hill Primary School	28	386
Crofton Junior School	55	701
Holy Innocents Catholic Primary	20	211
St Mary's Catholic Primary	10	424
Highfield Infant School	8	271
Highfield Junior School	19	383
Hayes Primary School	28	651
Raglan Primary School	24	438
Tubbenden Primary School	47	650
Primary total	3481	25614
<u>Secondary</u>		
Harris Beckenham	190	866
Harris Bromley	222	892
Bishop Justus	130	1128
Bullers Wood School	105	1508
Coopers Technology College	159	1363
Langley Park School for Boys	49	1675
Ravens Wood School	67	1507
Newstead Wood School	19	1039
Kemnal Technology College	140	888
Hayes School	56	1643
Beaverwood School for Girls	134	1279
Charles Darwin	115	1282
St Olave's Grammar School	7	955
Langley Park Girls School	55	1636
The Ravensbourne School	205	1500
Darrick Wood School	94	1681
The Priory School	214	1102
Secondary total	1961	21944
<u>Special</u>		
Glebe School	44	142
Marjorie McClure School	40	98

Burwood School	22	43
Riverside School	74	206
Special total	180	489
Totals	5622	48047

**Pupils Attending Bromley Schools
Eligible for Free School Meals (FSM)
by Ward of Residence
(Based on School Census return January 2013)**

Ward	Number eligible for FSM on 14/01/2013	All Pupils	% Eligible
Bickley	99	1617	6%
Biggin Hill	117	1386	8%
Bromley Common and Keston	316	2437	13%
Bromley Town	192	2159	9%
Chelsfield and Pratts Bottom	96	1991	5%
Chislehurst	105	1346	8%
Clock House	156	1692	9%
Copers Cope	160	1066	15%
Cray Valley East	525	2374	22%
Cray Valley West	576	2872	20%
Crystal Palace	313	1028	30%
Darwin	41	586	7%
Farnborough and Crofton	136	2302	6%
Hayes and Coney Hall	107	2712	4%
Kelsey and Eden Park	122	2293	5%
Mottingham and Chislehurst North	385	1451	27%
Orpington	280	2117	13%
Penge and Cator	453	1859	24%
Petts Wood and Knoll	56	1617	3%
Plaistow and Sundridge	238	1876	13%
Shortlands	49	1358	4%
West Wickham	59	2455	2%
Out of Borough Ward	876	7139	12%
Grand Total	5457	47733	11%

This page is left intentionally blank