

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE SCRUTINY COMMISSION FOR HEALTH ISSUES HELD ON
TUESDAY 12 JANUARY 2010 IN THE
BOURGES/VIERSEN ROOM - TOWN HALL**

Present: Councillors B Rush (Chairman), D Fower, P Nash, J Peach and Y Lowndes

Officers Present: Denise Radley, Executive Director, Adult Social Care
Leonie McCarthy, Neighbourhood Manager
Angela Bailey, NHS Peterborough
Michelle Abbott, Lawyer
Lindsay Tomlinson, Senior Governance Officer
Alana Hair, Governance Officer

1. Apologies for Absence

Apologies had been received from Councillor Sharp. Councillor Harrington attended as substitute for Councillor Sharp. Apologies had also been received from Diana Millard, PPI Forum representative.

2. Declarations of Interest and Whipping Declarations

There were no declarations.

3. Minutes of the Meeting Held on 10 November 2009

The minutes of the meeting held on 10 November 2009 were approved.

4. Call In of any Cabinet, Cabinet Member or Key Officer Decisions

There were no call in requests to consider.

5. Safe Sharps Disposal Pilot Project

The Safe Sharps Disposal Pilot planned the placement of special bins for injecting equipment and other sharp implements in public places to reduce the risk of injury and potential transmission of blood borne viruses to members of the public. At its meeting in September 2009, the Commission was advised that one bin had so far been installed and the remainder were due to be installed by the end of that month.

The Neighbourhood Manager gave a presentation during which the Commission was informed that the delay in progressing the project was the result of the team lacking in expertise in what was required to deliver the sharps bins, as the project was complex and it was not just a case of identifying locations and installing the bins.

The Commission heard that the Neighbourhood Team were consulting with users and the agencies working with users on the appropriate locations for the bins. Residents and Councillors were not being directly consulted but would be kept informed of developments.

Observations and questions were raised and responses given including:

- The installations were meant to be finished by the end of November 2009 – why the rather large delay?

- It had been believed that information on proposed locations was already available and it was just a case of the bins being installed. Issues around permissions and land ownership had not been dealt with and were the cause of the current delay.
- There is one (1) bin installed – how long has it been installed for and has the use been as anticipated?
- It was not known how long the bin had been installed and whether its use had been as anticipated – the Neighbourhood Manager undertook to investigate and provide this information to Members outside the meeting.
- Have officers investigated how these issues were dealt with by other authorities?
- Officers have taken in to account national best practice during this process however have not conducted the level of community consultation that Blackpool undertook, as the previous team had said that the proposal had received a negative response.
- Is there a new project finish date?
- The installation of the bins is recognised as an urgent need in Peterborough and the Neighbourhood Manager is seeking support from the Commission to proceed with the installation of the bins without further community consultation.
- To clarify, can permission to install the bins be refused by owners of land?
- That is correct; however a date for the installation of bins on PCC owned land could be agreed.
- Were most of the sites identified for this scheme PCC owned?
- As most of the sites identified are on PCC owned land, installation should not be a problem and could be completed on these sites by the end of March 2010.
- The Neighbourhood Manager suggested that this was a generous amount of time and hoped that all bins, not just those to be installed on PCC owned land, could be installed by the end of March 2010.

ACTION AGREED

The Commission agreed that all bins should be installed by the end of March 2010.

6. NHS Peterborough Budgetary Monitoring Report to 30th November 2009

Final figures for the period to 30th November 2009 are expected to show a deficit of £7 million. Despite a recovery plan being in place to keep down the level of overspend, the plan will not recover all overspends and the overall year end forecast outturn is a deficit of £6.4 million.

In presenting the report, the NHS Peterborough Chief Executive highlighted the following:

- The biggest single area of overspend was in Continuing Care, with a forecast overspend of £2,450k by year end
- A large element of the overspend was in specialist commissioning, with a forecast overspend of £857k by year end
- The report did not capture the overall impact of the additional cost of swine flu being the impacts on GPs, Hospitals and care.
- The deficit of £6.4m equates to approximately 2% of the overall budget, and any deficit will be the first deduction in the 2010/2011 budget. It is expected that government spending and funding will be extremely tight following 2010/2011 and so the NHS plans for basic inflation but no growth. The future will be one of looking for efficiency savings.

Observations and questions were raised and responses given including:

- At the last meeting the Commission suggested a combined resources approach to back office services by linking with other organisations. Has this taken place and what efficiency savings have been made as a result?
- Discussions have taken place between the NHS and PCC on how to bring some back office and commissioning services together and it was expected that something may be in place by the end of March 2010. Discussions have been going on for some time, and no savings have been made to date.
- What efficiency savings will be made with the new Hospital given services will be provided on one site in new buildings, with new technology?
- Commissioning is paid by tariff at a set rate. The NHS will be looking for 7% savings from 2011 for three years. The overhead costs at the new hospital will be far greater but service efficiencies were expected. 57% of the rooms at the new hospital are single rooms. The increased cost of the facility was to be absorbed with efficiency savings and no extra funding.
- As the budget could not be redeemed within the financial year, was NHS Peterborough confident that it had the expertise to put the budget right and prevent an overspend happening again?
- A new lay member had been appointed at board level, with a financial background. A new audit and governance chair was an asset to the board. The strengthened financial team will turn around the budget and control it from now into next year. David Bacon was involved in the financial recovery project and another very experienced financial director had been brought in as an additional resource.
- Had the recovery plan been provided to the Commission? An opportunity to discuss the budget and recovery plan would be very welcome.
- The recovery plan had not been provided to the Commission however NHS Peterborough would be happy to meet and discuss.
- Would the deficit affect any new facilities or services planned at the new hospital?
- There would be no cuts to planned services at the hospital.
- On page 23, appendix 5, what are 'tangible assets' and 'intangible assets'?
- Tangible assets are buildings, equipment, vehicles etc. The NHS Peterborough Chief Executive undertook to report back to the Commission with regard to 'intangible assets'.
- Will another bout of bad weather increase the forecast deficit?
- Bad weather always has an impact on A and E admissions, and places increased pressure on services.

ACTION AGREED

The Commission agreed to hold an informal briefing with NHS Peterborough to go over the Recovery Plan. The NHS Peterborough Chief Executive would provide the details of the most appropriate representatives to attend.

7. Older People's Accommodation Strategy

The accommodation strategy for older people is a critical part of delivering the Community Strategy and Local Area Agreement as it is focussed on supporting as many older people as possible to live in their own homes with good quality care and support. This report will be presented to Cabinet in February 2010 and was presented to the Scrutiny Commission for comment.

The following question was raised and response given:

- Given the current financial constraints, what are the timescales involved?
- Coneygree Lodge, Stanground, should be able to achieve given the number of residents that have already moved. It was envisaged that extra care housing can be developed at a rate of 1 per year. Upgrading 2 homes in the more medium term and funds are in the draft budget but are also investigating other ways to fund the project. Sheltered housing is at the other end of the spectrum, but working with providers as could develop sheltered accommodation as extra care homes.
- With regard to people not wanting to move, it would be more efficient if they did move. What reassurances can we give on them receiving better care? Is the concept of having their own flats putting people off?
- People have said that the facilities are great but that residents are used to a particular way of living. We need to do more to help boost confidence as there is evidence that people can make the change from living in residential care to extra care.
- The problems have been identified – what is being done to address them?
- Changes will be made to the information pack, for example on how extra care is funded, how to access it. Independent Advocacy will take place separately to the initial meeting to allow people more time to absorb the information that they have received. Work needs to be done to increase awareness in extra care. The option of keeping a flat available for short stays to 'try out' the accommodation is being investigated to improve confidence.
- If a resident tries the accommodation and thinks wants to move in right away, will they be able to?
- Residents can be moved quickly but not immediately as there is a panel process.
- Villages?
- There is not a live plan to build any villages. The charity has put its plan on hold in the current economic climate, as the success of the scheme was heavily reliant on part purchases.

ACTION AGREED

The Commission noted the report and supports the Older People's Accommodation Strategy.

8. Care Quality Commission Ratings for Adult Social Care 2008/09

The Commission received the Care Quality Commission's Performance Letter and Summary of Adult Social Care (appendix 1) and the action plan (appendix 2) that has been developed to support the key areas for improvement.

ACTION AGREED

The Commission noted the Quality Commission's Performance Letter and Summary of Adult Social Care and the action plan.

9. Forward Plan of Key Decisions

The Commission received the Council's Forward Plan which outlined forthcoming Executive Decisions for the period January to April 2010.

ACTION AGREED

The Panel noted the report.

10. Work Programme

The Commission approved the current work programme.

11. Date of Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Scrutiny Commission will be held on 9 March 2010.

The meeting began at 7.00 pm and ended at 8.20 pm

CHAIRMAN