



**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
SCRUTINY COMMISSION FOR RURAL COMMUNITIES
HELD IN THE
BOURGES & VIERSEN ROOMS, TOWN HALL, PETERBOROUGH
ON 3 NOVEMBER 2015**

Present: Councillors: Harrington (Chairman), Murphy (Vice-Chairman), Sanders, Brown, Rush, Okonkowski and J R Fox.

Also Present:	Henry Clark	Independent Co-opted Member
	Keith Lievesley	Independent Co-opted Member
	Joe Dobson	Independent Co-opted Member
	Philip Nuttall	Independent Co-opted Member
	Tracy Cannell	Chief Operating Officer, UnitingCare Partnership

Officers in Attendance:	Adrian Chapman	Service Director for Adult Services and Communities
	Clair George	Senior Road Safety Officer
	Peter Garnham	Highway Maintenance & Schemes Commissioning Manager
	Dania Castagliuolo	Democratic Services Officer

1. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Stokes. Councillor Rush was in attendance as substitute.

2. Declaration of Interest and Whipping Declarations

There were no declarations of interest or whipping declarations.

3. Minutes of Meeting Held on 7 September 2015

The minutes of the meeting held on 7 September 2015 were approved as a true and accurate record subject to the addition of Councillor Sanders as he was in attendance at the meeting and had been omitted from the list of those present.

4. UnitingCare Partnership

The Chief Operating Officer of UnitingCare Partnership introduced the report which provided the Commission with information on the UnitingCare Partnership and the UnitingCare model.

The Commission was asked to note the report.

Questions and comments were raised around the following areas:

- Members queried whether there were further staff vacancies within UnitingCare Partnership. *The Chief Operating Officer for UnitingCare Partnership responded that some members of staff had been transferred from Cambridge therefore, the exact number of transferred staff was not known.*
- Members queried whether the Single View of the Patient Record had been successful. *Members were informed that the Single View had already been delivered*

by ORION and was successful due to it not having complexities such as information was only extracted from the system and not inputted. This system allowed medical staff to view medication prescribed to patients by their GP.

- Members queried whether any volunteers had been recruited. *Members were advised that it was important to bring together third sector organisations and have a directory of services which people could be signposted to.*
- A co-opted Member queried what the savings would be for UnitingCare. *Members were advised that the UnitingCare Partnership was trying to stay within the budget available whilst remaining proactive and community based.*
- Members referred to page 7 of the report, 3.4, where it referred to reducing the length of time people stayed in hospital when they were fit to go home by 19% over the outturn in March 2015, and queried whether this would be achievable. *Members were informed that a model which had been introduced in a Joint Emergency Team (JET) area, had seen a 9% reduction in hospital admissions. This model involved providing safe care for frail and confused people as hospital admission was not the best option in some cases.*
- Members were concerned about people who lived in isolated rural areas with no neighbours close by and suggested that an alarm system could be installed for emergencies.
- A co-opted Member expressed concern that the model applied to vulnerable people who were already recognised by the system and queried how other vulnerable people would be identified. *Members were advised that vulnerable or potentially vulnerable people would be identified through working with GP practices case management. The aim was to also open a further referral route with the Housing Department.*
- A Co-opted Member expressed concern that due to the weak mobile phone signal in rural areas Healthcare Professionals would not have access to Single View. *Members were informed that further work on this issue was to be carried out.*
- Members commented that the focus of the UnitingCare Partnership was on the vulnerable and queried whether there was any responsibility for young people. *Members were informed that UnitingCare was only for those who were living with long-term health conditions, the rest was outside of its remit.*

ACTION AGREED

The Commission noted the report.

5. Road Safety in Rural Areas

The Senior Road Safety Officer introduced the report to the Commission which reported details of accidents which were happening on roads in rural areas of Peterborough, partnership work being delivered to reduce the number of casualties and future opportunities for casualty reduction. The following key points were included within the report:

- Casualty Data
- Governance
- Infrastructure in Rural Areas Including Bus Stops/Shelters
- Maintenance of Footpaths and Road Network
- Network Rail Crossing Closure Programme
- Current Prevention Targeted Work
- Safety Cameras
- Future Opportunities

Members were asked to scrutinise the report, challenge where necessary and suggest ideas and initiatives which could impact on reducing road traffic casualties in rural areas.

Questions and comments were raised around the following areas:

- A co-opted Members suggested that the lack of adequate signage in rural areas contributed towards road traffic collisions rural areas and queried whether the signs could be upgraded. *The Highway Maintenance & Schemes Commissioning Manager responded that where signs were in place they were maintained by the Department for Transport to meet safety requirements.*
- Members commented that there was no data within the report which reflected the root cause of accidents. *The Senior Road Safety Officer responded that the main cause of road traffic collisions was people failing to look properly when approaching junctions.*
- Members queried whether motorcyclists or car drivers usually caused accidents. *Members were advised that the percentage was 50/50 in terms of cause.*
- A co-opted member queried the Council had a remit to monitor driving schools. *Members were advised that the Council did not have a remit to monitor driving schools and that this fell under the Driving Standards Agency. Instructors were being encouraged to join the Client Centred Learning scheme through the Safer Peterborough Partnership.*
- A Co-opted Member queried whether most road traffic collisions involved young drivers. *Members were informed that this was not the case at a local level, although nationally reports stated that young drivers could be involved in road traffic collisions within a year of passing their driving test.*
- Members queried the nationality of the majority of drivers who caused accidents on Peterborough roads. *Members were advised that this was not known, although, nationally this information was now being introduced within STATS 19 to identify the nationality of drivers.*
- Members queried whether the 20mph speed limit for villages was enforceable. *Members were informed that a Task and Finish Group was formed on 20mph speed limit and a report went to Cabinet, following this some 20mph speed limits had been implemented although, there was no evidence to imply that this scheme had reduced accidents.*
- Members were concerned that fatalities in Cambridgeshire were rising and queried if the cause could be the use of mobile phones and Satnavs. *Members were informed that fatalities had risen in Cambridgeshire while Peterborough had remained the same, this could be due to Peterborough being a smaller area.*
- Members commented that the local policing teams were rarely present. *Members were informed that the Road Policing Unit were part of the Tri-force and they were a key partner on Cambridgeshire and Peterborough's Road Safety Partnership.*
- Members asked for information on the type of interventions, stated on page 13 of the report, section 4.1.9. *Members were informed that MAST and Mosaic were social demographics and preferred media to target the correct audience.*
- Members queried whether the Council and Partners could lobby insurance companies to offer cheaper insurance premiums to people who attended road safety events. *Members were advised that the Council did not lobby insurance companies directly, although Road Safety GB did. The black box would be a useful tool in reducing young driver accidents.*

ACTION AGREED

The Commission noted the report and agreed for the Senior Road Safety Officer to:

- Circulate a briefing note on fatalities in Peterborough.
- Provide information on the involvement of road policing within the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Road Safety Partnership.

6. Forward Plan of Executive Decisions

The Commission received the latest version of the Council's Forward Plan of Executive Decisions, which contained key decisions that the Leader of the Council anticipated the Cabinet or individual Cabinet Members would make during the course of the forthcoming month. Members were invited to comment on the Plan and, where appropriate, identify any relevant areas for inclusion in the Commission's work programme.

ACTION AGREED

The Commission noted the latest version of the Council's Forward Plan of Executive Decisions.

6. Work Programme

Members considered the Commission's Work Programme for 2015/16 and discussed possible items for inclusion.

AGREED ACTION

The Commission noted and agreed the 2015/2016 work programme.

7. Date of Next Meeting

The Chair advised the Commission that the next meeting was scheduled for Monday 11 January 2016.

The meeting began at 7.00pm and ended at 8.02pm

CHAIRMAN