



Minutes
of the
Meeting of the
Health Scrutiny Committee
on
Thursday, 11 July 2019

1. **Agenda**

F_PRO

2. **Minutes**

F_PRO

Minutes



To: All Members of the Health Scrutiny Committee, Chief Executive, Chief Officers, All officers named for 'actions'

From: Legal, Democratic & Statutory Services
Ask for: Michelle Diprose
Ext: 25566

HEALTH SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

THURSDAY, 11 JULY 2019
M I N U T E S

ATTENDANCE

MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE (20) - QUORUM 7

COUNTY COUNCILLORS (10)

S Brown, M A Eames-Petersen, L J Greensmyth, F Guest, D Hart, D J Hewitt, S Quilty (*Chairman*), R A C Thake, G Tindall, C J White (*Vice Chairman*)

DISTRICT COUNCILLORS (10)

P Cousin (St Albans), M Downing (Stevenage) (*substitute for M McKay*), B Fitzsimon (Welwyn Hatfield), Amanda Grimston (Watford), D Lambert (Hertsmere), S Newton (East Herts) (*substitute for N Symonds*), G Nicholson (Broxbourne), A Scarth (Three Rivers)

OTHER MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE:

Upon consideration of the agenda for the Health Scrutiny Committee meeting on 11 July 2019 as circulated, copy annexed, conclusions were reached and are recorded below.

Note: No conflicts of interest were declared by any member of the Committee in relation to the matters on which conclusions were reached at this meeting.

CHAIRMAN'S INITIALS

.....

PART 1 ('OPEN') BUSINESS

1. MINUTES

1.1 The minutes of the meeting of 15 May 2019 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

PUBLIC PETITIONS

None received.

3. PROPOSED MOVE OF MOORFIELDS EYE HOSPITAL'S CITY ROAD SERVICES

Officer Contact: Denise Tyrrell, Programme Director, Herts Valleys Clinical Commissioning Group (Tel: 07818 291387)

3.1 The Committee received a report to from NHS England Specialist Commissioning and NHS Camden Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) on behalf of all commissioners of Moorfields' services advising they were leading a public consultation on a proposed new centre for Moorfields Eye Hospital. The Committee was invited to respond to the consultation which provided a summary of the proposals, an update on discussions so far and an outline of the consultation plan for the period 24 May to 16 September 2019.

3.2 Members agreed the move was positive as it would be more consistent and would bring clinical expertise together.

3.3 Members noted the challenges for some patients travelling to the new proposed site, but were pleased that alternative methods of transport were being investigated.

3.4 Members heard the four sources of funding to relocate the hospital were from the Sustainability & Transformation Partnership (STP), the Moorfield Foundation Trust, sale proceeds from the existing building and through fund raising.

3.5 The Committee heard the proposed move from City Road to another site would not include changes to the satellite sites, although over time these would be considered as part of a wider review of the ophthalmology model of care across London.

3.6 The Committee were pleased to note the consultation document would include braille and the document itself would be in 'Word' so font size could be increased.

CHAIRMAN'S INITIALS

.....

3.7 The Committee requested an update on the proposed move be presented to the October 2019 meeting of the Committee.

Conclusions

3.8 The Committee:

1. noted the report and advised and made suggestions for further action to ensure a meaningful consultation process
2. also provided an indication of its views on the proposals as detailed above
3. requested an update report be presented to the October 2019 meeting of the Committee

4. WEST HERTFORDSHIRE HOSIPTAL TRUST (WHHT) ESTATE UPDATE

Officer Contact: Juliet Rodgers, Associate Director, Communications and Engagement, Herts Valleys Clinical Commissioning Group (HVCCG) (Tel: 07771 344593)

4.1 The Committee received a report providing them with an update on progress with the plans for redevelopment of hospital facilities in west Hertfordshire. This follows on from a report and discussion at the Committees meeting on 15 May 2019.

4.2 Members were informed by the Head of Scrutiny that there was no representation from WHHT because their board meetings coincided with this Committee meeting. It was noted the boards were having separate debates on the preferred way forward for the strategic outline case (SOC). Members were informed the decision would be circulated to them on 12 July 2019.

4.3 The Chairman suggested that a topic group be held to scrutinise the public consultation process to ensure it has been carried out correctly and that key patient and key resident groups have been involved. The Committee agreed this course of action.

4.4 The Head of Scrutiny informed the Committee both WHHT and the Herts Valleys Clinical Commissioning Group (HVCCG) were happy to support the topic group approach and a meeting was being held to scope the topic group questions, it was hoped the topic group would take place Wednesday 18 September 2019.

4.5 Members were asked to advise the Head of Scrutiny if they wished to participate in the topic group.

CHAIRMAN'S INITIALS

.....

4.6 The Chairman reiterated that the County Council needed to ensure the best outcome is vital for the residents of Hertfordshire.

Conclusion

4.7 The Committee:

1. noted the report
2. agreed to a topic group in September 2019 to scrutinise the consultation process of WHHT and the CCG

5. HERTS & WEST ESSEX SUSTAINABILITY & TRANSFORMATION PARTNERSHIP CONTRIBUTION TO THE NHS EAST OF ENGLAND REGIONAL CONTROL TOTAL

Officer Contact: Dean Westcott, Finance Director Hertfordshire & west Essex STP (Tel: 01707 247253)

5.1 The Committee received a report which gave Members a briefing on the support provided by the Hertfordshire and West Essex Sustainability & Transformation Partnership (STP) to achieving the NHS East of England regional control total.

5.2 The Committee heard that Cambridgeshire & Peterborough STP was not in financial balance and following a number of meetings the regional office requested the deficit of around £25 million be shared by the five STPs in the East of England with £5million per STP to be repaid within three years. Members noted that this was considered by Hertfordshire and West Essex STP Chief Executives and it was agreed to loan £5m in support of this request.

5.3 The Committee agreed that it was a difficult situation as the outcome would entail reducing Hertfordshire and West Essex STP organisations' budgets. These were also under pressure and this £5million could have been used in Hertfordshire and West Essex STP to ease pressure in the area.

5.4 The Committee was reminded that in the past the money would have been top-sliced and put into central government funds. It was believed by health colleagues that although the situation was not ideal, by doing it this way the money was still being spent closer to home and would benefit Hertfordshire residents that used services provided in Cambridgeshire & Peterborough STP such as Addenbrooke's.

**CHAIRMAN'S
INITIALS**

.....

- 5.5 The Committee raised its concern that there was an expectation of the regional office that the five STPs could each release the £5million. It also raised concern that the report before it gave no background explanation of why Cambridgeshire & Peterborough STP was in deficit.
- 5.6 Following a Member comment it was agreed that regular updates on the STP be presented to the Health Scrutiny Committee.
- 5.7 Although the Committee was not content with this situation the Chairman suggest that the Committee note the report with regret and hoped the money was repaid as quickly as possible to support Hertfordshire and West Essex. The Committee agreed this proposal.

Conclusion

- 5.8 The Committee noted the report with regret and hoped the money was repaid as quickly as possible to support Hertfordshire and West Essex NHS services.

6. MOUNT VERNON CANCER CENTRE REVIEW

Officer Contact: Jessamy Kinghorn, Head of Communications and Engagement NHS England & Improvement (East of England) (Tel: 0113 8247539)

- 6.1 The Committee received a report providing a briefing on the purpose and process being taken to review the services delivered at the Mount Vernon Cancer Centre.
- 6.2 The Committee was informed that an independent external Clinical Advisory Group made up of clinicians from specialised cancer centres from other regions had been formed.
- 6.3 Members heard there has been a public engagement exercise undertaken, patient workshops, focus groups, visits to patient support groups and relevant community groups which would help shape the shortlist of options available.
- 6.4 The Committee was informed there were twenty six organisations involved and there was a determination by all the organisations to deliver this review. Clinicians at Mount Vernon have made suggestions on what they would like included and independent clinicians have made recommendations and options to resolve the issues around acute services for Mount Vernon.
- 6.5 Members were reminded this was not a review of cancer services

CHAIRMAN'S INITIALS

.....

in hospital but a review of the Mount Vernon site only and this may raise implications for services provided at satellite sites which would be explored as part of the review.

- 6.6 If the preferred option required consultation it was agreed that the Committee should be involved. At this stage it is unclear which authority would lead, although the Committee believed it should be Hertfordshire as it has the greatest number of patients attending Mount Vernon for treatment from one local authority area. The Head of Scrutiny advised Members she would undertake to liaise with the London Borough of Hillingdon and the Centre of Public Scrutiny to ensure that any joint committee was properly constituted and led by the right authority.
- 6.7 In response to a Member question it was noted the Michael Sobel Hospice would not be part of the Mount Vernon review. There was, however, a separate consultation about its future use.
- 6.8 Jessamy Kinghorn, Head of Communications and Engagement NHS England & Improvement (East of England), advised that the NHS was committed to update the Health Scrutiny Committee and would present a further report at the next meeting on 16 October 2019.

Conclusion

- 6.9 The Committee noted the report.

7. REVIEW OF OPENING HOURS AT THE URGENT CARE CENTRE, WELWYN GARDEN CITY

- 7.1 Officer Contact: Nuala Milbourn, Assistant Director for Communications and Engagement, East and North Hertfordshire CCG (01707 685145)
- 7.2 The Committee received a report giving a briefing on the proposals to close the Urgent Care Centre (UCC) for minor illnesses and minor injuries at the New QEII Hospital in Welwyn Garden City between 10 p.m. and 8 a.m. The report also outlined the public engagement process which was currently underway to inform the CCG's decision-making process. It also informed the Committee about the local and national context and the range of urgent and emergency and 'out of hours' health services that were available to residents living in west and north Hertfordshire
- 7.3 Members heard the UCC was staffed by two highly skilled nursing staff from East and North Hertfordshire NHS Trust with a minimum of two clinical staff on duty at all times. Members noted

**CHAIRMAN'S
INITIALS**

.....

the UCC was used very well during the day but an average of one person per hour used it overnight. It was also noted that if the two highly skilled nursing staff were moved to Lister Hospital they would be able to treat eighty more seriously ill patients with life threatening condition or patients to A&E.

- 7.4 Members were informed the proposal to close the UCC overnight was not about cost savings but was due to the national health care shortage. There was a shortage of forty thousand nurses in the UK which was likely to rise to sixty eight thousand. One hundred and forty nurses would graduate this year and this would decrease over following years. Following a Member question in relation to why the numbers of trainee nurses were decreasing, Members were informed the bursary system for nurses had been replaced with a student loan and this had an impact on numbers applying, as it is often older people and those with families that apply rather than younger people immediately following sixth form. This meant that fewer people interested in nursing as a career felt that that could afford to repay the loan.
- 7.5 In response to a Member question in relation to the 111 number and if a doctor was available to give guidance, it was noted that if people contact the 111 number they would be triaged and passed to a GP or referred to hospital, if necessary. It was also noted since January 2019 the 111 system was being trialled online.
- 7.6 In relation to how urgently people needed to be seen, Members were informed people visiting the UCC would normally have minor injury or illness which could be treated by a GP or suitably qualified person, without needing to be seen by a consultant.
- 7.7 In response to a question in relation to more pressure being put on the 111 service and the ambulance services if the UCC did close overnight, Members were informed it would be approximately ten more calls a night and health colleagues believed this would not be a significant pressure on the service. The report to the Committee also highlighted that the majority of patients using the UCC overnight arrived in a private car. A Member of the Committee asked if there was any data on how the 111 service was performing. Beverley Flowers, ENHCCG agreed to circulate assurance data to the Committee.
- 7.8 A Member of the Committee highlighted there was no information on the engagement within the report. A health colleague from the CCG undertook to provide copies of the engagement document to the Committee which can be found here <https://qeiiucc.enhertscg.nhs.uk>.

**CHAIRMAN'S
INITIALS**

.....

- 7.9 A Member stated the Committee needed to weigh up what was the best for the people of Hertfordshire and believed the decision should have been made earlier but it was not the Committee's position to say where resources were best placed.
- 7.10 The Chairman stated the Committee recognised the problems and suggested the Committee noted the report and supported the direction of travel. Following a vote, 16 Members voted in favour of noting the report and supporting the direction of travel, 1 voted against and 1 abstained.

Conclusion

- 7.11 The Committee noted the report and supported the direction of travel. Note: 16 Members voted in favour, 1 voted against and 1 abstained.

8. SCRUTINY WORK PROGRAMME

Officer Contact: Natalie Rotherham Head of Scrutiny (Tel: 01992 588485)

- 8.1 The Committee considered its work programme 2018 – 2019, attached as Appendix 1(a), 1(b) and 1(c) to the report, and those scrutinies scheduled for the forthcoming period
- 8.2 The Committee was informed of a meeting invitation that had been sent to them for 18 September 2019 for a site visit to see Princess Alexandra Hospital in action complemented by a presentation from PAH.
- 8.3 Members heard that the normal approach to budget scrutiny has been to scrutinise the CCGs in one year and in the second year to scrutinise the six key providers. Going forward, the Sustainability & Transformation Partnership (STP) would be commissioning health which would have implications for the budget/s. It was noted the STP would be running a shadow budget for next year and the STP would seek suggestions from the Committee. The Head of Scrutiny advised the Committee that she was looking to run a STP development workshop to see how commissioners and providers were working together. It was suggested the workshop be held on the afternoon of 16 October 2019, with the main Committee meeting on the morning of 16 October 2019. The Committee welcomed the idea of a workshop and also agreed the workshop would not be held in public.
- 8.4 A Member suggested that as Hertfordshire's STP also included

CHAIRMAN'S INITIALS

.....

West Essex that Essex County Council should also be invited to send a representative to the workshop.

8.5 Members noted that the Impact of Scrutiny Advisory Committee (ISAC) had met on 19 June 2019 and noted the minutes and tracker attached to the report.

8.6 The Committee agreed to add to the work programme a topic group in September 2019 to scrutinise the consultation process of WHHT and the CCG in relation to the proposals of hospital facilities in west Hertfordshire to ensure it has been carried out correctly and that key patient and key resident groups have been involved.

Conclusion

- 8.7
1. The scrutiny work programme attached as Appendices 1(a), 1(b) and 1(c) was approved.
 2. The Committee agreed its work programme, amended as follows:-
 - i. agreed to a topic group in September 2019 to scrutinise the consultation process of WHHT and the CCG
 - ii. To add a STP workshop to the programme and to invite a representative from Essex County Council
 3. The Committee noted the minutes of the meetings of the ISAC meeting held on 19 June 2019 and the recommendations tracker attached as Appendix 2(a) and 2(b) to the report

*Natalie
Rotherham /
Charles
Lambert to
action all*

9. ITEMS FOR REPORT TO THE COUNTY COUNCIL (STANDING ORDER SC. 7(2))

9.1 To agree items for inclusion in the Committee's report to County Council. In the absence of a decision, a summary of all items will be reported to the County Council at its meeting on 26 November 2019.

**QUENTIN BAKER
CHIEF LEGAL OFFICER**

CHAIRMAN.....

**CHAIRMAN'S
INITIALS**

.....

This page is intentionally left blank