

## **HEALTH AND PUBLIC SERVICES SCRUTINY SUB-COMMITTEE**

### **Minutes of the Inaugural Meeting held on Monday, 3<sup>rd</sup> June 2013 at Worksop Town Hall**

Present: Councillor D G Pidwell (Chair)  
Councillors B Barker, H M Brand, S J Fielding, G Jones, J Potts and T Taylor.

Officers: G Blenkinsop, J Hamilton and R Theakstone.

(Meeting opened at 6.30pm.)

(The Chair welcomed all to the meeting.)

#### **1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors M Gregory, A Mumby, D R Pressley, J M Sanger, J C Shephard and A Simpson.

#### **2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST BY MEMBERS AND OFFICERS**

##### **(a) Members**

There were no declarations of interest by Members.

##### **(b) Officers**

There were no declarations of interest by officers.

#### **Key Decisions**

None.

#### **Other Decisions**

#### **3. REPORT(S) OF THE DIRECTOR OF CORPORATE SERVICES**

##### **(a) Proposed Health and Public Services Sub-Committee Programme 2013/14**

Members were presented with an overview of the Committee's meeting programme for 2013/14, a revised version of which was tabled at the meeting, and agreement was sought to vary the delivery of the work programme for 2013/14 if any urgent issues arose. A review timetable was also tabled at the meeting.

The Corporate Development and Policy Manager explained how the work programme was organised and how preparation for the next meeting, and any review, would take place at the previous meeting. Updates from previous scrutiny reviews would also be presented to Members. It was acknowledged that time spent on the scrutiny review(s) would have to be condensed as it(they) would form part of the Sub-Committee meeting.

Members raised the issue of Mental Health and how both Bassetlaw Hospital and the East Midlands Ambulance Service deal with patients with acute mental health issues. It was felt that this issue would impact on every service and could be considered as part of the review of the Health and Well-being Board and the Dementia Agenda. Each service provider could be asked how it deals with service users with mental health issues. With regard to the Bassetlaw and

Newark & Sherwood Community Safety Partnership, the Sub-Committee could suggest questions, through the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, to be asked at the Joint Overview and Scrutiny Committee which scrutinises the Partnership.

Three scopes were appended to the report and Members' approval was sought for these, together with any additional/revised questions which Members would like to raise during the review(s). Questions would be agreed and forwarded to the service provider for answers which would be circulated in advance of the Sub-Committee meeting. This will enable the answers to be probed and the service provider could advise the Sub-Committee of any planned changes and brief Members on any current issues.

With regard to the scope for Future Services at Bassetlaw Hospital, Members made the following suggestions:

- Councillors M Gregory and A Mumby be asked to answer questions as witnesses.
- Organisations such as Health Watch and the Patient Advocacy Groups be invited to listen to the evidence and comment upon.
- A question be asked as to why it takes so long to get a doctor's appointment at a surgery?
- A question be asked as to the use of locums in Accident and Emergency departments, as opposed to junior doctors and consultants?
- A question be asked as to how mental health issues are differentiated?
- A question be asked as to how many organisations are involved in mental health issues?
- A question be asked as to how patients with acute mental health issues are dealt with in Accident and Emergency Departments?
- A question be asked as to whether the recommendations arising from the scrutiny review were helpful to the Hospital?
- A copy of the final scrutiny review report should be made available to those Members who had not been involved in the scrutiny review.

With regard to the scope for Patient Advocacy in Nottinghamshire, Members made the following suggestions:

- As all services have a Patient Advisory Liaison Service and Foundation Trust Governors, a question be asked as to how do Health Watch and POhWER link into these organisations?
- Representatives of the Patient Advisory Liaison Service and Foundation Trust Governors organisations be asked to give feedback.
- A question be asked as to what powers does the Health Watch organisation have?
- A question be asked as to how Health Watch and POhWER relate to the District Council and its Members, and what business interests are shared?
- A question be asked as to what relationship these two organisations have with mental health and what would be the mental health dimension?
- A question be asked as to what is the trend for complaints about mental health issues?

With regard to the scope for the Health and Well-being Board, it was noted that the District Council does NOT have a representative on the Board. Only three witnesses (Dr C Kenny, Dr S Kell and C George) would be called for this scrutiny review as the representatives of Health Watch and POhWER would have been called previously. Members made the following suggestions:

- As the Council's link with the Board is via the Deputy Leader, Councillor G J Wynne be invited to give feedback.
- A question be asked as to how urban and rural needs compare, and is the rural dispersal of the Bassetlaw District taken into account?
- A question be asked as to the Board's link with mental health issues and how the mental health strategy is being taken forward in the District?
- A question be asked as to how the obesity strategy is being tackled in the District?

- A question be asked as to how the Board looks at the Health and Well-being of the District in a wider social and economic context, e.g. levels of deprivation, and how these impact upon particular needs?

**RESOLVED** that:

1. Members of the Sub-Committee not present at the inaugural meeting be briefed on its remit.
2. Consideration be given to the inclusion of mental health issues within the work programme.
3. Mental health issues be considered as part of the Equalities approach to each scrutiny review.
4. The work programme for 2013/14 be approved.
5. The questions for the three scopes be amended following Members' suggestions, the revised questions be circulated to Members, and the service providers and service users be invited to the respective meetings.

## **SECTION B – ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION IN PRIVATE**

### **Key Decisions**

None.

### **Other Decisions**

None.

### **4. ANY OTHER BUSINESS WHICH THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS TO BE URGENT**

As there was no other urgent business to consider the Chairman closed the meeting.