

Minutes of a meeting of the Scrutiny Committee held on 11th December 2017 at Pippbrook, Dorking from 7.00pm to 9.08pm

Present: Councillors David Draper (Chairman), Stephen Cooksey, David Hawksworth (substituting for Patricia Wiltshire), Mary Huggins, Chris Hunt, Malcolm Ladell, and Paul Potter

Also present: Councillors Margaret Cooksey, Clare Malcomson and Clayton Wellman

40. Minutes

The minutes of the Scrutiny Committee meeting held on 14th November 2017 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

41. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Tim Ashton, David Harper and Patricia Wiltshire

42. Disclosure of Interests

Councillor David Hawksworth declared:-

- a non-pecuniary interest in the presentation from the Surrey Wildlife Trust as he was a Member of the Surrey Wildlife Trust

43. Presentation from the East Surrey Rural Transport Partnership

Marcus Dodé, Chief Executive of the East Surrey Rural Transport Partnership (ESRTP), attended the meeting to give Members an update on the work of the ESRTP. During the course of the presentation the following points were noted:-

- The ESRTP were purchasing 35 new buses which would replace the old ones they had been operating. This had been in part funded by a grant of £10,000 from Mole Valley District Council (MVDC) and this amounted to £96 per week per bus.
- The moped loan scheme was a service that was still operating for people who were over 16 years of age and had a firm job offer, were in full time employment or tertiary education.
- The ERSTP delivered a number of fixed route bus services as well as their demand based service.

The Committee questioned where the fixed bus routes that the ESRTP operated went within Mole Valley. It was explained that these ran through Ockley, Coldharbour, Brockham and Leigh. A route also ran from Leigh and Newdigate to Horsham. The Chief Executive of ESRTP explained that he could distribute some leaflets which explained the routes in more detail to any Member who wanted more information.

It was suggested that the ESRTP should make contact with the Amber Foundation in Mole Valley as the Foundation's residents were expected to be in employment and struggled with finding transport for this purpose. The Chief Executive of the ESRTP welcomed this suggestion and advised they would make contact with the Amber Foundation in the future.

The Committee thanked the Chief Executive of the ESRTP for the presentation and for answering Members' questions.

44. Presentation from the East Surrey Domestic Abuse Service

The Chief Executive of East Surrey Domestic Abuse Services (ESDAS), Michelle Blunsom, attended the meeting to provide the Committee with an update on the work of the organisation. During the course of the presentation the following points were noted:-

- As well as self referral, there was outreach through the Police and Children Services to victims of domestic abuse (DA).
- The ESDAS victim recovery programme was strength based. This meant that they focused on the victims' strengths and what they had achieved by surviving. There was also a focus on long term recovery to break the impact of the DA and maximise the wellbeing of survivors.
- ESDAS had been working with the Surrey Police to create a culture change by launching the programme called 'DA Matters'. This had proved successful and there had been a 40% increase in referrals in 2017-18 from the Police since this training had taken place.
- The 'Ask Me' project focussed on getting people talking about DA and training people in the community (hairdressers, vicars) on how to talk about it and recognise the signs.
- Volunteers were highly valuable and ESDAS relied on them to deliver their service. 50% of their volunteers were survivors themselves and the volunteering was part of their long term recovery.

The Committee questioned whether ESDAS would consider offering training to MVDC Councillors as Members mentioned that they had experienced situations where they suspected DA might be happening and training would help them recognise the signs. The Chief Executive of ESDAS welcomed this suggestion and it was agreed that this would be followed up after the meeting.

It was queried how many men had been reported as suffering from DA in Surrey. It was explained that this was a difficult statistic to provide, but that it was certain that there were significantly less men than women who came forward as suffering from DA. This was something that would need to be tackled as part of the overall gender equality issue. There was a reoccurring issue in Police referrals where male perpetrators would come forward to say they were being abused as a way of stopping their partner from coming forward.

The Committee discussed funding for ESDAS. It was explained that funding had remained consistent from Local Authorities, Surrey County Council and the Police and Crime Commissioner over the past few years. However, there had been no inflation increase to the funding in the last 10 years which has made a significant difference to how the funding could be used.

It was explained that ESDAS would need to go to tender shortly for the services they provided and they would be up against national charities that would stand a much better chance of winning the tender. It was queried whether MVDC could assist ESDAS with their tender application. The Corporate Head of Environmental Services agreed to make enquiries and get back to the Chief Executive of ESDAS.

The Committee thanked the Chief Executive of the ESDAS for the presentation and for answering Members' questions.

45. Presentation from the Surrey Wildlife Trust on Norbury Park

Nigel Davenport, Chief Executive of the Surrey Wildlife Trust (SWT), attended the meeting to give Members an update on the work of the SWT which touched on Norbury Park. During the course of the presentation the following points were noted:-

- Extensive work had been carried out at the Nower Wood site to improve the facilities, including an adult disabled toilet with full changing facilities.
- The sawmill in Norbury Park was considered an asset by the SWT, but lacked investment so was not reaching its full potential.
- The SWT relied heavily on volunteers and they had the equivalent of 8814 days of volunteers working on all their sites.
- Car Parking charges were being introduced at some of their sites including Norbury Park. The income raised will go straight to SWT and would bridge the gap from the loss of funding from Surrey County Council (SCC).

- The SWT were working towards making some of their sites self-sustaining so that they did not have to continue relying on funding from other organisations.

It was questioned whether the number of Rangers had changed at the SWT and how their Ranger system worked. It was explained that changes had been made to deliver financial savings and make the system more efficient. In reality there were only three fewer staff at the SWT than before the changes were made, but the process of change had not been received favourably by some who worked at SWT.

The Committee discussed the work that the SWT did with young children and it was asked what the capacity of the Nower Wood centre was. It was explained that the refurbished site had three classrooms which had capacity for 30 children in each. This would enable many schools to book the site for a whole year group.

Members queried whether the SWT advertised their facilities or whether they relied on schools and organisations approaching them. It was explained that mostly schools approached the SWT. In the future the SWT were looking to do more marketing for use of their facilities all year round including school holidays.

The Committee discussed the introduction of charging at the SWT car parks. It was advised that Norbury Park had been selected as it was one of the bigger sites. It was advised that the consultation had only just finished and therefore the final plans were still in development.

The Committee discussed membership of the SWT and whether the membership fee could be increased to cover parking. It was explained that they could not increase membership by too much as it would mean that the SWT would need to start paying VAT on membership fees, which would be an added complication and result in the SWT losing money.

The Committee thanked the Chief Executive of the Surrey Wildlife Trust for the presentation and for answering Members' questions.

46. Presentation from the Epsom & St Helier University Hospitals NHS Trust

Daniel Elkeles, the Chief Executive of the Epsom & St Helier University Hospitals NHS Trust attended the meeting to give Members an update on the work of their recent engagement for a 'Strategic outline case for investment in our hospitals 2020-2030'. During the course of the presentation the following points were noted:-

- There were three major elements to the case for change: clinical viability, estates functionality, financial viability.
- They faced some estate challenges. It would require £398 million to bring acute facilities up to standard at St Helier. Over 80% of the estate was not functionally suitable for modern healthcare delivery, including bed spacing.
- Their engagement involved three scenarios which would work to deliver their clinical model. The engagement took place over duration of 13 weeks and included four 'talk and tour' events, 31 staff briefing sessions, contact with seven Members of Parliament and six Councils. 25,000 people took part in the engagement.
- 37 Stakeholders responded broadly in favour of the proposed clinical model. Including four local authorities, five local Members of Parliament and 12 residents associations. 18 Stakeholders responded not in favour and one remained neutral of the proposed clinical model.
- If the Trust received agreement to proceed then the next step would be to have their pre-consultation and outline business case completed by June 2018, followed by a public consultation in Summer/Autumn 2018. They would then expect a decision on the public consultation by Spring 2019.

The Committee discussed what was on offer for the Epsom & St Helier sites. It was explained that there would be the same facilities on both sites for some services, such as elective procedures and

local A&E, and patients would receive their care in improved buildings. Acute services would then be placed on one of three possible sites; Epsom Hospital, St Helier Hospital or Sutton Hospital and the Royal Marsden (co-located). The cost of the work and where the funding would come from was queried by Members. In response the Chief Executive of the Trust explained that they had an estates strategy which would take them to 2020. This involved a £1m investment in their buildings and would only be spent on buildings which would be kept in any of the three scenarios from the engagement, to ensure that none of the investment was wasted. An application had been submitted to Government for more funding and they were currently waiting to hear the outcome.

The Committee discussed which hospitals people would be delivered to by ambulances responding to emergency calls. It was explained that when responding to an emergency call, ambulance staff were provided with information relating to which hospital the patient would need to be taken to for their care. If the patient's condition could be treated at more than one site the paramedic would give the patient a choice. This may involve explaining to the patient that there was a longer ambulance waiting time at the local hospital and therefore it may be worth travelling to a hospital further away to be seen sooner.

Travel times were discussed by the Committee as there was concern relating to how an ambulance might reach a patient in the south of Mole Valley where they were the farthest distance from the hospitals. It was explained that ideally in any scenario an ambulance would reach a patient within 7 minutes as they were stationed in many different locations. Once the paramedics were with the patients it did not matter if they were in the ambulance for an hour as the paramedics were highly trained to keep patients alive while in their care and travelling. The Committee noted that public transport was difficult between the different sites and that it was important to consider how visitors would travel to see sick patients.

The Committee discussed the risks associated with the different scenarios. Antenatal and postnatal care was given as an example and it was explained that the midwives who provided this care were split between community based staff and hospital based staff. The way in which this care was delivered as a service would not change in any of the three scenarios.

The Committee thanked the Chief Executive of the Epsom & St Helier University Hospitals NHS Trust for the presentation and for answering Members' questions.

47. Outside Organisations – Member Update

The Committee received an update from the MVDC Member representative, Councillor Margaret Cooksey, on the work of the Police & Crime Panel. It was explained that the Police and Crime Panel met four times a year in February, July, September and December at County Hall in Kingston. All the meetings were public and webcast online to ensure that they could be accessed easily by anyone who may struggle to attend the meeting in person. The MVDC Member representative met with the Community Safety and Wellbeing Manager at MVDC before and after each Panel Meeting to go over the agenda and feedback on the work of the Panel. The meeting which took place in February each year was to consider the Budget Proposals. The Panel had the power to veto the proposal only once, so should they decide to do so they would have to accept any other Proposal put to them thereafter.

There were also Working Groups in addition to the main Panel meetings. This included a Complaints Working Group which considered all complaints against the Police and Crime Commissioner which were not of a legal nature. There was the potential in the future for complaints against the Police Force to be considered by the Complaints Working Group, as many people did not feel comfortable with their complaints against the Police being dealt with by the Police.

The Committee questioned whether the Police worked closely with any of the other emergency services. It was explained that they did work closely with the Fire Service, as the Police relied on the Fire and Rescue Service for breaking down doors and gaining access to vehicles in road traffic accidents.

The MVDC Member representative on the Police and Crime Panel invited Members to contact her with any questions they may wish to be posed to the Police and Crime Commissioner at any of the Panel meetings.

The Chairman thanked Councillor Margaret Cooksey for the presentation on the Police and Crime Panel and for answering Members' questions.