

ACTION NOTES

SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
TUESDAY, 28 AUGUST 2012



COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT

Councillor Bob Adams	Councillor Michael King
Councillor Paul Cosham	Councillor David Nalson
Councillor Reginald Howard (Chairman)	Councillor Bob Russell
Councillor Mrs Rosemary Kaberry-Brown	Councillor Bob Sampson
Councillor Vic Kerr	

OFFICERS

Strategic Director – Development and Growth (Ian Yates)
Head of Legal and Democratic Services (Lucy Youles)
Head of HR, Customer Services and Performance (Sue Griffiths)
Development Management Service Manager (Pat Reid)
Community Engagement and Policy Development Officer (Carol Drury)
Principal Democracy Officer (Jo Toomey)

John Randall – Medical Director for Peterborough and Stamford Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust
Marie Kaempfe-Rice – Procurement Lincolnshire
Mark Harvey – Procurement Lincolnshire

1 member of the public

17. MEMBERSHIP

The Committee was notified that Councillor Adams was substituting for Councillor Mrs Smith and Councillor Vic Kerr was substituting for Councillor Powell for this meeting only.

18. APOLOGIES

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Turner.

19. DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS

No interests were disclosed.

20. ACTION NOTES - 12 JUNE 2012 AND 11 JULY 2012

Subject to the following amendments, the action notes from the meeting held on 12 June 2012 were agreed as a correct record and noted:

- Page 3, minute number 6: sentence 3 should read: “Based on the session, the Committee expressed some concerns about the workload of the [Economic Development] portfolio holder.
- Page 5, minute number 9: bullet point 11 should read “Wind energy Supplementary Planning Document”.

The action notes from the meeting held on 11 July 2012 were agreed as a correct record and noted.

21. STAMFORD AND RUTLAND HOSPITAL CLINICAL STRATEGY

John Randall, the Medical Director for Peterborough and Stamford Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust gave a presentation on the proposed Clinical Strategy for Stamford and Rutland Hospital.

Mr Randall reported that the hospital was popular with patients, general practitioners, the public and staff. Stamford was seen as core to the Trust’s future, as 30% of patients came from South Lincolnshire. Mr Randall noted that the Stamford site was in need of urgent redevelopment. The Trust wanted to redevelop Stamford hospital as a health campus encompassing health and social care, which would entail establishing the clinical services on site and the estate required to support them.

Proposals had been discussed with the Welland and South Lincolnshire Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCG) together with GPs in Stamford, Bourne and the Deepings and CCGs and GPs in neighbouring counties (Rutland, Leicestershire and Northamptonshire).

Mr Randall provided a breakdown of current service provision on the Stamford hospital site and patient numbers from 2008/9 through to 2011/12.

The proposed clinical strategy included:

- Redeveloping the John Van Geest ward to provide intermediate care in a nurse/therapy-led facility
- Outpatients as today but probably expanded treatment options
- Nurse-led minor injuries unit
- Oncology and haematology (plus chemotherapy)
- Day treatment unit – two procedure rooms (for endoscopy, one-stop haematuria clinic, dermatology, gynaecology and pain management)
- Endoscopy service
- Pain management
- Ante-natal services to continue

- Imaging (ultrasound and plain x-ray)
- Expanded therapy provision
- Phlebotomy plus point of care testing (on-site blood testing and results)

No decisions or proposals had been made in respect of the operating theatre. The Trust was out to tender for a primary care surgical service. Any proposals would take account of the sustainability and capital costs of upgrading or replacing facilities. The risks and costs of providing general anaesthetics in hospitals with one theatre and cross-trust theatre requirements would also be taken into account.

Mr Randall summarised the next steps in respect of developing a business case in support of proposals and stakeholder engagement. A public consultation evening would be held in Stamford on Monday 3 September 2012.

Councillors asked questions on the presentation:

- Any oncology and chemotherapy service in Stamford would provide a local service and complement provision in Peterborough. Similar units were in operation in Oundle and Spalding.
- The minor injuries unit would service walk-in patients and some GP referrals.
- When considering the viability of the operating theatre, the Trust needed to establish whether demand for day case surgery was sufficient to justify investment.
- Any operating theatre provision would need to have a long term future; currently contracts were only awarded for a year.
- It was possible, following a full tender process, that private healthcare advisors would be interested in working from the site.

Councillors commented that Stamford hospital was well-loved locally and complimented the quality of care provided. They suggested that as part of a review, the Trust should look at providing single-sex wards.

The Chairman thanked Mr Randall for attending the meeting and his presentation.

22. QUARTER 1 PERFORMANCE REPORT

The Head of HR, Customer Services and Performance summarised report number PPMO2, which provided a summary of performance and project progress during the first quarter. Three projects had been fully implemented: green waste charging, the Olympic torch relay events and the Local Authority Mortgage Scheme.

The report highlighted performance indicators that were not meeting targets (working days lost due to sickness absence, number of days taken to determine minor planning applications and number of days taken to determine other

planning applications) and an indication of the direction of travel and a summary of action that was being taken to address these issues.

Councillors questioned performance in respect of determining planning applications, in particular the determination of straightforward applications as performance had deteriorated from April 2012 when targets were achieved. Officers explained that the Council was still following the lean system that had led to the initial improvement. The Committee noted that delays were caused when officers requested further information from applicants, which was not forthcoming. Further information was often requested when applicants had not followed or not taken pre-application advice from officers. To develop a more customer focused service, officers had not given applicants deadlines by which information needed returning, which delayed determination.

Measures had been put in place to proactively manage applications and follow-up requests with customers. Committee members indicated that if an applicant did not meet deadlines for submitting further information, they thought applications should automatically be put forward for determination. Officers also explained that straight forward applications could include developments with up to 9 properties; further delays were subsequently experienced negotiating community benefits. It was noted that the time it took to determine applications did not affect performance figures until after the matter had been determined. This meant that performance figures were skewed whenever a longstanding application was resolved.

Councillors suggested that additional meetings of the Development Control Committee could be called to deal with the backlog of information. The Development Management Service Manager explained that a new forward plan of applications had been developed which helped predict the number of applications that would be considered at a particular meeting. Councillors referred to previous arrangements when Development Control Committee meetings were held on a 3-week cycle and suggested that a return to these arrangements could help clear the backlog.

Committee members questioned the terminology used in the performance report and suggested that the “direction of travel” aspect of the report could prove difficult to understand. It was suggested that the heading could be adjusted to “is performance improving”, with a yes/no option.

The Strategic Director for Development and Growth gave a presentation which summarised progress against the projects within the “Grow The Economy” priority, including: station approach, the Grantham Business Innovation Centre, Wide Westgate, Market Place planters scheme, southern quadrant, the shop front improvement scheme and the Grantham Gateway.

23. PROCUREMENT LINCOLNSHIRE

Marie Kaempfe-Rice and Mark Harvey presented the Procurement Lincolnshire

Annual Report for 2011/12, which was circulated with the agenda. They explained that Procurement Lincolnshire had two main priorities: efficient, effective sustainable procurement and socially responsible procurement. Following a district council contribution of approximately £40k, Procurement Lincolnshire reported savings of £366k for South Kesteven.

The officers emphasised the benefits of collaborative working and explained that undertaking a spend analysis of contracts and identifying common vendors highlighted potential opportunities.

The preferred method for tendering was electronic. Procurement Lincolnshire used a secure web-based system and was preparing the rollout of further software which provided an electronic contract management tool, on which the council's contract register would be maintained.

Procurement Lincolnshire had been a case study in a review of shared service by the Local Government Association, from which officers reported positive feedback.

During 2011/12, work continued to support supplier development. Training had been delivered to suppliers in conjunction with the Federation of Small Businesses and the Chamber of Commerce. A recent buyer event had attracted over 150 suppliers.

Two major initiatives for Procurement Lincolnshire during 2011/12 were a local small and medium sized enterprise policy which suggested that for contracts under £25k officers needed to obtain one quote from a local supplier and the development of a community purchasing plan. The community purchasing plan had five key themes:

- Identify opportunities
- Establish and manage contracts
- Build capacity for local small and medium enterprises
- Monitor and evaluate strategy
- Organisational improvements

Procurement Lincolnshire's governance arrangements had been altered; the Procurement Advisory Board was unchanged, however work undertaken through the Lincolnshire Finance Officers Group was now directed through a Strategic Procurement Board. Officers reported this was working better than previous arrangements.

Key performance indicators for Procurement Lincolnshire included:

- Value for money
- Training and development
- E-procurement
- Collaboration

- Community and customer involvement and regeneration

The officers were thanked for their presentation and left the meeting.

Councillors expressed their disappointment that the recommendations made as part of their scrutiny review had not been addressed, particularly highlighting the methodology for calculating savings and the sustainability of savings. It was proposed, seconded and agreed that Councillor King should approach the Chief Executive to do the following:

Action Point:

1. ***To confirm the Scrutiny Committee's recommendations had been put to a meeting of the Procurement Advisory Board and the Strategic Procurement Board for discussion and to make resolutions***
2. ***Request that the chairmen of the Procurement Advisory Board and the Strategic Procurement Board attend a future meeting of the Scrutiny Committee to go through their feedback***

24. DRAFT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORT 2011/12

A copy of the Committee's draft report for 2011/12 was circulated with the agenda. It was proposed, seconded and agreed that the report should be put forward to Council.

Action Point:

The Scrutiny Committee's annual report for 2011/12 should be put forward for consideration at Council on 18 October 2012.

25. REPORTS FROM WORKING GROUPS

An update was provided on the progress of the working group looking at the process for developing the wind energy supplementary planning document (SPD). A presentation was made to the Communities Policy Development Group on 19 July 2012, which explained the process that would be followed. The Cabinet was due to consider whether to approve the draft document for consultation at its meeting on 3 September 2012. As the draft document would not have been ready for consideration on this date, the decision was deferred to the meeting on 1 October 2012.

A member of the public, Mr Worth, asked for permission to make a statement to the Committee. He suggested that the Committee could use its powers to question planning policy officers and urged the council to defer the consideration of any applications until the SPD had been adopted. The Head of Legal and Democratic Services advised the Committee that it could not direct the Development Control Committee as it had delegated authority from the

Council to determine planning applications in accordance with the law and the policies of the council.

Members of the committee questioned the status of a recommendation made at the meeting held on 12 June 2012, where Councillors recommended that “the process to adopt a wind farm supplementary planning document should not continue until all parish councils have been given the opportunity to participate in the consultation.” After the meeting officers had verified that correspondence had been sent to all parish clerks in respect of the SPD’s terms of reference. Councillors reported that parishes within their Wards had received the document and feedback had been submitted.

The Chairman explained that he was going to see the Head of Development and Growth on a related matter and was asked by the Committee for a progress update and find out whether there would be an opportunity for the Committee to consider the draft document when it became available.

26. WORK PROGRAMME

A working group meeting to consider the Committee’s work programme was scheduled for Monday 17 September 2012. Two additional items had been proposed for inclusion: contract monitoring of the grounds maintenance contract (particularly grass verges) and the consultation on proposed changes to ambulance provision by the East Midlands Ambulance Service. The final work programme would be presented to the Committee for its approval on 9 October 2012

27. REPRESENTATIVES ON OUTSIDE BODIES

Councillor Mrs Kaberry-Brown advised the Committee that the next meeting of the Lincolnshire Health Scrutiny Committee would take place during the week commencing 3 September 2012. Items the committee was considering and in which it had been involved included the performance of the East Midlands Ambulance Service and support for alcoholics, dementia sufferers and those with Parkinson’s disease. The committee had also submitted a representation about the proposed closure of the paediatric coronary unit in Leicester, to which the Minister had responded.

Representatives from the Welland and Deepings Internal Drainage Board had gone to another area to see a modern system for water management which had been introduced.

28. CLOSE OF MEETING

The meeting was closed at 12:54pm.