

MINUTES

COUNCIL

THURSDAY, 22 SEPTEMBER 2016

2.00 PM



PRESENT

Councillor Mrs Judy Smith Chairman

Councillor Bob Adams
Councillor Duncan Ashwell
Councillor Ashley Baxter
Councillor Stephen Benn
Councillor Katherine Brown
Councillor Terl Bryant
Councillor Mrs Frances Cartwright
Councillor George Chivers
Councillor Kelham Cooke
Councillor Lynda Coutts
Councillor Nick Craft
Councillor Felicity Cunningham
Councillor Phil Dilks
Councillor Damian Evans
Councillor Mike Exton
Councillor Tracey Forman
Councillor Helen Goral
Councillor Breda Griffin
Councillor Graham Jeal
Councillor Mrs Rosemary Kaberry-Brown
Councillor Ms Jane Kingman
Councillor Matthew Lee
Councillor Nikki Manterfield

Councillor David Mapp
Councillor Charmaine Morgan
Councillor Nick Neilson
Councillor Nick Robins
Councillor Bob Russell
Councillor Bob Sampson
Councillor Ian Selby
Councillor Jacky Smith
Councillor Peter Stephens
Councillor Judy Stevens
Councillor Adam Stokes
Councillor Ian Stokes
Councillor Mrs Sarah Stokes
Councillor Brian Sumner
Councillor Mrs Brenda Sumner
Councillor Frank Turner
Councillor Mrs Andrea Webster
Councillor Hannah Westropp
Councillor Paul Wood
Councillor Rosemary H Woolley
Councillor Mrs Linda Wootten
Councillor Ray Wootten

OFFICERS

Chief Executive (Beverly Agass)
Strategic Directors (Tracey Blackwell,
Steve Ingram, Daren Turner)
Executive Manager, Corporate (Lucy
Youles)

OFFICERS

Corporate Finance Manager (Richard
Wyles)
Principal Democracy Officer (Jo Toomey)

Your council working for you

A period of silence was observed in memory of former Councillor, Mrs. Jean Taylor who had recently passed away.

A number of members paid tribute to the work of Mrs. Taylor both as a member of the Council, Chairman's lady and Mayoress of Grantham. Members also sent their condolences to her husband, family and friends.

34. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Mrs Bosworth, Cook, Dobson, King, Dr. Moseley, Powell, Reid, Ward and Wilkins.

35. DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS

No interests were disclosed.

36. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 16 JUNE 2016

The minutes of the meeting held on 16 June 2016 were proposed, seconded and agreed as a correct record. Comment was passed about the format in which the members' open questions session was recorded. Members were reminded that when the motion to pilot the session was approved, members agreed that the format for the minutes would follow that used by Lincolnshire County Council.

37. COMMUNICATIONS (INCLUDING CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS)

The Council noted the Chairman's engagements.

The Chairman announced that she intended to call an extraordinary meeting of the Council on Monday 24 October 2016, at which members would be asked to make a decision on the devolution proposal for Greater Lincolnshire.

The Chairman announced that she intended to take both items that related to Grantham Hospital one after the other, moving agenda item 14, the motion on notice submitted by Councillor Wootten, so that it immediately followed agenda item 6.

38. GRANTHAM HOSPITAL

The Chairman welcomed Dr. Suneil Kapadia and Mark Brassington, the Medical Director and Chief Operating Officer respectively, from United Lincolnshire Hospitals Trust (ULHT). The ULHT representatives had been invited to the meeting to talk about the closure of Grantham hospital's accident and emergency department between 6:30pm to 9am for a period of 3 months from Wednesday 17 August 2016.

The presentation began by providing the national context: that there was a shortage of trained doctors to work in accident and emergency departments. To keep three A&E units open 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, it was recommended that there should be 24 consultants and a minimum of 28 middle grade doctors. ULHT had budget for 15 consultants and 28 middle grade doctors. Across the three A&E departments at Lincoln, Boston and Grantham 14 consultants (10 of which were locums) and 12 middle grade doctors were in place. The presentation included a breakdown of the number of doctors at different grades across the three sites, highlighting the number of substantive staff members and the number of locums.

Members were also given comparator information on patient attendances and admissions, including information from hospitals run by neighbouring trusts. These figures showed that the number of patients presenting at Grantham hospital on a daily basis were lower than at either of the other ULHT sites, Peterborough Hospital, Sherwood Forest Hospital and Nottingham University Hospitals.

In making their decision, ULHT had determined that reducing the opening hours at Grantham hospital was the safest option for all of Lincolnshire. The decision was supported by the clinical commissioning groups, NHS England and NHS Improvement. In reducing the number of hours at Grantham, capacity was made available to support Lincoln hospital. The ULHT representatives stated that in taking the decision, consideration had also been given to the other facilities and specialisms that were available on each site. While all three sites had access to anaesthetists, only the Lincoln and Pilgrim sites had intensive care consultants. It was noted that Lincoln hospital was also a designated trauma centre, so reducing resource there was not practicable. The assessment that ULHT made also took account of patients that would automatically be diverted from Grantham hospital even if the A&E department had been open 24-hours a day.

The representatives from ULHT also talked about the difficulties they had experienced in recruiting staff. Intensive work was underway to recruit doctors, with the Trust looking both in the UK and abroad, attending conferences and recruitment fairs. The Trust was also offering a programme where A&E doctors would be able to work part-time while studying part-time for a fully-funded Masters degree or PHD. The financial drain caused by recruitment was recognised, with agencies receiving a payment of £10k for each doctor recruited.

Members of the Council were given the opportunity to ask questions of the representatives. A number of speakers referred to the value in which Grantham hospital was held by residents in Grantham and the surrounding towns and villages. A number of members questioned the justification of the removal of doctors from Grantham on safety grounds. Several Members referred to the growing population of Grantham and asked how the loss of the A&E service in Grantham could make things safer for residents in the town. A request was

made that the risk assessments on which the decision was made should be shared. Members of the Council were advised that all of the documents on which the ULHT Board's decision was based were publicly available and could be shared. Some members highlighted that the closure of Grantham hospital might constitute the 'least-worst' option, but that did not make it acceptable.

Other Members talked about the financial aspects of the decision, clarifying through their questions that the Trust had funding in place for their desired 15 consultants and the costs of using locums in comparison to permanent staff members.

Further comments and questions raised by Members reflected their concerns that the part-time closure was a pilot for a permanent reduction in services and asked about the Trust's sustainability and transformation plan. Members were advised that this was due to be published from October 2016 and while services had to be sustainable, the ULHT board was clear that each of the three hospital sites had a future.

The representatives from ULHT reiterated that within the county, Lincoln and Boston Pilgrim were the major sites, with intensive care and surgery services that were not available in Grantham. By diverting patients from one of the other sites to Grantham would mean that they could not receive the specialist care that they needed because those wider support services were not available. One Member questioned the impact of the closure on the 'golden hour' when alternative sites were approximately one-hour away. Members were reminded of those most serious conditions for which patients would automatically be taken Lincoln or Boston. While the speed of treatment was one factor, the right expertise had to be available to deliver it; this expertise was not available in Grantham. Reference was made to professional guidance that said if a patient was within 45 minutes of a major trauma centre, the local hospital should be bypassed. This guidance was now being extended to 1 hour.

Interest was shown in what additional support was provided in Lincoln and Boston as a result of the overnight closure in Grantham and whether it meant that there was a consultant on duty, on-site overnight. A breakdown of the on-site arrangements for consultants was provided that indicated that to provide a 24-hour a day consultant presence would require 16 to 18 consultants per A&E department.

The ULHT representatives advised Members that work was underway with clinicians at Grantham hospital to create pathways for admitting patients with existing conditions where a visit to A&E would not be necessary to admit them. It was hoped that would keep as many patients in Grantham as possible.

The Chairman thanked Dr. Kapadia and Mr. Brassington for attending the meeting and answering members' questions.

39. NOTICES OF MOTION GIVEN UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 4.9:

Decision:

That this Council understands the staffing shortages throughout health and care services in Lincolnshire and the decision to temporarily close emergency services at Grantham Hospital if patient safety is at risk. However, this Council urges United Lincolnshire Hospitals Trust to reinstate those services at the hospital at the earliest opportunity.

In proposing his motion, Councillor Wootten referred to a recent protest where it was estimated that 3,000 people marched in support of Grantham hospital and also referred to a petition and a facebook page. He also spoke about the fears of local residents together with their suspicions that the temporary closure would become permanent. Reference was made to statistical information about the number of patient attendances and admissions to Grantham hospital, the planned growth of the town and the effect winter would have for patients from the Grantham area. The motion was seconded.

During wider debate by Members, the efforts of the campaign supporters and organisers were acknowledged and commended. Comments were also made, which referred to a similar motion that was agreed unanimously by Lincolnshire County Council, a recent meeting of the Lincolnshire Health Scrutiny Committee and the non-party political nature of the motion.

While the challenge for ULHT with the national shortage of doctors and wider financing issues was recognised, the consensus of Members was that Grantham, as the largest town in Lincolnshire with significant growth plans and aspirations, meant that a 24-hour accident and emergency department was essential. The temporary closure was also identified by Members as an extension of previous cuts to services at Grantham hospital, citing the loss of services for children and the maternity unit.

Councillor Wootten was given the opportunity to sum up; during his speech he referred to his experiences of the staff at both Grantham and Lincoln hospitals and expressed his gratitude to them. He also reiterated his passion about the NHS and Grantham hospital.

The motion was put to the vote and unanimously approved.

15:18-15:39 – the meeting adjourned

40. GO GRANTHAM BUSINESS IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT

The Chairman welcomed Stuart Pigram, Simon Beardsley, Sonia Braybrook and Rachel Chadwick from Go Grantham. They had been invited to give a presentation to the Council on Go Grantham's proposals for a business

improvement district (BID) in Grantham prior to the BID ballot. As a payer of non-domestic rates within the proposed BID area, the Council would be entitled to vote in the ballot, with the Council forming its view at the meeting to be held on 17 November 2016.

The presentation began with an explanation of what a BID was: businesses within a defined area would be required to pay an additional levy to fund projects within that area. Projects could range from environmental enhancements to collaborative learning and development. Any BID projects should be in addition to services already provided by the district council, not in lieu of them.

A prospectus for the BID had been produced, which was constructed around four main themes, including examples of how a BID could provide benefits:

- Marketing Grantham – providing a website and central hub for businesses in the area and providing a high quality, targeted marketing, PR and promotion strategy
- Supporting Grantham – business investment and support, business cost reduction through collaboration, town centre wardens and crime reduction schemes
- Working in Grantham – providing training support for businesses, providing training courses to assist improve recruitment and retention of local people and partnership working
- Visiting Grantham – promoting the heritage and history of the area, supporting events and festivals and shopping locally

Included within the presentation was a summary of the consultation that had taken place to date, with a brief explanation on the methodology used.

The BID levy would be set at 1.5% of a business' rateable value, with an exemption for businesses with a rateable value of less than £7,000. Over the five-year life of the proposed BID £2.6m income would be raised through the levy.

Members were advised of the timeline for the BID ballot. Notice of the ballot would be sent by 19 October 2016, ballot papers would be issued on 2 November 2016, votes would need to be cast by 30 November 2016 and the result of the ballot would be announced on 1 December 2016. For the BID to be successful over 50% of those businesses who voted would need to vote in favour of the BID with those businesses that voted in favour of the BID representing over 50% of the rateable value of those who voted.

Within the wider context of South Kesteven, the Go Grantham representatives stated that the BID would help attract visitors to Grantham, from which the surrounding areas would also experience benefit, increasing the spend in the local area.

Simon Beardsley, who represented the Lincolnshire Chamber of Trade and Commerce spoke about the Chamber's experiences on other BIDs that had been successful together with those that had not been successful. He advised Councillors that the Chamber had provided funding to support development work, reflecting its confidence in the approach that had been taken.

After the presentation, Members were given the opportunity to ask questions of the Go Grantham representatives. Topics raised during the question and answer session are summarised below:

- The BID would give the opportunity to provide enhancements that attract people to the surrounding area by improving key gateways to the town; the example was given of the area around Grantham railway station
- If the ballot was successful, the BID would come into effect from 1 April 2017. This gap between the ballot result and the commencement of the BID would provide sufficient time for arrangements to be made for its management and administration
- Noting that charities were not exempt from the BID levy but schools were, members identified the potential for challenge with regard to academies. Assurance was given that there were agreed criteria against which non-domestic rate payers would be assessed as to whether they were eligible to pay the levy
- The composition of the BID board would be defined in its constitution, which would be agreed by the Go Grantham Board should the ballot be successful; after it had been agreed, it would be shared with non-domestic ratepayers in the BID area. The Constitution would be designed so that special interests could not dominate Board decisions
- There would be no guaranteed vote on the BID board for the district council however it would have the same opportunity to seek the election of a representative as any other business-rate payer in the area
- Any new business looking to come to the town would consider the impact of any BID levy as part of their due diligence so they should factor in the additional costs
- Educational establishments had been included in the consultation

Other general comments were made, in which Members expressed their support for the principle of a Grantham BID. The suggestion was also made that since the district council would, through the BID, be providing increased funding for improvements in the Grantham area, then it might also make similar contributions to support the development of other towns within the district. There was also some discussion about how the BID might enhance the festival offer within Grantham and the impact of that on council officers. A number of Members also commended the work that had been done to date on the production of the prospectus and in the development of the BID proposals.

The Chairman thanked the representatives from Go Grantham for the time they had given to present the BID proposals to members.

As the meeting had been in progress for three hours Article 4.6.4 of the Council's Constitution required members to vote on whether to proceed. It was proposed, seconded and on being put to the vote agreed that the meeting should continue until the business listed on the agenda had been concluded.

41. STRATEGIC ALLIANCE - GREATER CAMBRIDGESHIRE GREATER PETERBOROUGH (GCGP) LOCAL ENTERPRISE PARTNERSHIP

Decision:

- 1. That the Council notes the strategic alliance with the Greater Cambridge and Greater Peterborough Local Economic Partnership**
- 2. That delegation is given to the Chief Executive in consultation with the Leader to sign and enter into a memorandum of understanding with the Greater Cambridge and Greater Peterborough Local Economic Partnership**

The Leader briefly introduced report number SEG20, which informed Members of a strategic alliance that the Council had formed with the Greater Cambridge and Greater Peterborough Local Enterprise Partnership. In proposing the recommendations in the report, one of which provided delegated authority for the Chief Executive (in consultation with the Leader) to sign and enter into a Memorandum of Understanding, the Leader stated that the Memorandum would be shared with Members either via e-mail, or if time permitted, at a meeting of the council. The proposition was seconded.

During debate on the proposition, Members recognised the advantages of looking beyond the Lincolnshire LEP given the proximity of the southern part of the district to Peterborough and Cambridgeshire. Members from the Deepings area also highlighted that the people who lived in the Deepings felt a greater affinity with Peterborough than either Grantham or Lincoln.

On being put to the vote, the proposition was carried.

42. MEMBERS ON COMMITTEES AND POLICY DEVELOPMENT GROUPS

Decision:

- 1. To hold the Conservative vacancy on the Development Control**
- 2. To appoint Councillor Brian Sumner to fill the vacancy on the Resources Policy Development Group**
- 3. To appoint Councillor Adam Stokes to fill the vacancy on the Governance and Audit Committee**
- 4. To appoint Councillor David Mapp as the Vice-Chairman of the Governance and Audit Committee**

Following the resignation of Members from a number of the council's

committees and policy development groups, which were highlighted in report number LDS181, the Leader was invited to make nominations to fill those vacancies. The Leader informed the council that he did not propose to fill the vacancy on the Development Control Committee while Councillor Brian Sumner was nominated to fill the vacancy on the Resources Policy Development Group, Councillor Adam Stokes was nominated to fill the vacancy on the Governance and Audit Committee and Councillor David Mapp was nominated as the Vice-Chairman of the Governance and Audit Committee. The nominations were seconded, and, on being put to the vote, were agreed.

43. REPRESENTATIVES ON OUTSIDE BODIES

Decision

To appoint Councillor Robert Reid as the Council's representative on the Elsea Park Community Trust.

Report number LDS180 informed Members of the resignation of Councillor Ms Kingman as the Council's representative on the Elsea Park Community Trust. Councillor Robert Reid was nominated as the Council's new representative, which was seconded and on being put to the vote, approved.

44. LEADER'S REPORT ON URGENT DECISIONS

Report number CAB021 was a statutory report that the Leader was required to make. It informed the Council of any Executive decisions made under special urgency provisions. Council noted that since September 2015, no Executive decisions had been made under these provisions.

45. MEMBERS' OPEN QUESTIONS

Question 1

From: Councillor Ashley Baxter

To: Councillor Bob Adams

The amount of information that would be available to support Members' decision-making on devolution in Greater Lincolnshire

Question 2

From: Councillor David Mapp

To: Councillor Bob Adams

Progress on the designer outlet proposed for Grantham

Question 3

From: Councillor Phil Dilks

To: Councillor Bob Adams

The impact of the Government's requirement for a directly elected Mayor on devolution proposals in Greater Lincolnshire.

Question 4

From: Councillor Terl Bryant

To: Councillor Bob Adams

Planning permission for a residential development in Stamford

Question 5

From: Councillor Ian Selby

To: Councillor Bob Adams

Whether representatives from United Lincolnshire Hospitals Trust should have apologised about the partial closure of Grantham hospital's A&E department

46. CLOSE OF MEETING

The meeting was closed at 17:36.