

BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL
OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

4.00pm 9 SEPTEMBER 2015

THE RONUK HALL, PORTSLADE TOWN HALL

MINUTES

Present: Councillor Simson (Chair), Allen, Barradell, Bennett, Deane, Moonan, O'Quinn, Page, Peltzer Dunn and Wares

Also in attendance: Sally Polanski, Community Works; Nicky Cambridge, Healthwatch Brighton & Hove; Colin Vincent, Older People's Council

Apologies: Reuben Brett, Youth Council

PART ONE

17 PROCEDURAL BUSINESS

(a) Declarations of Substitutes

17.1 Councillor Barradell was present in substitution for Councillor Cattell.

(b) Declarations of Interest

17.2 Nicky Cambridge, Healthwatch Representative, declared an interest as she was also an employee of Brighton & Hove City Council, on secondment to Healthwatch Brighton and Hove.

(c) Exclusion of Press and Public

17.3 In accordance with Section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972 ("the Act"), the Committee considered whether the public should be excluded from the meeting during consideration of any item of business on the grounds that it is likely in view of the business to be transacted or the nature of the proceedings, that if members of the public were present during it, there would be disclosure to them of confidential information as defined in Section 100A (3) of the Act.

17.4 **RESOLVED** - That the public are not excluded from any item of business on the agenda.

18 MINUTES

18.1 Councillor Wares said that the minutes did not reflect his concerns about the closure of Goodwood Court; he had asked for a further report to come back to OSC.

RESOLVED – the Scrutiny officer would revise the wording to reflect this.

19 CHAIRS COMMUNICATIONS

19.1 The Chair gave the following communications:

Welcome back to everyone after the summer holidays

There was a lot of discussion at the last OSC about GP provision; there has been similar discussion at the Health and Wellbeing Board. There is work to organise a joint session in private with HWB members and the NHS, CCG etc. as we share the same concerns. The current proposed date is 6 October but scrutiny officers will confirm as soon as possible. You will have seen that the CQC report on Goodwood Court is attached for information. A few members including myself attended the CCG session at the end of August about delegating GP commissioning to local CCGs. This is going to be an ongoing conversation between the CCG and the NHS; you were all emailed the presentation yesterday and we will keep updated at these meetings

As usual due to the volume and complexity of the agenda we are restricted for time. Please focus your comments and questions on issues that would take the agenda forward for our residents. If you have technical questions that could be discussed at a later date, please let Scrutiny know and they can address these outside the meeting.

Some Councillors have been getting complaints from neighbours and local residents about party houses. I have always said that this is going to be a responsive and flexible agenda. Therefore we are therefore bringing the monitoring report forward to the next meeting so that we can try and address this as much as we can.

I am aware that this agenda is very health –focussed so do please raise any non-health scrutiny issues that could be covered.”

20 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

20.1 The Chair noted that no items had been submitted for consideration at the meeting by members of the public.

21 MEMBER INVOLVEMENT

21.1 The Chair noted that there were no items for consideration from Members for the current meeting.

22 UPDATE FROM CO-OPTEES

22.1 The Healthwatch representative reported that Healthwatch had recently worked alongside CQC regarding GP safeguarding practices and staff training. The report summarised the findings from public reports. The Chair and Committee agreed for this to be brought to Committee or a workshop.

23 SUSSEX PARTNERSHIP FOUNDATION TRUST CQC INSPECTION SUMMARY AND BRIGHTON AND HOVE ACTION PLAN

23.1 Dr Kay MacDonald, Sussex Partnership Trust, introduced the report and stated that the Care Quality Commission (CQC) held a planned week long inspection of services provided by Sussex Partnership NHS Foundation (SPFT) in January 2015.

23.2 The CQC rated Sussex Partnership as an organisation which 'requires improvement' and the Sussex Partnership Trust stated that this was disappointing. Colm Donaghy, the Chief Executive of SPFT had written to committee members about their engagement process. He intended to keep members involved with the process and would welcome any feedback.

23.3 Members heard that had been a number of 'good' findings too, which were welcomed.

23.4 One area of concern was the suicide prevention plan; there was no internal policy so SPFT was working with partners to create a more comprehensive strategy.

23.5 Members heard that more focus was being put on learning from serious incidents, in order to develop trustwide learning.

23.6 The CQC felt the recording of statutory and mandatory training was not recorded accurately and was overall not adequate enough as a trust. There had been problems centralising the learning database but since the inspection, "My Learning" has been introduced and this would be shown in the next inspection. It is much easier for managers to assess any training needs now.

23.7 There has been a change in the strategic direction of the trust, with a new Chief Executive and Chair. Work is already underway to develop the 2020 strategy and vision. There has also been a governance review, which has resulted in any governance gaps being addressed.

23.8 John Child, Service Director, explained to the Committee that the majority of findings from the inspection are trust wide, rather than local to Brighton and Hove. He outlined the local findings in the report.

23.9 It was outlined that concerns were raised in regards to the safety in Hanover Crescent, which was found to have a confusing service model. It had been immediately closed to new admissions and all residents had now been moved on. There were also concerns around medication management in Brunswick Ward. It was explained that a monthly Quality Improvement Plan will be submitted to the CQC to improve on these areas.

23.10 Councillor Allen thanked Mr Child for the Brighton & Hove specific details. He requested a map and information to be sent to the Committee Members in regards to the areas

around Brighton and Hove that were inspected, as the City's residents are often treated outside of the city. Mr Child agreed to send these out.

- 23.11 In response to Councillor Peltzer Dunn, it was expressed that the Sussex Partnership Trust does wish to improve all the services in the City and especially in patient's confidence. It was stated that the services have started to communicate more with patients and listen to their feedback, in addition to working closely with the CQC and Brighton & Hove City Council.
- 23.12 Dr MacDonald clarified to the Committee that the Sussex Partnership had their own inspection before the CQC inspection and were anticipating some problems around the accuracy of recording information. It was explained that a new electronic recording system has now been introduced to help record care in a consistent way and across the trust, replacing nine previous recording systems. It is currently in Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS) and will be introduced to other services in November 2015.
- 23.13 Councillor Barradell asked whether there was a strategy for staff who had their own mental health issues, SPFT said that they were working closely with unions to ensure adequate provision for staff. There is an intention to employ more staff who have got their own 'lived experience' of mental health issues; this is exemplar employee practice. There is also a focus on peer support workers.
- 23.14 Councillor Wares expressed concern that the Sussex Partnership Trust "saw it coming"- in which case why was it not addressed earlier. Dr McDonald accepted the point and said that there were a number of complex deep seated issues, In response to Councillor Wares' concerns, Dr MacDonald clarified that a further visit from CQC in November was scheduled and the Sussex Partnership Trust were required to show their work plans to them. There would be ongoing engagement with service users and stakeholders.
- 23.15 In response to the Healthwatch Representative's question about patient feedback, Dr MacDonald assured the Committee that there had been interviews with carers and the CQC had looked into this feedback, alongside surveys. They had since revised the way that they incorporated patients and carers in care planning. Mr Child added that they work closely with MIND and Brighton & Hove City Council to ensure feedback from services users.
- 23.16 Members questioned what would happen with a transgender patient and where they would be placed. In response, Mr Child said they would expect the team to decide the best setting for the patient on a case by case basis.
- 23.17 **RESOLVED** – The Committee agreed to note the report and asked the Trust to report back in six months on progress against the actions.

24 CLINICAL COMMISSIONING GROUP PROPOSALS FOR HANOVER CRESCENT

- 24.1 Mr Child introduced the report to the Committee. Hanover Crescent was a nine bedroom rehabilitation unit. The specific problems with Hanover Crescent, which resulted in the closure, were the service log appeared confusing, which triggered

concerns around staff understanding, the safety and environment of the building and it being an out of date model.

- 24.2 It was explained that the staff from Hanover Crescent were reemployed in other areas and services and the transition team and rehabilitation team are working with patients to move them into alternative accommodation. Mr Child also stated that they have looked into offering rehabilitation services to patients in their own homes, as this may meet individual needs better than supported accommodation.
- 24.3 Mr Child clarified that the Sussex Partnership Trust owned Hanover Crescent but it would be sold, and will no longer provide a service. The money from the sale will go back into the Sussex Partnership Trust but it had not yet been decided if it'll be reinvested in a specific service. Some members said that they would like to see the capital receipt ring-fenced for mental health services. This was supported by the Committee.
- 24.4 Councillor Deane questioned whether a patient with a high suicide rate should be in their own accommodation as an alternative to being in supported housing or a rehabilitation unit. In response, it was clarified that each individual was monitored and placed in suitable accommodation for their needs.
- 24.5 Healthwatch asked how a homeless patient would be treated within a community setting. Mr Child said that there was a specific mental health homeless team who would support the person in this case.
- 24.6 In response to Councillor O'Quinn, it was discussed that it has been recognised that there is a gap for respite care in the city. Mr Child confirmed that the Trust are looking into it and are willing to come back to Committee with an update and plans on this. The Committee welcomed this.
- 24.7 Members noted that the closure of Hanover Crescent had led to nine supported accommodation beds being taken out of the system. It was questioned what effect this had had on placing people out of area and it was confirmed that that patients were not in Hanover Crescent as an alternative to acute care, but it did impact on the ability to discharge patients from more acute provision so this would need to be explored further.
- 24.8 **RESOLVED** – The Committee noted the report and asked the Trust to report back. They amended the recommendation to state that the capital receipt from the sale of Hanover Crescent stays within Brighton & Hove. This was agreed.

25 HOMELESSNESS SCRUTINY PANEL MONITORING REPORT

- 25.1 James Crane, Service Improvement Manager, introduced the Homelessness Scrutiny Panel Monitoring Report.
- 25.2 In response to Councillor Deane, Mr Crane explained that the British Legion works closely with ex-servicemen and support and help with Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD); however, this isn't a big problem in the city.

- 25.3 In response to Councillor Barradell, Mr Crane explained that the Council does not have a statutory duty to find temporary accommodation but do still try to provide some. The Council also try to relocate homeless people who do not have any connection with the city.
- 25.4 Mr Crane confirmed to the Committee that a rough sleeper's count happens every November. All homeless organisations in the City keep a record and these are cross referenced regularly.
- 25.5 The Chair stated to the Committee that other Committees will continue to monitor the situation and asked whether the Overview & Scrutiny Committee felt the report should come back or whether the recommendations could be discharged. On balance members felt that there were some outstanding issues, and asked for a very brief report to come back to committee next year.
- 25.6 **RESOLVED** – The Committee decided the report would come back to an Overview & Scrutiny Committee in a year's time.

26 BULLYING IN SCHOOLS SCRUTINY PANEL MONITORING

- 26.1 Sam Beal, Consultant, introduced the report on Bullying in Schools scrutiny monitoring. This was the third monitoring report. She explained that it was not a full report on bullying in the City but it provided the update to the Committee. Ms Beal stated that a bullying leaflet had been produced and they have worked alongside School Admissions Team to provide training regarding sensitive situations.
- 26.2 In response to Councillor Allen, Ms Beal confirmed that the original reports had gone to Children, Young People & Skills Committee. She said that she was confident that there are monitoring systems in place as well as regular challenges from third sector colleagues, Ms Beal said that she felt that there was little more that Overview and Scrutiny could add at this stage.
- 26.3 In response to Councillor Barradell, Ms Beal explained that children are being educated on prejudice based bullying, such as; gender equalities, LGBT and sexual harassment.
- 26.4 **RESOLVED** – The Committee agreed to change recommendation 2.2 to read "The Overview and Scrutiny Members decide that future monitoring will be taken by Children, Young People & Skills Committee". This was agreed by the committee

27 GOODWOOD COURT MEDICAL CENTRE, QUALITY REPORT

- 27.1 **RESOLVED** – The Committee agreed to note the report.

28 OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE DRAFT WORK PLAN/SCRUTINY UPDATE

- 28.1 **RESOLVED** – The Committee noted the work plan. Councillor Allen said that he felt that there was a role for the committee to look at Adult Social Care, as this was not being democratically scrutinised in any other forum at present. It was agreed to discuss this outside of the committee meeting and report back.

The meeting concluded at 19:10.

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of