

MAIDSTONE BOROUGH COUNCIL

Community, Environment and Housing Overview and Scrutiny Committee

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY 9 DECEMBER 2014

Present: Councillor J.A. Wilson (Chairman), and
Councillors Mrs Joy, D Mortimer, Round, Sargeant,
Mrs Stockell and Vizzard

Also Present: Councillors Daley and Mrs Grigg

49. THE COMMITTEE TO CONSIDER WHETHER ALL ITEMS ON THE AGENDA SHOULD BE WEB-CAST

RESOLVED: That all items on the agenda be webcast.

50. APOLOGIES

Apologies were noted from Councillors Mrs Parvin and Cllr B Watson.

51. NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

Councillor Vizzard was present as a substitute for Councillor B Watson.

52. NOTIFICATION OF VISITING MEMBERS

Councillors Daley and Grigg were present as visiting members for item 8 on the agenda: Review of Maternity Services in Maidstone Borough.

53. DISCLOSURES BY MEMBERS AND OFFICERS

There were no disclosures by members or officers.

54. TO CONSIDER WHETHER ANY ITEMS SHOULD BE TAKEN IN PRIVATE BECAUSE OF THE POSSIBLE DISCLOSURE OF EXEMPT INFORMATION

RESOLVED: That all items be taken in public as proposed.

55. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 11 NOVEMBER 2014

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 11 November be approved as a correct record and signed, subject to ensuring Janet Greenroyd's name is spelt correctly on page 7.

56. REVIEW OF MATERNITY SERVICES IN MAIDSTONE BOROUGH

Before this item was taken, the Chairman read out a point of clarification on Maternity Services in Maidstone. The Chairman stated that publicity that had been sent out for this item, as well as the covering report for this item, which had stated that 'Maternity Services have moved from Maidstone'. This was not the case- what the publicity and covering report should have stated was that Maternity Services at Maidstone Hospital had changed from a Consultant led service to a Midwife led service.

The Chairman read out a statement from Helen Grant, the MP for Maidstone and the Weald, concerning this item. The statement said that at the time of the consultation on the proposals local GPs wanted to keep consultant led services at Maidstone. However wider regional support for the proposals won local opposition in Maidstone. Mrs Grant asked the committee to seek a response to two questions: whether all stakeholders were happy maternity services at both Pembury and Maidstone Hospitals were adequate and safe for Maidstone mothers and babies; and, whether there had been any incidents over the past three years that may suggest a need to look at the current configuration in more detail.

Councillor Grigg was asked to speak on this topic as it had been her suggestion to conduct this review.

Cllr Grigg explained she had suggested this topic as one of her residents had had a bad experience at in Maidstone and Tunbridge Wells Hospitals. Cllr Grigg explained she thought it might be a good idea to see whether there were any other reports of this happening or if it was a one off case.

Dr Bob Bowes, Chair of West Kent Health and Wellbeing Board, was invited to speak on this item. Dr Bowes made a presentation to the committee covering the following points:

- At the time of the suggested changes to services, around 97% of local GPs had concerns about the changes;
- However statistical analysis had shown a reduction in adverse outcomes in deliveries since the service changed;
- Dr Bowes had asked GP colleagues who were on the Clinical Commissioning Group whether they had heard of any negative experiences from their patients. Dr Bowes explained only one GP had noted a negative experience of the service. This was regarding a mother who had given birth in an ambulance. However it was noted the mother did not experience any adverse outcomes as a result;
- Dr Bowes explained to the committee whilst there was concern in Maidstone regarding the need to travel to Tunbridge Wells to access a consultant led service; those in Tunbridge Wells who needed to access the midwife led service in Maidstone experienced similar travel issues;
- Dr Bowes informed the committee that one of the assessments of NHS services, the 'friends and family' test, where patients were asked whether they would recommend the service to their friends and family. Dr Bowes suggested the committee asked for the

results of this assessment for the maternity service from Maidstone and Tunbridge Wells NHS Trust.

Following the presentation from Dr Bowes, Cllr Daley spoke on this item. Cllr Daley explained to the committee that he was a member of Kent County Council, and sat on their Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee. Cllr Daley made a presentation to the committee covering the following points:

- Due to concerns raised during the consultation on the changes to the maternity services, the Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee had been keeping a close watch over the new service since the changes had been implemented;
- The reason for the changes to services was that staffing numbers for the number of births at both hospitals were not enough to deliver a full range of maternity services at both sites. Therefore the midwife led and consultant led services were split between the two hospitals;
- Emergency transport (ambulances with blue lights) were rarely used to transport patients between sites. This was because when patients arrived at Maidstone Hospital they were given an early stage pre-assessment, and if appropriate were transferred to Pembury Hospital;
- Approximately 30% of first time mothers, and 12% of second time mothers were referred to the unit in Pembury;
- The unit at Maidstone was a £3 million facility, which was state of the art and delivered an excellent service;
- The roll out of the service had been considered a success, and the model piloted in Maidstone and Tunbridge Wells had been followed elsewhere in the country where similar problems with staffing levels had been identified;
- The County Council's Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee would continue to monitor the performance of maternity services.

57. REVIEW OF STREET CLEANSING SERVICE

Jennifer Shepherd, Waste and Street Scene Manager, and Gary Stevenson, Shared Head of Environment and Street Scene were invited to speak on this item.

Mrs Shepherd gave a presentation to the committee covering the following points:

- The aims of the new street cleansing service were:
 - Greater transparency;
 - A service that reflected the needs of the borough;
 - Increased attention to detail; and
 - Reducing costs from 2016.
- The review compared different ways of delivering the street cleansing service, including private sector and in house teams and mechanical and manual methods;
- Every street in the borough was assessed to determine its cleansing needs;

- A review of productivity levels in the cleansing teams showed lower productivity than was expected. This was not down to the work of the cleansing teams but due to the systems and structures being used. For example, the splitting of the borough into two zones had hindered flexibility.
- The review found the service relied on a high levels of overtime to deliver core functions.

In response to this review, the following changes were being implemented, in consultation with the workforce:

- More manual cleansing, instead of mechanised cleansing. Manual cleansing was better for achieving greater attention to detail.
- Moving from area based cleansing to team based cleansing.
- Formation of a 'hit squad' to cleanse areas that required urgent attention. This team could be sent out via an app, and members of the public could 'tag' areas online that needed urgent attention.

In response to a question from the committee, Mrs Shepherd stated the last review of street cleansing took place in 2010. This review led to the area based cleansing system in place at this time.

The committee were interested to know why shopping areas seemed to receive a lot of attention from cleansing teams, as this ought to be the responsibility of shops. Mrs Shepherd responded that the approaches to shopping areas were high footfall areas, where high levels of waste gathered.

The committee asked Mrs Shepherd for a copy of the cleansing schedule. Mrs Shepherd explained this not available yet, as workforce engagement had not yet taken place on the new proposals. It was important to engage with staff as they had the expert knowledge on what would work well on the ground. Once the new schedule had been finalised, it would be made publicly available on the internet.

The committee enquired whether the proposals would lead to an increase in the number of staff employed on cleansing. Mrs Shepherd informed the committee that the proposals within the review were focused on using existing resources better, rather than taking on new staff. Mrs Shepherd made it very clear that cleansing staff were committed to the job and hard working, however the systems in place could make them inefficient. For example, through long journey times between jobs.

A member of the committee asked what delegation was given to parishes for cleansing in their areas. Mrs Shepherd responded that some work was carried out in collaboration with larger parishes, however the cost of the equipment required meant it was not an option for all parishes.

Mrs Shepherd informed the committee that the cleansing teams had been equipped with a handheld mobile working device. The new cleansing system would be introduced alongside a new app. This app would allow the public to report areas requiring attention, and a cleansing team could be directed there via their handheld device. The app would also lead to

less duplication as residents would be able to see reports that had already been made. In addition, the app would be sophisticated enough to identify who was responsible for each piece of land and forward a request to the appropriate agency. For example if a fly tip was reported on land belonging to Golding Homes, Golding Homes would be notified directly. The app had the added benefit of helping enforcement to map fly tipping hotspots.

RESOLVED: That

- 1) The Waste and Street Scene Manager bring an update report on the new street cleansing service to the appropriate committee in September 2015, once the new service was up and running.
- 2) The Waste and Street Scene Manager make available to all members the cleansing schedule for their area, once it has been finalised in consultation with the workforce.

58. MAIDSTONE FAMILIES MATTER UPDATE - REPORT ONLY

RESOLVED: That the committee noted the report.

59. FINANCIAL CAPABILITY UPDATE - REPORT ONLY

The committee noted that Citizens Advice Bureaux (CAB) was not mentioned as one of the partners in the Financial Capability Partnership in Miss Kershaw's report. The committee requested that Miss Kershaw provide clarification over whether CAB were involved in the Financial Capability Partnership.

RESOLVED: That the committee noted the report.

60. FUTURE WORK PROGRAMME AND SCRAIP UPDATE REPORT

The Chairman introduced the Future Work Programme and SCRAIP update to the committee.

The following changes had taken place to the Future Work Programme since the last meeting:

- Impact of welfare reforms- moved from the 9 December 2014 to 14 April 2015 as the data was not available to complete the report;
- Private Rented Sector Update- moved from 13 January 2015 to 14 April 2015 as central government requirements had not yet been published;
- A report on the proposed model to gather data for the Loneliness and Isolation in the over 65s of Maidstone borough be presented at the meeting of 13 January 2015; and
- A report on bereavement services in Maidstone borough is to be presented at the meeting of 13 January 2015.

All SCRAIPs that were due for the meeting had been responded to.

RESOLVED: That the Head of Housing and Community Services prioritises the cost/benefit analysis of the night time economy so that it is available for the next Crime and Disorder Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting on 10 March 2015.

61. DURATION OF MEETING

18:35 to 19:55