

4 June 2020

**SOUTH WEST LONDON & SURREY JHSC SUB-COMMITTEE - IMPROVING  
HEALTHCARE TOGETHER 2020-2030**

**4 June 2020 at 7.30 pm**

**MEMBERS:** Councillor Colin Stears (Chair), Councillor Bill Chapman (Vice-Chair)  
and Councillors Sean Fitzsimons, Ian Lewer, Peter McCabe and Anita  
Schaper

**1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS**

The clerk opened the meeting, it was proposed by Cllr Schaper and seconded by Cllr Chapman that Cllr Fitzsimons be Chair until Cllr Stears was able to join the meeting.

The Chair, Councillor Sean Fitzsimons, welcomed those present

**2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

There were no apologies for absence.

**3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

**4. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

**RESOLVED:** that the minutes of the meeting held on 26 September 2019 be agreed as an accurate record.

Councillor Colin Stears joined the meeting at 7.45pm and took the Chair.

**5. IMPROVING HEALTHCARE TOGETHER JOINT HEALTH SCRUTINY COMMITTEE  
(IHT JHSC) - STATUS REPORT AND MOVING FORWARD**

David Olney, Scrutiny Officer, London Borough of Sutton presented the report.

There were no further questions from Members of the Committee.

Resolved that:

1 The member authorities of the Improving Healthcare Together Joint Health Scrutiny Committee (IHT JHSC) are confirmed as London Borough of Sutton, London Borough of Merton, Surrey County Council, London Borough of Wandsworth, Kingston Council and London Borough of Croydon.

2 That Councils that have not considered their position regarding the power of referral to the Secretary of State will do so and will then to report their decision back to this committee.

**4 June 2020**

3 Timetabling future activity of the Improving Healthcare Together Joint Health Scrutiny Committee (IHT JHSC) was considered.

## **6. IMPROVING HEALTHCARE TOGETHER - PROGRAMME UPDATE**

### **(a) Independent consultants report on public consultation**

Charlie Wilson, Opinion Research Services presented the report.

Members expressed concerns there was insufficient funding allocated for infrastructure, such as roads, around all of the proposed sites, or considerations and allowances given for population growth in the area in the data within the report.

Members expressed they were reassured the report reflected concerns members had raised and concerns they had made aware of by residents.

The representative from Opinion Research explained that the evidence in the report took information from personal experiences of service users and their families, both those traveling by blue light, visitors traveling by car or public transport. Also that the information supporting the report had been collected using a wide range of methods so as to include the views of a wide range of interested groups.

Members explained they were aware that some of the residents they represent as Councillors felt that in some cases more weight was being put on the views of NHS staff than the views of local residents. This was of concern due to differences between the views of residents and those of NHS employees. Members recognised that many residents would like health care located near to their homes and that this created a challenge as the model was a single hospital covering three areas. Members also drew attention that a significant number of residents were reported not to have heard of the IHT programme and suggested that this may have limited the findings of the consultation.

Members drew attention to health inequalities of the poorest and those with the highest levels of deprivation, and reduced life expectancy of this group, drawing attention to the areas with the highest levels of deprivation being found in the locations around the St Helier hospital site.

The representative from Opinion Research reported the views of staff have been separated from those of residents, but no weighting had been added to the views of any group in the findings. The report included the views of all responses to the consultation including the submission from Merton Council. It included both majority and minority views. The findings from the consultation show some level of support for each of the sites.

Resolved:

The analysis of the consultation feedback and findings were noted.

### **(b) NHS IHT programme update**

Andrew Demetriades, IHT Programme Director presented the report and thanked those who had responded to the consultation. He informed members that a high level report was being

**4 June 2020**

developed regarding the learning to date and impacts of the COVID 19 situation for the programme. This report will include work that is being carried out by the Epsom and St Helier Trust. It was confirmed by the IHT programme team that the COVID 19 report and findings will be considered but they suggested the situation would not be an issue in relation to the options for the programme.

Members expressed concerns that the report and findings relating to COVID 19 would not be made available to elected councillors before the submissions were due on 19 June 2020. The lack of sight of this report to elected Members was of particular concern as Members considered that the COVID 19 crisis would have health and other implications including economic impacts on the community in the short, medium and long term. Concern was raised that recognition of the impacts of COVID 19 were not being fully considered and understood before the decision on 3 July 2020. Members expressed dissatisfaction that the findings of the high level COVID 19 report being prepared would be available to decision makers but not to elected councillors and that the findings of this report could result in changes to thinking and the programme.

The IHT programme confirmed the business case will include a 'you said, we did' section.

Resolved that:

The Programme Director's update be noted.

## **7. UPDATE ON THE INTEGRATED IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

Brian Niven, Mott MacDonald presented the report.

Members drew attention to the data relating to maternity care, and the impact for various groups including those of child bearing age and the separation of care between the sites.

All Members expressed concern about the changes which had been made to the report and that the most up to date reports were not available to this meeting. The Chair confirmed that he would follow up with the Accountable Officers the requirement that all, and the most up to date information, is required by elected councillors in order they are able to provide a response by 19 June 2020.

Brian Niven confirmed that the wording in the report had been amended twice, once had been following the report being presented to the IIA Steering Group on Monday 1 June 2020, therefore the report provided to this meeting was not the most up to date version. Brian Niven stated the changes to the report had been minor.

Members drew attention to the Marmot report on Health Inequalities in England, and the suggestion from the programme that services would be moved away from the more deprived areas within the geographies.

Resolved that:

The Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA) and its implications for the Improving Healthcare Together (IHT) Joint Health Scrutiny Committee's (JHSC) consultation response were considered and questioned.

## **8. PUBLIC REPRESENTATIONS**

Members reviewed the public representations included within the agenda, and agreed they would be used to support and inform their responses due by 19 June 2020.

**4 June 2020**

Resolved that:

The Public representations were noted.

## **9. COUNCILS AND CONSULTANTS COMMENTS**

Roger Steer, External Independent advisor presented the report.

Members explained this report had been commissioned by Merton Council, it challenged assumptions made, and noted that no options for alternatives to the models proposed by the IHT team had been presented at the Listening Events attended by residents. Members recognised that this paper was outside the remit of this Sub Committee.

Members stated they felt that the changes caused by the current situation (COVID -19) required the programme to be paused and that decisions should not be taken on 3 July 2020, but there should be a short delay.

Councillor Peter McCabe reported that Merton Council's view was that the preferred site be the St Helier site, and welcomed that this view had also been expressed by Sutton Council.

Resolved that:

The views and information provided were noted.

## **10. MERTON, SUTTON AND SURREY DOWNS CCGS - PRESENTATION TO FACILITATE CONSULTATION FEEDBACK**

Members noted the report and the consultation feedback.

Members suggested the programme should be delayed to allow the impacts of COVID- 19 to be considered, and that a short delay would not create issues as the process had taken place over a long timescale to date. Members reiterated their concerns that the IIA had been altered and that the most up to date version was not available also that some evidence, the COVID- 19 report, would be used to take a decision which will affect communities was not being made available to the elected councillors.

Andrew Demetriades, IHT Programme Director stated that the timeline position was set out by the CCG. He noted Members' concerns in relation to the COVID- 19 situation that national and regional advice and learning would be taken into account, however the IHT programme do not feel they should delay the decision.

Resolved that:

The views and information provided were noted.

## **11. ANY URGENT BUSINESS**

There was no urgent business.

The meeting ended at 10.20 pm

Chair: .....

Date: .....

This page is intentionally left blank