



Committee and Date

Item

1

Public

**LOTON AND TERN
LOCAL JOINT COMMITTEE**

**NOTE OF DECISIONS AND ACTIONS STEMMING FROM THE MEETING HELD
ON 6TH NOVEMBER
7.30 PM – 9.00 PM
AT
ASTLEY VILLAGE HALL, ASTLEY**

Responsible Officer Mathew Mead

e-mail: mathew.mead@shropshire.gov.uk

Tel: 01743 252534

Committee Members Present:

Shropshire Council

David Roberts

Loton Electoral Ward

John Everall

Tern Electoral Ward

Town/Parish Councils

Elliott Blackmore

Bicton Parish Council

Pam Furber

Bomere Heath Parish Council

Phil Heath

Withington Parish Council

Lynne Padmore

Uffington Parish Council

Roy Griffiths

Alberbury with Cardeston Parish Council

Malcolm Colclough

Astley Parish Council

David Sandbach

Westbury Parish Council

Officers Present:

Mathew Mead

Community Enablement Officer

Neil Wilcox

Commissioning Manager Shropshire Council

1. Welcome and Introductions

Mathew Mead welcomed everyone to the meeting.

2. Apologies for Absence

Apologies were received from Councillor Barry Bennion, Councillor David Nunn and Councillor Patrick Siese, with Councillor Roy Griffiths substituting

3. Disposable Pecuniary Interests

Members were reminded that they must not participate in the discussion or voting on any matter in which they have a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest and should leave the room prior to the commencement of the debate.

4. Notes of Previous Meeting

The minutes were agreed as a correct record of the previous LJC on 31st July, and the Chairman signed the minutes.

5. **Update on Locality Commissioning and Local Joint Committees by Neil Willcox, Locality Commissioning Manager Shropshire Council**

Mathew Mead introduced Neil and recapped the reasons behind needing to change the boundaries of the Local Joint Committees (LJC's) in the Shrewsbury area. Currently there are 4 rural and 6 urban Local Joint Committees, and due to reductions in staff at the Council, together with a need to alter the way LJC's operate these needed to be reduced down to 3 Rural LJC's and 1 urban LJC for Shrewsbury.

Discussions had taken place with the Shropshire Councillors for the area, and Parish Councils and a number of options had been discussed, with the option of creating an East/West split of the rural LJC's being the preferred option of the Shropshire Councillors.

This would see Councillor David Roberts electoral division of Loton (Westbury, Alberbury, Great Ness and Little Ness and Montford) join the existing Longden Ford and Rea Valley LJC to form the Loton, Longden, Ford and Rea Valley LJC

Councillor John Everalls electoral division on Tern (Bomere Heath, Bicton, Astley, Upton Magna, Uffington and Withington) join with the Severn Valley electoral division to form a new Tern and Severn Valley LJC. A map of the proposed areas was shown.

The basis behind the new areas was that:

Each Shropshire Councillor division should not be split between two LJC's

There should be approximately the same population within each LJC area

There should be some similarities of geography and interests between communities in each LJC

However both Shropshire Councillors and officers acknowledged that the proposed new LJC areas were not perfect and had to be a compromise of a number of different issues. The concerns of Bomere Heath, Bicton and Great Ness and Little Ness Parishes had been raised in the consultation process and were acknowledged as being significant issues in the new LJC boundaries.

Neil went on to talk more about the new role proposed for Local Joint Committees. Rather than simply being a forum where issues were discussed the new LJC's would play a role in the devolving of decision making and resources to a more local level.

Local Joint Committee's would take a role in identifying the local needs within their area, and start to allocate resources to tackle these issues. The first of these areas of work would be youth services. Less youth activity would be delivered directly by Shropshire Council, but it would instead commission community led organisations to deliver services that met identified needs of young people. LJC's would help identify these issues and discuss how best to tackle the issue, with the Community Enablement Officers and Councils Commissioning team then helping the LJC's to commission the new services. The town and parish Councils on the LJC would not be employing staff directly, this would still be done through Shropshire Council.

Committee members gave their initial views on the proposals.

Councillors from the Loton division said they could see the thinking behind linking them with the Longden, Ford and Rea Valley LJC, as they perhaps looked more to Pontesbury and Minsterley for some of their services, and these areas also fell within the Mary Webb School catchment area, which was important from a youth perspective

Councillors from the Tern division expressed concern that the area was too large and Parishes to the north west of Shrewsbury (Bicton, Bomere Heath, Nesscliffe) had little in common with the Severn Valley and would be better suited to the Longden, Ford and Rea Valley or Five Perry Parishes LJC.

Members of the LJC also expressed concerns that the commissioning model was simply one aimed at saving money and passing too much decision making down to a Parish Council level. Neil acknowledged that the new youth commissioning budget was significantly less than the previous budget, but that these levels of budget reduction were happening across the Council, and the Council couldn't continue to deliver services in the way it had. It was a risk of the new model that some Parish Councils might chose not to take part in the new LJC's.

Councillors Overall and Roberts acknowledged the issue of the geographies not suiting every parish, but felt that moving some parishes to different areas would alter the populations so one LJC had a much larger population than another. They also put forward the idea of holding meetings in one or two central venues to help reduce travel times and costs for the Councillors.

Over time the housing developments in Shrewsbury and Bicton, and also in areas such as Bomere Heath and Nesscliffe would mean a boundary review was needed, and that would provide an opportunity to alter the electoral

divisions in a more equitable way. However the new LJC's for a first step in looking to work in a different way.

Mathew and Neil stated that the new proposals and commissioning model still needed to be confirmed by Shropshire Council, but that it was hoped the new LJC's would start to operate and look at allocating funding early in 2015. It would therefore be necessary to hold an initial meeting of the new LJC's before Christmas to start to discuss the local issues.

While an area might be in one LJC there was no reason why they couldn't work closely with neighbouring LJC's, and attend their meetings. Many services are delivered across boundaries and using local knowledge to identify these would be important. Community Enablement Officers would also be able to support cross boarder work, and on a day to day basis their work with Parish Councils would remain unchanged.

6. Update in Future Fit Consultation Paul Tulley – Chief Operating Officer Shropshire CCG group.

Paul thanked the Committee for its invitation to speak to them and gave a brief background on the Future Fit programme. It was based in the assumption that hospital services needed to change if they were to meet the changing needs of the population in the 21st century, whilst also meeting the budgetary restrictions placed on the health service. Some of the key issues it addressed were people living longer, with life long illness; the need to provide top quality care for people suffering trauma injuries or illness; and to reduce illness caused by obesity, smoking and diet.

Future Fit looked at how services could be offered in Shropshire and Telford and Wrekin, and included emergency care, long term care and also preventative care. The long list of proposals looked at how urgent care, planned care and community based services could be delivered.

Clinically hosting emergency care (A&E) at one centre provided the best care, and allowed the service to recruit the best staff and offer the best service. This could be located at Shrewsbury; Telford or possibly a new site in between the two towns. Urgent care centres for less serious emergency care cases could be located in both Shrewsbury and Telford, as well as between 2 and 5 other locations in the county.

The Future Fit programme also suggested setting up a separate planned care unit, where planned operations could take place. By separating this from the A&E unit the quality of service would improve and appointments wouldn't be cancelled as doctors wouldn't be diverted to deal with emergencies.

However the location of the emergency care unit was a very difficult issue to resolve. Hosting the service at Shrewsbury would make it easier to access for people from South Shropshire and mid Wales; but there was a higher population in Telford so it also made sense to locate it where there were more people.

Paul stressed that every service currently available in the county would remain in the new proposals. Some major trauma cases will go to Stoke, Birmingham or Wolverhampton, as they do now – but the number of patients that have to have this level of care are very small.

A long list of options for the future of hospital services in Shropshire has been drawn up, and these would be reduced down to a short list of 3-4 which would be consulted on again at the start of 2015. Any proposals were based on the service not receiving any more government funding, so if new sites were built they would have to be funded by cost savings from other areas. However purpose built sites were cheaper to run and could offer significant revenue savings. New services would be unlikely to start until 2018 at the earliest.

Councillor Sandbach (formerly chief executive of Telford and Wrekin hospital) suggested that while the Future Fit plans had some issues, he felt they offered the opportunity to create a very effective health care service in the county. Separating emergency and planned care up was a very important change that could bring big benefits. However he preferred the option of locating emergency care at Shrewsbury, as it provided quicker access to services for people to the west of the county. Committee members agreed with this, and felt that while Telford had a larger population they also had more alternative hospitals near-by such as Wolverhampton, Birmingham and Stafford.

Members of the public asked about the location of clinics, as many people with long term conditions have to travel to Shrewsbury or Telford for treatments and consultations and this is difficult for people in rural areas.

Paul responded that more local centre's, and wider ranges of services at local surgeries were being looked at to help this issue. Local centres could hold clinics which consultants visited for appointments, and increasing skills of surgery staff to undertake services such as blood tests, dressing changes, and elements of minor surgery were being looked at. Some members of the audience suggested this sounded like a return to cottage hospitals. Paul also felt that new technology could also help deliver solutions locally or even in people's homes, with video consultations and even some treatments now being possible remotely using computers.

Members of the Committee commented that ambulances were also an issue in Shropshire, and in rural areas response times were often way below national averages and agreed targets. Paul said these issues were being considered as part of the programme. Improving ambulance response times was important, but this had to be balanced against the cost. Hundreds of new ambulance staff would be needed to reduce response times, and clinically it might be better to invest this money in hospital services to provide better outcomes for patients.

The work of Community First Responders and having defibrillation units available in communities was also an effective way of providing immediate emergency care at a local level, and making sure the voluntary sector was included in the discussions was important.

Further consultations on the Future Fit shortlist would take place in 2015 and Paul encouraged communities to get involved and give their views and also offered to provide further updates via the LJC's in the future.

7. Resolutions and updates from the Parish Councils

No resolutions were received from the Parish Councils

8. Community Enablement Update

Details of the new “Horsewatch” scheme to reduce thefts and attacks on farm animals in the region were circulated to the meeting. Owners of livestock can sign up to receive information on livestock related crime and get news on preventative measures they can adopt to reduce the risk of their animals being stolen. Residents can also sign up to other updates from Neighbourhood Watch at

<https://www.westmercia.police.uk/register-to-receive-watch-messages.html>

The Police are also looking to reintroduce the “Community Speedwatch” scheme in the Policing area. The scheme allows volunteers to monitor speeding in their area. While the scheme can’t be run on all roads, and some training is required, it could be a way of addressing concerns about speeding identified in many rural communities.

Parish Councils can register their interest in the scheme by contacting the coordinator, Ian Connolly

Ian Connolly Scheme Coordinator – Warwickshire and West Mercia Police

Tel: 01562 826032 ext 3032

Email: ian.connolly@westmercia.pnn.police.uk

9. Have your say question time

No questions were raised by members of the public attending the meeting

Councillor Roberts closed the meeting at 9pm and thanked Paul Tulley for his presentation, and Astley Parish Council for hosting the meeting.

Chair: _____

Date: _____