

Minutes

External Services Scrutiny Committee

23 September 2009

Meeting held in Committee Room 6 at the Civic Centre, Uxbridge UB8 1UW



	<p>Committee Members Present: Councillors Mary O'Connor (Chairman), Michael White (Vice-Chairman), Phodaj Jarjussey, Judy Kelly and Peter Kemp</p> <p>Officers Present: Inspector Darren Malpass: British Transport Police (BTP) Chief Inspector Maurice Hartnett: Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) Sergeant Caroline Young: Safer Transport Team (STT) Kevin Dulling: Transport for London (TfL)</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: Ian Edwards, Head of Partnerships, Business and Communities Ed Shaylor, Head of Community Safety Nikki Stubbs, Democratic Services Manager</p> <p>Others present: Councillor John Major</p> <p>Public present: 2</p>	
10.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING</p> <p>Councillor John Major declared a personal interest in Item 6 – LINK & External Services Scrutiny Committee Protocol in that he was a member of the LINK, and remained in the room during the consideration thereof.</p>	
11.	<p>EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC</p> <p>RESOLVED – That all items of business were considered in public.</p>	
12.	<p>SAFER TRANSPORT (<i>Agenda Item 5</i>)</p> <p>Consideration was given to the report on safer transport.</p> <p>Chief Inspector Maurice Hartnett, from the Metropolitan Police Service, advised that Transport for London (TfL) had been the principle funder for the new Hub Team in Hayes town and the Safer Transport Team, which had resulted in extra services being provided for residents of the Borough.</p>	Action by

	<p>The Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) continued to be very active in the Borough and had produced one of the best performing Safer Transport Teams in London.</p> <p>Chief Inspector Hartnett advised that the Safer Transport Team (STT) had devised a victim/offender/location problem solving methodology where the expected results were agreed and engagement with victims and offenders was reviewed. By way of furthering this engagement, Members noted that a new online youth survey had been launched on Monday 21 September 2009 which looked at issues surrounding young people. A tasking meeting, which involved all West London Boroughs, was held quarterly. At this meeting, officers were held to account for the work of the STTs, generating a healthy debate.</p> <p>Sergeant Caroline Young from the Safer Transport Team advised Members that Hillingdon did not have a large anti-social behaviour problem on the local transport network. Most crime that did take place on public transport was fairly low level, e.g., rowdy children on their journeys to and from school.</p> <p>The STT had been proactive in its work and had made contacts at the Youth Council. It had also been involved in the KICKZ and FIESTA programmes. The STT had, for some time, been visiting primary schools to talk to the pupils. This had now been extended to early years and secondary schools.</p> <p>Members were reassured that the STT received data from TfL on a daily basis to enable officer to track where problems were occurring. Trends could then be highlighted and addressed. It was through this work that the U4 and 140 buses had been identified as problem routes and then targeted through joint working between the STT and British Transport Police (BTP). Further work was also undertaken through joint working, particularly with Harrow and Ealing.</p> <p>It was thought that the PCSOs working in the STT had returned to a more traditional style of policing. The diversity this gave them meant that the turnover of officers in the STT was very low and job satisfaction was high. The STT work often resulted in a PCSO applying for a position as a regular Police Officer.</p> <p>It was noted that serious youth violence was a Metropolitan Police priority, particularly during school journeys. Members were advised that Operation Safe Bus was currently underway and involved significant police presence on buses. Further measures were being put in place during the half term period and for Halloween.</p> <p>Mr Kevin Dulling, from Transport for London, reiterated that Hillingdon was one of the safest Boroughs in London and TfL</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>was very happy with the efforts of the STT. He advised that 40 Hub Teams had been established across London at roughly the same time. Each of these teams would be subjected to an environmental audit - starting with those that had been experiencing high levels of crime. As the crime levels in Hillingdon were very low, this Borough would be one of the last to be audited.</p> <p>Following the robbery attack on a woman at the subway in Carlyon Road last year, Mr Dulling had undertaken a crime prevention audit at the scene. From this, a report was produced with recommendations for safety improvements at the subway site. The following recommendations have since been agreed and would be implemented in due course:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cut back slopes to improve sightlines to subways – convex mirrors would be installed where this was not possible • Installation of more frequent and improved lighting on the approach to subways (possibly with the use of high pressure sodium lighting which would make it uncomfortable to loiter underneath) • The southern footway area was owned by TfL. One side of this area (the school side) had been properly fenced off whilst the other side was unkempt. This unkempt side would be cut back and replanted with thorny, fast growing plants to deter people from hiding in them • Railings would be installed on the exits to the subways • Installation of a stand alone CCTV system on the approaches to the subways • Erection of a 1.4m wire mesh fence for 5m on either side of each subway entrance <p>Similar crime prevention audits had been undertaken by Mr Dulling with regard to the Minet Country Park and the Avondale Estate but his recommendations had not yet been agreed. Remedial action was also being considered at Beck Theatre to restore the use of areas for passengers and the wider community. It was noted that the Council's Community Safety team would be working with TfL to resolve this matter.</p> <p>Mr Dulling had volunteered to undertake a survey and would be looking to apply for a grant from the Community Safety and Enforcement Directorate at TfL for financial assistance for PCSOs. He would keep Committee Members updated on progress regarding this matter.</p> <p>Inspector Darren Malpas, from British Transport Police (BTP), advised that there were 11 stations in the area and he had been working with the SNT, STT and Residents to address any issues that had arisen and to build of the existing partnerships and relationships. The BTP spent time reassuring the public that the fear of crime was much higher than the actual levels of</p>	<p>Kevin Dulling</p>
--	--	----------------------

	<p>crime and that there were few instances of anti social behaviour in the Borough.</p> <p>The BTP held monthly meetings with users of the public transport system. Issues that were identified at these meetings were added to the BTP action plan. Any action taken and issues resolved were reported back to these meetings.</p> <p>Inspector Malpas advised that the BTP was pre-empting an increase in anti-social behaviour on the trains around certain times such as Halloween. This proactive approach enabled the BTP to deal with issues before they arose. It was noted that these actions, along with the work of the SNT, had helped reduce crime rates across the board and had contributed to the increase in the number of detections.</p> <p>It was agreed that, although the crime levels in the Borough were low, this was resultant from significant work undertaken by the BTP, MPS, TfL and other organisations. It was thought that any reduction in the resources committed to this work would see an increase in the instances of crime.</p> <p>The Head of Community Safety advised that the Council had set up and funded a Police Partnership Tasking Team which comprised 12 members. Signs of success had been reported regarding the Hub and Safer Transport Teams and a survey was underway to gauge feedback from residents in Hayes on this service. It had been noted that, since the Hub Team had started in Hayes, the perpetrators of anti-social behaviour had been displaced to Uxbridge Road.</p> <p>Members were generally very satisfied with the improvements that had been made and the resultant low levels of crime on the transport network in the Borough. It was acknowledged that the majority of young people using the transport system did not cause trouble. As such, the STT role was more to ensure that passengers could travel safely rather than a hard enforcement role.</p> <p>With regard to the removal of a young person's Oyster Card, Members were advised that only TfL Revenue Control Inspectors had the authority to remove cards. This could be done on a temporary basis (once the young person had reached their destination) or on a permanent basis whereby the young person would have the right of appeal. The permanent removal of a card could only be undertaken through a Judicial Disposal when the individual had been given (a police caution or charge). Other actions that could be taken included the addition of a clause in an Anti Social Behaviour Order (ASBO) to prevent an individual who had been caught for graffiti from sitting on the top deck of a double decker bus.</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>Mr Dulling mentioned that TfL were planning to implement a scheme called “Earn Your Travel Back”, whereby young people who had their Oyster Cards permanently removed could earn them back. This scheme was still being developed and further details should be available soon.</p> <p>Members were advised that an Information Sharing Protocol was being drawn up between TfL and the Council's Youth Offending Team to promote early intervention. It was anticipated that it will enable the two organisations to share information regarding individuals who had been acting inappropriately.</p> <p>The Head of Community Safety advised that the Hillingdon Early Intervention Panel comprises representatives from organisations including the Police, the Council and Hillingdon Homes. This Panel deals with all age groups but finds that there are a significant number of referrals for young people. If a referral had originated from the Safer Transport Team, consideration could be given to putting an Acceptable Behaviour Contract or an ASBO in place. It was noted that the BTP had applied a large number of Acceptable Behaviour Contracts, which could then be used to support a request for an ASBO if the need arose.</p> <p>RESOLVED – That:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The presentation be noted; and 2. Mr Kevin Dulling report back to the Committee Members on progress regarding the application for a grant from the Community Safety and Enforcement Directorate at TfL. 	
13.	<p>STRENGTHENING LOCAL DEMOCRACY – CONSULTATION RESPONSE (<i>Agenda Item 8</i>)</p> <p>Local Government (DCLG) consultation document on <i>Strengthening local democracy: Consultation</i>. Responses to the consultation document were required by 2 October 2009.</p> <p>DCLG suggested that the proposals contained within the consultation document would promote democratic renewal by strengthening the capacity of local government to serve citizens. It proposed to: give councils more scope to scrutinise the spending and decisions of local services providers; explore the barriers to using existing powers; ensure councils had the powers needed to tackle climate change; explore how the powers and responsibilities of sub-regional structures should be matched by clear and accountable leadership; and explore how to ensure that the functions of Government and local government were clear to residents.</p>	Action by

	<p>It was agreed that the overall aims of the proposed revisions were laudable but that there were some concerns that the paper did not go far enough in some areas. Whilst it was mentioned that suggestions for organisations that could be scrutinised should be included in the Council's response to the consultation document, it was clear that any such list would be outdated as soon as it was published. It was suggested any publically funded service delivered locally should be made subject to scrutiny but if that were to be too broad then a list of the services that could be scrutinized should be used rather than the names of organisations. Furthermore, it was suggested that such a list should include Government services/functions such as Immigration which, in Hillingdon, was of concern to Borough Residents.</p> <p>Members were advised that the proposals would see the Council scrutinising organisations that provided services to its residents but it would not be responsible for the operational issues of the organisation. This could be problematic in that in the eyes of residents the Council would become accountable for ensuring the standards and efficiency of all public services delivered in their area but the Council would not be empowered to force change if it deemed it necessary. For example the Council would continue to have no power in things like the appointment or removal of the Police or Fire Borough Commander. It was felt that members of the public would have difficulty in differencing strategic and operational accountabilities and that the public expectation would be that the Council dealt with everything.</p> <p>The proposals included the suggestion that Cabinet Members may have an increased role in scrutiny. It was thought that this would blur the separation of roles and potentially weaken existing scrutiny and this concern should be noted in the Council's response to the consultation.</p> <p>Members of the Committee were reassured that they would be sent a copy of the Council's consultation response before it was submitted.</p> <p>RESOLVED – That:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> the following comments be passed on to the relevant officers for consideration and inclusion in the Council's response to the <i>Strengthening local democracy: consultation</i> document: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suggest that a list of services that could be scrutinised be compiled rather than a list of organisations. Suggest that Government departments be included on the list of services that could be scrutinised. Highlight the potential problems if Cabinet became more 	<p>Nikki Stubbs</p> <p>Nikki Stubbs</p>
--	---	---

	involved in scrutiny. 2. a copy of the consultation response be forwarded to Committee Members prior to submission.	
14.	<p>LINK & EXTERNAL SERVICES SCRUTINY COMMITTEE PROTOCOL (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p>Consideration was given to the draft protocol between the Hillingdon LINK and the External Services Scrutiny Committee. HAP UK had developed the draft protocol in consultation with Council officers and this had subsequently been considered by the LINK. The LINK comments had been incorporated into the draft protocol as tracked changes. It was noted that the Protocol would be monitored and amended as required.</p> <p>It was suggested that this Protocol would support a strong partnership and working relationship between the Council and the LINK. Members agreed that lines of communication should be maintained to ensure that each organisation was aware of the work undertaken by the other.</p> <p>With the introduction on individual budgets and the resultant wider ranges of choice available to Residents, it was thought important to ensure that the LINK was involved in the monitoring of these providers.</p> <p>Members were advised that it was unlikely that the Committee would be inundated with reports from the LINK. Reports would only be submitted in relation to issues that had been addressed by the LINK but which remained unresolved. It was anticipated that the small number of reports that were submitted to the Scrutiny Committee would reduce as the LINK gained reputation and status within the community. A separate report would be submitted to the Committee to update Members on the work that had been undertaken by the LINK.</p> <p>RESOLVED – That the protocol, as amended and attached as Appendix A, be agreed.</p>	Action by
15.	<p>WORK PROGRAMME (<i>Agenda Item 7</i>)</p> <p>Consideration was given to the External Services Scrutiny Committee's 2009/2010 Work Programme.</p> <p><u>29 October 2009 – NHS & GPs</u> It was agreed that Professor Yi-Mien Koh be invited to attend and represent the PCT at the Committee's next meeting on 29 October 2009 to discuss the NHS and GPs. Should Professor Koh not be available, Colin Peel would be invited.</p>	Action by

Members were advised that Adam Crosby, Ambulance Service Commander, would not be able to attend this meeting and, rather than send a replacement, requested whether he could report to another meeting instead. It was agreed that he be invited to attend a future meeting instead.

Members requested that Mr Robert Bell, Chief Executive of the Royal Brompton & Harefield PCT be invited to attend the meeting.

25 November 2009 – Podiatry & Footcare

Members requested that the following be invited to attend the meeting on 25 November 2009:

- Chris Comerford, Chief Executive of Age Concern Hillingdon
- Maria O'Brien, PCT

Although a letter had been sent to Ronak Lakhani, Chief Podiatrist in the NHS Podiatry Department, Members suggested that he be emailed to ensure that he received the invitation.

Jean McGiffen, PA to the Chief Executive at Hillingdon Hospital, had been contacted to try to arrange a site visit for Members.

Children and Young People Who Abuse Their Parents and Carers Working Group

Consideration was given to the scoping report and terms of reference of the *Children and Young People Who Abuse Their Parents and Carers Working Group*. It was noted that Councillor Judy Kelly would be unable to attend the first meeting due to work commitments and it was agreed that the second meeting on 4 November 2009 be rescheduled to start at 7pm.

It was agreed that the invitees to the first witness session should be officers from the following teams:

- Parent Partnership
- Youth Offending Team
- Safeguarding Adults Team
- Domestic Violence Team

Broadmoor Hospital Redevelopment

It was noted that the Council had been contacted regarding the redevelopment proposals at Broadmoor Hospital, which would see the overall number of beds increase from 244 to 266. After some discussion, it was agreed that the proposed development of Broadmoor Hospital would not constitute a substantial development or variation in health services to Borough Residents. As such, the Council's response should state that it did not wish to engage in consultation over the redevelopment.

Reshaping of Children's Cancer Services in North West London

Members had been forwarded a copy of the briefing paper on the reshaping of children's cancer services in North West London. The Committee supported the proposals and believed that the changes to the shared care arrangements would result in improved clinical safety and effectiveness. A response to reflect these comments would be prepared and set to Sue Perrin at the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham.

Framework for Quality Accounts

Consideration was given to the consultation being undertaken by the Department for Health on proposals for the Framework for Quality Accounts. Quality Account aimed to improve public accountability and encourage in the quality of care provided.

Responses to the consultation should be submitted by Thursday 10 December 2009.

Children's Cardiac Surgery Services News

Members' attention was drawn to the Safe and Sustainable newsletter produced by the NHS National Specialist Commissioning Group. It was noted that a national stakeholder event had been planned for 22 October 2009 at Dexter House Tower Hill, London. This event would give delegates the opportunity to discuss draft service standards and shape the Group's work programme.

Daniel Ward

Members were updated on the closure of Daniel Ward. It was noted that long term care was not within the remit of Hillingdon Hospital. As such, provision would need to be made for the 8 patients currently being cared for on Daniel Ward. The PCT had contacted all of the patients, their families and the staff on the ward. Each patient would have a medical assessment, to which their family would be invited. The redeployment of staff would be considered and reassurances were given that the closure be a slow and sensitive process. Councillor O'Connor would keep the Committee updated on this matter.

It was noted that the LINK was involved in the closure of Daniel Ward and had acted as an independent body in setting up a meeting between the PCT, patients and their families and the staff.

Education & Children's Services POC

Members were advised that the Education and Children's Services POC would be undertaking its second review on *Child Trafficking – A review of how Children's Services work with partner agencies to provide safeguarding and how the Heathrow Airport Port of Entry is regulated*. It was anticipated

	<p>that the review would start in January 2010.</p> <p>RESOLVED – That:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. the External Services Scrutiny Committee's 2009/2010 Work Programme be agreed; 2. the scoping report and terms of reference of the <i>Children and Young People Who Abuse Their Parents and Carers Working Group</i> be agreed; 3. the start time of the Working Group meeting proposed for 4 November 2009 be changed to 7pm; 4. A response be submitted to the London Specialised Commissioning Group to advise that this Council did not wish to engage in consultation over the proposed redevelopment of Broadmoor Hospital; and 5. the second review topic being considered by the Education & Children's Services POC be noted. 	
16.	<p>MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETINGS – 15 JULY 2009</p> <p>RESOLVED – That the minutes of the External Services Scrutiny Committee meeting held on 15 July 2009 be agreed as a correct record.</p>	
	<p>Meeting closed at: 7.50pm Next meeting: 29 October 2009</p>	

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Nikki Stubbs on 01895 250472. Circulation of these minutes is to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.

PROTOCOL BETWEEN HILLINGDON'S EXTERNAL SERVICES SCRUTINY COMMITTEE AND THE HILLINGDON LOCAL INVOLVEMENT NETWORK (LINK)

Overview

The following are guidelines to govern the relationship between the Scrutiny function at the London Borough of Hillingdon and the Hillingdon LINK. On a day-to-day basis it would be beneficial to all parties for there to be a relaxed and informal dialogue based on good relations and a common interest in the delivery and need for improvement (should it be necessary) of health and social care services in the Borough.

In terms of the Scrutiny function at the London Borough of Hillingdon, the first point of contact would be the Chairman of the External Services Scrutiny Committee via Democratic Services [Nikki Stubbs, Democratic Services Manager, Tel: 01895 250472; Email: nstubbs@hillington.gov.uk].

In terms of the LINK, the first point of contact would be the Chairman of the LINK via the LINK Officer at the host organisation [Fiona Ford, Tel: 01895 422407; Email: fionaford@hapuk.co.uk].

Annual reviews of this protocol will be undertaken.

Relationship

LINKs and Scrutiny have a relationship set out in statute. The guided role of the Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee is a strategic level one and the LINK has a more operational and representative role. The statutory powers of the bodies are very complimentary and are designed to ensure good evidence is gathered to drive the provision of appropriate quality services in the area.

#See 'NHS Centre for Involvement Guide 17' for further detail on OSC/LINK Relationships

Attendance at Scrutiny

Where the Scrutiny Committee is considering a report produced by the LINK, a named LINK representative will be invited to attend the meeting to present the report. Where other parties are called to respond to the report, the LINK representative may ask questions after the Committee Members have spoken. However, this would not mean that the LINK representative would be a member of the Committee and would not automatically have speaking rights. A substitute representative should also be named and, if the actual representative is unable to attend the meeting, Democratic Services should be notified before the meeting that the named substitute will be attending in their place. Copies of the agenda would be circulated to both the representative and the reserve for each meeting (the agenda will include a copy of the Committee's Work Programme for the year).

Work Plan

An annual work programme will be produced by the LINK following a process of consultation and engagement with all stakeholders. The LINK work programme will be distributed to stakeholders including Democratic Services and other areas/officers of the Council.

The Scrutiny Committee and the LINK will work together to avoid duplication. The scrutiny officers will meet informally with LINK support staff on a regular / quarterly basis to discuss any work issues.

The LINK will be invited to attend the first meeting of the External Services Scrutiny Committee (usually June) to feed into the Committee's work programme and to establish likely areas of joint working. Work undertaken jointly will be formally reported, with findings, to the Council through Democratic Services.

It is recognised that issues and topics may come to the attention of the LINK which need to be brought to the urgent attention of Democratic Services. It is expected that this would be done via a phone call and followed up by e-mail and letter.

The LINK's normal communication mechanism, in terms of outcomes from work undertaken by the LINK, will be directly with the Council's relevant Director and/or Head of Service. If there are difficulties through this normal channel, issues will be referred to the Scrutiny Committee, as outlined in the statutory guidance.

It is important that the host organisation and the LINK establish an appropriate day-to-day working relationship with the relevant Directors and/or Heads of Service and officers that underpin this process.

Evidence Gathering for any scrutiny review

For ongoing scrutiny reviews, the Scrutiny Committee should be able to ask the LINK to pull together evidence from users and carers, to suggest witnesses, or to enter and view.

Where appropriate, the Scrutiny Committee may also ask the LINK to undertake survey work. The implementation of any such arrangement will be by mutual agreement between the LINK and the Scrutiny Committee in advance of the survey taking place.

Referrals [From Scrutiny to the LINK]

Although there is no statutory requirement for the Scrutiny Committee to be able to refer items of work to the LINK, it is good practice. Should the Committee refer items to the LINK, it will provide the same information that the LINK must provide when referring to Scrutiny.

Good practice dictates that referrals from Scrutiny to the LINK will also feature in both organisations' Annual Reports.

Referrals [From the LINK to Scrutiny]

All referrals from a LINK to the Scrutiny Committee shall be co-ordinated through the administration arrangements for the LINK. Individual LINK members will not be able to make a referral without going through the central administration for the LINK.

If the LINK wants to refer an item for the consideration of the Scrutiny Committee, the following shall be provided:

- (1) A description of the item of work;
- (2) Reasons why the LINK thinks the Scrutiny Committee needs to consider the item of work;
- (3) Why the LINK thinks it more appropriate that the Scrutiny Committee considers the item of work rather than the LINK considering it;
- (4) Any evidence that the LINK has already considered prior to the referral to Scrutiny; and

- (5) What other organisations the LINK has approached for discussion on the item prior to the referral to Scrutiny.

The LINK will receive an acknowledgement from Democratic Services of the referral within 7 working days of receipt.

The Scrutiny Committee, in discussion with other relevant Councillors and the LINK, will then consider the referral and decide whether to undertake the piece of work. Should the Scrutiny Committee decide not to undertake the piece of work, full reasons for this decision will be given to the LINK. This decision will be final and as detailed in Statutory Instrument 528. All outcomes of LINK referrals to the Scrutiny Committee will be detailed in the LINK Annual Report. The Scrutiny Committee will also list the details and outcomes of any referrals from the LINK in its annual report.

The LINK, under The Local Involvement Networks Regulations 2008, will also be required to publish any decision taken to refer a matter to the London Borough of Hillingdon's External Services Scrutiny Committee.

The LINK will be required to produce evidence of problems that result in referrals to the Scrutiny Committee, including evidence of communication with Health and/or Adult Social Care prior to the referral. Individual complaints about services will not be eligible for referral as separate complaints procedures are available for these situations.

The LINK may also bring issues by petition to the London Borough of Hillingdon's External Services Scrutiny Committee. LINK petitions must bear the names, addresses and signatures of at least 500 people who are Hillingdon Residents. Petitions containing the details of fewer than 500 Residents may be considered at the Committee's discretion.

A protocol flowchart for the Scrutiny Committee's responses to LINK referrals is set out below.

Flowchart – Handling referrals from the LINK to Scrutiny

