

## HEALTH AND WELL BEING SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

6<sup>th</sup> September, 2011

**PRESENT** – Councillor Newall (in the Chair); Donoghue, Francis, Macnab, Nutt, Regan, E. A Richmond, S. Richmond, H. Scott and J. Taylor. (10)

**APOLOGIES** – Councillors I. Haszeldine. (1)

**ALSO IN ATTENDANCE** – Councillors Copeland, Long and A. Scott.

**OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE** – Ada Burns, Chief Executive; Mary Hall, Voluntary and Community Sector Engagement Manager, Murray Rose, Director of People; Chris Sivers, Assistant Director Development and Commissioning and Cath Whitehaed, Assistant Director Resources.

**EXTERNAL REPRESENTATIVES** – Edmund Lovell, Assistant Director of Marketing and Communications; County Durham and Darlington NHS Foundation Trust.

**INVITED GUESTS** – Penny Hilary, Richmondshire District Council, Diane Lax, Darlington LINKs, Gillian Peel, Age UK and a representative from Age UK Stroke Club.

**HWB15. DECLARATION OF INTERESTS** – There were no declarations of interest reported at the meeting.

**HWB16. HYPER ACUTE STROKE SERVICES REVIEW GROUP – FINAL REPORT** – The Director of Resources submitted a report (previously submitted) reporting the findings and recommendations of the Hyper Acute Stroke Services Review Group.

The Director of People provided Members with an overview of information gathered so far. The Director explained that the consultation has been a lengthy process and that evidence provided appeared to have changed overtime. He reminded Members of the Stakeholder event held in February 2011, when the Trust talked about poor access to vascular imaging at Darlington Memorial Hospital (DMH), which was not mentioned in the consultation document. He acknowledged that the consultation has resulted in a high quality debate, although, previously held views have to alter throughout the consultation process, specifically around the weighing of ambulance journey times and patient numbers which were previously regarded to as crucial to the reasoning behind the preferred option.

Members were reminded of the National Policies and Guidelines which have influenced the need for a consultation on the provision of hyper acute stroke services and the proposal to consolidate the service onto one site. The Director recognised that consolidating services was a Regional and National issue and regional models have been considered as part of the Options Appraisal process.

The Director provided information about the number and percentages of people aged 65 and over (in 2010) for Darlington, County Durham, Hambleton and Richmondshire, which demonstrated that people in Hambleton have a higher percentage of older people than the other locations. Interestingly in Richmondshire there are a higher percentage of Black Minority Ethnic (BME) people than the other areas, which is notable as BME people are more likely to suffer

from stroke than other communities. Reference was made to the Sentinel Audit, produced by the Royal College of Physicians, as it highlights that DMH was performing better than University Hospital of North Durham (UHND) in a number of categories associated with hyper acute stroke services. It was disappointed to note that County Durham and Darlington NHS Foundation Trust had not submitted to the recent SYNAP Audit.

The Director questioned whether the population and area served by DMH which includes Darlington Borough (the town and villages in the Borough), the southern part of County Durham (including Barnard Castle, Teesdale and Newton Aycliffe) and the northern part of North Yorkshire (Richmondshire District), was given sufficient consideration in the consultation document, and further work was being undertaken in respect of this. From all the information considered and latest data available the Director queried why DMH couldn't have been sighted as the preferred option.

The Director commended the work of the Scrutiny Committee and advised that he would incorporate their work in the Council's response to the consultation, together whether any new evidence that comes to light in the next few days.

The Chair invited Members and invited guests to comment on the Review Groups findings. Members welcomed the report and agreed that it had been a lengthy process and a vast amount of evidence had been gathered to inform the final report. A number comments were made including their disappointment at the low level of public attendance at the additional public meetings; inadequate advertising of the additional public meetings; the lack of Darlington representation on the Stroke Strategy Improvement Group and that the area serviced by DMH including North Yorkshire patients was not taken into consideration. Members also expressed their frustrations about the consultation process as a whole.

Penny Hilary, Richmondshire District Council reported that Members of its Scrutiny Committee were meeting with representative from NHS York and North Yorkshire and Yorkshire Ambulance to query the patient numbers for Richmondshire and North Yorkshire reported in the consultation document. They were also interested to establish the patient figures for 2009/10 that attended DMH and agreed to report back to the Democratic Officer the outcome of that meeting.

Gillian Peel reported concerns expressed by Age UK and members of the Stroke Club around the nature of the consultation, the questions in the consultation document, the data included and use of the language which they found extremely confusing. Particular reference was made about the treatment timeframe of Thrombolysis and information provided appears to be misleading and vary depending who was spoken to. Ms Peel also reported that Age UK had organised a petition to 'Save Our Stroke Unit' and it currently had over 450 signatures which would be presented to the Leader of the Council and the NHS on Friday 9<sup>th</sup> September 2011.

Diane Lax, Darlington LINKs informed Members that they had received over 140 completed questionnaires and they were currently consolidating the views of LINKs members to the consultation document. Confusion around the data from NEAS and DASH was highlighted by the majority of people who had completed the questionnaire. LINK members had also expressed their disappointment about the layout of the questionnaire, within the consultation document saying it was confusing and difficult to complete.

The Health and Partnerships portfolio holder congratulated the Scrutiny Committee on its robust, transparent and detailed scrutiny work which had resulted in a fair and excellent report. The

Chair of the Committee thanked all Members of the Review Group for their support, commitment and enthusiasm to the Review and also thanked the Democratic Officer.

**RESOLVED** – (a) That subject to minor amendments the findings of the Hyper Acute Stroke Services Review Group be approved;

(b) That the Director of people submitted a response to the consultation on behalf of Darlington Borough Council and incorporates the work of the Review Group; and

(c) That the congratulations and thanks bestowed at the meeting be noted.