

## EAST GRINSTEAD TOWN COUNCIL

### PUBLIC SERVICES COMMITTEE – 5<sup>th</sup> SEPTEMBER 2013

Present: Councillor Mrs Bennett (Chairman)  
Councillor Saul (Vice Chairman)  
Councillor Mrs Belsey (Town Mayor)  
Councillor Hodges (Deputy Town Mayor)  
Councillor Mrs Beckford  
Councillors Favor, Reeves, Sillitoe, Sweatman and Whittaker

Also present: Councillors Mainstone and Webster, Dr Manesh Patel, 3 members of the public and one member of the press.

Officers present: Town Clerk

#### 112 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

There being no questions the chairman moved to the next item

#### 113 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE:

None received

#### 114 MINUTES

The Chairman updated that Mr Rossiter had been met with by herself and the matter concluded at this time.

RESOLVED: The minutes of the meetings dated 6<sup>th</sup> June 2013 and were agreed and signed by the Chairman

#### 115 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cllr Mrs Belsey advised that she was the MSDC representative on the Wallis Centre Management Committee.

Cllr Mrs Beckford advised that she was a member of the Wallis Centre Management Committee.

Cllr Favor advised that he was the EGTC representative to Age UK.

Cllr Mrs Bennett advised that she was the EGTC representative on the Wallis Centre Management Committee and that she was a WSCC councillor.

All of the above have been granted a dispensation to discuss and vote on agenda item 9.

#### 116 CLINICAL COMMISSIONING GROUP AND HEALTH REVIEW

Dr Patel as lead of the Mid Sussex and Horsham health review, explained to the Committee the role of the CCG that is to commission 70% of the health services locally but while this did not include GP's it did include the remit for reviewing performance of GP's. The plans for individual communities are being drawn up for

health services and a deal of imagination is being required as there is no money for new build, for example when a substantial new housing development springs up which will need a new surgery. Smaller ones need to be merged or closed in order to realise the capital to supply a new one. Larger and merged surgeries are the order for the future. Luckily East Grinstead is not one of the areas that is tasked with this challenge but areas in Horsham have seen significant growth in areas that have demanded change.

The CCG will be engaging with the community and bodies such as the Town Councils to continue to draw up its plans and bring forward the options and concepts. The challenges in East Grinstead are around the non DDA conformity of one of the surgeries and the capacity issues of the other two, making best use of the space available to improve the patient experience. The Framework will be published in October and then further consultation will follow.

Questions from the committee followed:

When the Brighton and Sussex University Hospital relocate some of their services, will these be passed to Horsham and Mid Sussex areas?

*BSUH have been commended for their decanting services model and while there are opportunities that could come from this other risks will also surface. It is most important that rather than moving services around, the different organisations work together to find the best result.*

What methods of engaging with people for your consultation have you used?

*As many different options as are available, emphasis is on the hard to reach groups, who are of course hard to reach and working with partners to do so is very important.*

How will the plans affect the average patient?

*A GP development plan has been drawn up, moving towards proactive not reactive care. Getting the practices away from the day to day to take time to reflect and think about how they can deliver the service better has been key. The services need to juggle the demands of same day and future planned access to the health care and it is important the balance is right through co-ordination.*

Are the plans learning from the past or are they new ideas?

*Learning from the past but in many ways it is a revolution on care provision.*

Health Care reforms were controversial when put forward by the government. How has the implementation gone and was Dr Patel in favour?

*Whilst the need for the reforms was not demonstrated as necessary, in retrospect the result is favourable. The PCT's could have been reformed, but the evidence is that while it has been difficult the amount of reform that has been delivered since April is more than was done in the former 10 years of the PCT.*

The Vice Chairman offered a vote of thanks to Dr Patel for coming and addressing the meeting, he would be welcomed back in order to update the committee again most readily and he was wished well with the challenges of the CCG ahead. The Committee thanked Dr Patel in the normal manner.

117 POLICING ISSUES IN EAST GRINSTEAD

A Councillor noted sadly that the statistics were no longer provided, which had been valuable. The Clerk advised that the WSCC resource that had previously collated these at ward level had been removed and the Police were not able to provide these. The information is available via the Sussex Police Website but it is not easy to extrapolate and the town council simply does not have the resource to undertake this new task.

A Councillor asked for an update on the College Lane Bridge talks, The clerk was able to advise that following the brainstorming meeting with the officers, several ideas (some mainstream and some more innovative) had been considered. The options explored by the County Officers were not deemed feasible and therefore the officers were charged with thinking again. An idea had come from the police but would include WSCC and MSDC and therefore needed to involve all parties to get the relevant permissions. Should this come to fruition it will be reported back to the committee.

The remainder of the report was noted.

118 PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

The report was noted

119 GATWICK COMMUNICATIONS

The chairman referred to the report and clarified that while 10 correspondents for air craft noise was not many, these were regular loggers who were providing detail of evidence. It was noted that the website included how to complain and that we were encouraging people to take good evidence and copy us in. Not that we would take the complaint forward as an individual but would add it to the evidence base that was growing. It was further suggested that apps could give some quite detailed information, it was also commented that malicious complainants would be able to use such devices.

The chairman advised that the Council had this week received an email from the Gatwick Diamond asking whether we supported the proposed expansion at Gatwick Airport. As the committee are aware that a GAL representative will be addressing the committee in November it is perhaps too early to respond. It was

RESOLVED: that the Clerk write to the Gatwick Diamond to say this has not yet been debated by this council and therefore we can neither confirm nor deny support, we have concerns over noise disturbance being increased and at this time do not have enough information to take a firm view

120 YOUTH FACILITIES PROVISION(Wallis Centre

The chairman referred to the report which set out two possible ways forward for the committee. The report referred to the building survey which has now been received in full and the chairman highlighted some of the main issues that have been revealed including:

The timber floor is in poor condition, all windows are in poor condition. Boilers are adequate but radiators are not delivering enough heat to heat building during winter and the system should be updated, a full asbestos survey should be undertaken. Although scoping for detailed repairs and costs has not been carried out this is clearly suggestive of a significant sum of money. WSCC would be required to make good the building before completing any CAT. WSCC have indicated that they are happy to consider proposals and would make good assets, but faced with this significant finding maybe alternatives should be considered as making good would be before any enhancements and this could be costly.

It was suggested that EGTC could not take on this type of commitment if WSCC were not prepared to make good the defects. WSCC and EGTC should look to work together to resolve this situation so as not to lose the building.

It was further stated that MSDC may be willing to make S 106 money available to assist with the building defects, it would have to go through the bid process but indications are that MSDC may be favourably disposed to assisting.

It was suggested that WSCC who had initially stated that they were interested in CAT would have to make the building good.

It was stated that WSCC may be amenable to other options concerning the realisation of assets. There was understood to be some changes in policy that may allow a new approach (such as re-provision of the centre) to be considered.

It was commented that the transfer of the building as it was, was not viable and the Town Council could not take on what would in affect be a liability not an asset. It was further stated that there remained a risk with Age UK who had struggled financially, and with local councils reducing grants this could be escalated.

It was clarified that the total income for Age UK that relied on local grant was approximately 1/3 and that a statement of assurance of sustainability had been received from Age UK (which the clerk read to the committee).

There was concern that tenants may not be able to remain in the premises, it was not guaranteed that MSDC or WSCC would make money available and therefore rather than proceeding with this site, the exploration of using existing buildings in the town for youth and other community service accommodation should be preferred.

It was further stated that there was not a high risk to the business case as the tenants were there and the building could be made good by the County before being passed over.

It was stated that the financial climate has been difficult and not looking to be reversed soon, however looking after the youth in the town was important. Youth service as a whole but also intergenerational work and provision of services was important. This site is important to the town and we should look for innovative answers to this problem.

It was further stated that the costs to bring the building up to scratch were looking to be considerable. Perhaps WSCC would consider redeveloping the site as an alternative with a new community centre.

The need to move quickly should further discussions and options be considered was requested.

The Chairman summed up the discussion as a difficult decision needing to be made. The Council are minded to do something positive to find a workable solution for the centre and also the youth service in the town.

RESOLVED: 1) The Town Council will endeavour to work with the County Council to ensure that a weekly youth club and presence of youth services continues in the town, delivered through an existing community venue. The Working Group should negotiate possible options for a partnership arrangement for the re-development of the site and re-provision of a new community centre.

2) The existing Youth Service Working Group to have the following members added to it for this task ; Cllrs Mrs Belsey, Mrs Brunsdon, Reeves and Whittaker and that Cllr Whittaker takes the chair of the working group.

121 COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW

The report was noted

122 ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS

There being no other business the Chairman closed the meeting at 9.04pm.

SIGNED:

CHAIRMAN