

# minutes



Meeting RUSHCLIFFE MUTUAL SELECT COMMITTEE

Date Monday, 4<sup>th</sup> September 2006 (commencing at 2.00 pm)

## **Membership**

Persons absent are marked with `A`

## **COUNCILLORS**

Edward Llewellyn-Jones (Chair)  
A Mrs K L Cutts (Vice Chair)

	John Allin	A Andy Freeman
	Martin Brandon-Bravo OBE	Ellie Lodziak
	Richard Butler	Parry Tsimbiridis
A	Steve Carr	

## **Co-opted Member**

Barbara Venes

## **MINUTES**

The minutes of the last meeting held on 27 September 2006 having been circulated were confirmed and signed by the Chair.

## **MEMBERSHIP**

It was reported that Councillor Steve Carr had been appointed to the committee, and that Mr T Morton has resigned as a co-opted member, following his resignation from Rushcliffe PPIF.

Given that the review was half way through, it was not felt necessary to co-opt someone else from the PPIF. However, it was agreed that the Forum be invited to submit views about the proposals, either in person or in writing.

## **APOLOGY FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Mrs K L Cutts and Steve Carr (both on other County Council business).

## **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST BY MEMBERS AND OFFICERS**

None.

## **REVIEW OF THE RUSHCLIFFE MUTUAL PROPOSALS**

Councillor Brandon-Bravo drew attention to the statement on page 2 of the minutes that Rushcliffe Mutual would be funded by aggregating the GP practices' indicative budgets. He said that he had spoken to a Rushcliffe GP, who, while supporting the principle of the proposals, had a different understanding of how they would be funded. There was consensus that funding was a fundamental aspect of the proposals. It was agreed to seek clarification from the PCT in time for the next meeting.

The Select Committee then took evidence from David Pearson, Strategic Director of Adult Social Care and Health and Ian Bradford, Rushcliffe Council for Voluntary Service.

Mr Pearson said that his views reflected those of Children's Services as well. He saw the proposals' strengths as being a clear vision and commitment, clinical leadership building on the work of Rushcliffe PCT, the emphasis on partnerships and on more resources for primary care and community services, and strong patient support for the proposals. Issues carrying a degree of risk had been mentioned at the previous meeting, and included the respective responsibilities for Rushcliffe Mutual and the PCT for commissioning, the potential difficulties for partnership working when there were different arrangements across the county, how to ensure that more resources went to primary care, and how employment arrangements would work.

Councillor Llewellyn-Jones reminded the committee of the government's intention for all GP practices to commission services. They might do this by joining together, or by inviting companies to undertake the commissioning role. He saw the risk that imbalances would develop. Barbara Venes wondered whether services like occupational therapy, physiotherapy and community dentistry would come under Rushcliffe Mutual; whether practices would be able to refuse difficult patients; how patients living in one area but seeing a GP in another would be dealt with; the nature of patient representation on Rushcliffe Mutual; and how payment by results would be applied to services like mental health. Councillor Llewellyn-Jones drew attention to an article in Nursing Times, 8 August 2006, which gave some details of the proposal.

Mr Bradford's particular interest was how the wider range of services would be provided and how the public could influence Rushcliffe Mutual. Public involvement should be made easily accessible, and might need to be promoted.

Councillor Llewellyn-Jones thanked Mr Bradford and Mr Pearson for their contributions. He said he was becoming less convinced that the proposals had been thought through. He was concerned about the PCT's diminished capacity for commissioning, and the end of the PCT's current over-arching role. He wondered what would happen if a patient wanted a service which had not been commissioned. Councillor Lodziak was concerned by the lack of interest in LIFT which had been expressed by the proposals' proponents at the last meeting.

Matthew Garrard, Scrutiny Officer, outlined the responses which had been received to the requests for written and verbal evidence to assist the review. The Select Committee agreed to seek further information from the Rushcliffe Mutual company and other witnesses at the next meeting.

The meeting closed at 3.40 pm.

**CHAIR**

**Ref: Rushcliffe mutual/m\_4 sept 06**