

JOINT HEALTH OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE (JHOSC) ON LAMBETH HOSPITAL REDEVELOPMENT

Tuesday 30 June 2020 at 6.00 pm

MINUTES

PRESENT: Councillor Joshua Lindsey, Councillor Maria Linforth-Hall, Councillor Nanda Manley-Browne, Councillor Marianna Masters and Councillor Charlie Smith

APOLOGIES: Councillor Victoria Olisa

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Victoria Olisa and apologies for lateness were received from Councillor Maria Linforth-Hall.

2. DECLARATIONS OF PECUNIARY INTEREST

There were none.

3. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 28 May 2020 be approved as a correct record of proceedings.

4. CONSULTATION FEEDBACK / RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE LAMBETH TOGETHER STRATEGIC BOARD

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting, including representatives from South London and Maudsley NHS Foundation Trust (SLaM), Lambeth Council, Southwark Council, NHS South East London CCG, Southwark Healthwatch, London Communications, and service user consultants.

Andrew Eyres, Strategic Director, Health and Care, Lambeth Council and CCG, informed the Committee that a presentation, concerning the reconfiguration of Lambeth Hospital mental health services, had been published with the agenda. This covered a range of issues in relation to consultation feedback and recommendations, including: the scope of the consultation; feedback and key metrics; feedback themes and recommendations; the decision making process; and further considerations arising from the consultation.

Jane Bowie, Director of Integrated Commissioning, Lambeth Council, highlighted that an independent consultation feedback report had been published via a supplementary agenda. In response to questions, David Orekoya, Assistant Director, Integrated Commissioning: Mental Health, Lambeth Council, provided further information on the consultation process, the methodology, the approach to the analysis and key findings from the independent report.

During the discussion the Chair invited service user consultants to provide feedback on their experiences. It was recognised that any relocation would lead to a significant improvement in the quality of the environment and therefore an improved service user experience. However, it was

also noted, as set out via the supplementary agenda, that there were concerns about not being able to access services within their own borough.

The Committee was asked to note key themes arising from the consultation feedback and recommendations relating to each thematic group, set out via the agenda. A wide range of issues were considered in relation to: Alternative options; Travel and access to the Maudsley; Reputation and familiarity; The Maudsley Hospital site; Clinical pathways; Clinical and non-clinical support services; and the future of the Lambeth Hospital site.

Adrian McLachlan, GP and Governing Body Member NHS South East London CCG, clinical lead for Lambeth Living Well Network Alliance provided an update on decision making following the Lambeth Together Strategic Board meeting held on 17 June. The following points were noted:

- The Strategic Board had reflected on the feedback and appraisals provided and was asked to support the proposed recommendations to be included in the Decision-Making Business Case for presentation to South East London CCG. The Strategic Board was also asked to provide their support to an overarching recommendation that South East London CCG approve the preferred option as described in the pre-consultation business case.
- The Strategic Board welcomed the consultation and proposals but had been unable to make a recommendation at that point since it was noted Black Thrive had sought further information on involvement from the BAME community. As a result, the Strategic Board agreed that further assurance be addressed on this issue in advance of a final recommendation to the South East London CCG Governing Body.

It was explained that the proposed recommendation remained Option 2 – to relocate four acute wards and the Psychiatric Intensive Care Unit to the Maudsley site. However, following the Strategic Board the CCG had engaged further with Black Thrive to understand the issues that had been raised and to provide clarification on the engagement process undertaken. Neil Robertson, (Interim) Chief Operating Officer, SlaM, highlighted that these meetings, together with the independent analysis of the consultation, had reassured Black Thrive who had since confirmed they were happy to proceed to the next stage. In response to questions it was noted that a formal decision was expected from South East London CCG on 16 July.

The Committee noted that the focus of the public consultation was the suitability of relocating services for Lambeth's patients to a site outside of the borough. There were, however, a number of issues raised for Southwark. The Committee was disappointed at the inadequate response to the consultation and suggested that: the process of engagement in Southwark be continued; and that plans be put in place, with a clear timeframe for action, to address issues raised in relation to concerns about (i) there not being enough inpatient capacity available for Southwark service users and (ii) possible financial implications for Southwark.

RESOLVED:

That the proposal to relocate four acute wards and the Psychiatric Intensive Care Unit (PICU) from Lambeth Hospital to the Maudsley site be supported, subject to the following clarifications and recommendations:

- a. That clarification be provided by the NEL Healthcare Consulting Team to confirm the exact number of respondents, and percentage of survey responses, from Lambeth and Southwark.
- b. That steps be taken, with a clear timeframe for action, to monitor and proactively address the following concerns raised by stakeholders during the consultation:

Stakeholders	Concerns / Action Required
Service users and carers	There were concerns about no longer being able to access services within their own borough. Carers identified strong concerns about the increased travel times to visit loved ones.
Black and Minority Groups	Particular challenges for this group centred around concerns over being close to a busy road and hospital. The increased noise and activity were not felt to be conducive for recovery. There was a desire to see a discrete entrance to the building as this group expressed stigma and shame around accessing mental health services. Please include information to reassure this group in the 'Welcome Pack'.
Staff	It was noted that the potential relocation of services could mean an increase in commuting time for some staff. Please monitor this by further consultation with staff and report back on the reality of commuting and whether this objection has been handled. Staff commented that the Maudsley Hospital site already feels quite full and there were concerns over available clinical and non-clinical space to ensure a high-quality service for patients, as well as ensuring staff have appropriate working spaces. Please include details in 'Welcome Pack'.
Lambeth residents	Primary concerns were about the future use of the site (both moving away from NHS use and what it would be used for) and retaining services within Lambeth. Please integrate this information in the 'Welcome Pack'. Travel concerns featured heavily amongst residents with reference being made to additional costs. Please clearly give most cost-effective directions in the welcome pack and address with ongoing engagement measures.
Southwark residents	A need to reinforce the message, through ongoing engagement, that there would be no reduction in Southwark Services as a result of the service change for Lambeth
Members of the public	Members of the public, alongside Lambeth residents, were most concerned with the future use of the site (both moving away from NHS use and what it would be used for) and retaining services within Lambeth. Ongoing engagement needed to address concerns.

- c. That a detailed action plan, with clear timeframe, be developed should the decision making business case be approved, to address each of the key themes arising from the consultation, and that this be reviewed by the JHOSC 6 months (approx.) after a decision is made by SEL CCG:

Thematic Group	Themes to be addressed
Alternate plans	The JHOSC did not raise any issues concerning alternate arrangements to the recommended redevelopment at the Maudsley but agreed a clear communications plan was required to allay concerns as part of the next steps in the project.

<p>Travel and access to the Maudsley</p>	<p>The predominant feedback related to travel from a minority of postcodes in areas near Streatham and Norwood who were concerned that they may be adversely affected by the proposed move to the Maudsley. Further analysis should be undertaken as to the historic and projected demand relating to access to inpatient services to test the likely frequency of impact in advance of looking at remedial measures. Where the issue is deemed to be significant then further actions should be taken to look at potential changes to the current transport options with providers.</p>
<p>Reputation and familiarity</p>	<p>Within the consultation responses concern was raised as to the reputation of the Maudsley Hospital and unfamiliarity with the local area which might deter those service users and carers from accessing services.</p> <p>The JHOSC agreed that the Trust should develop a welcome pack for all wards offering simple induction materials such as how to find and access the on-site facilities and also, where the care plan allows, how to access those services more broadly such as local shops, community groups, third sector support organisations and spaces such as Ruskin Park.</p> <p>It is recommended that as part of the transitional process from Lambeth inpatient wards to those at the Maudsley that current service users are allowed a period of familiarisation in the new environment and introduction to the local area before they move to the new accommodation.</p>
<p>The Maudsley Hospital</p>	<p>The predominance of feedback was based on the perceptions that the Maudsley Hospital site was too dense for the development of another ward block to be reasonable. Further to this there was a feeling that there was insufficient green space available on the site relative to that at the Lambeth Hospital site. It was agreed that information should continue to be provided on the green space potential during the continued process of engagement.</p>
<p>Clinical Pathways</p>	<p>It was noted that the predominance of responses relating the clinical models and pathways focussed on ensuring that the service model provided on the wards was refreshed to be appropriate for the case mix and demographic mix of service users frequenting the services. Members of the JHOSC were encouraged by the proactive steps that had already been piloted at Lambeth Hospital which included a voluntary community service in reach offer to people receiving inpatient care. It was noted that Mosaic and Thames Reach had been providing regular inreach to the wards, which included meaningful activity in the care setting, supporting people with leave from the ward and connecting people with local community offers. It was agreed that the next scrutiny report (in 6 months time) should provide detail on progress in expanding this to the new services opened. Members were also impressed at the important work being carried out to developing cultural appropriate future models of care and care pathways that were cognisant of the high level of representation of the black community within the ward setting at Lambeth. It was noted that SLAM would be working with Black Thrive to engage with the black community to set a best standard offer for culturally appropriate inpatient care, with testing and learning built into it. The JHOSC requested more details on this with a clear timeframe for action.</p>

<p>The Future use of Lambeth Hospital</p>	<p>Like the respondents to the consultation the JHOSC raised concerns relating to the future of the Lambeth Hospital site which focused around the loss of its use for NHS services and apprehension of what the site may be used for in the future. Members requested more detail regarding the commercial aspect and made the following suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SLaM should hold a detailed and robust planning consultation on the future of the site with a range of stakeholders covering local residents, the local authority, Lambeth Together and other representative groups to ensure a broad range of views could be taken into account about what the local area would benefit from when looking at the future development of the site. • A scheme for the Trust and partners to develop approximately 575 homes, of which 50% would be classed as affordable, would have a significant benefit to the public and also importantly to key workers within SLaM and other local organisations who have a real issue with recruitment and retention given the high cost of living in the area. • Clarification concerning the definition of 'affordable' and requested detailed information on the mix of affordable units with a breakdown of units subject to: Affordable rent; Shared ownership; and Discounted market sale price for those that met S106 key worker requirements. <p>It was also agreed that further assurances were needed to ensure that there was an effective mix of risk and reward given that there were a number of options being evaluated as to whether the site should be sold for a fixed fee or whether elements of the site were retained from which the NHS could continue to benefit from future income from the site. Members of the JHOSC highlighted the Treasury / DHSC/ NHSE / NHSI needed to develop a business case to evaluate the most effective route to take.</p>
<p>Clinical and non-clinical support services</p>	<p>Feedback in this area focussed on several key clinical and non-clinical support services and concerns over where their future locations may be should the Lambeth Hospital site be closed. Specific services mentioned included: Home Treatment Team; Pharmacy; Community Services / Outpatients; Library; and Training Suites. As set out in the presentation the JHOSC wanted to ensure a full business case for all clinical and non-clinical support services was included as supporting information to the main investment objectives so that there was clarity as to the future position of these services.</p>
<p>Southwark concerns</p>	<p>The Committee was disappointed at the inadequate response to the consultation and suggested that: the process of engagement in Southwark be continued; and that plans be put in place, with a clear timeframe for action, to address issues raised in relation to concerns about (i) there not being enough inpatient capacity available for Southwark service users and (ii) possible financial implications for Southwark.</p>

CLOSE OF MEETING

The meeting ended at 8.30 pm

CHAIR

Date of Despatch: 15 July 2020

Contact for Enquiries: Christian Scade

Tel: 020 7926 0045

E-mail: cscade@lambeth.gov.uk

Web: www.lambeth.gov.uk