SPECIAL OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE – 15 OCTOBER 2015

A special meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee will be held at 5.30pm on Thursday 15 October 2015 in Committee Room 1, Town Hall, Rugby.

Councillor Ms Edwards
Chairman of Overview and Scrutiny Committee

A G E N D A

PART 1 – PUBLIC BUSINESS

1. Apologies

To receive apologies for absence from the meeting.

2. Declarations of Interest

To receive declarations of:

(a) non-pecuniary interests as defined by the Council’s Code of Conduct for Councillors;

(b) pecuniary interests as defined by the Council’s Code of Conduct for Councillors;

(c) notice under Section 106 Local Government Finance Act 1992 – non-payment of Community Charge or Council Tax.

Note: Members are reminded that they should declare the existence and nature of their non-pecuniary interests at the commencement of the meeting (or as soon as the interest becomes apparent). If that interest is a pecuniary interest, the Member must withdraw from the room unless one of the exceptions applies.

Membership of Warwickshire County Council or any Parish Council is classed as a non-pecuniary interest under the Code of Conduct. A Member does not need to declare this interest unless the Member chooses to speak on a matter relating to their membership. If the Member does not wish to speak on the matter, the Member may still vote on the matter without making a declaration.
3. Motion from Council – Air Quality in Dunchurch
5. Committee Work Programme

Any additional papers for this meeting can be accessed via the website.

Membership of the Committee:

Councillors Ms Edwards (Chairman), Allen, Birkett, Mrs Bragg, Cade, Ellis, Gillias, Lewis, Mrs New, Mrs O’Rourke, Pacey-Day, Ms Robbins and Sandison

If you have any general queries with regard to this agenda please contact Veronika Beckova, Democratic and Scrutiny Services Officer (01788 533522 or e-mail veronika.beckova@rugby.gov.uk). Any specific queries concerning reports should be directed to the listed contact officer.

If you wish to attend the meeting and have any special requirements for access please contact the Democratic and Scrutiny Services Officer named above.
AGENDA MANAGEMENT SHEET

Name of Meeting: Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Date of Meeting: 15 October 2015

Report Title: Motion from Council – Air quality in Dunchurch

Ward Relevance: Dunsmore

Contact Officer: Debbie Dawson, Scrutiny Officer, Tel: (01788) 533592

Summary: On 21 July 2015, Council referred a motion to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee in accordance with Council Standing Order 11.

The Committee is asked to consider the matter and report to Cabinet, or appoint a task group to consider the matter in further detail.

Financial Implications: There are no financial implications arising from this report.

Risk Management Implications: There are no risk management implications arising from this report.

Environmental Implications: Air quality monitoring and management delivers environmental benefits.

Legal Implications: The Council is required to review and assess air quality under the Environment Act 1995.

Equality and Diversity: No new or existing policy or procedure has been recommended.
Summary

On 21 July 2015, Council referred a motion to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee in accordance with Council Standing Order 11.

The Committee is asked to consider the matter and report to Cabinet, or appoint a task group to consider the matter in further detail.

1. MOTION FROM COUNCIL

On 21 July 2015, Councillor Roberts moved and Councillor Mrs Roberts seconded the following motion:

“This council notes the most recent air quality report of the Borough.

The council mandates officers to:

1. investigate the causes of excessive concentrations of nitrogen dioxide particles at the crossroads in Dunchurch

2. develop, in partnership with Dunchurch Parish Council and Warwickshire County Council, a strategy to reduce the nitrogen dioxide concentration to an acceptable level. This should be done rapidly to avoid any potential illness to local residents from the nitrogen dioxide; and

3. instruct the Planning Committee that any applications which seem likely to worsen by any degree the current problem are deemed to be unsustainable and therefore grounds for refusal of the application.”

In accordance with Standing Order 11, the motion then stood referred to the relevant scrutiny committee.

The committee is asked to consider the motion and report back to Cabinet, or appoint a task group to consider the matter in more detail. Background information is provided below to support the committee’s consideration of the motion.
2. OFFICER COMMENTS

2.1 Legislative context

The Council has been under a duty under the Environment Act 1995 since 2000 to review, assess and manage air quality for specific high risk pollutants, which include nitrogen dioxide. There are two national objectives for NO2 which are an annual average of 40 μg.m-3 and an hourly objective of 200 μg.m-3. The process requires rounds of updating and screening assessments (USA) every 3 years. If they identify issues, a Detailed Assessment is then required and if that confirms an issue, a Further Assessment is required. If that shows exceedances, the Council is required to declare an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) and produce an Air Quality Action Plan (AQAP) to manage it. A progress report has to be submitted to the Department for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) each year. Air pollution is assessed at the facade of a sensitive receptor (where a person may be exposed for the objective period).

2.2 Air quality in Rugby and Dunchurch

The USA in 2003 predicted a risk of exceedance of the NO2 annual objective in the town centre. A Detailed Assessment in 2004 and a Further Assessment in 2005 were then carried out which confirmed the risk in the town centre and a possible risk in Dunchurch. An AQMA was declared for Rugby town and Dunchurch in 2004 for the annual average of NO2. The USA in 2009 identified a new risk due to the ASDA development so a combined Detailed Assessment and Further Assessment was carried out in 2010 which confirmed that Dunchurch was at high risk. Pollutant concentrations were predicted at fourteen relevant receptors in the Dunchurch study area, where the public are likely to be exposed regularly. All receptors were modelled at a ground floor height of 1.5 metres, representing average human height.

The table below, from the 2010 report, shows the modelled results at sensitive receptors in the Dunchurch study area. The report stated that annual mean NO2 concentrations at all receptors were unlikely to exceed the UK air quality objective of 40 μg/m3 in 2009 and 2011. The highest annual mean NO2 concentration was predicted to occur at Receptor 97, located along the A426 Rugby Road.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Receptor No.</th>
<th>Grid Reference</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Predicted Annual Mean NO2 Concentration (μg/m³)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>448371 271334</td>
<td>Coventry Road / The Green, Dunchurch</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>448454 271323</td>
<td>Dunsmore Heath Surgery, Dunchurch</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>448538 271338</td>
<td>Rugby Road, Dunchurch</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>448528 271295</td>
<td>Rugby Road / Vicarage Lane, Dunchurch</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>448438 271271</td>
<td>The Green / The Square, Dunchurch</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>448495 271245</td>
<td>The Square / Rugby Road, Dunchurch</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>448523 271242</td>
<td>The Square / Rugby Road, Dunchurch</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>448513 271209</td>
<td>The Square, Dunchurch</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>448529 271199</td>
<td>The Square, Dunchurch</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>448420 271182</td>
<td>Southam Road, Dunchurch</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>448389 271146</td>
<td>Southam Road / Sandford Way, Dunchurch</td>
<td>25.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>448202 271250</td>
<td>Dunchurch County First School</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>448157 270921</td>
<td>Southam Road / Sandford Way, Dunchurch</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>448200 270896</td>
<td>Southam Road, Dunchurch</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Following the expansion of the NO2 diffusion tube monitoring network in April 2012, Rugby Borough Council identified Dunchurch as an area for concern from an air quality
perspective due to a newly identified exceedance at site S24 in Dunchurch. In recognition of this concern, Rugby Borough Council installed 2 additional monitoring sites in Dunchurch in May 2013. These tubes, S52 and S53, showed annual mean concentrations of 23.0 μg/m³ and 21.2 μg/m³ in 2013 (significantly below the air objective value of 40 μg/m³). In 2014, tubes S52 and S53 showed annual mean concentrations of 23.0 and 21.4 μg/m³ respectively.

The latest USA (2015), which includes monitoring data from a number of sites in Dunchurch, shows continued exceedance of the annual NO₂ objective outside the Dun Cow. The highest NO₂ concentration in the borough, 46.4 μg/m³, was monitored at this site, which is almost identical to the value monitored at this site in 2013 (46.6 μg/m³).

Background levels of NO₂ are low. The main reason for exceedance is road traffic from those driving through the village, but also because of the village residents using vehicles.

It must be made clear that the number of residential properties in Dunchurch at risk is very low. As it is an annual average, other users are at lower risk.

2.3 Air quality action plan

Rugby Borough Council has been working with Warwickshire County Council since 2004 in developing and implementing an action plan. However, there is no simple or low cost solution. Window seals may remove the risk to residents but the law requires pollution to be reduced at the facade, requiring very expensive works such as a bypass or relief road.

Dunchurch is a conservation area and close to Rugby. Improvements to the cross roads are possible, but they will not reduce air pollution enough to bring it below the objective.

Other options in Defra guidance are Low Emission Zones (LEZs) and modal shifts to more environmentally friendly transport, for example cycling and electric cars. An LEZ is not appropriate as it is based on exceedance being due to high levels of HGVs and buses. The main cause in Dunchurch is cars for commuters, those going through the village and village residents. Modal shift is being attempted (eg. WCC cycle routes, charging points in new houses), but is only likely to have a slight impact in the short term.

Without significant measures by the highway authority, such as closing Rugby Road in Dunchurch, it is doubtful that rapid improvements can be made. A scheme for residents only is unlikely to be enforceable.

The Dunchurch results were discussed by Customer and Partnerships Committee, who have been monitoring compliance with air quality legislation on behalf of Cabinet for a number of years. The committee made no specific recommendations regarding any changes to the actions already being taken.

2.4 Planning

Air quality issues are a material consideration in the planning process. Planning Committee makes its decision based on the Officer’s Report that is in front of it, or representations made to it directly at the committee meeting, regarding each individual application - not on an instruction from another Council committee or full Council itself.
Members should be aware that, under the Localism Act, EU fines for UK exceedances of the NO₂ objective can be passed on to local authorities. In view of this, officers sought advice from Defra in relation to a previous planning proposal which was expected to have a significant impact on air quality. Defra declined to comment informally and requested a written enquiry from the council. Officers could pursue this if members wish to take this further.
Name of Meeting: Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Date of Meeting: 15 October 2015

Subject Matter: Motion from Council – Air quality in Dunchurch

LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS

There are no background papers for this item.
AGENDA MANAGEMENT SHEET

Name of Meeting         Overview and Scrutiny Committee
Date of Meeting         15 October 2015
Report Title            Ambulance Service Restructuring: Freedom of Information Request
Ward Relevance          None
Contact Officer         Debbie Dawson, Scrutiny Officer, Tel: (01788) 533592
Summary                 This paper presents a response received to a Freedom of Information request made to West Midlands Ambulance Service on behalf of the former Customer and Partnerships Committee, for consideration by the committee.
Financial Implications  There are no financial implications arising from this report.
Risk Management Implications  There are no risk management implications arising from this report.
Environmental Implications  There are no environmental implications arising from this report.
Legal Implications       There are no legal implications arising from this report.
Equality and Diversity   No new or existing policy or procedure has been recommended.
Public Report to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee

15 October 2015

Ambulance Service Restructuring: Freedom of Information Request

Summary

This paper presents a response received to a Freedom of Information request made to West Midlands Ambulance Service on behalf of the former Customer and Partnerships Committee, for consideration by the committee.

1. BACKGROUND

A key focus of the meeting of the former Customer and Partnerships Committee held on 26 March 2015 was an assessment of the local impact of the ambulance service restructure. The committee issued a call for evidence which resulted in a number of members of the public contacting the committee with details of their experiences of delays in accessing ambulances, and one couple attending the committee meeting to give their evidence in person. Representatives of Coventry and Rugby CCG attended the meeting to discuss the performance of the emergency ambulance contract from their perspective as service commissioners, and they engaged in discussion with the committee about the impact of the service restructure. An extract from the minutes of that meeting is attached at appendix 1 for reference.

Coventry and Rugby CCG agreed to take away the specific concerns raised by members of the public, and also undertook to try to provide further evidence to the committee on a number of points relating to the performance of WMAS and the deployment of emergency vehicles in Rugby. In particular:

- ambulance response times
- how often the community ambulance points in Rugby were being used; and
- what proportion of call-outs required an ambulance to attend following a first response.

Their response was considered at the Customer and Partnerships Committee meeting on 25 June 2015. The letter stated that Coventry and Rugby CCG were unable to fulfil the Rugby level data requested as WMAS were only able to provide verified data at a CCG level. Members of the committee were disappointed with this response and asked that representation be made to the Coventry and Rugby CCG expressing their dissatisfaction.

The committee also resolved to submit a freedom of information request directly to West Midlands Ambulance Service NHS Foundation Trust seeking the additional data requested by the committee.
2. FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST

A freedom of information request was submitted to WMAS on 15 July 2015 from the then chairman of Customer and Partnerships Committee, seeking the following information for the period from 1 January 2014 to the latest available:

- Performance against Red 1, 2 and 19 and Green 2 targets for Rugby borough
- How many calls requiring an emergency response were received from people in Rugby borough (if possible on a monthly basis)?
- Average ambulance response times in Rugby borough during that period on a monthly basis
- Details of the time taken to respond to calls requiring an emergency response (both for cases where targets were met and those where they were not):
  - in how many cases did people wait for more than half an hour, 45 minutes, an hour, 90 minutes etc?
  - what was the longest time wait?
- How many calls requiring an emergency response in Rugby borough required onward patient transport?
- Details of the time taken for onward patient transport to arrive:
  - in how many cases did it take more than half an hour, 45 minutes, an hour, 90 minutes etc. for onward patient transport to arrive?
  - what was the longest wait for onward patient transport?
- Information on the use of the community ambulance points in Rugby:
  - how many calls requiring an emergency response in Rugby borough were responded to by vehicles waiting at the response points at Rugby North and Rugby St Cross?
  - how many of these calls were responded to by vehicles coming from UHCW or the Coventry Hub?

A response was received on 14 August 2015 and the information provided is attached at appendix 2 for consideration by the committee. A letter received from Coventry and Rugby CCG is also attached at appendix 3 for information.

3. ANALYSIS

3.1 What does the data tell us about ambulance response times in Rugby since the service restructure?

Performance against Red 1 and Red 2 (8 minute response) targets\(^1\) in the borough since the restructuring has been above target, at 75.9% for Red 1 and 76.6% for Red 2 (against target of 75%). Performance against green\(^2\) (30 minute response) has been below target, at 88.5% (against target of 90%). Performance against the Red 19 target\(^3\) was also below target, at 89.7% against a target of 95%.

---

\(^1\) Red 1: presenting conditions, which may be immediately life threatening and should receive an emergency response within 8 minutes irrespective of location in 75% of cases; and Red 2: presenting conditions, which may be life threatening but less time-critical and should receive an emergency response within 8 minutes irrespective of location in 75% of cases.

\(^2\) Green 2: less serious clinical need, target to Respond to 90% of calls within 30 mins

\(^3\) Where onward patient transport is required in a life-threatening situation, the ambulance should arrive on scene within 19 minutes
Of those red incident calls, requiring an 8 minute response, 76.6% (5806) received a response in under 8 minutes, 15.4% (1164) received a response in 8-15 minutes and 7.8% (595) received a response in 15 to 30 minutes. 15 red incident calls since the ambulance service restructure received a response in more than 30 minutes. Data about response times has not been provided in relation to those incidents categorised as ‘green’ (not life-threatening).

The monthly average response times provided do not add significantly to our understanding of ambulance response times in Rugby since the service restructure.

The Trust were asked to clarify terminology used in the responses to questions 3 and 4 (appendix 2), and additional information has been provided on this point. The term “best response” refers to the arrival of the first response on scene, measured from when the call came in. The average best response, therefore, is the average of all ‘first on scene’ responses.

The “maximum best response time” refers to the maximum time it took for the first response to arrive on scene at an incident. The table in relation to question 4 provides the maximum response time for all ‘red’ incidents. However, on some occasions, the first response on scene was from another ambulance service, due to Rugby being on the regional border. The 4 incidents recorded as over 45 minutes were responses by other ambulance services who were first on the scene. The WMAS vehicle figure is therefore provided for clarity in respect of WMAS response times.

3.2 What does the data tell us about how often the community ambulance points in Rugby are used following the service restructure?

A total of 8411 incidents were attended by community paramedic resources on duty at the two Rugby locations (Rugby North and Rugby St Cross). This equates to 46.2% of the 18,208 total incidents in the borough recorded in the period January 2013/14 to June 2015/16.

However, the response does not provide a categorical answer to the question. The data is caveated with the statement that “figures relate to vehicles based at the stated location, although the vehicle(s) may not have actually responded from that location”. In addition, it is noted that the vehicles based at the stated locations may also have responded to incidents outside the defined postcode areas. If this were the case, this would have a negative impact on the percentage figure for the proportion of incidents in the borough attended by community paramedic resources stationed in Rugby.

3.3 What does the data tell us about the proportion of call-outs that required an ambulance to attend following a first response in Rugby?

Information has only been provided in relation to ‘red’ incidents that required transport to hospital. This would not, therefore, include incidents like that reported to the committee by a member of the public who had fallen and was left waiting on the floor outside in the cold for a considerable amount of time before an ambulance arrived. The Trust advised that this incident was coded as a green call.

The data provided indicates that 65.7% of red incidents (4980 out of 7580) required at least one transport to a hospital within the WMAS area. The average time taken for
onward transport to arrive (for red incidents) is reported as 20 minutes, and the Trust has been unable to provide any more detailed information on this point.

The Red 19 target is also of relevance to this question as it relates to the proportion of 'red' incidents requiring onward patient transport where the ambulance arrived on scene within 19 minutes. This was the case in 89.7% (around 6800) of incidents, significantly below the target of 95%. Therefore, in around 780 'red' (life-threatening) incidents in this period patients waited more than 19 minutes for onward transport to hospital.

4. CONCLUSION

Members are asked to consider the data provided and to determine whether to take any further action at this time.

It should be noted that Customer and Partnerships Committee made a commitment to revisit the performance of the ambulance service in Rugby 12-18 months on from the committee’s review in March 2015, and this can be added to the new overview and scrutiny work programme with the agreement of the chairmen and vice chairmen of the new overview and scrutiny committees.

At the last meeting of the Customer and Partnerships Committee it was also reported that WCC’s Adult Social Care and Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee were looking to develop a Quality Assurance Task and Finish Group for West Midlands Ambulance Service and to work with the Trust to develop more meaningful local performance indicators. It is understood that this Task and Finish Group will shortly be established and district and borough councils are to be invited to be involved. This may provide an opportunity to pursue any concerns and issues raised through this committee’s work at a county level.
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**LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description of Document</th>
<th>Officer's Reference</th>
<th>File Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>26 March 2015</td>
<td>Customer and Partnerships Committee, agenda items 5 and 6 and minutes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>11 September 2014</td>
<td>Customer and Partnerships Committee, agenda item 5 (Health and Wellbeing Update – West Midlands Ambulance Service)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
48. **EMERGENCY AMBULANCE CONTRACT**

The committee received a report (Part 1 – agenda item 5) concerning the emergency ambulance contract and commissioning of the service.

Matt Gilks, Head of Contracting and Procurement at Coventry and Rugby CCG and Sue Davies, Head of Partnerships at Coventry and Rugby CCG gave members a short presentation on the CCG’s response and performance monitoring based on the four key lines of enquiry raised by the committee. A copy of the presentation is attached at Annex 1 to the minutes.

The main points raised were as follows:

During the previous two years the service had underperformed and it had not been clear whether this was an anomaly or a trend. As a result there had no growth in commissioning. However, over performance was fully funded by the CCG and was not subsidised by WMAS.

The service had seen unprecedented demand in the current year. Overall there was a downward trend in performance against targets across the West Midlands and an increase in service levels.

Following the deterioration of red and green targets, contract query notices were issued to the provider. An investigation was held and remedial actions agreed.

One key factor was handover delays at hospitals.

There had also been a reduction in non-transfer calls (see and treat and hear and treat) and the CCG intended to discuss this further with the ambulance trust.

In planning for 2015/16, activity levels had been reviewed and an increase of 3 per cent in funding had been agreed.

CRCCG were also working proactively with WMAS to address the increase in activity levels. There was an urgent care working group in place for Coventry and Rugby. This was exploring how resources could be utilised more effectively and looking at alternative ways of handling patient need.

Implementation of a new ‘falls pathway’ had recently begun in Rugby. This enabled WMAS to refer appropriate patients directly to community services rather than transporting them to hospital. A more proactive approach would also encourage people to seek more self-help means, such as through pharmacies.
During further discussion the following points were raised:

Calls for Coventry and Rugby average at 12,500 per month but it was not possible to state how this translated to cost.

A member asked whether any work had been carried out to understand the reason for the increased demand on the service. One of the ways this was being addressed included looking at why the public access services. There may be a lack of trust in the 111 system and work was being carried out to raise the profile of this service. The public often call 999 for non-emergencies when there are different avenues of healthcare available, but care was needed in how to define accident and emergencies. 111 calls are re-routed to 999 as necessary.

There was evidence to suggest that people attend the accident and emergency department rather than call their own general practitioner (GP) because it is more convenient and it can be difficult to access GPs out of hours.

Members suggested that the 111 system has become a message taking service and there is no instant medical response or reassurance. It was also possible some people knew how to manipulate the service to get elevated to an emergency level.

The CRCCG was currently in the process of re-tendering the ambulance contract. The new contract included enhanced clinical triage, as there was evidence that the more clinical advice people receive at the triage stage the less likely they are to call for an ambulance.

Older people may have transport issues and this means they need an ambulance to reach hospital. It was hoped that work on a new patient transport contract would result in an improved service and better use of ambulance resources.

The county council’s health overview and scrutiny committee has a select committee scheduled to look at winter pressures. This will engage with all health service organisations and the outcomes of this may be useful to the CRCCG.

RESOLVED THAT – the committee thanked Matt Gilks and Sue Davies for their attendance at the meeting.

49. AMBULANCE SERVICE RESTRUCTURING

The committee received a report (Part 1 – agenda item 6) concerning the ambulance service in Rugby following its restructuring. Significant changes had been made to the operation of emergency ambulance services in Rugby as part of West Midlands Ambulance Service’s ‘Transformation’ programme, including the closure of the ambulance station on Brownsover Lane in Rugby the previous year. This had been replaced with a ‘make ready’ hub in Coventry and two community response points in Rugby.

The report summarised evidence received from West Midlands Ambulance Service by the committee in September 2014 regarding the service restructure and included updated performance data, showing a slight decline in performance against response targets. In addition, the committee had issued a call for evidence to local
residents and patient reference groups about their experiences of ambulance response times in the previous year. Three individuals had responded and their feedback was included in the report.

Evidence was heard at the meeting from another member of the public who described their experience after they had suffered a fall in the town centre on a Sunday afternoon in March 2014. They explained how they had laid on the floor in the cold for almost an hour and a half waiting for an ambulance to arrive. They felt that the ambulance service staff had been extremely stretched, and that this was reflective of a wider decline in health services in Rugby over a number of years.

Members of the committee and others present also described examples of poor ambulance response times, which corroborated some of the experiences detailed in the responses to the call for evidence. One of these responses stated that “there were no first responders or ambulances available in Rugby on a Saturday afternoon” and members noted that there appeared to be a recurrent theme of delayed emergency responses at weekends.

CRCCG acknowledged that these experiences were not good. Individual cases raised with the committee could be addressed on a contractual basis by CRCCG with WMAS as part of their process for holding the Trust to account against their contract.

However, it was noted that the national context was one of declining performance against ambulance response targets and it was necessary to investigate further to understand whether there was a particular problem in Rugby as a result of the ambulance service restructure. There was a view that the data from Rugby was broadly in line with national trends. There were also a number of other pressures on the service, including delays at hospital handover points and patient discharge transport, which may be contributing to the performance deficit.

A member stated that there was a local perception that there were no longer any ambulances stationed in Rugby, and that this reflected a general decline in services over time, including the removal of maternity and paediatric hospital services from the borough.

A member questioned whether there was a patient safety issue as a result of the transport times involved in transferring patients to hospital in Coventry. It was also suggested that delays in hospital turnaround times could cause significant delays if ambulances were travelling from the hospital in Coventry.

Members also asked how many times first response vehicles needed to call an ambulance. It was suggested that response times and targets may be being met, but often an ambulance was still required and this was not reflected in the performance data. It was also unclear whether the community ambulance points in Rugby were being used, and how much of the time ambulances were stationed at positions in Rugby.

The CRCCG agreed to try to provide a breakdown of the figures specifically for Rugby with regard to:
- ambulance response times
- how often the community ambulance points in Rugby were being used
Members asked CRCCG how they were engaging with Rugby residents with regard to their concerns about ambulance response times. The CCG holds regular local engagement forums and this issue had not been previously raised, but it could be suggested to the public engagement team as a future topic for discussion.

The CRCCG representatives were invited to share the outcomes and any further evidence and respond to issues raised by members of the public.

RESOLVED THAT –

(1) the CRCCG be asked to provide data for Rugby with regard to:
   - ambulance response times
   - how often the community ambulance points in Rugby were being used; and
   - what proportion of call-outs required an ambulance to attend following a first response; and

(2) the members of the public who attended and submitted evidence to the meeting be thanked for their contribution.
Data provided for January 2014 to June 2015 (inclusive).

Please note: The Rugby area is not a defined location WMAS reports on; the area forms part of the Coventry and Rugby CCG. Therefore the Rugby area has been defined as three postcode areas which cover Rugby itself and the outer lying area to the West of the town, as per the following excerpts from Google maps - provided for illustrative purposes only (however the reporting geography is the same). We cannot report on ‘boroughs’ as they are not defined areas for reporting.
**Q1:** Performance against Red 1, 2 and 19 and Green targets for Rugby borough.
Performance figures provided for the three stated postcode areas as detailed above (CV21, CV22, CV23).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target</th>
<th>75%</th>
<th>75%</th>
<th>95%</th>
<th>90%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial Month / Metric</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red 1 - 08 Min Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red 2 - 08 Min Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red 19 Min Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green 2 - 30 min Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2014 to June 2015</td>
<td>75.9%</td>
<td>76.6%</td>
<td>89.7%</td>
<td>88.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Red text denotes sub target performance.

**Q2:** How many calls requiring an emergency response were received in Rugby.
An Incident count is provided - an Incident is where at least 1 WMAS resource attended scene. All Incident types.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial Month</th>
<th>Incident Count Total per Month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 2013/2014</td>
<td>1,015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2013/2014</td>
<td>916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2013/2014</td>
<td>1,048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2014/2015</td>
<td>944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2014/2015</td>
<td>1,059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2014/2015</td>
<td>1,022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2014/2015</td>
<td>1,082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2014/2015</td>
<td>964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep 2014/2015</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2014/2015</td>
<td>1,017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 2014/2015</td>
<td>1,107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2014/2015</td>
<td>1,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2015/2015</td>
<td>1,048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2015/2015</td>
<td>902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2015/2015</td>
<td>1,003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2015/2016</td>
<td>942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2015/2016</td>
<td>1,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2015/2016</td>
<td>1,009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Q3: Average ambulance response times in Rugby borough**

Face to face responses (crew on scene). Emergency incidents only.

Metric used is: **Average** Best Response Time (in decimal minutes).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target response time</th>
<th>8 mins</th>
<th>8 mins</th>
<th>30 mins</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial Month</td>
<td>Red 1</td>
<td>Red 2</td>
<td>Green 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2013/2014</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2013/2014</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2013/2014</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2014/2015</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2014/2015</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2014/2015</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2014/2015</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2014/2015</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep 2014/2015</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2014/2015</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 2014/2015</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Dec 2014/2015</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that the high volume of Red 2 incidents has a greater effect on the monthly average than Red 1s; Red 1 volumes are small so have less influence on the average. This is why Red 2 best responses appear better than Red 1.

*December 2014 was one of the busiest months ever experienced by the Trust*

**Q4: Emergency response times - durations by month.**

Face to face responses (crew on scene) for 1st arriving resources. Emergency incidents only.

Red Incidents provided - those which require an 8 minute response.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 8 minutes</td>
<td>5806</td>
<td>76.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 to 15 minutes</td>
<td>1164</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 30 minutes</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 to 45 minutes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 to 60 minutes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 60 mins</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>7580</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The maximum best response time for face to face Red incidents by a WMAS vehicle within WMAS Operational Area: 44.33 minutes.
Q5: How many patients requiring an emergency response required a transport to Hospital?
Data is a Transport count - the number of [Red] incidents that required at least one transport to a main Hospital within the WMAS area. This is not a count of the number of vehicles attending Hospital.
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Q6: Details of time taken for onward patient transport to arrive.
Details of the time taken for onward transport (backup) to arrive cannot be provided by time band.

Therefore, the average for the period for Red incidents is 20 minutes.

Q7: Community Ambulances in the Rugby Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Paramedic (CP) Response Point: Rugby North</th>
<th>4130 Incidents attended by CP resources on duty at this location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Paramedic (CP) Response Point: Rugby St. Cross</td>
<td>4281 Incidents attended by CP resources on duty at this location</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that the CP resource may not be the 1st to arrive and may have responded with or without backup.
Figures are Incident Counts for Red 1, Red 2 & Green 2 call categories
Figures relate to vehicles based at the stated location, although the vehicle(s) may not have actually responded from that location.
Vehicles based at the stated locations may also have responded to incidents outside the defined postcode areas.
Our Ref: MG/SK

3rd August 2015

Sent by e:mail: 3.8.15

###Ms Debbie Dawson
Scrubiny Officer
Rugby Borough Council
Town Hall
Evreux Way
Rugby
CV1 2RR

Dear Debbie

**Ambulance Services in Rugby**

I am in receipt of your letter, dated 15th July 2015, regarding performance data in relation to the ambulance service transformation programme in the council area and the subsequent perceived local concerns over response times following the closure of the Brownsover Lane station.

It is regrettable that the committee was disappointed by the original data supplied by West Midlands Ambulance Service, because it was effectively felt to be not properly verified, but the issue by the committee of a formal Freedom of Information request to the WMAS Trust will undoubtedly provide the quality of information required.

Coventry and Rugby CCG are always happy to assist the committee in its work in whatever way is appropriate, and if I can be of any further assistance please do not hesitate to ask.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

Matt Gilks
Director of Commissioning

cc: Donna Carver

---

Chair: Dr Adrian Canale-Parola
Chief Officer: Dr Steve Allen
**AGENDA MANAGEMENT SHEET**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Name of Meeting</strong></th>
<th>Overview and Scrutiny Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date of Meeting</strong></td>
<td>15 October 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Report Title</strong></td>
<td>Overview and Scrutiny Work Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ward Relevance</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contact Officer</strong></td>
<td>Debbie Dawson, Scrutiny Officer, Tel: (01788) 533592</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary**
The report helps the committee to prepare for its next meeting and updates the committee on the progress of task group reviews.

**Financial Implications**
There is a budget of £500 available to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board in 2015/16 to spend on the delivery of the overview and scrutiny work programme.

**Risk Management Implications**
There are no risk management implications arising from this report.

**Environmental Implications**
There are no environmental implications arising from this report.

**Legal Implications**
There are no legal implications arising from this report.

**Equality and Diversity**
No new or existing policy or procedure has been recommended.
Public Report to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee

15 October 2015

Committee Work Programme

Summary
The report helps the committee to prepare for its next meeting and updates the committee on the progress of task group reviews.

1. PROGRESS ON SCRUTINY REVIEWS

The existing reviews in the overview and scrutiny work programme have yet to be allocated to the new overview and scrutiny committees for the purposes of overseeing their work. In the meantime a summary of progress against the reviews in the work programme is provided in Appendix 1.

2. FUTURE WORK PROGRAMME

The new overview and scrutiny chairmen and vice chairmen will be meeting on 5 November to decide the allocation of existing work to each of the new committees. It is likely that some of the committee dates for 2016 will be changed to avoid meetings in April, and hopefully utilising dates that were already in the calendar for the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board. As soon as these revised dates are confirmed they will be circulated to members.

3. NEXT MEETING OF THE COMMITTEE

The next meeting of this committee is scheduled for Thursday 12 November 2015. The agenda items are detailed below and members are asked to comment on the proposed areas of focus and suggest any particular issues that should be covered.

Crime and disorder scrutiny

This will be an annual update on the work of the Community Safety Partnership, as part of the overview and scrutiny committees’ statutory responsibility (at least once a year) to review the decisions and actions of the responsible authorities within the Community Safety Partnership in relation to their crime and disorder functions.

The Community Safety Partnership Manager and Inspector Karl Faulkner of the Rugby Safer Neighbourhood’s Team will report to the committee and the local Neighbourhood Watch chair has also been invited to attend the meeting. The Warwickshire Police and Crime Commissioner has also been advised about the meeting.
The Community Safety Partnership Manager proposes to report to the committee on the following:

- Performance for 2014/15
- Changed priorities for 2015/16
- Performance in 2015/16
- Examples of project work, including East European Project and Stonham Domestic Violence project
- Futures Unlocked
- Current challenges

Members are also advised that motorcycling provision for young people in the borough was previously raised with the former CUSP as an issue by Rugby Youth Council. Members agreed at the time to raise the matter with the Community Safety Manager.

**Finance and Performance Monitoring**

Scrutiny of the Quarter 2 finance and performance report, prior to its consideration by Cabinet on 16 November.

**Review of Universal Credit and Welfare Reform**

As previously agreed by Customer and Partnerships Committee, update from the task group to be presented to the committee by the task group chairman, Councillor Tom Mahoney, to inform a decision about the focus and form of any future scrutiny work on welfare reform.

4. **CONCLUSION**

The committee is asked to:

- note the progress in the task group reviews; and
- determine and approve the focus of the next meeting of the committee.
Name of Meeting: Overview and Scrutiny Committee
Date of Meeting: 15 October 2015
Subject Matter: Committee Work Programme

LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS
There are no background papers relating to this item.
## Programme of Reviews 2015/16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review title</th>
<th>Start date</th>
<th>Progress</th>
<th>Expected report date</th>
<th>Budget considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Universal credit and welfare reforms</td>
<td>June 2013</td>
<td>Second interim report on the task group’s work was presented to Customer and Partnerships Committee in June 2015. The committee asked for a further report in November when the committee would make a decision on whether the task group should continue its work in its current form. Task group to meet on 7 October 2015 for an update on latest policy developments and impact measures before reporting back to the committee.</td>
<td></td>
<td>This is a standing task group. As the reforms are being phased in over several years, the task group’s role is ongoing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting independent living</td>
<td>February 2015</td>
<td>A meeting of the task group is scheduled for 29 October, when the task group take evidence from the council’s community development team and discuss their findings with the portfolio holders for Sustainable Inclusive Communities and Health, Community Safety and Equality. A further meeting will take place on Thursday 26 November, when the task group hopes to receive evidence from voluntary sector representatives. A visit to the Control Centre at Rounds Gardens and Albert Square is also due to be scheduled.</td>
<td>January 2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hackney carriage stands</td>
<td>July 2014</td>
<td>The task group has completed its work and is due to report to committee on the outcomes of the review.</td>
<td>September 2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems Thinking review</td>
<td>July 2015</td>
<td>The task group held its inaugural meeting on 28 July and will next meet, on a date yet to be arranged, to gather evidence from a sample of managers and staff who have embraced the systems thinking process and achieved positive results.</td>
<td>tbc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review title</td>
<td>Start date</td>
<td>Progress</td>
<td>Expected report date</td>
<td>Budget considerations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The role of cycling in improving health and wellbeing and reducing congestion</td>
<td>November 2015</td>
<td>Light touch review scheduled for 19 November. Scoping to take place at the special overview and scrutiny committee meeting on 22 October.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car parking</td>
<td>January 2016?</td>
<td>This will be a short, light touch review, to be carried out once enough time has elapsed to capture the necessary data on performance since WCC took back the on-street parking enforcement contract.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugby Borough Council’s SLAs with voluntary sector organisations</td>
<td>tbc</td>
<td>The start date will be influenced by officer capacity and the timing of the introduction of revised SLAs: late 2015/16 at the earliest. In practice it may not be possible to carry out useful scrutiny work till well into 2016/17 after the new SLAs have been in operation for some time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>