

Questions to October Primary Care Commissioning Committee

Date: 12 October 2018	Name: Unknown
How received: Letter	
Question asked:	
<p>1. If funding were available, what is the possibility of the sale of the Practice as a going concern to Doctors and others, with a view to continuing at Wollaston? If this has not been considered what is the reason?</p> <p>The practice cannot be sold as a going concern. The contract is with 3 villages to provide services from SH&SCC and Wollaston. The practice are applying to vary their contract to remove the Wollaston premises.</p> <p>The CCG cannot own premises.</p> <p>If it was determined that a surgery was required in the area then full procurement rules would apply.</p>	
<p>2. In view of the very large resistance to the proposal, and to Winter travelling difficulties for older people, the equitable choice must surely be that a decision is deferred until all possibilities have been examined.</p> <p>If Committee take the decision to agree the application then the proposal is that the branch would not close until April 2019</p>	
<p>3. Is there any likelihood of Doctors who have left the Practice recently, such as Dr A. Wild, acting together to form a new partnership operating in Wollaston?</p> <p>See point 1. Wollaston is not operated under a separate contract. In the event that it was determined that a surgery was required and a new service procured then if a new partnership was formed they could tender for a contract. However, this is highly unlikely. Norton practice were trying for over 2 years to recruit, Doctors don't want to make the financial commitment and it's widely understood that there is a national shortage of doctors.</p>	
<p>4. What is the situation regarding loss of Sunday surgeries, which at previous meetings had not been approved by the Landlord of the John Corbett Drive premises?</p> <p>Current contracted opening hours at SHSCC does not include a Sunday however the provision could be moved to a Saturday as an alternative thus still providing weekend provision. This would need to be agreed with the CCG.</p>	
<p>5. Many Wollaston patients reside in Stourton and Kinver, and in view of a known proposal to amalgamate a Kinver surgery (South Staffs CCG) with a Kingswinford surgery (CCG Dudley) why can the Wollaston branch of Three Villages practice not be included in this?</p> <p>As point 1 – Unlike Moss Grove Kinver & Moss Grove Kingswinford, Wollaston does not hold a contract.</p>	

6. Under-use of resources: The upper floor of Wollaston surgery is almost unused, surely this could be an available source of income by sub-letting, for example to the very busy adjacent dental practice or others such as doctors in Private Practice? The original Three Villages (Amblecote) vacant site at Audnam, whether owned by the Trust or the Practice, is a chronic waste of land .Could sale or use of this provide capital or revenue for either?

Wollaston Surgery has three rooms upstairs and a small toilet. It is accessed via a narrow stair way which includes a stair lift. The size and accessibility of these rooms is not suitable for subletting.

The ability for GP Practices to provide private work is limited. See BMA guidance attached.

<https://www.bma.org.uk/advice/employment/gp-practices/service-provision/private-practice>

The practice would not be able to provide services for its registered population privately.

The Audnum site is no longer owned by Three Villages Medical Practice. The current partnership does not have any responsibility for the previous ownership of the building/ land. I do not believe that the CCG has any affiliations with its current owners.

7. What proportion of patients directly approached have responded to the consultation document?

859 surveys completed as set out in the practice report. 9913 list size = 8.67%

Date: 12 October	Name: Patient A
How received: Via email	
Question asked:	
<p>1. The PPG is pleased to see that there are lay members on the PCCC. However as these people represent the patient population in Dudley we hope that they will have a vote on the proposed closure of 3 Villages Wollaston surgery?</p> <p>The following are voting members of the Committee</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lay member for Governance (Chair) • Lay member for Quality & Safety (Vice Chair) • Lay member for Patient & Public Engagement <p>2. If the vote goes in favour of the above closure, is there an appeal procedure to NHS England, CCG Chief Exec etc.?</p> <p>If the practice appeals the decision there is a formal NHS dispute resolution procedure. If the public are unhappy about the way that the CCG has made a decision or the process we have followed then we would encourage them to contact our chief executive officer in the first instance. We would then follow the NHS complaints resolution process.</p> <p>3. Is the PCCC aware that the last branch premises in Audnam closed by 3 Villages MP approx. 9 years ago is an empty eyesore after arson and vandalism over the years?</p> <p>The Audnum site is no longer owned by Three Villages Medical Practice. The current partnership does not have any responsibility for the previous ownership of the building/ land. The CCG does</p>	

not have any affiliations with its current owners

Date: 16 October

Name: Patient B

How received: Via email

Question asked:

- 1. What is proposed with regards to the extra parking that will be needed at John Corbett drive if there is no other Surgery to be provided in Wollaston?**

Three Villages Medical Practice is already looking into parking issues at SHSCC and are in discussions with the landlord. This issue was already being addressed prior to the proposal.

Date: 16 October

Name: Patient C

How received: Via email

Question asked:

- 1. Why did Dr Tapparo not tell the patients at the public meetings that she another partner and a retired partner own the Wollaston branch premises?**

At the public meetings Dr Tapparo was asked, what will happen to the premises if a decision is made to close, and does the partnership own the building. The response given, which is explained in section 1.1 of the practice report was that the partnership of Three Villages Medical Practice does not own the building. This is factually correct.

It is also true that 2 partners of Three Village's part own the building with another partner so we can understand how this response may have been misinterpreted at the meeting but it is clearly explained in the report.

- 2. Why can't the CCG negotiate a lower rent with the 3 Villages partners for Wollaston branch premises if they want to save the NHS some money ?**

Rental payments to general practices are governed by The GMS Premises Costs Directions, which require the CCG to make rental payments to the practice in line with the valuation placed on the premises by the District Valuation Office, an arm of the government Valuation Office Agency. The CCG have no discretion to negotiate lower payments in these circumstances, and must reimburse the rental value agreed by the DVO.

- 3. Why were the Dudley Phlebotomy service told by a CCG Board member in August that 3 Villages Wollaston branch would be closing and weekly blood testing could cease from early September?**

No CCG Board Member gave that message to the provider, the conversation which has been mis-understood was between a CCG clinical Lead and the service provider. The CCG has always been very clear that any changes to phlebotomy services would be subject to public involvement.

There are currently discussions with the phlebotomy service provider (The Dudley Group FT) about some proposed changes to their clinics. The service are aware of the proposals to close Wollaston but also aware that no decision has been made. They have also been told that no changes can be made to phlebotomy clinics without adequate involvement of patients and the public. This position has been reiterated to the provider in light of your email.

I can therefore confirm that there will be no decision to make any changes to phlebotomy services in Dudley until patients and the public have had an opportunity to comment on any

proposals and until that feedback has been conscientiously considered by the provider and the CCG. The provider is currently making arrangements for that. The CCG is sorry if you have been given the wrong information by the provider of this service. The CCG position is quite clear and we have reiterated this to the service.

- 4. In the published procedure for closing branch surgeries the contracting practice is responsible for contacting adjacent CCG`s where applicable. As 3 Villages has approx. 400 patients in South Staffs why is there no mention in the consultation report of any feedback from South Staffs CCG? Their local MP Mr Gavin Williamson expressed concern at the fate of his constituents and agreed to take this up with Dudley CCG**

The Three Villages Practice have not contacted the adjacent CCG but they have made contact with the practice (Moss Grove) who are a member practice within South Staffordshire and Seisdon Peninsula CCG to confirm that there would be no detrimental impact on them and that they could take on patients resident in that area if patients chose to do so as a result of the proposed closure.

Dudley CCG did receive a letter from the local MP Mr Gavin Williamson and made him aware of the practice involvement period and the practice reasons for the proposal. We have not received any further correspondence.

- 5. In consultation summary the practice claims only 5.7% of total 3VMP patients said closure of Wollaston branch would have a negative impact. However 70% of people who completed consultation forms said it would have a negative impact. Using Wollaston parish data for population and practice membership if 70% of Wollaston patients agreed then approx. 16%of total patients would claim a negative impact if the closure goes ahead.**

The summary of consultation refers to the 5.7% of patients who in the utilisation analysis were found to only use the Wollaston site. The practice do not state that only 5.7% feel that the proposal would have a negative impact.

The report does state that 68.61% of respondents felt that the proposal would have a small or significant negative impact on them.

The report does not differentiate between Wollaston patients and Stourbridge as all patients are registered at the 3 villages practice not at separate sites.

- 6. Practice graphs claim 89%of patients have strong/ moderate preference for SHSCC appointments .Patients accept appointments wherever they can get one or where their nominated/ preferred GP is working on the day , so the surgery site is not important . Also so few appointments are available at Wollaston [approx. 60 over 6 days] that patients are forced to travel to SHSCC sometimes.**

There is the use of the word preference in the utilisation section of the practice report, this is unfortunate terminology and it is right that we clarify that what the section of the report shows is not the preference of patients but the documents utilisation of the two sites.

- 7. We already have 2 very large medical practices in Stourbridge [Lion Health and Wychbury] . What is the CCG strategic plan for the town particularly relative to 3 Villages practice which is the smallest with approx. 10000 patients?**

It is not within the role of Primary Care Commissioning Committee to set strategic plans for

Wollaston.

Date: 16 October

Name: Patient D

How received: Via email

Question asked:

There is concern here as to the planning application that has been lodged with Dudley MBC. This application is for a new medical surgery, not far from Lion Health. The applicant has applied via an agent, so their identity is not known. We are concerned that this may be connected with the closure of Wollaston. If you have any information which would help to clarify the picture for us, we would be very pleased to hear of it.

The CCG understands that this planning application is from Ramsay Healthcare, a private healthcare group, to build a new private hospital containing an operating theatre and several outpatient clinics. The application is totally unconnected to the branch surgery application, and will have no impact on the provision of primary care services.

The CCG commissions some secondary healthcare services from Ramsay Healthcare, and we were informed several months ago as part of our contracting process that Ramsay were looking to build a facility in this area. However, we were unaware of the submission of this planning application until it was brought to our attention by this question, and its timing is purely coincidental.

Date: 16 October

Name: Patient E

How received: Via email

Question asked:

- 1) The Three Spires is unmanned for the majority of the day (from midday onwards it seem and getting answers after waiting several minutes to speak to? All the gentleman informed me" he was the only person on the premises and he could not answer questions only pass queries on." We lost our connection and although I tried to reconnect he and I have not succeeded.
- 2) 2): Where are cars to be parked since Boots, Surgeries and Corbett Hospitals staff already cause an overflow any additional transport could result in very serious consequences.

In common with a number of health centres across Dudley, patient car parking is limited at Stourbridge Health and Social Care Centre (SHSCC), and this is exacerbated by the overflow of staff parking, as well as patients visiting the adjacent Corbett outpatient centre taking advantage of free car parking on the site (parking at Corbett Hospital is not free).

The CCG have recently commissioned a feasibility study into options to improve parking at SHSCC, and are looking at a number of options to increase capacity for patient parking. However, the site does benefit from good public transport links and the CCG would encourage all patients able to access public transport to utilise it.

- 3) Access to surgery will not be possible I understand at weekends. This is appalling! Russells Hall Accident and Emergency is not easy to access for the elderly or infirm and Kidderminster is some 20/30mins by car.

Access to the SHSCC building can be made available on a Saturday but not on a Sunday.