

Title:	<b>Clennon Valley Healthy Living Centre Consultation Feedback</b>		
Report to:	Torbay Council Health Scrutiny Committee		
Prepared By:	Steve Honeywill	Contributors:	
Directorate/Department:	Corporate Services		
Date Prepared:	March 2010	Date of Meeting:	8 April 2010

The purpose of this report is to brief Torbay Council Health Scrutiny Board with respect to the feedback following the formal public consultation exercise that took place over a period of three months between December 2009 and February 2010 concerning the proposed Clennon Valley Healthy Living Centre scheme.

## 1. Background

At the Health Scrutiny Committee on 10<sup>th</sup> September 2009 the board considered the impact of the proposed Healthy Living Centre upon patients and carers. The view was reached that the proposal constituted a “Substantial variation or substantial development of health services”. As a result Torbay Care Trust undertook a formal public consultation with the Paignton community between December 2009 and February 2010 to seek view with respect to the scheme and which services would be provided in the proposed building.

The Healthy Living Centre for Health and Social Care has formed part of the strategic direction for Health and Social Care services in Paignton for a number of years. Throughout this period the involvement of the staff, service users and general public has been valued in shaping the project. The vision behind The Healthy Living Centre is articulated in the form of two clear fundamental principles that underpin all our service development:

- Services should be developed to ensure that for each individual the Right Care, must be provided in the Right Place at the Right Time, and...
- Wherever possible these services should be delivered locally in the person's own home or in the community.

This Healthy Living Centre facility would provide access to local care for the people of Paignton. The key partners involved in the scheme are: Torbay Care Trust, Torbay Care Trust Patient Forum, Grosvenor Road Surgery, Withycombe Lodge Surgery, Devon Partnership Trust, Torbay Council, South Devon Healthcare Trust and PMP Health Developments. An Outline Business Case for the project was approved by the Strategic Health Authority in the summer of 2007 and work has been on going on the design of the building subsequently. The Healthy Living Centre has been planned on the basis that it will provide an integrated one stop shop for the people of Paignton in the optimum of settings. The building will:

- Enable the relocation of the Grosvenor Road and Withycombe Lodge General Medical Practice Surgeries to fit for purpose facilities.
- Achieve integration of health and social services which will in turn enhance the service received by the service user.

- Enable the Devon Partnership Trust to provide modern mental health services
- Enable the shift of outpatient activity from Torbay Hospital to a more localised setting.

## **2. Public Consultation process**

The trust approached the consultation process with the aim of making it as inclusive and wide ranging as possible to ensure that we maximised feedback and engagement from the community. We also viewed this activity as a positive opportunity to raise awareness of the scheme and its potential benefits for the people of Paignton and to clarify our aims and objectives.

The formal consultation period ran from 1<sup>st</sup> December 2009 to 28<sup>th</sup> February 2010. During this period we took a number of approaches to reach people as many of the public as possible

### **Consultation leaflet**

(a) A leaflet (see appendix 4) was sent to households in Paignton explaining the scope of the scheme and providing tick-box options for the public to record a view on which additional services they would like to see in the building. A page was also included inviting free text comments related to the proposal. This leaflet was developed and agreed with end users and Health Scrutiny Board.

The leaflet was delivered to residential addresses seeking views with respect to the services to be provided in the building. Approximately 16,000 leaflets were delivered by the Post Office to addresses in post codes TQ3 & TQ4 during December. The Post Office did not have the capacity to deliver approximately 4,000 leaflets to households in Paignton within our timescales. As a consequence a second provider was commissioned to deliver to one sector of TQ3 and TQ4 postcodes and a small part of the TQ5 area. This supplementary delivery of leaflets took place in mid-January 2010. The Head of Estates received 7 contacts from residents at Paignton addresses saying they had not received a leaflet. A leaflet was then sent directly to those householders. Every effort was made by the Trust to ensure as comprehensive a distribution of leaflets occurred as practicable.

Approximately 1,600 leaflets were also distributed to public sites and organisations including Grosvenor Road and Withycombe Lodge surgeries, Paignton Hospital, Midvale Road clinic, Fernham Day Centre, Public Library's, Torbay Hospital, Torbay Council and Torbay Care Trust public access sites, community groups such as the Chadwell Organisation, Over 50's Group, Torbay Leisure Centre and Devon Partnership Trust and at public meetings. This spread of sites also helped raise awareness of the consultation process and added encouragement for the community to contribute.

21,600 leaflets have been circulated into the public domain during the three month public consultation period.

The leaflet was also made available to staff for comment and feedback in offices and trust buildings.

### **Ward Partnerships**

(b) Head of Estates asked the Council for an invitation to attend all the five Paignton Ward Partnership meetings during the consultation period as part of the engagement process to seek feedback. However this was only possible to attend the Goodrington, Roseland's and Hookhills public meeting which took place in December and The Blatchcombe meeting in early February. Unfortunately the Ward Partnerships for Paignton Town, Preston and Clifton and Maidenway did not hold a public forum during the December to February period of the consultation.

The Goodrington, Roseland's and Hookhills meeting was reasonably well attended. The Head of Estates made a presentation with respect to the scheme followed by a useful question and answer session. Also a supply of leaflets was left for all those who attended. Parking was a topic of interest from this meeting as it was also was at The Blatchcombe meeting on 4<sup>th</sup> February 2010.

### **LINKs group**

(c) During the consultation period the Heads of Estates had a dialogue with the trust's lead member for the LINKs group with respect to running the process itself and comments about the scheme content. This LINKs representative (Judy Punshon) is also an established member of the Clennon Valley Project Team who has worked on the building design amongst other aspects of the scheme. Through this route LINKs have had long standing input into the project and have provided lively challenge to the schemes development.

### **Hard to Reach groups**

(d) The Head of Estates was also committed to including "hard to reach" groups as a key element of the consultation activity and consulted with Torbay Council with respect to this approach. Sessions took place, arranged via the Council, with the "Disabilities Community group" and "Over 50's group" in late January. The Over 50's group included a very active question and answer session with the 25 or so members of the public who attended and enabled a detailed dialogue to take place around issues such as parking. The Disabilities group was attended by about 10 members and included useful dialogue related to a disabled friendly building design and related access issues. Both these meetings suggested the Trust should be actively progressing the scheme and it was thus useful to explain the current state of play with the project and the reasons for delays in the past two years. Scheme affordability was also a common concern in the challenging public sector financial climate. The fear was voiced about the project being shelved due to finances. The Council's Equality & Engagement officer organised these events. Feedback from the Council was that "Quite a few people found (the meetings) really useful"

The Head of Estates also attended the CHAD organisations AGM in early January to discuss the scheme and distribute leaflets. CHAD are an umbrella organisation for a

number of disabilities groups who used to use the Chadwell building at Preston and are now based at Hollacombe CRC. The group wanted to explore the potential use of the Healthy Living Centre as an out of hour's venue for various disabilities and other groups. This could be an option for some of the multi- functional rooms envisaged for the building. At this meeting the Head of Estates also presented a paper that was requested by the chair to explain the NHS historic relationship with CHAD dating back to the late 1970's. The purpose of this report was to clarify the history between the two organisations with respect to the Chadwell building at Hollacombe.

### **Torbay Council Consultation caravan**

(e) On 23<sup>rd</sup> February the Head of Estates also had slot on the Council's consultation caravan in central Paignton (Victoria Street) to distribute leaflets and answer queries from members of the public with respect to the proposed scheme.

### **Public Meeting**

(f) A public meeting was also held in the Torbay Leisure Centre at Clennon Valley on 18<sup>th</sup> February. The Trust publicised this event via the local media and by widely distributing posters to relevant public sector buildings (Trust buildings, GP's, Torbay Council etc) The Head of Estates also visited Pebble Court, which is the nearest residential accommodation in Penwill Way to the proposed building, to invite residents to the meeting via the Warden. Previously residents at Pebble Court attended Overview and Scrutiny when the Healthy Living Centre was on the agenda. The Head of Estates made a commitment to keep Pebble Court informed with respect to the schemes progress. This meeting was partly set up for residents in the immediate vicinity and also as an additional opportunity for anyone who wanted to contribute, but could not attend any of the meetings covered above.

Four residents from Pebble Court attended the meeting and found it useful. They supported the proposal for the Healthy Living Centre, however expressed concerns with respect to the design of the building and traffic volumes. It was agreed that at the planning application stage a separate meeting would be set up at Pebble Court with the Trust and the schemes developer to look at the specifics of the design when available and related issues.

### **Other contacts**

(g) Seven members of the public also telephoned the Head of Estates on receipt of the consultation leaflet or following meetings to seek further clarification with respect to specific points concerning the project. One letter also appeared in the Herald Express supporting the need for the facility but suggesting it should be located on the sea side of the Dartmouth Road. One positive e-mail of support was also sent by a member of the public. From late January when the Trust's new website was fully up and running, a page appeared in the "Latest News" section explaining the aims the Healthy Living Centre proposal, including a copy the consultation leaflet.

### **3. Consultation findings and reflections**

The consultation closed on 28<sup>th</sup> February 2010 after a three-month period. At that juncture the Trust had received 562 returned leaflet from a total distribution of 21,600 leaflets circulated a percentage return of just under 3%. Although the response rate was arguably small from the whole sample of leaflets, combined with the feedback from the various meeting and forums it has provided the Trust is a helpful range of comments and issues to flag up and address as the scheme hopefully progresses. It is worth restating that the consultation related to the proposed services to be provided in the building, the opportunity for the public to comment upon the specifics of a design and site layout will occur as part of a future planning application. Many members of the public were only interested in issues related to the planning application process and associated matters.

Attached to this report in appendix form are detailed sets of information covering the numbers of leaflets circulated, responses rates, support/ticks for specific services to be provided in the centre, verbatim comments by member of the public arranged by topic and a number graphic representations of the data and relationships. These should be looked in conjunction with the following observations and analysis.

#### **Response rate**

(a) Whilst the response was 3% of the total of leaflets circulated, 562 leaflets returned does provide a large sample of comments and a healthy range of feedback to provide the Trust with useful data and food for thoughts in terms of planning the way forward. (See appendix 1.1)

(b) The feedback demonstrated a variety of views, some broadly in favour of or broadly against the proposal or aspects of it and those who simply made comments about operational matters (mainly parking) and how they would work in practice. Statistically no particularly definitive theme emerged from the feedback as a headline message, other than perhaps concerns or queries with respect to parking and transport arrangements.

#### **Tick- box responses**

(c) The leaflet included a tick-box section that asked people to tell us what else they would like to see in the new centre. The most popular services in this category were Mobile Diagnostics, Community Pharmacy and Integrated Health and Social Care Team. The attached appendix section of this report includes the data with respect to the tick-box feedback section and associated statistically analysis. (See appendix 1.2)

#### **Comments from the public**

(d) The comments section of the leaflet is also covered in the detailed appendix (2.0 to 2.6) to this report at some length. People commented for and against the scheme and a range of associated issue. As anticipated the topic of most interest related to parking and transport.

## **Doctor's surgeries**

(e) The proposal to relocate the two GP surgeries is a key component of the scheme. Out of the combined patients' numbers for Grosvenor Road and Whitycombe Lodge (see appendix 3.5) only 0.2% commented via the leaflet, with only 5 people explicitly against. The conclusion drawn from this is that the patients are content with the proposal in general terms. This concurs entirely with previous research and communication undertaken by the GP's over a number of years. The relocation of less than a mile in return for improved facilities and access was not opposed by the patients. Both surgeries will still maintain the personal touch, the loss of the close relationship between patient and GP was a theme, but this will not happen with respect to this proposal. Currently there is virtually no free parking for either surgery whilst at Clennon Valley sufficient parking will be available.

A strand of feedback suggested alternative locations or suggestions to explore for where to site the proposed building, however after much work and time spent looking to identify a site the Clennon Valley car park has proven to be only viable option for the project to proceed. The Library Hub in Western Way is mentioned several times in the comments appendix as is the general point that some people would prefer to see the surgeries in town. However these suggestions are not feasible due to the long standing scarcity of sites/land in the appropriate catchment area for these services.

## **Transport and Parking**

(f) Transport/parking: The requirement to provide adequate parking on site was the topic that created most comment in the narrative section of the leaflet and through face to face contact at the various meetings. (See appendix 3.2 and 3.3)

This split into two broad strands of the comment. One group stating that adequate parking should be provided on site close to the proposed building with disabled parking spaces, and a second group against having to pay for parking on site. Given that Clennon Valley is a Council owned pay and display car park and we don't have a viable alternative site of the scheme, the requirement to charge is unfortunately a given. However at the meetings the fact that we are proposing a pay on exit system on site and free access for short-term visits to drop off and pick ups, did appear to mitigate some concerns with respect to charging, although a strong view against having to pay is reflected in the comments of those who responded. Members of the public at the Blatchcombe Ward Partnership meeting supported the scheme and the proposal to have a pay on exit parking arrangement at Clennon Valley.

To put this issue in context, only a handful of free and readily available parking spaces are occasionally available at the GP sites, currently access is poor with parking restrictions in the local area, thus many patients therefore already have to use pay and display facilities to attend appointments. Clennon Valley will provide adequate parking right next to the building on a pay and display/pay on exit basis.



At the meetings it was explained that the details of issues such as managing parking on site with the Leisure Centre, design and layout of the car park and the use of pay on exit technology would be addressed at a later stage.

## **Bus Routes**

Several positive comments have been made about good access to the site via the number 12, 12C and 120 buses that stop on the Dartmouth Road currently adjacent to the Leisure Centre. However if the scheme does proceed to the next stage further work may need to be undertaken in this area, such as discussions with the bus companies about local routes (two buses required from Roseland's). The location of the proposed centre is served well by the 12 bus route (see attached appendix 5 bus routes from Stagecoach) which provides a regular service with bus stops close by on both sides of the Dartmouth Road.

## **Planning Application stage**

(g) Some of the matters above will be addressed as part of a future planning application when the Trust intends to hold public events to show the layout of the site including scale models and elevations etc, so the reality of the proposal and its design can be clearly and openly viewed. The trust will continue to actively consult with the public and stakeholders as the scheme moves forwards.

## **Summary**

(h) In summary the feedback tick-box section of the leaflet has provided the Trust with a helpful guide concerning which services the public wish to see in the building and areas they believe are less important or would duplicate activity and services elsewhere. These comments will inform out proposals in the coming months. The GP's can be clear from this process that they also have support for this re-location, which builds upon their own communications previously. As anticipated issues centred around parking arrangements on site proved the liveliest topic. However the provision of adequate parking at Clennon Valley site and the proposed pay on exit scheme proved positive features in feedback. Also the message related to ensuring the building complied with disabilities requirements came through clearly.

With respect to the main concerns raised in the feedback the Trust intends to mitigate these are follows:

Concerns with respect to sufficient parking on site?	The current number of parking spaces currently at Clennon Valley will still be available on completion of the Healthy Living Centre
Concerns with respect to pay and display parking arrangements at Clennon Valley?	Clennon is a pay and display car park, however a pay on exit scheme will be used and short-term/drop off visits will be free for approximately 10/15 minutes. A detailed parking management arrangement to be agreed with Torbay Leisure Centre
Concerns with respect to the proposed location at	The current site is the only viable location identified following detailed site searches over several years. The

Clennon Valley and why other suggested options are not viable?	location of the Library hub in Western Way is not suitable and the building is not large enough. The poor condition of the existing trust estates means that a new facility for these services is the only sustainable way forward
Concerns about GP relocation of Grosvenor Road and Whitycombe Lodge to Clennon Valley?	Statistically no significant opposition to these proposed moves emerged from the consultation. (See 3e in this report & Appendix 3.5) The current GP accommodation is neither fit for purpose or sustainable

The Trust is committed to carrying out a strong communication plan when the scheme reaches the planning application stage. We will need to actively demonstrate to the public that building itself will be aesthetically acceptable in terms of design and that the parking/traffic arrangements will prove adequate as envisaged. Overall the process did demonstrate support, accepting that we have no other viable site for the scheme.

#### **4. Next stages**

The Clennon Valley project team will need to look at the impact of the consultation data and the Scrutiny Boards feedback upon the proposed services for the building and any design implications. This will be reported to the Care Trust Management Team and Board, and back to Health Scrutiny for regular updates.

A number of detailed design matters are still being worked through to determine the best layouts and adjacencies for the clinical areas. This has proved more challenging than expected as the footprint of the proposed building is smaller than previous versions. It is envisaged that a settled design will be signed off in the near future for wider consideration to share with the Management Team and others partners. When this layout is settled with end-users and the partner organisations as suitable in terms of operational functionality then further detailed works needs to take place with respect to security and building servicing and operating arrangements. A revised costing and re-testing the affordability of the project will be undertaken at this stage involving Trust finance staff and the District Valuer.

Post consultation and after the design is frozen end users will be asked to produce detailed room data sheets for their service to meet their specific operational requirements. After this another revised costing would take place to test the definitively the affordability of the scheme. Also at this juncture a detailed project programme will be produced.

In broad terms it is envisaged that final design work, a planning application, European building tender process (OJEU) Full Business Case (FBC) approvals will occur. With respect FBC work needs to be undertaken between Commissioning and colleagues at SDHC to agree the specifics of the out-patients transfer to Clennon Valley. This is an important strand of the scheme as we will need evidence value for money and innovation. This will need to become a priority work stream in due course



## **5. Provisional project timeline**

A provisional outline of key events is below for information from May 2010 onwards assuming the successful progress of the scheme. Please note this is a speculative programme at this stage.

- Consultation impact upon the scheme assessed & report to Health Scrutiny
- Provisional designs for consideration MT and Board and Financial affordability checks
- Detailed design work for planning application, make planning application June, decision September/October
- OJEU progress from May, evaluate returns, tender, appoint contractor December
- Full Business Case trust management team/board Autumn/Winter

Once planning and tender/contractor approved, District Valuer signed off finance etc

- SHA Capital Board Early 2011
- Full SHA Board August 2011
- Contractor mobilised and start on site Spring 2011
- Contractor completes between Summer 2012 and Autumn 2012 (15/18 months build)

Steve Honeywill,  
Head of Estates,  
March 2010