

PLEASE NOTE – THIS IS AN ADDITIONAL MEETING

HEALTH SCRUTINY FORUM AGENDA



Monday, 11 August 2008

at 3.00 pm

**in Council Chamber
Civic Centre, Hartlepool**

MEMBERS: HARTLEPOOL'S HEALTH SCRUTINY FORUM:

Councillors Barker, Brash, R W Cook, S Cook, A Lilley, Plant, Simmons, Sutheran and Young

Resident Representatives: Jean Kennedy, Linda Shields, Mike Ward

REPRESENTATIVES FROM DURHAM COUNTY COUNCIL: Jean Chaplow, Rick Burnip, Vacancy

- 1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**
- 2. TO RECEIVE ANY DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST BY MEMBERS**
- 3. MINUTES**

Minutes of the meeting of the Health Scrutiny Forum held on 4 August 2008 (*to follow*)

- 4. RESPONSES FROM THE COUNCIL, THE EXECUTIVE OR COMMITTEES OF THE COUNCIL TO FINAL REPORTS OF THIS FORUM**

No items.

- 5. CONSIDERATION OF REQUEST FOR SCRUTINY REVIEWS REFERRED VIA SCRUTINY CO-ORDINATING COMMITTEE**

No items.

6. **CONSIDERATION OF PROGRESS REPORTS / BUDGET AND POLICY
FRAMEWORK DOCUMENTS**

No items.

7. **ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION**

7.1 Momentum: Pathways to Healthcare – Consultation Response - *Scrutiny Support
Officer (to follow)*

8. **ISSUES IDENTIFIED FROM FORWARD PLAN**

9. **FEEDBACK FROM RECENT MEETING OF TEES VALLEY HEALTH SCRUTINY
JOINT COMMITTEE**

10. **ANY OTHER ITEMS WHICH THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS ARE URGENT**

ITEMS FOR INFORMATION

Dates of Next Meetings

- (i) Health Scrutiny Forum – Tuesday, 9 September 2008 at 3.00 pm in
Committee Room B
- (ii) Section 244 Health Scrutiny Joint Committee – Momentum: Pathways to
Healthcare – Tuesday, 2 September 2008 at 3.00 pm in the Council Chamber,
Hartlepool

HEALTH SCRUTINY FORUM

MINUTES

4 August 2008

The meeting commenced at 11.00 am in the Civic Centre, Hartlepool

Present:

Councillor: Jonathan Brash (In the Chair);

Councillors: Caroline Barker, Rob Cook, Alison Lilley, Michelle Plant, Chris Simmons and David Young.

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 4.2 (ii) Councillor Gladys Worthy was in attendance as substitute for Councillor Lillian Sutheran and Councillor Carl Richardson as substitute for Councillor Shaun Cook

Resident Representatives:

Linda Shields

Also Present: Councillors Geoff Lilley, Frances London and Arthur Preece
Liz North, Sedgefield Borough Council
Councillor Pauline Crathorne, Sedgefield Borough Council
Councillor Richard Burnip, Durham County Council
Ali Wilson, Director of Estates and Health Systems Development, Hartlepool PCT and North Tees PCT
Carole Langrick, Director of Strategy, North Tees & Hartlepool NHS Foundation Trust
Jeremy Brock, County Durham PCT
Sarah Scott, Hartlepool and North Tees PCT
Steve Wallace, Chairman, Hartlepool PCT
Nick Roper, Consultant Physician (North Tees & Hartlepool NHS Foundation Trust);
Paul Frank, Head of Patient Experience, Tees Primary Care Trust
Carl Parker, Joint PEC Chair for Hartlepool PCT & North Tees PCT
Kevin Oxley, Director of Operations, North Tees and Hartlepool NHS Foundation Trust
Richard Shield, Director DTZ

Officers: Gill Harrison, Assistant Director, Adult and Community Services
Stuart Green, Assistant Director, Regeneration and Planning Services
Charlotte Burnham, Scrutiny Manager
Joan Wilkins, Scrutiny Support Officer
Denise Wimpenny, Principal Democratic Services Officer

32. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors Shaun Cook, Lillian Sutheran, resident representatives, Jean Kennedy, Mike Ward and Durham County Council representatives, Councillor Jean Chaplow, and Faisal Jassat.

33. Declarations of Interest by Members

Councillor Jonathan Brash declared a non-prejudicial interest in minute number 38.

34. Minutes of the Meeting held on 25 July 2008

Confirmed.

35. Responses from the Council, the Executive or Committees of the Council to Final Reports of this Forum

None.

36. Consideration of Request for Scrutiny Reviews referred via Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee

None.

37. Consideration of Progress Reports/Budget and Policy Framework Documents

None.

38. Momentum: Pathways to Healthcare - Consultation *(Scrutiny Support Officer)*

The Scrutiny Support Officer reported that representatives from North Tees and Hartlepool NHS Foundation Trust, Hartlepool Primary Care Trust (PCT) and North Tees PCT were in attendance at today's meeting to provide an update on consultation, themes and responses emerging from the Momentum: Pathways to Healthcare consultation process and further discuss issues raised at the last meeting of the Forum held on 25 July 2008.

Members were informed that a fourth meeting would be held on 11 August at 3.00 pm in the Council Chamber, Civic Centre to approve the Forum's response to the consultation.

The Head of Patient Experience, Tees Primary Care Trust delivered a detailed and comprehensive presentation which outlined the following:-

- Update on consultation process
- Emerging themes from consultation process
 - main issues/main benefits
- Communication and Consultation Methods
 - stakeholder distribution;
 - leaflet/poster distribution
 - free paper coverage
 - radio advertising campaign
 - roadshow events
 - local press and council magazines
 - targeted engagement plan

Discussion ensued which included the following issues:-

- (i) Following discussion regarding the consultation process and media coverage, the Forum commented on the excellent consultation process which had provided ample opportunities for the public to contribute.
- (ii) A member of the Hartlepool Access Group highlighted the importance of ensuring public transport to the hospital was accessible to all, particularly the blind community with safe pedestrian crossing facilities in an accessible location with access to a bus stop.
- (iii) In response to a request for feedback on the views of Wynyard residents, the Head of Patient Experience advised that the residents main concerns were relating to access and the impact on the Wynyard Estate.
- (iv) Disappointment was expressed from a representative of Sedgfield Borough Council that the consultation roadshow in Sedgfield did not extend to Spennymoor or Newton Aycliffe

The Director of Operations provided a detailed presentation on the key issues in relation to location:-

- Original site selection by Trust and Advisors
 - Golden Flatts
 - Queens Meadow Business Park
 - Portrack Lane
 - North Shore
 - Wynyard Business Park
- 3 Additional sites identified to more closely reflected the IRP recommendation:-
 - Green Farm Wolviston
 - Green Farm, Wolviston and Fairfield Farm, Newton Bewley
 - Green Farm Wolviston and Fairfield and West Farms, Newton Bewley
- Site selection – business case process and evaluation criteria
- Emphasis on IRP recommendations

- Map outlining centre of travel times
- Shortlisting- 10 sites to 4 sites
- 4 sites to 2 sites
- Site approval process
- DTZ short listed sites – final proposals
- Proposed Site A – Wynyard Business Park
- Proposed Site B – Green Farm, Wolviston
- Site investigations
- Outline Business Case
- Timetable

A lengthy discussion ensued which included the following issues:-

- (i) In response to the Chair's request for comments on the planning policy considerations, the Assistant Director referred Members to the report of the Director of Regeneration and Planning Services and clarified that Site A already had outline planning permission for a business park and raised fewer strategic planning issues. In addition to this, ecological studies had shown the presence of greater crested newts on Site B, whilst concerns regarding the retention of woodland could be allayed with assurances that a woodland buffer would be retained between the proposed hospital and the business park site.
- (ii) Potential access difficulties for emergency vehicles to the new hospital site was highlighted and it was considered that an additional lane on the A19 could address this issue. It was also suggested that transport links should be addressed at the same time as the construction of the new hospital. The Director of Operations reported that improvements to road links would be examined in consultation with the Integrated Transport Unit and Tees Valley Regeneration, the details of which were yet to be determined. The Assistant Director of Regeneration and Planning added that a transport assessment would be required with any planning application and a contribution from the Joint Health Committee was possible.
- (iii) In response to a request for details of costings for Site B, it was reported that the commercial terms were confidential at present, however, would be included in the overall site assessment.
- (iv) A representative from Durham County Council advised that there had been no preference stated for either site at a recent meeting in this regard. However, queries had been raised in relation to how the figures had been calculated on the evaluation matrix. In response, the Director of Operations advised that this information was not publicly available as certain elements of the working papers were currently commercially sensitive. Further details were, however, to be made available on the Momentum website before the end of the consultation.
- (v) A lengthy discussion ensued on public transport provision generally, the need for a transport infrastructure to serve the whole region, the benefits of a tram system and the importance of good public access to services for all users, particularly those without their own transport. Some concern was expressed regarding the reliance on the Council to subsidise bus routes and a query was raised as to whether the

Trust would subsidise transport provision during peak and non-peak periods. The Director of Operations was of the view that a public bus route would be commercially viable, however, if that proved not to be the case, subsidy would have to be provided. A number of public transport options had been identified including park and ride, shuttle service and dial-a-ride. The Chair of Hartlepool PCT indicated that transport provision would be a partnership arrangement and car owners should be encouraged to use public transport.

- (vi) A Member emphasised the importance of a number of transport options at an affordable cost to the public.
- (vii) A representative from Durham County Council expressed concerns that the community services in the Easington area were not adequate and also highlighted concerns regarding the impact the introductions of polyclinics in Ryhope.

Concluding discussions, the Forum agreed that the following views should be used as the basis of Hartlepool's response to the Momentum: Pathways to Healthcare consultation. The Forum:-

- (a) Agreed in principle that the proposed new model was the way forward for the provision of health services in Hartlepool and where clinically safe services should be provided in the community.
- (b) Agreed in principle with the proposed location of additional community facilities, with the caveat that:-
 - (i) The provision of facilities across all areas of Hartlepool, and in particular areas of need, is imperative for the new model of health care provision to be effective; and
 - (ii) The Forum wished to see evidence in the future of work being undertaken to further explore the expansion of facilities in the north and south of Hartlepool; and
 - (iii) The further work needs to be undertaken to allay Sedgefield and Easington residents concerns regarding the impact of the proposed new facilities on their existing amenities.
- (c) Agreed that Site A (Wynyard Business Park) would be its preferred location for the new hospital. The grounds for this being that it:-
 - (i) Lies predominantly within the boundary of Hartlepool;
 - (ii) Already has outline planning permission for a business park and raises fewer strategic planning issues, in that it falls within an area already allocated for development in two relevant local plans;
 - (iii) Has only one land owner (i.e. unlike Site B where the area of land is owned by three separate parties);
 - (iv) Has no ecological issues (i.e. unlike Site B where greater crested newts have been found); and

- (v) Has easier and more established access routes and so presents fewer issues in terms of effective transport links.

The Scrutiny Support Officer reported that the next step in the process was to consider the draft final report which would be submitted to Members shortly and would form the basis of a joint report with Stockton for consideration by the Section 244 Health Scrutiny Joint Committee on 2 September 2008 to discuss the issues raised and comments made during each authority's discussions on the proposals. The joint report would then be referred to the Tees Valley Health Scrutiny Joint Committee for consideration during the formulation of a final response to the NHS Joint Committee in September.

The Chair thanked the representatives from North Tees and Hartlepool NHS Trust and Hartlepool and North Tees PCTs for their attendance and informative presentation.

Recommendation

- (i) That the contents of the presentations and comments of the Forum, be noted and the views expressed in Sections (a), (b) and (c) above form the basis of Hartlepool's response to the Momentum: Pathways to Healthcare consultation.

39. Forward Plan

None.

40. Feedback from Recent Meeting of Tees Valley Health Scrutiny Joint Committee

None.

The meeting concluded at 12.20 pm.

CHAIRMAN

HEALTH SCRUTINY FORUM

11 August 2008



Report of: Health Scrutiny Forum

**Subject: MOMENTUM: PATHWAYS TO HEALTHCARE –
DRAFT CONSULTATION RESPONSE**

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To present the Health Scrutiny Forum's response to the consultation in relation to the Momentum: Pathways to Healthcare Proposals.

2. SETTING THE SCENE

- 2.1 There can be no argument as to the importance of the development and implementation of a clear vision for the future of healthcare in the region. Integral to this vision is the provision of high quality, safe, accessible and responsive health care services, integrated across all care providers (including the voluntary sector and social services / community services).
- 2.2 Working towards achieving this vision, Momentum: Pathways to Healthcare aims to provide services closer to home; local clinics, where much of what is provided in hospital can take place and a new hospital within easy reach of everyone in the area. As part of the Momentum: Pathways to Healthcare Programme consultations commenced on the 2 June 2008 in relation to the recommendations of the Independent Reconfiguration Panel. These recommendations being that:-
- (i) A modern hospital to replace the existing out of date hospital buildings should be provided on a new site in a well-situated location accessible to the people of Hartlepool, Stockton, Easington and Sedgefield; and
 - (ii) Further initiatives are needed to improve the provision of primary and community care, including community midwifery. All services that do not need to be provided in a hospital setting should be placed in the heart of communities in line with implementing the White Paper Our health, our care, our say: a new direction for community services.

- 2.3 Under Section 244 of the NHS Act 2006, local NHS bodies have a duty to consult local Overview and Scrutiny Committees on proposals for any substantial development of the health service or substantial variation in the provision in their areas. As part of this duty and in recognition of the cross boundary implications of the Momentum proposals, a protocol was established through the Tees Valley Health Scrutiny Joint Committee for the conduct of joint scrutiny.
- 2.4 In accordance with this protocol, Hartlepool Borough Council and Stockton Borough Council, with representations from North Yorkshire and Durham, County Councils, have been asked to compile two parallel consultation responses. The responses will then be combined into a joint report through the newly created Section 244 Health Scrutiny Joint Committee. This report will then be considered by the NHS Joint Committee, on the 29 September 2008, as part of the consultation process.

3. MEMBERSHIP OF THE HEALTH SCRUTINY FORUM

- 3.1 The membership of the Health Scrutiny Forum was as detailed below:-

Councillors Barker, Brash, R W Cook, S Cook, A Lilley, Plant, Simmons, Sutheran and Young.

Resident Representatives: Jean Kennedy, Linda Shields and Mike Ward.

- 3.2 In accordance with the protocol approved through the Tees Valley Health Scrutiny Joint Committee three Durham County Council elected members were invited to participate in the compilation of a response to the Momentum: Pathways to Healthcare consultation. Durham County Council's Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee representatives involved in the process were County Councillors Chaplow and Burnip, and Sedgfield District Councillor Pauline Crathorne.

4. SOURCES EVIDENCE CONSIDERED DURING THE FORMULATION OF THE FORUM'S CONSULTATION RESPONSE

- 4.1 Members of the Health Scrutiny Forum, and representatives from Durham County Council's Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee, met formally on three occasions, from the 3 July 2008 to the 4 August 2008, to receive evidence and formulate a response to the Momentum: Pathways to Healthcare proposals. A detailed record of the issues raised during these meetings is available from the Council's Democratic Services.
- 4.2 A brief summary of sources of evidence considered as part of the consultation process is outlined below:-

- (a) Detailed presentations from the North Tees and Hartlepool NHS Foundation Trust, Hartlepool and North Tees PCTs and DTZ;

- (b) Verbal evidence from Hartlepool's Portfolio Holder with responsibility for Adult and Community Services;
- (c) Written evidence from Hartlepool's Member of Parliament;
- (d) Verbal evidence from the Chair of Hartlepool PCT and NHS Joint Committee;
- (e) Written and verbal evidence from:-
 - (i) Hartlepool Borough Council's Regeneration and Planning Services Department (*in relation to planning issues*) and Neighbourhood Services Department (*in relation to transport issues*); and
 - (ii) Durham County Council's Regeneration and Planning Services Department.
- (f) Written and verbal evidence from the Cleveland Local Medical Committee;
- (g) Written evidence from Trade Unions (*Unison*);
- (h) The views of local residents (*Press releases provided before each of the Forum's three meetings and leaflets advertising the Hartlepool Scrutiny process distributed to community centres, residents associations / groups, libraries, GP practices and Hartlepool Hospital*); and
- (i) Invitations were also extended to:-
 - (i) Hartlepool Borough Council's Elected Mayor;
 - (ii) Member of Parliament for Sedgefield;
 - (iii) Member of Parliament for Easington;
 - (iv) Durham County Council's Leader and Cabinet Member for Adult and Community Services; and
 - (v) The Chair and Chief Executive of Durham PCT.

5. RESPONSE TO THE CONSULTATION PROCESS

- 5.1 In considering its consultation response Hartlepool's Health Scrutiny Forum, with elected member representations from Durham County Council's Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee, was pleased to receive evidence from a variety of sources (as detailed in Section 4 of this report). With the aid of this information, the Forum was able to formulate clear views in relation to the following issues for inclusion in the joint Hartlepool / Stockton consultation response:-

(a) The proposed service model for the provision of health services in, or as near to, home as possible, with only things which need to be done in hospital taking place there.

- (i) **Downgrading of Services** - Whilst concern was initially expressed regarding the possible down grading of services as a result of their provision in the community, the Forum was reassured that this would not be the case. Members welcomed assurances that the current range of services would continue to be provided by fully qualified individuals, however, a change in thinking was necessary in that these individuals would not always need to be doctors or consultants;
- (ii) **Implications for Staff** – In response to concerns regarding possibly reduced staffing needs / redundancies and loss of trained/skilled staff as a result of these changes, the Forum welcomed reassurances that there would be no reduction in staff levels. It was noted that the intent of the model was to provide services in a way, and place, best suited to ensure that the highest care is achieved for the patient. Whilst it was acknowledged that uncertainty could have a detrimental effect on staff morale, Members were pleased to find that arrangements are in place to ensure that staff are kept informed and involved in shaping the review; and
- (iii) **The Future** - Whilst initially some calls to keep and upgrade existing hospitals had been made during the scrutiny process, the Forum accepted that this was no longer an option. Members now recognised the need to move on from the location of the hospital and focus on the provision of world class health services within the new hospital, and local communities, for the region and in particular the residents of Hartlepool, Durham, Sedgefield and Easington.

A summary of the Forum's response to this Issue:- The Forum agreed in principle that the proposed new model was the way forward the provision of health services in Hartlepool and where clinically safe services should be provided in the community.

(b) The proposed locations of additional community facilities in Hartlepool and what should be provided.

- (i) **Maternity Services** - An issue of particular concern to residents participating in the Scrutiny process was the location of maternity services and the safety of mothers and babies. In response to a request from the Forum, Members were reassured to receive evidence confirming that no child or mother had been put at risk as a result of new maternity arrangements in the town;
- (ii) **Implications for GP's** – Members were already aware of the shortage of GP's in Hartlepool and noted with interest the benefits of increased numbers of GP practices, and additional resources, in

attracting GP's to the area. The Forum was reassured to find that there was no suggestion in the proposals that existing practices would lose out under the proposals. In fact indications were that GP's in Hartlepool were committed to the Momentum proposals and keen to see services transferred to a primary care setting;

- (iii) **Greater Patient Choice** – The Forum welcomed indications that the Momentum proposals would provide greater choice for patients and supported the view that GP practices should see the proposals as an opportunity to look at the way in which they deliver their services to encourage patient satisfaction and retention; and
- (iv) **Geographic Location of Facilities** – The Forum highlighted importance of providing facilities for all, in locations that are easy to access. Concern was expressed regarding the need to ensure that the future provision of facilities and services into communities are provided across all areas of Hartlepool and to the Easington and Sedgefield areas of County Durham, to all communities and in particular to areas of need / deprivation, where the effective provision of the new model for health care provision will be vital in addressing health inequalities.

A summary of the Forum's response to this Issue:- The Forum agreed in principle with the proposed location of additional community facilities, with the caveat that:-

- (i) The provision of facilities across all areas of Hartlepool and into the Easington and Sedgefield areas of County Durham, and in particular areas of need, is imperative for the new model of health care provision to be effective; and
- (ii) The Forum wished to see evidence in the future of work being undertaken to further explore the expansion of facilities in the north and south of Hartlepool; and
- (iii) The further work needs to be undertaken to address concerns of Sedgefield and Easington residents regarding the impact of the proposed new facilities on the services provided from their existing amenities - and in particular Peterlee Community Hospital.

(c) The preferred location of new hospital for Hartlepool, Stockton and parts of Easington and Sedgefield.

- (i) **Traffic Impact on the A19 / A689** – Members were encouraged to find that work was already ongoing between the NHS and other relevant bodies, including Hartlepool's Integrated Transport Unit, regarding possible traffic implications for the A19 / A689. The Forum welcomed indications that funding had already been allocated for the provision of a high occupancy vehicle lane and lights at the A19 interchange, with funding also already put forward by the owner of

the Wynyard Business Park. In addition to this, the Forum was pleased to find that even before proposals for the hospital, both local authorities and the Highways agency had been looking at a package of phased highways improvements in that area. It was also noted that a transport assessment would be a condition of any planning application;

- (ii) **Finance** - In considering the options for funding of the new hospital the Forum welcomed, and supported, the Trusts' desire to pursue the public capital investment route for funding as opposed to the PFI route;
- (iii) **Transport Needs** – The Forum was of the view that the provision of appropriate transport would be the single biggest barrier to the success of the new configuration of health services. Members drew particular attention to the importance of providing services at out of hour times for patients discharged at night, for people with disabilities (whether that be the provision of a golf cart system to transfer patients or visitors from buses to the hospital, buses able to take mobility scooter or wheel chairs) and the provision of suitable crossing facilities at the point of departure and arrival to enable sight impaired residents / visitors to reach the hospital safely;
- (iv) **Transport Planning** - Members were pleased to find that the issue was being considered relatively early in the process, with a multi-agency Transport Group already formed involving Hartlepool and Tees PCTs, local authorities and the Highways Agency. The purpose of this group would be to formulate a Transport Strategy to ensure the provision of good transport links to the new hospital for residents from all areas served by the new hospital (see vi below); it will also be looking at the issue of transport provision to community-based facilities, and issue of great importance to the Forum. Members were pleased to find that the Transport Strategy would need to be in place prior to planning approval being given;
- (v) **Transport Provision** – During the course of discussions the Forum made particular reference to the free shuttle service currently in place between Hartlepool and the North Tees Hospital. In considering the provision of a similar service to the new hospital, Members were encouraged to hear that this would be explored. The Forum, however, highlighted aware that the provision of an appropriate transport service would not be achieved with one measure alone, a package of measures would be needed. To do this, a creative approach needed to be taken in terms of what is spent, the types of services provided, including consideration of community transport approaches and the partnerships / multi-agency approaches entered into, including possibly the Tees Valley Metro;

- (vi) **Sustainability / Affordability of Transportation** – Issues of particular importance to the Forum in considering the provision of transportation to the hospital, and facilities within the community, were the need to ensure that services are affordable and have a sustainable future. The Forum was very keen that these factors be taken into consideration during the development of transport services.

Views were expressed by Members from the County Durham Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee in relation to the specific difficulty of transport from the relatively more distant locations of Sedgefield and Easington. There may be real issues in terms of developing and sustaining the viability of bus routes from these areas to the new hospital given the relatively fewer patients that would come from these areas compared to those coming from the Hartlepool and Teesside area.

In addition to this the issue of sustainability, Members supported the view that the provision of transport should not be directed solely at those without cars, there was a need to attract car users away from their vehicles, giving transport initiatives a real environmental benefit;

- (vii) **Car Parking** – Whilst it was brought to the Forums attention that hospital car parking fees were historically reinvested in the maintenance and security of car parks, the Forum felt strongly that car parking must be free if health services are truly be free at the point of need.

- (viii) **Planning and Ecological Issues** – Members received detailed information on the planning issues relating to Sites A and B. The Forum noted with interest that Site A already had outline planning permission for a business park and agreed that of the two sites it raises fewer strategic planning issues. In addition to this, ecological studies had shown the presence of greater crested newts on Site B, whilst concerns regarding the retention of woodland had been allayed with assurances that a woodland buffer would be retained between the proposed hospital and the business park site; and

- (ix) **Documentation Provided to Enable a Comparison to be Made** – During the course of discussions a number of queries were raised regarding the documentation provided to assist in the choice of a site. Members were advised that the information provided had been a brief summary and further detailed information was available from the Momentum office or Momentum website. Regarding the 'Evaluation Matrix', the Forum noted concerns regarding the criteria for the allocation of scores and the implications this had on the ability to select a preferred site. Members were, however, reassured that whilst some of the information used was sensitive, and as such could not be released; more detailed information would be made available on the Momentum website before the end of the consultation

process. In relation to the provision of 'financial information' concern was expressed that a financial comparison of advantages / disadvantages between the two proposed sites had not been provided to enable consultees to make an informed choice. In response to this, Members were advised that at this stage full financial information was commercially sensitive and as such was not available in the public domain.

A summary of the Forum's response to this Issue:- The Forum strongly supported the selection of Site A (Wynyard Business Park) as its preferred location for the new hospital. The grounds for this being that it:-

- (i) Lies predominantly within the boundary of Hartlepool;
- (ii) Already has outline planning permission for a business park and raises fewer strategic planning issues, in that it falls within an area already allocated for development in two relevant local plans;
- (iii) Has only one land owner (i.e. unlike Site B where the area of land is owned by three separate parties);
- (iv) Has no ecological issues (i.e. unlike Site B where greater crested newts have been found); and
- (v) Has easier and more established access routes and so presents fewer issues in terms of effective transport links.

(d) How best to bring in all the changes needed to build this new healthcare system.

- (i) **Ensuring Continued Service Provision** – The Forum felt strongly that services must be in place before the closure of the hospital. Members were assured that the transfer would be done across two stages beginning with the development of service provision within the community, followed by the opening of the new hospital. It was, however, noted that the details of how services are to be transferred to the new hospital had not yet been finalised;
- (ii) **Encouraging Resident 'buy in' to the New Model** - As one of the largest sections of the community utilising health services, and probably the most comfortable with the current status quo in service provision, the Forum recognised the importance of focusing activities to allay older people's concerns regarding the proposals and help them accept the benefits of changes. Attention also needs to be paid to the needs of vulnerable families / individuals;
- (iii) **Integration of Services** - The Forum agreed that the integration of health services with social services, as well other voluntary sector services, would be imperative to the effective provision of services

under the new model. Members were and as part of the process keen that lessons need to be learned from other areas with examples of good practice;

- (iv) **Links with Other Strategies and Funding Streams** – Members emphasised the importance of ensuring that links are explored, and where possible established, with other strategies and funding streams (i.e. education and housing) to assist in the creation of a holistic policy for improving health care and bringing services closer to people and communities.
- (v) **Programmes Working Together** - Members were of the view that proposals for the provision of additional GP practices and GP led Health Centres or Momentum proposals could not on their own ensure the provision of the exceptional health services. Members agreed that all initiatives / programmes would need to work together to provide the best health service for residents of Hartlepool.

A summary of the Forum's response to this Issue:- The Forum suggested that the points identified above could assist bringing in all of the changes needed to build this new healthcare system.

6. VIEWS ON THE COMMUNICATION / CONSULTATION PROCESS

- 6.1 In addition to the formulation of its response, the Forum also found it very useful to gain an understanding of the communication / consultation process implemented by the PCT and Foundation Trust.
- 6.2 Members were pleased to find that a large variety of communication / consultation mechanisms had been implemented as part of the Momentum process, including public meetings and road show events across Hartlepool, Stockton, Easington and Sedgefield. Other mediums had also been used to raise awareness and encourage participation in the process, including leaflets, the Website and radio advertising.
- 6.3 Based upon the evidence provided by the PCT / Foundation Trust, the Forum was unanimous in its praise for the exemplary consultation undertaken by the Momentum: Pathways to Healthcare team. Members were hugely satisfied at the incredible lengths the local NHS bodies had gone to in ensuring that all stakeholders, and all members of the public, were given the opportunity to express their views as part of this process. The Forum was confident that all individual who had wanted to contribute to the consultation process had most certainly had the opportunity.
- 6.4 Hartlepool's Health Scrutiny Forum paid tribute to the Momentum team for their extraordinary efforts and in terms of the direct relationship with the overview and scrutiny process felt the process had worked extremely well. It was also felt that this had been the most informative, engaging and meaningful consultation in memory.

7. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 7.1 The views outlined in Section 5 and 6 of this report form the basis of Hartlepool's response to the Momentum: Pathways to Healthcare consultation for inclusion in the joint report to be considered by the Section 244 Health Scrutiny Joint Committee on the 2 September 2008 and the NHS Joint Committee on the 29 September 2008.

COUNCILLOR BRASH CHAIR OF THE HEALTH SCRUTINY FORUM

August 2008

Contact Officer: Joan Wilkins – Scrutiny Support Officer
Chief Executive's Department - Corporate Strategy
Hartlepool Borough Council
Tel: 01429 284142
Email: joan.wilkins@hartlepool.gov.uk

BACKGROUND PAPERS

The following background papers were consulted or referred to in the preparation of this report:-

- (i) Reports and presentations from the Health Scrutiny Forum meetings on the 3 July 2008, 25 July 2008 and 4 August 2008; and
- (ii) Momentum: Pathways to Healthcare Consultation Booklet.