

Townlands Community Group
Notes of Meeting held on 27 January 2010, 19:30 – 21:00
Council Chamber, Henley Town Hall

Present: Ian Reissmann (Chair) (IR)
 Tony Burrage, Project Manager (TB)
 Catherine Mountford, Director of Quality & Strategy (CM)
 Louise Carlisle, Project Administrator (LC)

No	Item	Action
1	<p>Welcome and introductions IR welcomed everybody to the meeting and introduced the panel. IR also apologised to those present for the confusion over the start time.</p>	
2	<p>Apologies Apologies were received from Cathryn Bullimore, Dr Lisa Silver, Marina Taylor, Patricia Campbell, Jean Lowery, Ian MacGregor, John Howell MP, Dr Andrew Burnett and Alan Pontin</p>	
3	<p>Minutes from the last meeting These were accepted as a true record of the meeting held on 18 November 2009.</p> <p>However, it was noted that an email had been received from Jill Campbell with a request for the following amendments to be made;</p> <p>Item 4 Page 1 – first line should read the residents of <i>York Road/Clarence Road</i> Item 7 Page 4 – first line should read the residents of <i>York Road/Clarence Road</i></p> <p>Matters arising Fence issue – Nigel Spawton confirmed that he had received a letter from SODC stating that they are not preparing to take enforcement action against the PCT, so confirmed that the PCT will not be seeking retrospective planning permission.</p> <p>Representative from SODC planning department – Nigel Spawton from GBS Architects was present to update the group on the planning framework and it was thought that this update would be sufficient. However, someone from SODC planning department may attend in the future.</p>	
4	<p>Public Question Time The floor was then opened up to the public for questions.</p> <p><i>Q) I'm concerned that not enough young people attend these meetings. Can this meeting be put on the agenda of the Youth Forum?</i></p> <p>IR responded that both he and Cathryn Bullimore, Communications Manager will be attending the Henley Youth Council meeting on 8 February and they have a slot on the agenda.</p>	
5	<p>Project Update</p>	

- Tony Burrage gave an update on the project to date. The key points were;
 - Timeline – a timeline showing the key stages over the next 12 months was circulated and TB gave more detail as to what was involved. TB reported that the Invitation to Participate in Dialogue (ITPD) will be sent out to bidders within the next 2 weeks. IR confirmed that he along with the other community representatives will be reviewing the document before it goes out and one of them probably Dave Smewing will be involved with the dialogue process.
 - Finance – TB's key message was that he needed to make sure that the project is financed fully and affordable. It is important that as Project Manager he can show that this is a like for like re-provision. Dave Smewing is keeping the PCT realistic on the costs. TB also confirmed that bidders will be notified of the financial envelope available and will be evaluated on their ability to keep to this.

The floor was then asked for any questions and these are a record of those questions;

Q) Will the ownership of the building be in private hands with a lease or is there a public option?

A) (TB) Not sure as we don't know what solutions bidders will come forward with. The District Valuer is clear that the PCT should retain the land and lease the building. The PCT is looking for the DV to confirm that the successful bid is value for money.

Q) The MIU and bedded facility are on-site currently, so why are we asking for bids on a single or joint option?

A) (TB) When the PCT commissions services it moves towards outcomes it wants therefore we would say this is the service at the moment, but if you give us a different option we will listen. It maybe that we have the same services in a more modern environment that is fit for the 21st Century. We need to remember that care is being provided more in their own home, so not necessary in beds.

(CM) Whichever option there will be both sets of care provided, but may be with different providers.

Q) How many bidders are there? Or are you using preferred ones?

A) (TB) We advertised last year and bids went through a pre-qualification round and we shortlisted a number of providers for either a single solution or joint solution. I can't state how many exactly are still in the running due to commercial confidentiality issues.

(IR) there is commercially sensitive information going to bidders which can't be put in the public domain. There are some sections of the ITPD that can be shared and I'm working with the PCT on ensuring that this happens.

Q) At the last meeting there was a query raised about Mental Health services. Will the service be rolled out?

A) (TB) No, the original advert was for bedded and ambulatory care, but once we enter the dialogue stage we can look at opportunities with bidders

	<p>to provide space for other services which might include mental health. We will be asking bidders to state how they would work with other services.</p> <p><i>Q) Do you know what futureproofing should look like?</i></p> <p>A) (TB) We have some ideas and the Clinical Workstream group which Dr Ashby sits on have reviewed the clinical service specification and were asked to think about future provision. There are ideas happening all the time, so it will be interesting to see.</p> <p><i>Comment) One trend I've seen over the years is to have more visiting clinics e.g. Consultants from the Royal Berkshire hospital. This saves people a trip to Reading and is more convenient for the elderly, so I hope this will continue.</i></p> <p><i>Q) We are told that the money is safeguarded and in budget. Can you confirm that this is not reliant on capital receipts?</i></p> <p>A) (CM) The cost of re-provision is not dependant on capital receipts. We know how much it costs to run the site now and we have ring fenced the same amount of money for the re-provision.</p> <p><i>Q) So the hospital can be rebuilt first then the PCT will look at other options on the space?</i></p> <p>A) (TB) Yes, the District Valuer is very clear that the PCT should not be in the business of being a landlord.</p> <p>IR confirmed that he and the other community representatives on the group are very clear that the re-provision of healthcare comes first.</p> <p><i>Q) What will happen to the money from the sale of the surplus land?</i></p> <p>A) (TB) The PCT is currently in negotiations with the SHA about whether we could keep the money and use it to reduce the revenue consequence. The PCT wants to retain it for the benefit of Henley and its residents.</p>	
<p>6</p>	<p>Update from Nigel Spawton</p> <p>Nigel Spawton from GBS Architects updated the group on the process around the site survey and planning considerations. The key points were as follows;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NS has been asked by the PCT to do a site framework and the role is conduit to see that SODC, the public and the PCT get what they want. • NS has had several meetings with the planners at SODC. • There are 45 different written polices SODC apply to the site including energy, transport and waste management • The retention and use of historical buildings are key • The Council are happy with the potential for residential units proposed and 40% of them will be affordable. • Traffic planning – as well as the current access routes there could be opportunities for access via West Street and Mount View. There have been discussions with Oxfordshire County Council and they have asked for a number of traffic management surveys to be carried out. • The planning framework document will form part of the ITPD that will be sent out to bidders. 	

	<p><i>Q) Is the planning framework a confidential document?</i></p> <p>A) (NS) I personally feel that it is a public document. (TB) I'm not sure that it is, but I will find out and report back at the next meeting. 95% of the ITPD document should be shared, but there are some areas that I'm not sure we can release prior to the bidders receiving the document. (NS) It might be possible after May to run a roadshow so that we can share as much information as possible with the public. If the information can't be shared we need to know why.</p> <p>IR welcomed the possibility of such an event and stated that he and the other community representatives would be encouraging the holding of such an event.</p>	TB
7	<p>Communications update</p> <p>TB announced that an online forum is being launched tomorrow and a press release will be sent out. The aim of the forum is to allow people to debate and give feedback to the PCT on the re-provision of Townlands Community Hospital and give those who cannot make the meetings a chance to join the debate. TB ran through how to access the site and asked people to allow 24hrs in case of any technical problems. TB also asked people to suggest 2/3 areas/topics that they would be interested in debating to start off the forum – none were forthcoming, but TB asked that any ideas should be put on the feedback form and sent in to CB. TB stressed the importance of the public being involved as the process is a two way dialogue.</p> <p>IR stated that the PCT is now referred to as NHS Oxfordshire and this is being used interchangeably, but that the set up remains the same.</p>	
8	<p>AOB</p> <p>None</p>	
9	<p>Closing remarks and public questions</p> <p>The floor was then opened up to the public for further questions. The following is a record of those questions;</p> <p><i>Q) I live in Sonning Common and I'm very concerned that when thinking of future development of the hospital you need to consider that there are lots of planning issues going on particularly around housing. You need to be aware that outlying villages are having additional housing built and you need to include the increase in population in your figures.</i></p> <p>A) (TB) It has proved very difficult in getting growth projections beyond the next 5/6 years. However, I will re-examine and raise this at the next project group meeting in order that we include growth projections as far forward as possible.</p> <p><i>Q) If the re-development doesn't take place on the current site where will it be?</i></p> <p>A) (TB) We don't know as it depends on what the bidders come up with. (IR) the document going to the bidders doesn't say that the re-provision has to be on the same site, but the message(s) from this group are key as 30% of the marks awarded to any bid are for community acceptability.</p> <p><i>Q) What is the value of the current site?</i></p> <p>A) We don't know as we need to identify what area of land will be used for</p>	

	<p>the re-provision and then obtain a value on the unused land. This will then help us with our negotiations with the South Central Strategic Health Authority about using this to offset other costs of the projects.</p> <p><i>Q) Who are you asking to provide this valuation?</i></p> <p>A) (TB) It is a well known Quantity Surveyor.</p> <p>IR thanked everyone for turning up and participating in a useful debate. He also thanked TB and CM for giving up their time to attend the meeting.</p>	
10	<p>Date of next meeting Wednesday 21st April 2010, 6.30pm, Council Chamber, Henley Town Hall</p>	