

(D82069) Newmarket Road Surgery Boundary Responses

Hi Gemma

We do not have any concerns regarding this boundary change if this goes ahead.

kind regards
Sonja
Practice Manager
Trinity & Bowthorpe Medical Practice

D82060 Bacon Road Medical Centre
1.1 Mile

Email 17/05/18 Support Rationale - Practice will also be submitting a request to reduce boundary

D82088 UEA Medical Centre
1.6 Miles

I understand Newmarket Road Surgery's need for this as the Roundhouse Estate is getting larger and larger and there is further planned building.

This estate is also officially in South Norfolk District Council area although located close to Norwich.

I would like to take issue with one thing though. As someone who lives on the Roundhouse Estate – speaking as a resident rather than a manager.

It is incorrect to say that the area is well served by other practices. The only one close by is Cringleford Surgery where the wait for an appointment is often about 6 weeks
In order for my daughter to get her newborn baby a 6 week check on time, she would have needed to book the appointment before the baby was actually born – such was the wait for appointments.

Has Cringleford Surgery put in a request to expand? If not, where is it expected that all the new residents will register.

Cringleford Surgery is the only one in walking distance
Newmarket Road Surgery is the only one on a direct bus route

Kind regards
Christina

D82073 Lionwood Medical Practice
1.7 Miles

Dear Gemma

Lionwood Medical Practice have no objections

Many thanks

Lyn

Business Manager

Lionwood Medical Practice

D82040 Wensum Valley Medical Practice
2.0 Miles

Dear Gemma

We have no objections to Newmarket Road Surgery's request.

Many thanks

Jan

Jan Hardinge

Practice Manager

D82064 Humbleyard Practice

2.4 Miles

Good Morning

I am responding on behalf of the partners of The Humbleyard Practice regarding the request for a boundary change from Newmarket Road. We are very disappointed that one of our fellow GP practices has followed through in changing their boundaries to avoid dealing with a nursing and care home in their practice area.

Cavell Court is an 80 bedded residential and nursing home which opened in 2015. They have had a number of problems since they opened and have had problems keeping a manager in post, which has had an impact on their staffing and on their demands on us as a GP practice.

As the closest practice to the care home we have had more of the residents registered with us since the outset and so the impact has always been greater on us than on the other three practices (Mile End Road, Newmarket Road and Bacon Road).

The care home has recently seconded an experienced manager from another of their homes to manage Cavell Court and get them sorted out. She is already having a positive impact on their systems and the impact of the home on us as a GP practice, and this must also be having the same positive impact on the other three practices. They do still have a long way to go but things are on the right track.

A 80 bed care home is a lot for any one practice to manage and from when it opened there was a "gentleman's agreement" between the four practices that registrations would be split evenly between the practices, this never quite happened because of our proximity to the site we have always had the bigger share but we have accepted this. However, what we can't cope with is having the full 80 residents as our responsibility.

We have had a number of meetings with the other practices, and the CCG, to try to resolve the issues. We even offered to take 50% of the residents at the home which would allow the other practices to then split the remaining patients between them. The home has never been at capacity but if it was this would mean 13-14 patients each for the three Norwich practices. We feel this is reasonable and a compromise which takes into account the additional travelling time the other practices have for a home visit, and which means that changes of boundaries are unnecessary.

During these meetings the three Norwich Practices threatened to move their boundaries if they did not get additional funding from the CCG to manage the additional demand of the care home. We are very disappointed that rather than agreeing for the partners from the four practices to meet to discuss a workable solution they are choosing to take the drastic, un-proportional, action of moving their boundaries.

I agree that a care home patient puts a much higher demand on the resources of a practice than another patient in the community; however, it is unethical to then try to wash your hands of the problem by moving your boundaries and unfairly burdening your neighbouring practices instead.

Also taking into account that the CCG have said they have to look at each application depending on the situation at the time it is deceptive for Newmarket Road, who with their recent merger with St Stephens Gate can best cope with the demand, have put in their application first rather than either of the other practices. It unfairly disadvantages the other two Norwich practices when it comes to considering their applications as the areas will become less and less well covered as you progress. If the NHS England and the CCG are to consider the application we feel they should wait until they know the intentions of Mile End Road and Bacon Road and consider all three applications together.

A number of specific points relating to the content of the letter:-

- In the letter we have received from NHS England it is stated that the Newmarket Road have stated they only have 84 patients residing in the area which they wish to remove from their practice catchment area.

- o This seems a very low number bearing in mind the area they are removing. In the area they wish remove is the whole of the Roundhouse estate as it currently stands which includes over 400 homes. If you take out the 7-10 patients they have in Cavell Court this means they have only around 18-25 houses (as most are family homes) out of this 400+. This doesn't seem correct. We would ask that the figures involved be carefully checked and analysed ahead of any decision.

- Even though they don't intend to shed the patients immediately the main immediate impact will be from Cavell Court whose residents, by the nature of the age of the patients, do turn over quickly. The impact will come just as we are feeling the pressure of the winter again.

- They have stated that the main rationale for the proposed change is due to the new residential building work that is constantly taking place within Norwich. We find this a disingenuous statement. There is a lot less development within Norwich itself purely because there is not enough room for it. The main additional homes are within the outlying areas.

- o They have indicated an area to remove from their practice area where the bulk of the houses for which planning applications are been approved have already been built.

- o The main future development in Cringleford is on the Newfound Farm area which is 650 homes. The new boundary they have indicated falls across the middle of this proposed new development. There is also planning permission for another 620 homes, the majority of which will be to the south of the A11 between the A11, A47 and Cantley Lane and this still falls within their new boundary.

- o Therefore, to state that the removal of the Roundhouse Estate areas is to ensure they have capacity to deal with an increase in numbers cause by development within Norwich is misleading. If they were wishing to do this they would ensure that their boundary was moved to ensure it didn't include any of the land which is currently fields on which homes will be built – rather than removing an already established estate.

- They have stated that the area they wish to remove is well serviced by other practices in the locality. Although this currently may be the case, when there are four practices who cover the area, it is well understood that the three Norwich practices will follow each other's lead and that Newmarket Road are moving their boundaries because Bacon Road have said they would. Therefore once this is done, and Mile End Road in all likelihood also try to follow suit, the area will NOT be well served as we will be the only practice who cover the area.

- Within our practices area we already have 1500 new homes being built within the Hethersett area, 600 within the Mulbarton area, and in total will have had 1800 within the Cringleford area. We were aware that with Hethersett and Mulbarton we were the only practices who cover these new developments. We were however, reassured that with the Cringleford developments we were not the only practice who covered the area. Therefore, we estimated that we would receive about a half of all new patients from the Cringleford developments. For this to suddenly change to us receiving all of the new patients will have a huge impact on our sustainability and the ability for both our workforce and the buildings themselves cope with this increase in patients. If the new patients were

shared among the existing practices it is possible that we could all cope with the increase, if it all comes to us we are not going to be able to cope.

o If the Norwich practices do only take Roundhouse estate out of their practice area and keep the areas where the new developments will be this will of course mitigate some of the impact – although all the patients in Roundhouse will eventually need to be registered with us.

o However, if this is their intention then the reason they have given for moving the boundaries is disingenuous and it calls their proposal into question.

In summary we question the rationale that Newmarket Road have given for requesting the move.

We feel that their implying it is to ensure they can cope with additional development in Norwich is misleading and disingenuous as they have left in large areas of land which have approved planning permission on them. If they were truly wishing to ensure they could cope with developments in Norwich they would be requesting to move their boundary to the Norwich CCG boundary rather than just cut out Cavell Court on the Roundhouse estate.

We would question the ethics of a GP practice moving their boundary in an attempt to shift their duty of care to the elderly population purely because residents in a care home are more demanding on resources than young healthy patients. This is discrimination against the elderly patients which should not be allowed. They attempted to do this informally by just refusing to register patients from Cavell Court and are now trying to do the same by making a formal request to cut Cavell Court out of their patient area. This should not be allowed to happen.

Practices picking and choosing the parts of their practice area they wish to have and the parts they don't should not be allowed. Newmarket Road are choosing to keep the affluent areas in Cringleford and along Newmarket Road but cut out the care home and less affluent development of Roundhouse.

We would urge the CCG to refuse this application.

D82071 East Norwich Medical Practice
2.5 Miles

Hi Gemma,

I know there won't be any objection – We had to have a meeting with the Medicines Management team this week so our usual agenda got bumped. It was on the Agenda as a formality.

Lisa

Lisa Vandeppeer
Practice Manager
East Norwich Medical Partnership

D82048 Thorpewood Medical Group
2.8 Miles

Dear East Team

Given that the Primary Care Committee of NHSE/Norwich CCG has already rejected one request for boundary changes to a practice catchment area (PCC extraordinary meeting of November 2017?), it is inappropriate that the matter be brought up again in my view.

The PCC decision was that it would not approve any boundary changes due to increased population and new housing developments. even if this meant practice list closures, as the suggested way forward was for Norwich CCG to form a working party to look at the whole population demands and wider 'growth' plans.

As such I personally could not be in agreement to this request, as I fundamentally believe in 'one rule for all'. This view is held, even though there are plans for 10,000 new homes in our own catchment area over the next 8 years!

I hope those comments help inform the discussion.

Ian Wilson
Practice Manager
Thorpewood Medical Group

D82013 Old Catton Medical Practice
3.3 Miles

Hi Gemma

Although this does not directly affect us, a similar situation occurred locally last year that I did object to.

One Practice changing a boundary or closing a list simply pushes the problem of capacity onto neighbouring practices who are already stretched themselves. It does not solve the fundamental problem of growth in an area without resourcing additional Primary Care facilities.

As part of the overall Planning process (S106 I believe), developers are required to fund local amenities in return for being granted permission. NHSE needs to be in these discussions early on for building/improving premises.

I hope my thoughts are of some interest

With kind regards

David

David Morter MCMl
Practice Manager
Old Catton Medical Practice

D82036 Old Mill and Millgates Medical
3.8 Miles

This seems a very logical thing to do and it will not affect this practice so support given with no negative feedback from Old Mill.

Kind regards,

Mary Parker
Practice Manager
Old Mill and Millgates Medical Practice

D82078 Heathgate Medical Practice
4.2 Miles

We have no comment to make.

This is no where near our Practice boundary and so will not affect us.

Regards
Garry Whiting
Managing Partner
Heathgate Medical Practice
The Street
Poringland
Norwich

D82062 Coltishal Medical Practice
Dr Mansfield Practice
4.9 Miles

Hi Gemma

We were a little puzzled to have received this because Newmarket Road Surgery Boundaries are within the city of Norwich and none join those of this Practice which is about 6 miles from the centre of Norwich. As such we do not believe this would have any major, if any, impact on this Practice and as such did not respond.

Kind regards

Nikki Crawford
Practice Manager
Coltishall Medical Practice

CCG Response

Please find below NHS SN CCGs response to the proposed Newmarket Road Surgery boundary change.

NHS South Norfolk CCG is not supportive of the proposed Newmarket Road Surgery boundary change, as;

- 1) The proposed boundary change, as set out in annex 2, is seeking to annex a specific area / housing development and there is not a clear and equitable reduction in the overall practice boundary. The proposed changes could be perceived as the annexation of a specific patient population, based on post code, from the Newmarket Road Surgery practice area and associated patient list.
- 2) The application states that only 84 patients will be affected by the proposed boundary change. It is the understanding of NHS South Norfolk CCG that the figure of 84 patients represents out of area patient registrations and not the total number of patients, affected by or living in the proposed annexed area. NHS SN CCG wish to seek clarification as to the total number of patients, who resided in the proposed annexed area, that are registered at Newmarket Road Surgery.
- 3) Cavell Court Care Home, a high demand care home, is within the proposed annexed area, with any new patients being unable to registered with Newmarket Road Surgery, contradicting the NHS Choices Framework and the governments commitment to giving patients greater choice and control over how they receive their health care, and to empowering patients to shape and manage

their own health and care.

4) The proposed annexation of the Roundhouse development in Cringleford also impacts on any new patients being able to register with Newmarket Road Surgery, again, contradicting the NHS Choices Framework and the government's commitment to giving patients greater choice and control over how they receive their health care, and to empowering patients to shape and manage their own health and care.

5) The application discusses future housing growth and the impact this may have on Newmarket Road Surgery and that the Surgery wishes to ensure they have clinical and administrative capacity to accommodate the potential increase and as such are proposing the annexation of a single housing development, with the boundary change application not proposing the reduction of the Newmarket Road Surgery boundary to exclude the future housing growth in the perceived wealthier areas of their existing practice boundary.

6) Newmarket Road Surgery, within their application, advise that this area is well served by other practices in the locality. In reality, the biggest impact will be on Cringleford Surgery, part of the Humbleyard Practice, which is already operating at clinical and physical capacity.