

D82060 Bacon Road List Closure Response

D82088 UEA Medical Centre
0.6 Miles

Dear Gemma

As long as we have an assurance that we will not be expected to be allocated any Cringleford residents or local residents from Bacon Road at UEA Medical Centre unless they have a connection with the university or the hospital, I would not object to their boundary change or list closure.

Again though, I would point out, as someone who lives on the Roundhouse Development in Cringleford –where do you expect these residents to be registered? The only surgery in walking distance is the Cringleford Surgery and it can take 6 weeks already to get an appointment there already

Regards
Christina.

D82017 Trinity and Bowthorpe Medical Practice
0.8 Miles

Hi

No objections to either application.

kind regards
Sonja
Practice Manager
Trinity & Bowthorpe Medical Practice

D82040 Wensum Valley Medical Practice
0.9 Miles

Dear Gemma

We have no objections to the proposal

Kind regards

Jan

Jan Hardinge
Practice Manager
Wensum Valley Medical Practice (D82040)

Newmarket Road Surgery
1.1 Miles

We have no particular issues with the proposed list closure

Regarding the proposed boundary change no particular issues as long as they are not looking at removing Ivy Court, Delrose Court or any other residential institutions in their boundary area.

Many thanks

Rosemary

D82008 St Stephens Gate Medical Practice
1.1 Miles

Apologies if we have not responded

We have no objections or comments on the boundary change

We are however concerned about list closure and would urge the CCG and NHS England to offer full support to the practice. We are concerned that conceding the principle of closed lists across Norwich provision will seriously alter the current whole-system provision.

It means patients moving into that practice area from another city practice will not be able to register and will create a difficult pool of patients stranded miles from their original practice. That is not to acknowledge Bacon Road is under pressure but we feel the CCG should exhaust all options to help in the first instance.

In addition, we feel there is a real risk of a domino effect. If one surgery, why not another, and more after that, and it will lead to a two tier health service and inequality and discrimination against some Norwich patients.

For those reasons, we would need to see more evidence that list closure is unavoidable.

Thank you

Humbleyard Practice

1.9 Miles

Good Morning

I am responding on behalf of the partners of The Humbleyard Practice regarding the request for a boundary change from Bacon Road.

We recently also received notification of a boundary change request from Newmarket Road and a lot of the same issues apply to Bacon Road's request. If the numbers in the letter are correct the impact of the area on Bacon Road is very small therefore it seems the request to move the boundary is very much an aim to avoid dealing with a care home in the area rather than because of the impact of the new developments which are still to come.

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 practice. 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 and 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 on 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.

A number of specific points

- 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.
- Currently there are four practices who cover this area, and therefore the patients are spread between the four practices. However, without knowing what the outcome is from Newmarket Road's request it is hard to identify who will still be covering this catchment area should Bacon Road's boundary change.
 - o 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 was 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.

We, however, recognise that Bacon Road are struggling and we understand that their request is coming from a greater place of need than that of Newmarket Road. We also appreciated that they are moving their boundary back to the Norfolk CCG boundary and are therefore not cherry picking the nicer parts of Cringleford to keep.

We also appreciate that for them to formally request to close their list for a period of 10 months things must be at breaking point.

Therefore, although we would have preferred for the practice to work with us and Cavell Court to find a more workable solution we appreciate that when you are unable to recruit decisions have to be made to safeguard patient safety.

So although we do still not support this request from Bacon Road we do understand it. We would, however, urge the CCG to consider applications from Newmarket Road and Mile End Road in a different light as we believe they do not come from the same place of need.

D82073 Lionwood Medical Practice
2.5 Miles

Dear Gemma

Lionwood Medical Practice supports both applications.

Many thanks
Lyn

Lyn Bostan
Business Manager
Lionwood Medical Practice

D82018 Hellesdon Medical Practice
3.1 Miles

Dear Gemma

There have been a number of boundary change requests from Norwich practices in recent months. I include my practice in that although the CCG turned down our request. Whilst this application does not on the face of it impinge on our area I am concerned that Norwich practices are trying to control their list sizes by boundary changes and by "moving on" patients who now live outside their area. Our own list size increased by several hundred last year as a result of this practice which is entirely understandable. My comments therefore are about what provision is being considered and planned for to cope with the expected increasing population of Norwich.

These comments also relate to the recent requests from Newmarket Road & Drayton.
Kind Regards

Simon Farrow
Practice Manager
Hellesdon Medical Practice
D82018

D82071 East Norwich Medical Practice
3.3 Miles

Hi Gemma,

We discussed this at our partnership meeting this morning and there are no objections from East Norwich Medical Partnership in this regard.

Lisa

Lisa Vandeppeer
Practice Manager
East Norwich Medical Partnership

D82048 Thorpewood Medical Group
3.5Miles

As regards the request to close the practice list, I have no objection to this, as I am aware that some local practices have had list closures over the recent past, and that is a recognised method of dealing with 'pressure points' on the system.

I hope those comments help inform the discussion.

Ian Wilson
Practice Manager
Thorpewood Medical Group