

Review of Urgent Care Services in Croydon

The View of the Residents Associations in Croydon.

Over the past 18 months, a grouping of Croydon Residents Associations have been lobbying the Croydon Clinical Commissioning Group regarding urgent care services in the community. Unfortunately, our views and our suggestions have been ignored in the production of the final 3 potential scenarios. The Residents Associations do not believe these scenarios present the best choice for Croydon and we question the validity of the review process.

There are a number of issues regarding the review process:

Errors: the CCCG confirmed at our meeting in December that the cost for 3 GP hubs included in their preferred option is nearer to £1.75 million rather than the £340,000 stated in the September strategy review document and they were aware of this massive error in October at the latest!

Scenario appraisals: There are some obvious anomalies in the appraisal process, for example, Scenario 5 with 6 GP Hubs is appraised as less safe than scenario 6 with only 3 GP Hubs. How can more GP hubs be less safe than fewer GP hubs?!

Existing facilities: the CCCG appraisal of providing x-rays facilities at Purley ignores the fact that there is already an existing x-ray facility on site; used during the week for outpatients. The incremental cost of expanding x-ray usage for minor injuries, and longer hours is relatively small. Why have the CCG disregarded this in their appraisal process?

Finances: The CCCG have put operating costs of an Urgent Care Centre at Purley at approximately £2 million per annum. Whereas, prior to the downgrading of the unit in May 2014, the Purley Urgent Care Centre had an operating cost of £864,000 per annum. How do the CCG reconcile this increase in assumed costs?

Members of the CCG executive team have suggested that minor injuries service could be provided by a “Federation of GPs”. There are already press articles questioning the potential conflicts of interest of CCG Governing Body members through their financial interests as GPs. We share this concern. Additionally, the CCG Governing Body members combined remuneration package is already almost £1million per annum – isn’t it time that savings were made here, and money directed to front-line services?

There has been a significant miscalculation in the consultation document – as accepted by the CCCG at our meeting in December - which was not publicly corrected despite being known since October. Therefore, the CCG should start again with the review process, and properly and openly consult with Residents Associations, and members of the public, before decisions are made.

Issued by: Purley and Woodcote, East Coulsdon, Coulsdon West, Old Coulsdon, Hartley and District, Kenley and District, Riddlesdown, Sanderstead, and Selsdon Residents’ Associations

Continued overleaf/

KEY QUESTIONS

- 1) Why were the figures not corrected during the public consultation when it was discovered in October 2015 that there was a significant error in calculating the cost of the 3 GP extended services as £340,000 when, according to amended calculations, the cost will be between £1.5m and £2m?
 - 2) How was the decision made - at what the CCG considered was the end of the consultation - to move to 2 or 3 extended GP hubs as their preference?
 - 3) What information was considered in making this decision, was it based on the flawed information contained within the Consultation Document and who actually made the decision?
 - 4) At what point was the CCG board made aware of the error in the costing in the consultation document?
 - 5) When, and by whom, was the decision made to continue the public consultation with the cost errors uncorrected?
 - 6) In view of the discovery of the calculation errors, will you now re-consider the scenario 6b, with 2 GP hubs and Purley UCC which is the preferred service of all the residents associations in the area?
 - 7) Throughout the consultation, there has been an extreme resistance for any details on specification and locations of the services to be released on the grounds of “commercial confidentiality”. Please will you explain the circumstances?
 - 8) The specification for the emergency and central UCC services should be that of the ‘Healthy London Partnership, November 2015’. Are you working to this specification?
 - 9) The exact specification for the GP extended services is not provided. The public need to know more detail about these services to be able to fully understand what will be provided and to be able to fully engage in any consultation.
 - 10) How will these services be procured and how many providers will be invited to bid?
 - 11) How will these services be managed and monitored?
-