



SCRUTINY BOARD (CITY AND REGIONAL PARTNERSHIPS)

**Meeting to be held in Civic Hall, Leeds on
Thursday, 5th November, 2009 at 10.00 am**

(A pre-meeting will take place for ALL Members of the Board at 9.30 a.m.)

MEMBERSHIP

Councillors

- B Atha - Kirkstall;
- P Davey - City and Hunslet;
- G Driver - Middleton Park;
- J Dunn - Ardsley and Robin Hood;
- C Fox - Adel and Wharfedale;
- A Hussain - Gipton and Harehills;
- M Lyons - Temple Newsam;
- J Matthews - Headingley;
- R Pryke - Burmantofts and Richmond Hill;
- F Robinson - Calverley and Farsley;
- A Shelbrooke - Harewood;
- S Smith (Chair) - Rothwell;

**Agenda compiled by:
Governance Services
Civic Hall
LEEDS LS1 1UR**

**Andy Booth
24 74325**

**Principal Scrutiny Advisor:
Richard Mills
Tel: 2474557**

AGENDA

Item No	Ward/Equal Opportunities	Item Not Open		Page No
7			JOINT SERVICE CENTRE AT KIRKSTALL Further to Minute No. 17, 10 th September 2009, to receive and consider the attached statement from NHS Leeds.	1 - 4



BRIEFING PAPER FOR LEEDS CITY COUNCIL SCRUTINY COMMITTEE ON
5 NOVEMBER 2009
KIRKSTALL JOINT SERVICE CENTRE

- 1.1. The Kirkstall Joint Service Centre was proposed several years ago. Since this time there have been several major changes in the factors which would influence a decision to participate in the project, not least of which have been PCT merger and the changing economic environment.
- 1.2. Initially, the vision for the Kirkstall development focussed on a large health centre model with integrated GP Practices and a range of Primary Care Based Services. The original vision also included aspirations for providing minor surgery services in these developments.
- 1.3. The PCT view of the service needs of the project has changed over this period. The most critical change has been the review of the need or desire for GPs in Kirkstall to move into the new development. One practice in particular has pulled out of the scheme after having consulted with its patients.
- 1.4. The original plans for wide ranging minor surgery services in the community have also been revised by the PCT.
- 1.5. This means that two critical aspects supporting the polyclinic model have now fallen out of the service model.
- 1.6. In April 2009 the PCT Board rejected the initial draft of a stage one business case submission by the Estates Department with an initial revenue impact of £1.67 million. The options offered still made assumptions around significant GP usage within the new Health Centre which was highly likely not to be fully utilised once the building was completed.
- 1.7. The other main concerns voiced by the PCT Board were lack of a comprehensive options appraisal, (current and future) service demand modelling, benefits analysis and any comprehensive data as to the nature, patient need and configuration of the services to be provided in the JSC by the PCT. There was also no health outcome analysis to support the scheme. Furthermore, the site selected is a particularly difficult site to develop and will carry significantly high abnormal costs during the

- construction process – which will be reflected in the Lease Payment charges for the building over the next 25 years.
- 1.8. The PCT Board therefore charged the Estates and Strategic Planning teams to revisit the scheme, service by service in order to establish the true and up to date healthcare related need for this development.
 - 1.9. Following a more detailed review, the Primary Care team concluded that there was no need for additional or significant improvements in premises for GPs in Kirkstall and that the population is already reasonably well served in this respect.
 - 1.10. The Provider Arm review of services concluded that there was a need to improve the configuration of services for Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS) and that the lack of consolidated premises for this service was a significant drawback in this respect. The review also concluded that there was no other need for service development or expansions in any other services that the PCT provides in Kirkstall and that there is sufficient capacity within the PCT to accommodate all foreseen service developments.
 - 1.11. Therefore, in July 2009 EMT approved a preferred option for the JSC scheme whereby the CAMHS service would be relocated from the Cringlebar and Bramley sites into the new JSC. Cringlebar is scheduled for disposal.
 - 1.12. Leeds City Council subsequently advised that they considered this would not meet the requirements for a joint service centre, as the CAMHS service would require a separate entrance and users of the service would be unlikely to make use of the range of other services in the JSC, such as advice, benefits and library services. They requested the PCT give further thought to their other options.
 - 1.13. These alternatives have now been formulated jointly with LCC over the past few weeks, and it is once again necessary to review these proposals and their associated costs in the light of service needs and the strategic fit for NHS Leeds and in context of the benefits derived from the alternative proposals.
 - 1.14. There is a need to relocate the CAMHS service. Moving CAMHS into the JSC would have offered a ready made solution with little need to re-arrange any other services across the PCT. However, this would have been in the context of large pockets of underutilised estate across the city

- and the JSC arrangement would need to have been entered into only on the proviso that major rationalisation of the Estate would ensue in parallel at the PCT.
- 1.15. However, with LCC not being able to support the CAMHS only solution means that some significant shifting around of services needs now to take place to house CAMHS in existing PCT premises and move a range of other services into the JSC.
 - 1.16. The introduction of a more complex set of moves naturally led to a more challenging and in depth review of estate rationalisation options for the PCT and these need to be considered alongside all other aspects of the various solutions being examined.
 - 1.17. The Kirkstall options review is due to be discussed by the PCT Board in Mid November with a view to a final decision by the PCT being shared with the council before the end of the month.

Visseh Pejhan-Sykes
Acting Director of Finance
2 November 2009

This page is intentionally left blank