

Beacon Medical Practice

Meeting Minutes

Reference:	PPG Executive Meeting
Date:	Wednesday 25 th January 2017
Time Commenced:	14:00
Time Concluded:	15:25

People Present:	
A Bliss	PPG member
I Bradbury	PPG member
C Brockwell	BMP Practice Manager
S Carey	PPG member
P Chapman	PPG Vice Chair Person
M Chisnall	PPG Chair Person
M Crane	BMP IT & Data Quality Manager
E Gasson	PPG member
J Fletcher	BMP Dispensary Manager
L Hemmingway	PPG member
N Hutchinson	BMP PA/HR Administrator
Dr B Taiwo	BMP GP/Partner
T Tansley	PPG member
M Turton-Leivers	PPG member
Apologies:	
V Hudson	BMP Operations Manager

Initials	Notes
MCh	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Welcomed all. ▪ Wished all a belated Happy New Year. ▪ Welcomed PC back after period of absence. ▪ Thanked BMP for PPG x-mas buffet. Thanked PAC and TS for being able to attend buffet with CB.
MCh	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Asked for apologies, she had not received any.
NH	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Had no apologies received.
MCr	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Brought apologies from VH.
MCh	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Asked attendees to review minutes of previous meeting (23/11/2016).
EG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Commented on page 2 of minutes. Comments raised at Hospital Watch meeting. Was raised that it can be difficult to get hold of CB at BMP. ▪ Felt statement was disappointing and inaccurate. Personally never had any issues getting through to CB with issues. ▪ Even if CB unavailable at time, returns calls. Felt was nonsense.
IB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Noted on page 2 of minutes comments about Wainfleet surgery. Asked if there was any impact on BMP services due to closure?
CB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Responded that at the mid-point stage, some patients had joined BMP but mostly patients transferred to Hawthorn or Spilsby surgeries. ▪ Confirmed that Wainfleet is now closed permanently, NHSE observing and are keen for patients to settle. As of now transfer temporary whilst situation reviewed about local presence.
MCh	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Discussed concerns for local patients about accessibility. Age, no transport etc.

Version 2.0

This is not a verbatim account of the meeting but how the note taker perceived the meeting

CB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Agreed these were potential barriers. This was why NHSE and LECCG reviewing arrangements and options. ▪ Agreed with comments on age and transport for non-drivers. Also mentioned other issues locally in Wainfleet, such as the large home in the village that Wainfleet surgery had previously supported.
MCr	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Informed the meeting that Wainfleet surgery had a patient base of 2,500 that have now been dispersed to Hawthorn/Spilsby and others due to closure.
CB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Confirmed that BMP would keep PPG up to date with progress as information received.
MCh	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Asked CB to present Practice Managers report.
CB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Advised that as no PPG meeting in December to present November information, report figures are for the months of November and December this time. ▪ 11 complaints in all received. ▪ 10 November ▪ 1 December. ▪ 4 were excluded, which means either withdrawn or to NHSE. ▪ 4 were admin. ▪ 3 were medical. ▪ Issues were to do with prescriptions, cessation of shared care, lack of appointments, unhappiness with treatment received at appointment. ▪ Suggestion file has not been updated. Will provide up to date information at next meeting. ▪ Discussed clinician staffing. Advised about LMC proactively recruiting from Europe into area. Involves schooling current GPs to our standards with view of the relocating to region. ▪ This is a 3 year programme, looks at medical language, not just language in general. KS from LMC brought prospective candidate to visit, was very pleasant. ▪ Candidate had excellent English vocabulary. Focus of training also includes qualification and competency checks. ▪ BMP Partners are considering. Certainly exciting news for County. We keep PPG posted on developments. ▪ Previous Patient Council minutes had been distributed previously. ▪ Project for CSL new build appears to be unsupported by LECCG, although no specific reasons provided. ▪ Discussed GP Forward View initiative 2016/2020. Part of project includes looking at new builds. Our area may be considered further down the line but nothing imminent. Discussed proposals include 'super surgeries' etc. ▪ Practice Managers meeting w/c 30/01/17, will seek clarification and reasons for above there.
TT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Informed of a meeting had attended regarding Hardy's Farm building holiday park on land between CSL/Ingoldmells. ▪ Cllr RF in attendance. Referred to BMP, 106 and impact of build on area. Advised BMP stated there would be no impact. Did not show BMP in a good light. ▪ Queried comments, stated had minutes from previous meeting with CB, would be prepared to find and let TT see. ▪ Cllr RF reiterated that BMP said build would have no impact on services and stated BMP had no idea how to complete a 106 submission. Stated ELDC are happy to do on BMPs behalf and asked TT to pass that to CB. ▪ Proposed that for future meetings someone from BMP attend, to enable them to defend the business.

Version 2.0

This is not a verbatim account of the meeting but how the note taker perceived the meeting

CB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Responded that BMP were not aware of meeting, nor invited, otherwise would have been in attendance. ▪ Felt Cllr RF comments inappropriate, no recent meetings have taken place, so unsure of where comments had come from and would be interested to see notes of any such meeting herself. ▪ Discussed CCG belief that individual 106 submissions were no longer appropriate and CCG were not to put responses in. ▪ BMP not received anything about Hardy's or any other large build proposals. Only recent proposal seen was for development of 13 residential properties in CSL.
TT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Advised that Hardy's build involved 400+ static vans and a build of lodges etc. also Little Haven and Blue Anchor looking at expansions.
MTL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Questioned finances for new build surgery.
CB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Responded there was no issue with securing funding to build, Practice can buy own build, fund bricks and mortar of build. ▪ Reimbursement for rent is the issue from CCG/NHSE. ▪ Discussed issues around need to build larger surgery to be fit for purpose, against funding for comparable size only payment to current site size.
TT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Felt it was important that CB knew there was a lot of misinformation about BMP being spread about.
PC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Wondered why BMP had not been invited to meeting?
TT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Stated that other local services such as schools etc. had also been excluded.
MTL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Informed that he had arranged the meeting, as a large planning application had come in. from CSL Parish council perspective build is too big. Reason why Cllr RF invited, as he is portfolio holder for planning at ELDC. ▪ If approved Hardy's will be a massive development and have a major impact on CSL. 400 statics, similar number of lodges. Will double population in Summer, hard to get an appointment then as it is, but if Practice has money to build it is not an issue.
CB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reiterated previous comments that the build is not the issue, the rental would be the issue. Neither CCG nor NHSE would be prepared to pay. There is no point building a surgery of same size to existing site as same problems would remain and there is no point building something that would not be paid for. ▪ As Chair of CSL Council put issue back to you. What are you prepared to do to about issue? Who are you prepared to talk to and take it to? ▪ Discussed unfairness of being referred to in a meeting that nothing was known about by Cllr RF and from Hardy's.
MTL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Stated Parish Council had opposed build. Impact on village infrastructure too much. Discussed traffic and road issues from development.
PC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Talked about previously viewed potential sites in CSL.
CB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Confirmed South Road and Sea Lane were looked at. Nice central spots to access.
PC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Disagreed that local services were not invited to meeting.
TT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Agreed with PC due to local impact.
MTL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Replied that he had to act quickly in organising the meeting with ELDC due to time constraints on proposal for objection.
MCh	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Agreed that there should have been a line of communication from MTL to BMP regarding meeting.
MTL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Stated that meeting had to be arranged in a hurry. He knows impact on local services to report. Site was trying to rush through. Reason why

Version 2.0

This is not a verbatim account of the meeting but how the note taker perceived the meeting

	Parish Council has put in objection is due to impact.
JF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Felt Parish Council should have worked with BMP on matter.
TT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Added that it was now obvious BMP not aware but to those attending was perceived that they were.
PC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Stated she did not believe it was appropriate that BMP had not been advised and given opportunity to attend and speak. ▪ Asked if Hardy's had?
MTL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Stated that council have objected to build. ▪ Believes someone from Hardy's was in attendance but did not make themselves known and no invite to speak was made.
PC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Believed this wasn't right. As CSL Chair MTL should have invited Hardy's, to advise on and discuss impact and plans to reduce. ▪ Ingoldmells Parish Council had done so. ▪ CSL acted without full information. Not right, should have given them opportunity.
LH	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Agreed with PC. ▪ Hardy's spoke at their meeting and from information presented Ingoldmells Parish Council are very much for the development.
MTL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Asked for clarification that Ingoldmells had not opposed the proposal from Hardy's?
PC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Confirmed that Parish Council were for the proposal.
TT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Felt CSL vote was based on lack of information.
PC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Advised that if Hardy's had been invited as they should have been to talk, if they'd had chance to discuss plans, infrastructure, roads etc. had the opportunity to inform by attending, could have been viewed differently. For Ingoldmells this is a positive.
EG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Felt that to not invite BMP to the meeting was ludicrous.
LH	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Agreed that CSL Parish Council should have invited speakers/guests.
TT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Also agreed, adding that it has now been said in a public forum that BMP feel this development will have no impact.
CB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Asked for contact details for Cllr RF to discuss concerns.
MTL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Did not have but stated they can be found via ELDC website.
TT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Stated that Cllr PHG from CSL has notes from meeting that was said to have taken place.
CB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Advised that a meeting did take place but it was a long time ago, possibly 2015 and not in relation to this development.
TT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Felt like there were lots of issues with CSL parish Council. The village is like a pressure cooker at moment with all going on. This development, BMP and school excluded from meeting and are important local services. Street lights been switched off, buses being cancelled and rerouted.
JF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Added that local Care Home could also be impacted by increased local temporary demand.
CB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Also added that there would be increased demand on local hospital services.
MTL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Felt it should have been ELDC that informed not CSL Parish Council, due to enormity of issue.
MCr	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Commented that if someone knew a meeting was taking place, regardless of who did it, someone should have informed BMP to give opportunity to attend. If we had chosen not to send anyone then that is down to us, that would be our fault. But unfair situation to be blamed for and unable to defend ourselves on something we know nothing about.
PC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Stated its right isn't it?
MTL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Responded yes.

Version 2.0

This is not a verbatim account of the meeting but how the note taker perceived the meeting

CB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Suggested PPG contact CCG regarding today's discussions, as CCG have proposed taking planning applications forward. ▪ Aware have represented 5 Louth Practices as a whole.
IB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Asked if there would be further opportunities for new build in CSL?
CB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Referred back to GP Forward initiative.
MCh	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Thanked CB for report and information. ▪ Discussed progress with ING surgery bus-stop. ▪ Council have advised of a delay, may now be later in year as survey has to be carried out. Drainage ditch was to be filled in as apart of build project, however, it has come to light that living in ditch is a community of water voles. These are a protected species. ▪ Feasibility study to be carried out. Likely to be September before any more progress.
MCr	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Discussed changes to systems. Repeat Dispensing was being phased out. Reason due to pharmacies issuing early, so no consistency, dispensed to due rarely matches up. Can lead to shortfall over year. ▪ Decision in-line with good practice guidance from BMA and indemnity providers and in-line with other surgeries actions nationally. ▪ For repeats in future, no longer will be direct contact with staff when booking. Will be automated system, similar to appointment booking via phone. ▪ Patients can still bring scripts in for renewal in person and can continue to use online facility. Only patients affected are those that phone. Easy service, patient just needs to register for a pin number. ▪ Rolls out fully from March but starting to advertise on scripts and promote in-house. 1st March 2017 is date aiming to commence fully. ▪ Step by step guide available for what to do by phone. ▪ Willing to arrange demonstration with PPG so they can promote, recommend, advise on ease of use. ▪ Aware small percentage unable to use. Looking at options at present for these people, to support. Options such as third party access available to support etc.
LH	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Discussed diabetes strips and an issue someone had made him aware of. Tod to check twice monthly, which would equal 60 strips. Only issued 50 in a box. Each month 5 days short.
JF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Advised that this is not an issue, asked LH to advise patient to speak to her and she will reconfigure so 60 prescribed.
SC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Advised of good service at Beacon Pharmacy with turnaround of scripts. Finds much quicker than when used boots.
MCr	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Advised that dependant on time script submitted, Beacon always aim for a 24 hour turnaround whenever possible. ▪ Agreed it was a good service.
MCh	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Discussed proposed changes to meeting dates for future PPG meetings as Wednesdays were an issue for some.
LH	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Suggested meeting on 4th Monday monthly.
TT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Suggested meeting on 3rd Monday monthly.
MCh	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Agreed with 3rd Monday and set next meeting for Monday 20th February 2017, then every third Monday onwards.
TT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Asked what support if any could be offered regarding the withdrawal of bus services along part of route in CSL. Felt change would make it difficult for some vulnerable parties to attend surgery.
JF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Suggested use of Call Connect service.
MCh	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Felt it was not an issue for PPG, matter related to bus company not surgery.

Version 2.0

This is not a verbatim account of the meeting but how the note taker perceived the meeting

IB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Discussed when a similar incident occurred in Winthorpe, Call Connect was used. Good service, from door to door.
PC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Agreed Call Connect is a good service and has been advising people that they need to use it or risk losing it.
BT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Discussed how he would like to be made aware of any important meetings happening in CSL as he would like the opportunity to attend if available to do so.
TT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Advised BT that next CSL Residents Association meeting was 6th February, if he or another from BMP could attend this would be positive, as could discuss changes to repeat scribing and end of repeat dispensing to allay concerns.
MTL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Advised CSL Parish Council had planned to meet with Stagecoach when Chapel Point Observatory opens about reinstating route.
	MEETING CLOSED
*	<p>PPG meetings 3rd Monday of each month. Dates are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Monday 20th February 2017 ▪ Monday 20th March 2017 ▪ Monday 15th May 2017 ▪ Monday 19th June 2017 ▪ Monday 17th July 2017 ▪ Monday 18th September 2017 ▪ Monday 16th October 2017 ▪ Monday 20th November 2017 <p>Next meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Monday 20th February 2017 ▪ 2pm, Skegness Surgery Conference Room