

Report title: **Future of Mental Health inpatient facilities in East Berkshire**
Report to: Overview and Scrutiny Committee
From: Naveed Mohammed, Scrutiny Officer,
Tel: 01753 875657
Naveed.mohammed@slough.gov.uk
Date: 12th July 2011
Wards affected: All

1. Purpose

This paper provides a summary of the findings of the recent task and Finish Group review of the consultation carried out by Berkshire Healthcare Trust into the future of mental health inpatient facilities in East Berkshire.

The paper also details the recommendations made by the Health Scrutiny Panel and next steps.

2. Recommendations

The Committee is asked to consider the contents of this paper and:

- (a) Consider the suitability of the recommendations made by Health Scrutiny Panel
- (b) Advise on next steps and any further actions

3. Task and Finish Group Review Background

3.1 Berkshire Healthcare NHS Foundation Trust (BHFT) launched a Public Consultation in August 2010 on the future of Inpatient Mental Health services in East Berkshire. The background advised by the Trust was as a result of financial savings it needed to make. Three options were put forward for consideration:

- Option 1** All beds to be relocated to Prospect Park Hospital in Reading
- Option 2** Beds for older people to be at St Mark's Hospital in Maidenhead and for working age adults in Prospect Park
- Option 3** To continue with the decision reached in 2008 of a new purpose-built unit on the existing Upton Hospital site

3.2 The results of the Public Consultation were published in February 2011 with the Trust recommending Option 1 for final ratification by the Board.

"That decision has now been made with both Boards having first had sight of the outcome of the Public Consultation and the opportunity to consider other information pertinent to a decision. Both Boards understand that Option 3 is unaffordable in the current and future economic environment."

3.3 Following the Trust's announcement on 21 March 2011, Slough Borough Council's Health Scrutiny Panel resolved that further detailed scrutiny was required. The recommendations from the Panel were:

- (a) That the Health Scrutiny Panel rejects the decision of the Board and recommends that it does not proceed with the Trust's preferred option to progress the Outline Business Case on Option 1 (i.e. that all beds be relocated to Prospect Park Hospital in Reading),
- (b) That an Independent Working Group (Health Scrutiny Task and Finish Group) be set-up which should include appointed Panel Members, representatives of the Slough Local Involvement Network (LINK) and other similar parties. That the Group should seek the views of local people and other relevant stakeholders (including GPs) and whether the evidence used by the Board in reaching its decision was fair and accurate.
- (c) That subject to the findings of the Task and Finish Group, the matter may be referred to another person or body which may or may not include The Secretary of State for Health, Andrew Lansley MP.

4. Membership of the Review Group

4.1 The Task and Finish Group ('the Group') was established on 19 April 2011.

Membership of the Panel comprised

Councillor Julia Long (Chair)
Councillor David MacIsaac (who assumed co-optee status after 5 May 2011)
Councillor Roger Davies
Colin Pill (Slough LINK)
John Kelly (Slough LINK)

4.2 Policy support was initially offered through Andrew Millard and Sunita Sharma of Slough Borough Council and subsequently Naveed Mohammed, Slough Borough Council's Scrutiny Officer.

5. The Scope

5.1 To ascertain whether the Public Consultation, during which it is felt BHFT had clearly favoured Option 1 (moving to Prospect Park), was conducted in the best interest of patients and the local community or whether BHFT had pursued another agenda which may suit their own strategic long-term aims.

5.2 It was suggested that the Group focus on the rationale and financial reasons behind the Public Consultation and the resulting proposals as opposed to some of the minor detail.

6. Type of Review

6.1 The review opted for a short, sharp focused approach with the aim of presenting its final findings by 22 June 2011. The study used both a quantitative and qualitative research methodology.

7. Findings

Having carried out the review over the period 19th April 2011 – 31st May 2011, the findings of the task and Finish Group were as follows;

- (a) That there were fundamental discrepancies in some of the funding assumptions made by Berkshire Healthcare Foundation Trust. Further that some of the financial arguments posited by BHFT to justify a move to Prospect Park, lacked coherence and failed to address some of the specific concerns being raised by the group.

- (b) That the Group raised serious concerns regarding the status and nature of the clinical advice being received by Berkshire Healthcare Foundation Trust. In particular the independence and objectivity of the clinical advice remained questionable.
- (c) Concerns remained regarding the quality of GP engagement and whether views received were factored into the discussions/decisions.
- (d) A number of substantive concerns were raised regarding the timeline and origins behind the decision to vacate Heatherwood and Wexham Park Hospitals Trust.
- (e) The Group also raised fundamental doubts regarding the efficacy of the transport plans which would accompany any move to Prospect Park. Of particular concern was the impact this would have on patients, their families and carers – an issue that had not been adequately considered by BHFT.
- (f) Finally, whilst the Group appreciated that an impact assessment had been carried out, there were lasting questions on the findings of these assessments and what changes, if any, had been made to mitigate any impact.

8. Recommendations from the Panel

8.1 Based on the above and following a lengthy discussion the Panel resolved the following

- (a) That the Health Scrutiny Panel do not accept the findings of the Public Consultation regarding the provision of Mental Health In patient provision in East Berkshire.
- (b) That in the event that the Trust decides to relocate Mental Health in patient provision to Prospect Park Hospital, Reading, that the Panel recommend that the Overview and Scrutiny Panel refer the matter to the Secretary of State for review.
- (c) That the Panel request that Berkshire Healthcare Foundation Trust seek independent advice on the cost of a new purpose built facility and that the resulting detail submitted to the Panel at the earliest opportunity.
- (d) That in the event the independent advice determines that a new facility is unaffordable, that the Panel recommends that an improved and enhanced service in conjunction with HWP is the preferred option.
- (e) That the Panel recommend that once concluded, the outcome of the transport business case be presented to the Panel at its next meeting in September 2011.

9. Next Steps

9.1 Formal notification of the recommendations of the Health panel have been delivered to the PCT, Heatherwood and Wexham Hospitals Trust and Berkshire Healthcare Foundation.

9.2 The PCT are due to consider the evidence, including the findings of the review, at a meeting in July (possible date of the 12th). Following notification of the decision, the Committee will need to consider next steps.

9.3 The Health Panel are scheduled to consider this issue further in September with a particular focus on the business plan for the Transport options.

Background papers

- Berkshire Healthcare Trust Inpatient Services – a review of the Public Consultation held between August 2010 and December 2010 - A report produced by the Slough Borough Council Task and Finish Group (appendix A)