



North Somerset LINK further comments on Wrington Vale Medical Practice Draft Consultation Document November 2009

Overview

- The layout and the format of the document are still confusing. The consultation questions are in the body of the document and on a separate form – it's not clear why.
- In the body of the document, giving the information first and then asking the question gives the appearance that a decision has already been made.
- Some of the questions still appear to be biased or leading.
- North Somerset LINK considers that the length of the document (longer than the first draft) will discourage the public from completing the document.
- As mentioned previously, attention should be drawn early in the document to what the public are being asked to do, how to do it and where to find further information.
- It would be helpful to give an indication of 'what happens next' or 'what else is happening'.
- We are pleased to see that a lot of the jargon in the original document has been taken out but indicate below specific words/phrases we feel need to be changed.
- We are also pleased to see a separate feedback form.
- Background information to support the consultation should be provided in appendices.
- Front cover should say what it is about (briefly), followed by questions and then appendix with further information.

General

Throughout the document there is a typing error on the bottom of each page e.g. 1 fo 17.

Language/jargon

Page 3

Top para - 'models of delivery'?

What are we consulting on?

Bold print 'Additional Health Services' – asks which service should be provided locally etc

Followed by

What are we NOT consulting on?

Contradicting this pointnot a comprehensive...of additional services to be provided.....?

Page 4

Bullet 1 - ...more wide health services?

Bullet 2 – 'health shop'? – this is new to the document – what is it?

Page 5

Bullet 1- Numbering and question is confusing.

Bullet 2 – See our comments re Page 3

New mention of 'Rurals Group' – LINK as a member of the Rurals Group are not aware of any specific work the Rurals Group have undertaken on these topics.

Page 6

Table of evaluation criteria is improved, but options 5-8 are jargon and need better explanation – in the current list, items 1-4 are much clearer, so may be chosen in preference

Page 7

What are the options to improve the premises of WVMP?

.....with its Estates Strategy? – not sure that the public would understand this wording.

E-mail: contact@nsomersetlink.co.uk Tel: 01934 876806

Scout Enterprises (Western) Limited. Company Limited by Guarantee.

Registered in England & Wales No. 1796061.

Registered Office: Pavilion House, Bishop Road, Bristol BS7 8LX. Tel: 0117 923 2288

Registered Charity No. 295242. VAT Registration No. 713 1958 41

Page 6, 7 & 8 refer to 'affordability' and 'not attractive to a developer' – LINK appreciate it may be helpful for the public to understand that the GP practice is a private business and will not be able to operate without making a profit but the wording appears to 'dodge the issue'.

Significant cost and efficiency savings have been identified, but more detail about what these are would help readers understand the impact that these savings could have. (What financial options have been considered through the business case?)

Page 10 –

Last para - A preferred option on page 2 was mentioned, but not that it was Pudding Pie Lane. This location seems to appear on page 10 without relevant explanation about how it got there and could confuse the reader to think that a site has already been chosen.

Pages 10 & 11

Not sure how helpful the tables will be especially the walking/driving as it would need much more explanation and two of the figures have an asterisk although it does say what that refers to.

Jargon Buster (p14)

Although a jargon buster can be helpful it would be better to concentrate on using as much plain English as possible and the public may not bother to refer to it.

Numbering, format and layout need to be clearer which may have already been considered in the print version of the document e.g. section headings in larger print starting on different pages. This will help keep the reader interested – the maternity and new born services consultation document is a good example to use – it was a smaller A5 size booklet, which was very easy to read and clearly laid out.

Choices on large print and accessibility should be given at the beginning of the document.

Question 1

The removal of the word 'agree' is an improvement, but there are still 2 questions in 1, it doesn't give you option to say, extending the services on existing premises is a 'good option' and then to say 'no' to building a new surgery (and vice versa).

Question 2 (p6) & feedback form

It would be useful to provide background to the existing services listed, where they are currently located and how many people use them. It is difficult to envisage using these services locally if a resident does not have a current need

for them, so providing more detailed background allows for more informed choice.

Public may not know what Lymphodema is, can this be explained?
Is oral health dentistry? If it is should this be said.
More detail about teenage health clinics and what this is needed.

Question 4 is an important information-gathering question but may need to be separate to the consultation questions as the other questions, which ask for a choice or view.