

## GCCG Governing Body and Gloucestershire Care Services NHS Trust Board Meetings – 30th August 2018

### Subsequent response to questions from members of the public re Forest of Dean

Question	Joint Response
<p><b>Question 1:</b> Unfortunately I was not able to attend the Citizen’s Jury at Coleford recently. It appears to me that the recommendation of the Jury was not reached by reasons and standards of natural justice. I understand that the Boards will consider further questions by members of the public and, therefore, I would respectfully request that the following questions be submitted to the Board meeting on the 30th August</p> <p><b>1.1) Does the Board consider that the decision made by the Jury was ultra vires?</b></p> <p>Natural justice or duty to act fairly must be paramount. There was no rebuttal to any of the statements made at the ‘Jury stage’. There was no cross examination of any of the statements made by the presenters. I gather checks on some ‘facts’ were made by Health Watch officials, but again these were not cross examined. How could anyone make a decision on such uncontested facts/evidence? It was also noticed, I am informed, that members of the GCS/CCG Board were seen entering into the Jury room and who knows what took place. Any decision can be invalid if it is influenced by bias of the decision maker(s); another fundamental point of duty to act fairly. The jury should have been selected from people outside the area to combat any bias, as it has turned out people simply voted</p>	<p>1.1) A Citizens’ Jury is not a criminal jury. The methodology for a citizens’ jury was established by The Jefferson Center. Details about the citizens’ jury method can be found at: <a href="https://jefferson-center.org/citizens-jury/">https://jefferson-center.org/citizens-jury/</a></p> <p>The evidence presented to the jury could be challenging, and there was a considerable amount of evidence to consider. The jury members were given time and a structure through which to consider, ask questions and discuss the evidence amongst themselves. Many public policy questions are complicated, and citizens’ juries and citizens’ assemblies are designed specifically to address such complexity. The process was designed over a considerable period of time, led by the Jefferson Center, the organisation that developed the method.</p> <p>The Citizens’ Jury process was subject to considerable independent scrutiny. Firstly, the specification and design of the jury, plus all of the materials that the jury considered (with the exception of late changes to slides made by Lydney Town representatives) were reviewed in advance by an independent</p>

<p>for their local area.</p>	<p>oversight panel comprising of representatives from Healthwatch Gloucestershire, the county's independent health and social care champion, the Gloucestershire Voluntary and Community Sector (VCS) Alliance, which champions and supports voluntary sector organisations in our county and an elected representative from Forest of Dean District Council, the Cabinet Member for Planning Policy and Health and Wellbeing.</p> <p>Members of CCG and GCS staff had occasionally to access the Jury room to collect refreshments or discuss organisational issues with the Jefferson Centre members. They did not engage with the jury members this is evidenced as follows – Jury members were asked to identify potential sources of perceived bias in the end of jury questionnaire. Very little bias was perceived and all 18 jury members said “not at all” to the question about whether the jury facilitators ever tried to influence them towards particular conclusions. The results can be seen in the end-of-jury questionnaire published on the Citizens Juries c.i.c. website. <a href="https://citizensjuries.org/citizens-juries-2/forest-of-dean-citizens-jury/">https://citizensjuries.org/citizens-juries-2/forest-of-dean-citizens-jury/</a></p> <p>Changes were made to materials as a result of comments from the oversight panel. The oversight panel members completed a questionnaire asking about whether they perceived any bias in the process, and these questionnaires have been published on the Citizens Juries c.i.c. website. <a href="https://citizensjuries.org/citizens-juries-2/forest-of-dean-citizens-jury/">https://citizensjuries.org/citizens-juries-2/forest-of-dean-citizens-jury/</a> All three panel members declared in the questionnaires that the jury was successfully designed to minimise bias.</p> <p>Proceedings were held in public with very few private sessions where the jury could deliberate in private. On a number of occasions the independent jury facilitators from The Jefferson Centre judged that, following discussion with jurors it was important for the jurors to be able to discuss their thoughts with one another without being concerned about what members of the public might think. Particularly on the final day, jury members requested that part of</p>
------------------------------	--

<p>1.2) <b>Why were presenters prevented from making statements to the Jury on any site?</b> In your own documents you highlight 'criteria for location':</p> <p><i>There is an available site that: is able to accommodate a building/buildings (and parking provision) which meet current and future service requirements <b>What have the Board identified as future service requirements?</b> is accessible by car or public transport is available and affordable to enable completion of works by 2021/2022 o will be able to secure appropriate</i></p>	<p>their discussions were held in private.</p> <p>Jury members were asked to identify potential sources of perceived bias in the end of jury questionnaire. Very little bias was perceived and all 18 jury members said "not at all" to the question about whether the jury facilitators ever tried to influence them towards particular conclusions. The results can be seen in the end-of-jury questionnaire published on the Citizens Juries c.i.c. website. <a href="https://citizensjuries.org/citizens-juries-2/forest-of-dean-citizens-jury/">https://citizensjuries.org/citizens-juries-2/forest-of-dean-citizens-jury/</a></p> <p>GCCG, GCS and Citizens Juries c.i.c. discussed during a project initiation meeting whether a portion of the jurors should come from outside the Forest of Dean district. There are important arguments for and against, but in brief it was felt important that the recommendation came from local people. However, to address bias towards an individual's own area, a disproportionate number of jurors were deliberately selected who lived in the triangle between the three towns, and who could therefore reach all three towns easily.</p> <p>1.2) The role of the Citizens' Jury was to make a recommendation on the best location for the new community hospital in the Forest of Dean. Due to commercial sensitivity, the consideration of specific sites could not reasonably be expected to be carried out in a public forum. However, the Jury were advised that there were at least two sites in or near each of the three potential locations, which met all of the previously specified site criteria. Representatives making the case for each of the three towns worked to a common brief, which included the details of all of the evidence that would be presented by the impartial witnesses. In advance of the jury it was made clear in information provided to all three towns, and publically through the local newspapers, that the method for choosing a jury recommendation would be the supplementary vote system.</p>
--	--

*planning permission.*

*It is in an area which offers the greatest opportunities for co-location with primary care (e.g. GP services) and/or other related health and wellbeing services.*

*It should have the support of local health and care professionals.*

*It is a site that offers a design and development which provides best value for money for the public purse.*

### **Why were these points felt not applicable for presentations to the Jury?**

I understand that originally individual sites were to be included, but later excluded as it was thought by the Board that this would comprise the ability to negotiate a price - so only Towns for locations were then decided. The recommendation of Cinderford will certainly now be uppermost in the minds of Cinderford landowners for the sale of their land, as would no doubt occur with landowners in Lydney and Coleford. Individual sites should not have been excluded.

The fact that there was no strong decision on part of the Jury for a location, the most sensible way forward would be for the Board to delay their decision and reconsider ALL possible individually sites which meet the above and other stated criteria. I would guess that there are not that many sites in Coleford, Lydney or Cinderford.

1.3) The Jury's recommendation for Cinderford seems to have pivoted on deprivation, and to some extent regeneration. This was not included in the brief or criteria

This provides for first and second preferences and is a system used in the UK e.g. for electing a London Mayor.

The first preference voting did give a result of 8 votes for Cinderford and 5 each for the other two towns. As the town receiving the most votes in the first preference round of voting did not receive more than half the first preference votes (Cinderford), and there was a tie for second (Lydney and Coleford receiving the same number of votes), two scenarios were tested. Firstly, Lydney was eliminated and second preferences for those who voted Lydney were assigned to Cinderford and Coleford (resulting in 9 votes to 8 respectively). Then Coleford was eliminated and second preferences for those who voted Coleford were assigned to Cinderford and Lydney (resulting in 11 votes to 6 respectively). In each scenario Cinderford received the most votes of the three towns.

1.3) The Citizens' Jury was planned, designed and refined by Citizens Juries c.i.c. and the Jefferson Center. Part of this work included identification of the information that the jury would need to enable them to address the question

<p>for the presentations. <b>Under the duty to act fairly are the Board going to allow the data on deprivation to influence the location of the hospital?</b> Deprivation is a damaging lack of material benefits to be basic necessities in a society. <b>How does a hospital combat deprivation?</b> It is present for the treatment of chronic and acute ill health.</p> <p>What is vitally more important for any decision is the morbidity data.</p> <p><b>1.4) Are the Board satisfied that morbidity data has been thoroughly examined and made available to the Jury (and public) for transparency and to aid site recommendations?</b> The provision of primary health facilities in the form of a hospital must surely take this into account.</p>	<p>of location.</p> <p>Deprivation was one of the factors that were taken into account by the jury when reaching their recommendation. The jury heard evidence on deprivation from Rebecca Maclean, consultant in public health at Gloucestershire County Council, about The Index of Multiple Deprivation, which combines seven domains: Income Deprivation; Employment Deprivation; Education, Skills and Training Deprivation; Health Deprivation and Disability; Crime; Barriers to Housing and Services; and Living Environment Deprivation. Higher levels of deprivation are often associated with poorer experiences of health determinants, health outcomes and ease of access to services.</p> <p>1.4) As noted above, the jury heard evidence on deprivation based on The Index of Multiple Deprivation, which includes data on health deprivation and disability.</p> <p>Further information about the services provided at a community hospital and the people using these services was presented by Julie Goodenough, Gloucestershire Care Services NHS Trust.</p>
<p><b>Question 2</b></p> <p>Dear Chairman and members of both Boards, I write as someone born within the 'Hundred of St Briavels', and Living in Lydney for some 40 years, I have been very fortunate to be able spend time with a number of Charitable Trusts in the Forest</p> <p>2.1) My first question to the joint Boards is why was so much of the discussion at Forest Hills held in camera and</p>	<p>2.1) Citizens' jury process (in camera, suitability, participant selection) Very little of the jury proceedings were held in private, with the vast majority</p>

<p>yet on numerous occasions senior Health Officials who sat in the Public domain were seen in conversations with those involved with the Citizens Jury Process?</p>	<p>of the deliberations held in public view. On a number of occasions the independent jury facilitators from The Jefferson Centre judged that it was important for the jurors to be able to discuss their thoughts with one another without being concerned about what members of the public might think.</p> <p>Members of CCG and GCS staff had occasionally to access the Jury room to collect refreshments or discuss organisational issues with the Jefferson Centre members. They did not engage with the jury members this is evidenced as follows – Jury members were asked to identify potential sources of perceived bias in the end of jury questionnaire. Very little bias was perceived and all 18 jury members said “not at all” to the question about whether the jury facilitators ever tried to influence them towards particular conclusions. The results can be seen in the end-of-jury questionnaire published on the Citizens Juries c.i.c. website.  <a href="https://citizensjuries.org/citizens-juries-2/forest-of-dean-citizens-jury/">https://citizensjuries.org/citizens-juries-2/forest-of-dean-citizens-jury/</a></p>
<p>2.2) After the decision had been made by the Jury on the Friday I was surprised to learn that the Jury had been told that “Lydney has a brand-new surgery”, we have yet to find it, can you please tell me where it is?</p>	<p>2.2) The comment related to the relative ages of the current primary care estate in the three towns. In delivering the Gloucestershire CCG Primary Care Strategy (2016 – 2021), there is ongoing engagement with local GP surgeries from across the county and regular meetings with practices individually and as part of locality networks. The Primary Care Infrastructure Plan identified a number of primary care facilities across the county for development, including the health centres in Cinderford and Coleford. We continue to support these practices with their estates plans.</p>
<p>2.3) MIIU is very important to Lydney with three major industrial concerns working 24/7 and using the facilities on a regular basis as does the Tesco store, little mention of this is made in the report. Does the board realise that firms are attracted to a town with a hospital and this may affect future inward investment?</p>	<p>2.3) There is an ongoing commitment to provide urgent care services in the new community hospital, with the expectation that by bringing the services together into one new facility, we will be able to offer robust and effective care and treatment.</p>

2.4) From figures given to me via Town and District Council in Lydney current Building and projected Building is greater than anywhere else in the Forest and together with building taking place in Tutshill, Tidenham and Sedbury all who whilst being signed up with Welsh GPs tend to come towards Lydney, how many meetings and discussions took place with the Parish Councils covering those areas?

2.5) My final question is Why without naming specific locations were the Jury not made aware of the quality, suitability and size of the sites in the various towns. The Jurors asked questions about the sites and it would have helped them to make a more informed judgment. Will the board please investigate the sites before making their final decision?  
Making the right decision for the Future, locating the

2.4) The NHS liaises closely with local authority partners at district and county levels to obtain reliable information regarding population data. The jury received information on the current population and projected population figures from Nigel Gibbons, Forest of Dean District Council. The Forest of Dean District Council has not expressed any preference for the location of the new hospital, but in their presentation to the Jury note:

- All three towns are in principle suitable locations.
- Community use such as a hospital would be supported by policies on any suitable site - whether or not identified in a plan (should be accessible, sustainable etc)
- Each town with its immediate catchment has a similar population size. These overlap and facilities in one may serve the population in another
- The greatest change in terms of population increase will be at Lydney town but the populations, including the immediate areas of the towns, will then be similar by 2028.

A number of drop-ins and meetings have been held in the Sedbury, Tutshill and Tidenham areas in both the recent engagement period and the previous Consultation at the end of 2017. Whilst there have been no specific meetings with the Parish Council, local Councillors have attended these meetings, including the most recent event in June 2018.

2.5) The decision to commission an independent citizens' jury was made in response to feedback from the public consultation. It was decided that specific sites would not be included as an element of the decision making regarding location. The role of the Citizens' Jury was to make a recommendation on the best location for the new community hospital in the Forest of Dean. Due to commercial sensitivity, the consideration of specific sites could not reasonably be expected to be carried out in a public forum. However, the Jury were advised that there were at least two sites in or near

<p>hospital near the people, would dramatically reduce the amount of patient travel. I trust the Boards will give careful consideration to the above and not just pass blame to a third party but make the right decision and build in Lydney for the benefit of the wider Forest of Dean population.</p>	<p>each of the three potential locations, which met all of the previously specified site criteria. This was made clear throughout the engagement and to all three towns in preparation for the jury.</p>
<p><b>Question 3</b></p> <p>3.1) Firstly, it appears that the Tidenham Ward (Tutshill, Sedbury, Beachley) have been overlooked in the initial recommendations and I am very concerned the future of this Ward’s health needs have been considerably neglected. South of the Forest, the population growth of Sedbury is higher than Newent which is in the North. A member of the jury challenged the NHS presenter, at the Peoples Jury. She was concerned where the Tidenham Ward patients should attend for MIIU cases, if Cinderford site was chosen, as many residents would not travel through approximately 20 miles of Forest roads, especially in the winter months. She received the response “there are plenty of other hospitals for them to use”. In my view , this reply to this important question was dealt with inappropriately and the response was given in a flippant manner without any reassurance to the juror that Tidenham Wards population needs had been duly considered. In fact, the nearest MIIU to Sedbury, other than Cinderford, is Ystrad Mynach in the borough of Caerphilly which is approximately 32 miles away.</p>	<p>3.1) In making their decision the GCCG Governing Body and GCS Board considered which location best meets the needs of people living in the Forest of Dean district. This specifically includes all wards within the Forest of Dean District Council area including the wards you have listed. It was noted that residents of certain parts of the Forest of Dean District Council area have the option to choose services out of the area, including for example Herefordshire, Monmouthshire and other parts of Gloucestershire and the Bristol area.</p> <p>The NHS liaises closely with local authority partners at district and county levels to obtain reliable information regarding current and projected population data. The GCCG Governing Body and GCS Board considered the full range of data that was available to the Citizens’ Jury including the information gathered through the independent travel analysis, Equality Impact Analysis and Outcome of Engagement report.</p>

3.2) Secondly, the result of the Public Engagement Survey clearly showed that over 50% of respondents chose Lydney MIIU as their preferred choice of unit in the Forest. In respect of the two new proposed sites in Lydney, clearly the Public Engagement Survey should have great bearing on this decision. Both sites have excellent access to trunk roads and major rail routes. This will be highly beneficial to patients and crucial to attracting valuable medical staff to the Lydney area.

3.3 I truly believe that these chosen sites in Lydney will provide the opportunity for building a Hospital for both now and in the future. Both sites will have the provision for adequate parking now and crucially, expansion in the years ahead. I feel this is a key feature of the importance of choosing one of these sites to accommodate the growing population and housing development in Lydney and Tidenham Ward.

I trust that you will give your full attention to my matters of concern, as clearly I feel that the proposed Lydney sites have many positive factors for the future of health provision in the Forest.

3.2) The purpose of the recent engagement activity regarding the location of a new community hospital in the Forest of Dean was to collect qualitative feedback from respondents, as opposed to facilitating a vote. The views of the local community are important and have been taken into account as part of the decision making process.

The survey questionnaire was made available to the public, staff and stakeholders for a six week period in either print form or online. The survey was open to anyone wishing to provide feedback during the engagement period, resulting in a self-selecting, random sample of respondents to the engagement. It was noted that 47% of respondents who chose to give their postcode, were from the Lydney area. Regardless of place of residency, the feedback received shows that most people preferred the site that was closest to their home.

3.3) At this stage the GCCG Governing Body and GCS Board are making a decision on the best location for most people who live in the Forest of Dean district. It was decided that specific sites would not be included as an element of the decision making regarding location. This was made clear throughout the engagement and to all three towns in preparation for the jury. However, there are at least two sites in, or near, each of the potential locations which meet the site criteria previously agreed.

#### Question 4

4.1) Why would you consider moving a new hospital away from the largest growing population area in the South Forest, some areas of which are 30 miles from Gloucester to an area in the North which is only 12 miles away?

4.2) As the majority of people who live in the NP postcode live in the Tidenham area of Beachley, Sedbury, Tutshill and villages along the A48 and is the fastest growing area in the Forest with huge developments planned, some of which are underway. Numbers will increase even more when the Bridge tolls are removed and the Army camp closed and where even more development is planned. What provision is being made for this fast growing population which will have no convenient access to a hospital if it is sited in the North?

4.1) In deciding the best location for the new community hospital, consideration was given to accessibility for all areas of the Forest of Dean District. The information gathered through the independent travel analysis, Equality Impact Analysis, Outcome of Engagement and Citizens' Jury Report informed the decision making of GCCG Governing Body and GCS Board.

4.2) The NHS liaises closely with local authority partners at district and county levels to obtain reliable information regarding population data. The latest information we have details current and projected population figures across the Forest of Dean District. These show the Lydney area population to be a little lower than the other two towns, with the increased expected growth in Lydney bringing its population to the same level as Cinderford in 2028.

The Citizens' Jury recommended that Cinderford should be the location for the new community hospital. The report from the Citizens' Jury states:

“Our most important reasons for choosing Cinderford were, in order of importance:

- Area of highest deprivation in terms of health and disability and unhealthy behaviours, therefore statistically more likely to need and use Cinderford Hospital. Over 35% more illness, over 15% unhealthy behaviours
- Cinderford is central to the whole of the Forest
- More central location for staff who live throughout the FOD
- It is the geographic centre and can provide a Forest environment
- Cinderford has two A roads as primary routes to Gloucester in case of road closures
- Large percentage of people over 65 and over 85”

<p>4.3) why was the consultation ignored?</p>	<p>4.3) The purpose of the recent engagement activity regarding the location of a new community hospital in the Forest of Dean was to collect qualitative feedback from respondents, as opposed to facilitating a quantitative referendum. The views of the local community are important and have been taken into account as part of the decision making process.</p> <p>The survey questionnaire was made available to the public, staff and stakeholders for a six week period in either print form or online. The survey was open to anyone wishing to provide feedback during the engagement period, resulting in a self-selecting, random sample of respondents to the engagement. It was noted that 47% of respondents who chose to give their postcode, were from the Lydney area. Regardless of place of residency, the feedback received shows that most people preferred the site that was closest to their home.</p>
<p><b>Question 5</b></p> <p>I presented to and attended most of the Citizens' Jury sessions on behalf of Lydney. Below are some questions of my own and those posed by local people. The members worked hard and diligently trying to absorb information and data on subjects that many of us were unfamiliar with. As it was in many different formats I found at times it was difficult to interpret. And it is only now by reading through Board pack that the information, in colour, that it seems more understandable – see deprivation below. The resulting comments of the Juror's views are interesting and informative, but the final outcome vote was not clear cut (8- 5- 5) – the majority <u>not</u> voting for the town selected. In my view it is the Boards role, taking in account the recommendation and views of the Jury, to obtain the best possible outcome for the Future residents of the area at the same time investigating all funding opportunities and</p>	

to obtain good value for taxpayers money.  
The Jurors enquired on the characteristics of the sites available at different locations but, as presenters, we were specifically prohibited from including reference to them in our material. The Jury report makes reference to sites in its recommendation.

I understand that in other towns it could have compromised future commercial discussions.

5.1) In view of the “minority” 8-5-5 recommendation from the Jury would, before making their decision, the Boards consider the merits of the available sites taking into consideration :-

- Accessibility by Trunk road and Rail in all conditions for
  - Staff
  - MIIU and Outpatients
  - Emergency Services
- Size for parking and colocation with other services
- Pleasant outlook
- Value for money in acquisition and build cost – this is important as it is public money
- Population served now and in the Future
- Dr Weiss and other doctors’ views that Accessibility is more important than Centrality

What Priority does the Board give to each of the above- in particular value for money?

5.1) We can confirm that all of the evidence considered by the jury, together with the jury report, was fully taken into account by GCCG Governing Body and GCS Board before reaching their decisions regarding location, on 30 August 2018. Although neither GCCG, nor GCS are considering the merits of specific sites at this stage, they are aware that there are potential sites in each of the three towns that meet the criteria agreed in January 2018. As well making a recommendation regarding a location (the Jury identified Cinderford as the recommended location), the Jury was also asked to rank the desired criteria for the new site. As part of the recommendations the GCCG Governing Body and GCS Board were asked to consider on 30 August 2018, they were asked to:

- note the Jury’s ranking of the desired criteria for the new site and use this to inform decision making when acquiring a site in, or near, Cinderford.



<p>5.5) Do the board (and did the Jury) understand that many of the indices of deprivation shown on maps are % of population and not the actual number of People – a town may have more deprived people than a larger less populated rural area?</p>	<p>5.5) The maps and data presented to the Citizens' Jury and reviewed by the GCCG Governing Body and GCS Board includes a range of information some of which is shown by numbers of people and others by percentages. Each map has a legend which clearly states how the information is presented. In relation to the maps on indices of deprivation, the IMD is a national area-based measure, rather than a measure of individual experiences of deprivation and scores of deprivation are given to a small area (LSOA). Each LSOA has a similar population which allows for comparison between them.</p>
<p>5.6) Does the board believe that having a community hospital <u>prevents</u> deprivation?</p>	<p>5.6) Health Deprivation and Disability are just one of the factors that contribute to deprivation as measured by The Index of Multiple Deprivation. A community hospital on its own will not prevent deprivation, but working together as part of a wider health system will, over time, contribute to reducing health inequalities. Higher levels of deprivation are often associated with poorer experiences of health determinants, health outcomes and ease of access to services.</p>
<p>5.7) DO the boards believe that siting a Community hospital near to the centre of Population is better than in the geographical centre of the Forest? and how important is this to minimise patient miles?</p>	<p>5.7) Prior to our Consultation in 2017, the three potential locations i.e. in, or near, Cinderford, Coleford or Lydney, were chosen because they were the main population centres and enabled access within 30 minutes by car for the majority of Forest of Dean residents.</p>
<p>5.8) In planning for the future what period are the Board considering?</p>	<p>5.8) There is no specified period. It is important that the new community hospital in the Forest of Dean offers the flexibility to meet current and future service requirements, taking account of changing population, demographics and progression in the delivery of health care.</p>
<p>5.9) Have the board noted that more people choose to attend Lydney MIIU than Cinderford? Does the board consider this important?</p>	<p>5.9) We always encourage people to choose a Minor Injury and Illness Unit when appropriate to do so, recognising that there are many factors that influences people's choice. There is an ongoing commitment to provide</p>

<p>5.10) Has the Board noted that over 50% of those responding to the last engagement chose Lydney as their preferred location – double both the other Towns? Does the board attach importance to this outcome? If not, why did they conduct the engagement exercise?</p>	<p>urgent care services in the new community hospital, with the expectation that by bringing the services together into one new facility, we will be able to offer robust and effective care and treatment. Whilst urgent care will be an important feature of the new hospital, further consideration needs to take account of the full range of services that will need to be available.</p> <p>5.10) The purpose of the recent engagement activity regarding the location of a new community hospital in the Forest of Dean was to collect qualitative feedback from respondents, as opposed to facilitating a quantitative referendum. The views of the local community are important and will be taken into account as part of the decision making process.</p> <p>The survey questionnaire was made available to the public, staff and stakeholders for a six week period in either print form or online. The survey was open to anyone wishing to provide feedback during the engagement period, resulting in a self-selecting, random sample of respondents to the engagement. It was noted that 47% of respondents who chose to give their postcode, were from the Lydney area. Regardless of place of residency, the feedback received shows that most people preferred the site that was closest to their home.</p>
<p><b>Question 6</b></p> <p>I will not be able to attend the Seminar, but would be pleased if you would forward to both the CCG and GCS Boards my questions about the location of a new community hospital, based on my belief that any new hospital has to be adaptable and easily accessible to the majority of the population it serves and its staff for many years to come.</p>	

<p>6.1 A large housing development has just begun in Tutshill, adding to already completed, under construction and planned extra housing in Tutshill, Sedbury and Lydney. With the tolls on the Severn Bridge ending in December this year and Bristol commuters already seeking even more housing in Tutshill/Sedbury/Lydney as a result, have you taken into account that the South is rapidly becoming (and probably already is) the most densely populated area of the Forest?</p>	<p>6.1 The NHS liaises closely with local authority partners at district and county levels to obtain reliable information regarding population data. The jury received information on the current population and projected population figures from Nigel Gibbons, Forest of Dean District Council.</p>
<p>6.2 Have you looked at the amount of potential development land in the South, particularly alongside the Lydney bypass, which could offer excellent sites for building, future expansion, parking and public transport access?</p>	<p>6.2 The role of the Citizens' Jury was to make a recommendation on the best location for the new community hospital in the Forest of Dean. The role of the NHS was to consider that recommendation together with other information such as Equality impact Analysis and Travel analysis to assist them in making a decision regarding the location of a new hospital. Due to commercial sensitivity, the consideration of specific sites could not reasonably be expected to be carried out in a public forum. However, the Jury and the Governing Body of the Clinical Commissioning Group and the Trust Board of Gloucestershire Care Services NHS Trust were advised that there were at least two sites in or near each of the three potential locations, which met all of the previously specified site criteria.</p>
<p>6.3 Have you taken into account that Lydney, being on the A48 to Gloucester with easy access to motorways and a railway station, is and will be for the foreseeable future the most accessible location in the Forest for emergency vehicles, staff, the majority of the area's population and those from outside the Forest?</p>	<p>6.3 Accessibility was one of the factors considered by the Citizens Jury and will be taken into account by the GCS Board and CCG Governing Body.</p>
<p>6.4 Do you know about the plans to upgrade Lydney Station by doubling the parking and increasing bus connections, so that the town will be even better served</p>	<p>6.4 The independent travel analysis took into account public transport access including rail.</p>

<p>by rail for staff and patient visitors in future? Having recently travelled by train from Chepstow for an appointment at Gloucester Royal Hospital, it's a good service and there was a large number of passengers getting on and off at Lydney station.</p> <p>6.5 Have you taken into consideration that putting a new hospital in the Centre or North of the Forest will disadvantage what is becoming, or already is, the most populated part in the South, by moving health care further away and making accessibility harder (poor or non-existent public transport, poor too busy Forest roads and possible road closures in winter weather)?</p>	<p>6.5 Population growth, travel and access were points considered by the Citizens Jury, the GCS Board and CCG Governing Body as is detailed in the Board papers.</p>
<p><b>Question 7</b></p> <p>7.1) Have the board noted :-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the result of the recent engagement exercise which shows that over 50% of the respondents chose Lydney</li> <li>• the majority of people of all ages visiting MIU in the Forest chose Lydney</li> </ul> <p>and what effect will this have on their decision?</p>	<p>7.1) The purpose of the recent engagement activity regarding the location of a new community hospital in the Forest of Dean was to collect qualitative feedback from respondents, as opposed to facilitating a quantitative referendum. The views of the local community are important and will be taken into account as part of the decision making process.</p> <p>The survey questionnaire was made available to the public, staff and stakeholders for a six week period in either print form or online. The survey was open to anyone wishing to provide feedback during the engagement period, resulting in a self-selecting, random sample of respondents to the engagement. It was noted that 47% of respondents who chose to give their postcode, were from the Lydney area. Regardless of place of residency, the feedback received shows that most people preferred the site that was closest to their home.</p> <p>We always encourage people to choose a Minor Injury and Illness Unit when</p>

<p>7.2) How can the boards justify putting all the major healthcare facilities (new hospital and 5 million health care centre) in the north of the Forest and thereby disadvantaging and removing the choice for the significant and growing population of the south?</p> <p>7.3) Have the board taken into account the future growth in the Sedbury and district area and do they consider it was given sufficient weighting by the jury?</p> <p>7.4) Should the board not defer the decision until they commit to, and fund plans, to cover the additional medical care required for Lydney and the borders?</p>	<p>appropriate to do so, recognising that there are many factors that influences people's choice. There is an ongoing commitment to provide urgent care services in the new community hospital, with the expectation that by bringing the services together into one new facility, we will be able to offer robust and effective care and treatment. Whilst urgent care will be an important feature of the new hospital, further consideration needs to take account of the full range of services that will need to be available.</p> <p>7.2) In deciding the best location for the new community hospital, consideration was given to accessibility for all areas of the Forest of Dean. The information gathered through the independent travel analysis, Equality Impact Analysis and Outcome of Engagement report informed the decision making of GCCG Governing Body and GC S Board.</p> <p>7.3) The population data and information provided to the NHS from local authority partners is at a district and county levels and therefore includes all areas of the Forest of Dean. The report from the Citizens' Jury demonstrates that they spent a significant amount of time reviewing the information regarding travel and transport in the Forest of Dean. The full range of information gathered through the independent travel analysis, Equality Impact Analysis and Outcome of Engagement will also inform the decision making of GCCG Governing Body and GC S Board.</p> <p>7.4) The decision on a location of the new community hospital in the Forest of Dean was the next step in the wider review of health services in the Forest of Dean. Further work on the design of services for the new hospital will now be required, with an existing commitment to ensure local community engagement regarding this. Gloucestershire CCG have previously committed to reviewing primary care facilities in Lydney should the new hospital not be located in, or near, the town as described in the Gloucestershire Primary Care Infrastructure Plan.  <a href="https://www.gloucestershireccg.nhs.uk/wp-content/uploads/2012/12/Primary-">https://www.gloucestershireccg.nhs.uk/wp-content/uploads/2012/12/Primary-</a></p>
--	---

**Question 8**

I am grateful for the opportunity to express my concerns and raise questions regarding to the Citizens Jury and the process leading to its recommendation.

Deprivation was obviously a key consideration of the Jury, and I believe the evidence was somewhat misleading. Cinderford West ward as shown on the map in red looks hugely impressive in terms of Health Deprivation and Disability, but a large proportion of the geographical area is sparsely populated; Cinderford West accounts for only 2% of the District population which should be borne in mind. Lydney East ward has a population slightly larger than Cinderford West and is growing at an exceptional rate, some 2,000 houses being built, equating to approximately 5,000 people (At the last census Cinderford West population was 4,494) to take the ward population to 10,047. Lydney East ranks alongside Cinderford West in terms of deprivation in terms of Income, Employment, Education Skills and Training and Income Deprivation Relating to Children, and I believe only marginally behind in terms of Health and Disability. When you draw a line on a map it matters not that the difference is just 1 point, the map does not show such proximity.

Keynote – Indices of Deprivation - Forest of Dean District Council : July 2011 (Core Document 11)

Health Deprivation and Disability

3.7 Both Cinderford West 1 (34th) and Lydney East 1 (22nd) are in the bottom 10% in the county for health

deprivation and disability

It was suggested that "Cinderford has a large percentage of over 65 and 85" and "Dilke seems to have older age groups – Lydney younger", when Inform Gloucestershire at November 2016 quotes figures for Cinderford 5,395 and Lydney 5,890 for 65 plus in populations.

8.1) The question therefore is "Did the Jury question the evidence presented and were actual figures produced to enable members to come to a considered judgement?" The predicted growth in the population of Lydney as supported by FoDDC appears to have carried little weight, but with the potential closure of Lydney Hospital, a new Hospital located in Cinderford along with a major investment in Primary Care also in Cinderford, the map showing Health Deprivation and Disability will surely, in a few years change dramatically. As things stand Lydney residents will be the most challenged in terms of access to healthcare.

8.2) My second question therefore is "Were the Jury made fully aware of all the ramifications of their decision, particularly in regard to the population growth in Lydney and the southern part of the District as a whole?"

8.1) Deprivation was one factor that was taken into account by the jury when reaching their recommendation. The jury heard evidence on deprivation from Rebecca Maclean, consultant in public health at Gloucestershire County Council about The Index of Multiple Deprivation, which combines seven domains: Income Deprivation; Employment Deprivation; Education, Skills and Training Deprivation; Health Deprivation and Disability; Crime; Barriers to Housing and Services; and Living Environment Deprivation.

The map presented to the Jury showed an area (LSOA) around Cinderford being in the most deprived quintile nationally. The following link is to the indices of deprivation:  
<https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/english-indices-of-deprivation-2015>  
The indices of multiple deprivation show that the most deprived Lower Super Output Area in the Forest of Dean is Cinderford West 1. The indices of deprivation use codes for Lower Super Output Areas rather than names. The code for Cinderford West 1 is E01022238.

8.2) The evidence presented to the jury could be challenging, and there was a considerable amount of evidence to consider. The jury members were given time and a structure through which to consider, ask questions and discuss the evidence amongst themselves. Many public policy questions are complicated, and citizens' juries and citizens' assemblies are designed specifically to address such complexity. The process was designed over a considerable period of time, led by the Jefferson Center, the organisation that developed the method. The evidence presented to the jury was

reviewed by the independent oversight panel. All three towns were compared in a similar manner using the same set of variables. The jury heard expert evidence which confirmed that the NHS liaises closely with local authority partners at district and county levels to obtain reliable information regarding population data. The jury relied on the current population and projected population figures provided by Nigel Gibbons from Forest of Dean District Council. These show the Lydney area population to be a little lower than the other two towns, and increased expected growth in Lydney bringing its population to the same level as Cinderford in 2028.

The Juror's Report, which is written in the jurors own words can be found in full at <https://citizensjuries.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/08/Forest-of-Dean-Jurors-Report.pdf> **Included in the report are the following statements, which are of particular relevance to your question:**

"The jury was a far-reaching in-depth exercise, where we experienced a wide-range of information allowing us to make an educated decision and one we can be confident has been evaluated.

Everybody worked hard to ensure that the jury considered the Forest as a whole, what as many people as possible were able to access the new hospital. We recognised the limitations, specifically to the large geographical area this hospital is expected to cover. While intense, the jury was an absorbing process which everyone completely committed to. The jury process asked us to test our fair-mindedness and encouraged us to look at the decision of a future hospital location from a wide range of angles. We received and reviewed myriad evidence pertaining to hospital location - both generally and as it related to the proposed locations.

We received information in respect to demographics, equality, population growth, and transport to name a few. Witnesses, who were not to advocate for any particular location, remained un-biased, forcing us to deliberate about how their presentations would inform our choice of hospital location. We

	assessed and re-assessed the options for each location repeatedly with great dedication.”
<p><b>Question 9</b></p> <p>9. 1.re.Decision of the Jury based on economic regeneration/ deprivation. It was my understanding (based on what I had read from NHS documents, heard from NHS Officers at formal meetings and discussions with individual NHS Officers, that the monies available to build a new hospital in the Forest of Dean were to be used to provide the best possible health care facility in the Forest for all of the population.</p> <p>When and why did this become conflated with the idea of economic regeneration/deprivation? Do the Boards believe that this is appropriate in principle? Do the Boards think that it is appropriate given the sums of money already being pumped into Cinderford and the fact that other towns in the Forest have equally deprived wards?</p>	<p>9.1) We confirm that the new community hospital will be developed to provide the best possible health care facility for the population of the Forest of Dean.</p> <p>Following the Consultation in 2017, the GCCG Governing Body and GCS Board agreed a number of recommendations at their meetings in January 2018. As part of these recommendations, the criteria for the location of a new community hospital and the criteria pertinent to site characteristics were revised to take account of the feedback received during the Consultation. The criteria for location was expanded and subsequently included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is in an area which offers greatest potential to support the wider economic regeneration plans within the Forest of Dean.</li> </ul> <p>In designing the Citizens’ Jury process, Citizens Juries and the Jefferson Center developed a witness briefing that set out the questions which experts were asked to address in their presentations to the jury members. Information regarding impact on economic regeneration was therefore provided by the Forest of Dean District Council, who concluded that a new hospital would be likely to be a benefit to any of the three towns. Deprivation was also one factor that was taken into account by the jury when reaching their recommendation. Higher levels of deprivation are often associated with poorer experiences of health determinants, health outcomes and ease of access to services. The jury heard evidence on deprivation from a consultant in public health at Gloucestershire County Council about The Index of Multiple Deprivation, which combines seven domains: Income Deprivation; Employment Deprivation; Education, Skills and Training Deprivation; Health Deprivation and Disability; Crime; Barriers to Housing</p>

<p>9.2.re. Decision of the Jury based in insufficient consideration of future population growth. Lydney has the largest current population and, very importantly, a projected growth which exceeds Cinderford and Coleford combined (see FoDDC's Core Strategy). Are the boards satisfied that sufficient consideration was given to the crucial issue of the location of the hospital as related to future population growth?</p>	<p>and Services; and Living Environment Deprivation.</p> <p>The map presented to the Jury showed an area around Cinderford being in the most deprived nationally. The following link is to the indices of deprivation:  <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/english-indices-of-deprivation-2015">https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/english-indices-of-deprivation-2015</a></p> <p>The indices of multiple deprivation show that the most deprived Lower Super Output Area in the Forest of Dean is Cinderford West 1. The indices of deprivation use codes for Lower Super Output Areas rather than names. The code for Cinderford West 1 is E01022238</p> <p>9.2) The NHS liaises closely with local authority partners at district and county levels to obtain reliable information regarding population data. The jury received information on the current population and projected population figures from Nigel Gibbons, Forest of Dean District Council. The Forest of Dean District Council has not expressed any preference for the location of the new hospital, but in their presentation to the Jury noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All three towns are in principle suitable locations.</li> <li>• Community use such as a hospital would be supported by policies on any suitable site - whether or not identified in a plan (should be accessible, sustainable etc)</li> <li>• Each town with its immediate catchment has a similar population size. These overlap and facilities in one may serve the population in another</li> <li>• The greatest change in terms of population increase will be at Lydney town but the populations, including the immediate areas of the towns, will then be similar by 2028.</li> </ul> <p>An important consideration in selecting a specific site for the new community hospital in the Forest of Dean will be the flexibility the site offers to enable us to meet future service requirements, taking account of changing population, demographics and progression in the delivery of health care.</p>
--	--

**Question 10**

10.1) Will the two boards give consideration to the recent public consultation which clearly showed that the large majority of Forest residents who expressed a view were in favour of siting the new hospital close to Lydney. I submit that this was a more inclusive democratic exercise than the citizens' jury and therefore this preference should be given considerable weight in making the final decision. This view was supported by clear statistical evidence that more people currently attend Lydney Hospital MIIU than attend the Dilke, and this is likely to be even more significant as the population growth in the South Forest area expands at a faster pace than elsewhere.'

10.1) The purpose of the recent engagement activity regarding the location of a new community hospital in the Forest of Dean was to collect qualitative feedback from respondents, as opposed to facilitating a quantitative referendum. The views of the local community are important and will be taken into account by the GCCG Governing Body and GCS Board as part of the decision making process.

The survey questionnaire was made available to the public, staff and stakeholders for a six week period in either print form or online. The survey was open to anyone wishing to provide feedback during the engagement period, resulting in a self-selecting, random sample of respondents to the engagement. It was noted that 47% of respondents who chose to give their postcode, were from the Lydney area. Regardless of place of residency, the feedback received shows that most people preferred the site that was closest to their home.

We always encourage people to choose a Minor Injury and Illness Unit when appropriate to do so, recognising that there are many factors that influences people's choice. There is an ongoing commitment to provide urgent care services in the new community hospital, with the expectation that by bringing the services together into one new facility, we will be able to offer robust and effective care and treatment. Whilst urgent care will be an important feature of the new hospital, further consideration needs to be given to the full range of services that will need to be available.

The NHS liaises closely with local authority partners at district and county levels to obtain reliable information regarding population data. The jury relied on the current population and projected population figures provided by Nigel Gibbons from Forest of Dean District Council. These show the Lydney area population to be a little lower than the other two towns, and increased expected growth in Lydney bringing its population to the same level as Cinderford in 2028

**Question 11**

Letter from Lydney Town Council

Lydney Town Council remain disappointed at the Jury's recommendation that the new Forest Hospital should be in Cinderford. The Town Council have supported, and worked closely with the Friends of Lydney Hospital throughout the process and therefore now share their many concerns with this decision; Deputy Mayor, Cllr Brian Pearman being one of the presenters of the Lydney case to the Citizens Jury.

A major concern is the process the Board will use to make their decision?

We feel such needs to be comprehensive and based on the current facts and informed projections which we believe requires further scrutiny.

We would suggest that any decision should be deferred, for the given date of 30th August, given the deferral of the Jury, we do not feel gives sufficient time for the Board to apply due diligence and a thorough evaluation of all the evidence.

We were not surprised that the Coleford/Cinderford axis were favoured although we did not expect Cinderford to be the choice - principally on the grounds of deprivation, Lydney in fact has the ward with the highest claimant count. We believe consideration should also have been given to the fact that Cinderford is the most difficult location for the bulk of the Forest's

**NHS decision making process**

The Governing Body of NHS Gloucestershire Clinical Commissioning Group (GCCG) and the Board of Gloucestershire Care Services NHS Trust (GCS) will meet on 30 August 2018 at Forest Hills Golf Club, Coleford. This date was agreed after the decision was made to delay the Citizens' Jury. Governing Body and Board Members will have had sufficient opportunity to consider all of the information considered by the Citizen's Jury, as well as the Jury report. All of this information has been in the public domain since the Jury held its meetings (30 July- 3 August). Additionally the Governing Body and Board will consider the Outcome of Engagement, independent Equality Impact Analysis and Travel Analysis as part of the decision making process.

**Deprivation**

Deprivation was one factor that was taken into account by the jury when reaching their recommendation. The jury heard evidence on deprivation from Rebecca Maclean, consultant in public health at Gloucestershire County Council about The Index of Multiple Deprivation, which combines seven domains: Income Deprivation; Employment Deprivation; Education, Skills and Training Deprivation; Health Deprivation and Disability; Crim; Barriers to Housing and Services; and Living Environment Deprivation.

The map presented to the Jury showed an area around Cinderford being in the most deprived nationally. The following link is to the indices of deprivation:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/english-indices-of-deprivation-2015>

The indices of multiple deprivation show that the most deprived Lower Super Output Area in the Forest of Dean is Cinderford West 1. The indices of deprivation use codes for Lower Super Output Areas rather than names. The code for Cinderford West 1 is E01022238.

population to access.

The voting was not clear cut 8 -5 - 5 with no clear majority

The Town Council notes that though the Public Consultation was subject to scrutiny by the Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee of Gloucestershire County Council, the Citizens Jury process was not subject to such scrutiny. On a similar theme we wonder why it was necessary for some sessions of the Jury to be held "in camera".

We do not wish to apportion blame however merely wish to reiterate that the Citizens Jury process was not suitable for the purpose of choosing the location for the hospital. Naturally everyone is going to have an inclination towards their own postcode and to avoid this aspect a third of the participants should have been from out of the area.

The 'evidence' presented to the Jury must have been difficult to absorb - especially as many were not familiar with the issues involved. They were given graphs and maps with a mixture of measurements percentages, historic figures, deprivation indices, areas, densities etc- calculated travel times however these figures had not be checked/confirmed by a third party and therefore reassembled comparing apples with pears.

### **Travel analysis**

Following a recommendation agreed at the GCCG Governing Body and GCS Board in January 2018 to ensure that travel and access issues are reflected in any consideration of location, an independent travel analysis was commissioned to provide evidence about the accessibility of each of the three proposed locations for the new community hospital i.e. in, or near, Cinderford, Coleford or Lydney. This evidence was considered by the Jury and will also be considered at the meetings on 30 August 2018.

The travel analysis identified differences in travel times to and from the three proposed locations from 8 different places spread across the Forest of Dean District by both public transport and car.

Some places were better served by one location than another. However, when taken together, the travel time differences were not substantial. The analysis did not suggest that Cinderford is the most difficult location to reach.

### **Citizens' jury process (voting)**

In advance of the jury it was made clear in information provided to all three towns and to local newspapers, that the method for choosing a jury recommendation would be the supplementary vote system. This provides for first and second preferences and is a system used in the UK e.g. for electing a London Mayor. The first preference voting did give a result of 8 votes for Cinderford and 5 each for the other two towns. As the town receiving the most votes in the first preference round of voting did not receive more than half the first preference votes (Cinderford), and there was a tie for second (Lydney and Coleford receiving the same number of votes), two scenarios were tested. Firstly, Lydney was eliminated and second preferences for those who voted Lydney were assigned to Cinderford and Coleford (resulting in 9 votes to 8 respectively). Then Coleford was eliminated and second preferences for those who voted Coleford were assigned to Cinderford and Lydney (resulting in 11 votes to 6 respectively). In each scenario Cinderford

Two examples of particular concern are:

- Cinderford scored on "large percentage of people over 65 and 85", and "Dilke seems to have older age groups- Lydney younger", when Inform Glos at Nov 2016 quotes figures for Cinderford 5,395 and Lydney 5,890 for 65 plus.
- Cinderford has two A roads to Gloucester, but in reality one has to travel on Broads to access the A roads. Lydney sites are in fact alongside the A48.

Before the Jury met we understand the Friends of Lydney Hospital queried the key criteria for decision making and the hierarchy/weighting of those criteria to enable us to present a coherent case for Lydney. From what has been reported it would seem that the outline received was not adhered to during the course of the Jury's deliberations?

The hospital is yet to be built and is for the future - 2030+ - health provision will have changed but we feel certain patients will still expect to pop in to a MIU as opposed to phoning up and waiting for a GP appointment.

Beds are an issue but not as big as the general population feels. Already more people of all ages are coming to Lydney as opposed to Dilke for MIU.

received the most votes of the three towns.

### **Independent scrutiny**

The Gloucestershire County Council Health and Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee (HCOSC) has received regular reports regarding the progress of the Forest of Dean Community Services Review. The Outcome of Consultation (September-December 2018) and subsequent decisions made in January 2018 to replace the two existing hospitals in the Forest of Dean with a new community hospital in the Forest of Dean was reported to HCOSC, thereby meeting our statutory requirements. At the same time the decision to commission an independently facilitated panel, or Citizens' Jury was communicated to HCOSC and they were content with this process. HCOSC will receive an update on the Citizens' Jury process and outcome at their meeting in public on 11 September 2018.

The Citizens' Jury process was subject to considerable independent scrutiny. Firstly, the specification and design of the jury, plus all of the materials that the jury considered (with the exception of late changes to slides made by Lydney Town representatives) were reviewed in advance by an independent oversight panel comprising of representatives from Healthwatch Gloucestershire, the county's independent health and social care champion, the Gloucestershire Voluntary and Community Sector (VCS) Alliance, which champions and supports voluntary sector organisations in our county and an elected representative from Forest of Dean District Council, the Cabinet Member for Planning Policy and Health and Wellbeing.

Changes were made to materials as a result of comments from the oversight panel. The oversight panel members completed a questionnaire asking about whether they perceived any bias in the process, and these questionnaires have been published on the Citizens Juries c.i.c. website. <https://citizensjuries.org/citizens-juries-2/forest-of-dean-citizens-jury/> All three panel members declared in the questionnaires that the jury was successfully

In a recent public engagement consultation exercise over 50% of all respondents chose Lydney- twice as many as Coleford or Cinderford.

Besides the undeniably better access of the A48 and rail, Lydney currently has the largest population and has a projected growth greater than the other towns combined as can be confirmed by Forest of Dean DC's Core Strategy. Added to this is the real development actually taking place in the south and in and around Sedbury (Chepstow). It is already virtually as big as Newent and will be the 4th largest community in the FoDDC area which again could be easily serviced by a hospital in Lydney.

We strongly believe the hospital should be placed where the people are to be located both now and *in* the FUTURE and that will involve least patient travel.

The Medical Officer for the current hospitals supported Lydney at the Jury and since then other practices have said they would like to combine and co-locate to a new hospital in Lydney.

Please may we request that the Board do not simply accept the recommendation as given, passing all the 'blame' onto Jury, thus justifying its cost, but instead re-evaluates the responses given so as to be confident in its final decision for the Board should show due diligence in the validation of the facts and their own thought processes - we believe that should also involve considering the individual sites (excluded from

designed to minimise bias.

Proceedings were held in public with very few private sessions where the jury could deliberate in private.

Jury members were asked to identify potential sources of perceived bias in the end of jury questionnaire. Very little bias was perceived and all 18 jury members said "not at all" to the question about whether the jury facilitators ever tried to influence them towards particular conclusions. The results can be seen in the end-of-jury questionnaire published on the Citizens Juries c.i.c. website. <https://citizensjuries.org/citizens-juries-2/forest-of-dean-citizens-jury/>

**Citizens' jury process (*in camera*, suitability, participant selection)**

Very little of the jury proceedings were held in private, with the vast majority of the deliberations held in public view. On a number of occasions the independent jury facilitators from The Jefferson Centre judged that it was important for the jurors to be able to discuss their thoughts with one another without being concerned about what members of the public might think.

The consultation at the end of 2017 referred to above asked for views on the following question: If the option of single new community hospital in the Forest of Dean is agreed, how do you think a recommendation should be made on the location? The option to commission a combined panel (citizens and clinicians) with the purpose of applying the agreed criteria and making a recommendation on location, was approved at the Governing Body and Trust Board meetings in January 2018. This was the preference of over 50% of individuals who chose to respond to the consultation. In recognition of the diversity of clinical roles and the challenge of representation across the range of NHS organisations, it was subsequently agreed that the view of staff would be better gathered through staff and locality meetings and the engagement undertaken during May/June 2018. In addition, it was

<p>the Jury consideration) before finally deciding.</p>	<p>suggested that other members of the jury may potentially defer to the opinion of clinicians.</p> <p>GCCG, GCS and Citizens Juries c.i.c. discussed during a project initiation meeting whether a portion of the jurors should come from outside the Forest of Dean district. There are important arguments for and against, but in brief it was felt important that the recommendation came from local people. However, to address this issue, a disproportionate number of jurors were deliberately selected who lived in the triangle between the three towns, and who could therefore reach all three towns easily.</p> <p><b>Evidence presented to the jury</b></p> <p>The evidence presented to the jury could be challenging, and there was a considerable amount of evidence to consider. The jury members were given time and a structure through which to consider, ask questions and discuss the evidence amongst themselves. Many public policy questions are complicated, and citizens' juries and citizens' assemblies are designed specifically to address such complexity. The process was designed over a considerable period of time, led by the Jefferson Center, the organisation that developed the method.</p> <p>The evidence presented to the jury was reviewed by the independent oversight panel. All three towns were compared in a similar manner using the same set of variables.</p> <p>The presentation by Rebecca Maclean of Gloucestershire County Council highlighted that Cinderford does have a high proportion of older people. The presentation by Julie Goodenough of Gloucestershire Care Services NHS Trust showed that more elderly patients are admitted to the Dilke Memorial Hospital than to Lydney hospital.</p>
---	---

**Decision making criteria**

All three town representatives were given a clear written brief for making their presentation to the jury. It explained that each town was free to make their case to the jury as they saw fit. The written brief explained that the jury would consider, but would not be bound by, the criteria published during the public consultation exercise and confirmed by the meetings in January 2018.

**Urgent care**

A commitment has been made publicly that the new community hospital in the Forest of Dean will provide an urgent care service.

**Public engagement**

The purpose of the recent engagement activity regarding the location of a new community hospital in the Forest of Dean was to collect qualitative feedback from respondents, as opposed to facilitating a quantitative referendum. The survey questionnaire was made available to the public, staff and stakeholders for a six week period in either print form or online. The survey was open to anyone wishing to provide feedback during the engagement period, resulting in a self-selecting, random sample of respondents to the engagement. It was noted that 47% of respondents who chose to give their postcode, were from the Lydney area.

**Population**

The NHS liaises closely with local authority partners at district and county levels to obtain reliable information regarding population data. The jury relied on the current population and projected population figures provided by Nigel Gibbons from Forest of Dean District Council. These show the Lydney area population to be a little lower than the other two towns, and increased expected growth in Lydney bringing its population to the same level as Cinderford in 2028.

	<p><b>Local NHS views</b></p> <p>The presentation to the jury on behalf of the local NHS was made by Dr Paul Weiss. Within the presentation, Dr Weiss confirmed that local NHS organisations, including the Forest of Dean Primary Care Group, had no preference for location for the new community hospital in the Forest of Dean. No practices, either within Gloucestershire or in neighbouring areas, have contacted GCCG or GCS to indicate that they would like to combine and co-locate to a new hospital in Lydney.</p> <p>Individual staff views collected during the engagement are referred to in the Outcome of Engagement Report, were presented to the Jury and will be presented at the meeting on 30 August.</p> <p><b>Citizens' jury recommendation</b></p> <p>As previously stated, the decision to commission an independent citizens' jury was made in response to feedback from the public consultation. It was decided that specific sites would not be included as an element of the decision making regarding location. This was made clear throughout the engagement and to all three towns in preparation for the jury.</p> <p>I can confirm that the evidence considered by the jury, together with the jury report, the Outcome of Engagement, independent Equality Impact Analysis and Travel Analysis will all be fully taken into account by GCCG Governing Body and GCS Trust Board before reaching their decisions on 30 August 2018.</p>
<p><b>Question 12</b></p> <p>Would you please schedule the following question for the board:</p> <p>12.1) Has the board made any enquiries with local GP surgeries to co-locate with /in the new hospital development considering it was a frequent topic and issue</p>	<p>12.1) As part of the Forest of Dean Community Services Review, the concept of co-location of primary care with a new hospital in the Forest has been considered. There is no evidence to suggest that any of the proposed</p>

<p>during the consultation process, and would willingness of co-location by a local surgery influence the final decision?</p>	<p>locations for the new hospital offer better opportunities for co-location than others. There is an ongoing commitment to review primary care facilities in Lydney should the new hospital not be located in, or near the town.</p> <p>In delivering the Gloucestershire CCG Primary Care Strategy (2016 – 2021), there is ongoing engagement with local GP surgeries from across the county and regular meetings with practices individually and as part of locality networks. The Primary Care Infrastructure Plan identified a number of primary care facilities across the county for development, including the health centres in Cinderford and Coleford. We continue to support these practices with their estates plans.</p>
<p><b>Question 13</b> 13.1) Who will own the land that the new Community Hospital in the Forest of Dean will sit on and  13.2) Who will own the actual new Community Hospital in the Forest of Dean</p>	<p>13.1) The land that the new community hospital in the Forest of Dean will sit on will be owned by Gloucestershire Care Services NHS Trust.</p> <p>13.2) Gloucestershire Care Services NHS Trust will own the new community hospital in the Forest of Dean.</p>
<p><b>Question 14</b> 14.1) At the joint board meeting at Forest Hills Golf Club in January, the public were assured by the CCG board chairman that our questions and answers would be published online - but I cannot find them. Can the January responses be published in full and also the answers to the questions at this meeting?</p>	<p>14.1) The Q&amp;A responses from the meeting in January are available on the GCCG website at: <a href="https://www.gloucestershireccg.nhs.uk/governing-body-papers-thursday-25th-january-2018/">https://www.gloucestershireccg.nhs.uk/governing-body-papers-thursday-25th-january-2018/</a></p> <p>The Q&amp;A responses are also available in the minutes of the January 2018 GCS Board meeting (pages 16-20) on the GCS website at: <a href="https://www.glos-care.nhs.uk/images/GCS_NHSv2_TRUST_PUBLIC_BOARD_29TH_MARCH_2018.pdf">https://www.glos-care.nhs.uk/images/GCS_NHSv2_TRUST_PUBLIC_BOARD_29TH_MARCH_2018.pdf</a></p> <p>Similarly, the Q&amp;As from the meeting on 30 August will be available shortly.</p>

<p>14.2). Can the Joint Boards confirm that no decision has been made whether to close the Lydney and Dilke Memorial Community Hospitals?</p> <p>14.3) Given that the Gloucestershire Health and Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee in their letter of 9 January 2018 (last page: <a href="http://www.fodhealth.nhs.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/02/FoD-Health-Governing-Body-Papers-Part-1.pdf">http://www.fodhealth.nhs.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/02/FoD-Health-Governing-Body-Papers-Part-1.pdf</a>) demanded due consideration be given to the "lack of clarity as to why the shared investment suggestion is not viable", will the CCG/ GCS Trust publish the background evidence underpinning the Case For Change, such as six-tier building surveys, a full inventory of works needed and itemised estimates for the work?</p> <p>14.4). Will the Boards consider in their decision-making the "good" rating given to existing GCS Trust service provision, such as at the two existing Forest of Dean hospitals, by the Care Quality Commission published April 2018 (<a href="https://www.cqc.org.uk/sites/default/files/new_reports/AAA_H1467.pdf">https://www.cqc.org.uk/sites/default/files/new_reports/AAA_H1467.pdf</a>), address its recommendations about the "regular high bed occupancy in the community hospitals 96.4% 2017/18 year to date", and increase inpatient beds rather than reduce them to achieve an "accepted bed occupancy level from a national best practice recommendation of 85% and a contracted level of 90% to 92%", and also address criticisms about patients being out of sight of staff in new hospitals such as Tewkesbury?</p>	<p>14.2) We can confirm that no decision to close the Lydney &amp; District Community Hospital and/or Dilke Memorial Hospital has been made.</p> <p>14.3) The background evidence underpinning the Case for Change relating to the estate will be detailed in the rationale within the full business case.</p> <p>14.4) It was made clear throughout the earlier consultation and recent engagement that the services provided by the NHS staff working in the Forest of Dean were good.</p> <p>The GCCG Governing Body and GCS Board made a decision at their respective meetings on 30 August 2018, about the location of the new community hospital in the Forest of Dean.</p> <p>Additional work on the full range of services provided in the new hospital will then be completed. Members of both the Governing Body and Board recommitted to undertaking further engagement to ensure local people are fully involved in the development of the new community hospital in the Forest of Dean and the services that it provides (recommendation 1.ii).</p>
---	--