

03 September 2018

Question

WHY has the WLCCG posted such a disingenuous report to the LCC HOSC.

It is typical of the spin & out-right misinformation that comes from the WLCCG. I have asked repeatedly for information to be told I have what WLCCG are prepared to offer, ie no detail.

In early 2016 the Ashby Civic Society expressed a genuine interest in how S106 monies were managed by the WLCCG & the 2 Councils. This was a mixture of letters, Emails and attendance at a Loughborough Seminar asking how the process was managed. Councils & CCGs are controlled by procedures. We asked for a copy of these procedures. These requests were ignored at a detail level, with continuous references to the ethereal vision of working togetherness. Today's agenda is the first time I have seen a process flow diagram. I presume there is also a procedure that accompanies this, if not I am sure the HOSC would be alarmed. Repeated requests for detail resulted in me being branded vexatious. Generalised money statements as shown in today's report were created, but none that answered detail specifics. As S106 monies is in fact local community money there is every right to understand that it is managed competently. (In fact this perceived lack of competence was why we were here at the last HOSC meeting concerned about the WLCCG activities.) As a sop to engagement a meeting was organised between the County Council, WLCCG & the Ashby Civic Society where a diet of platitudes was served & no evidence presented. To move this on Ashby Civic Society asked the following specific question

'At the meeting, to solicit some actual detail about what positive activity NWLDC & WLCCG were doing together for the benefit of Ashby de la Zouch the 3 named players above were asked, as an example, to use the S106 monies available to improve/create lost clinic services in Ashby de la Zouch and place them in the North St GP surgery, or other suitable venue. An answer to this question was what was asked for. I would mention that this answer, asked for on 23rd Jan, might be most helpful ASAP and certainly well before the May HOSC meeting.'

This question was never answered.

On 29 March in a response to a Freedom of Information Act request, WLCCG provided the following information in respect of nine S106 agreements for primary care in Ashby de la Zouch, having a total value of £587,658.71. Of these 5 agreements were not time lapsed, totalling £370,593.67. The other 4 agreements were time lapsed and therefore potentially lost, having a value of £217,065.04.

The WLCCG report to the HOSC makes no reference to the important aspect of agreements that are time lapsed and therefore potentially lost. The report fails to include detailed information of all S106 healthcare funds secured, whether or not time expired, and spending. The report merely listing certain so called 'notable' projects. No Ashby projects are referred to.

In recent correspondence with the Chief Executive of North West Leicestershire District Council, I have been advised that £133,372 of developer funding towards a new health centre in Ashby cannot

now be secured, the centre having been provided instead under a PFI arrangement. The £133,372 is lost from the people of Ashby.

In my attempts to obtain more information on the question of S106 funds for health care by requesting copies of the procedures and minutes of the meetings between the WLCCG and NWLDC & LCC, I have been advised by NWLDC that no formal minutes of these meetings are taken.

I therefore consider that the HOSC should ask for more detailed information on these matters and that there should be more openness by both WLCCG and County and District Councils.

Surely to counter this abuse of the community is an example what the HOSC is set up for

regards

Ian Webb

Ashby Civic Society.

Question/statement submitted to Leicester County Council Health Overview Scrutiny Committee 5th September 2018 – Ian Webb

Background

Mr Webb has submitted a statement/question for consideration at the HOSC meeting on the 5th September 2018 (see appendix 1 below). Many of the elements of the statement/question relate to WLCCG activity or contacts - the following is information provided in order to assist HOSC members to respond to or discuss the issues raised.

Enquiries, complaints and requests for information to WLCCG from Mr Webb and his colleague Mr Bedford relating to Ashby District Hospital and section 106 agreements have been handled in a timely manner with all information provided where appropriate since 2013. This has included providing the same information on multiple occasions. All requests and enquiries have been dealt with.

Specific issues

1. The report provided by WLCCG and ELRCCG is a standard and general overview of section 106 activity, and is similar to those provided previously. These reports are provided in order to give high level information.
2. To be clear – no requests for information have been ignored. Mr Webb has been advised that the WLCCG has provided all information on a variety of matters linked to Ashby District Hospital that it holds, and has provided it on a number of occasions. Mr Webb was advised earlier in 2018 that if he persisted in repeating his questions, or making similar enquiries regarding section 106 agreements, the CCG would have to consider whether such enquiries were unreasonably persistent and/or vexatious. Mr Webb has not therefore been '*branded vexatious*' as stated.
The CCG has responded to multiple enquiries and Freedom of Information requests received from Mr Webb and his colleague Mr Bedford. As part of the provision of full and detailed information, numbers of section 106 agreements, funds associated and usage has been shared.
A process flowchart/map of the section 106 process was shared on the 29th March 2017.
3. The question that Mr Webb quotes ('At the meeting, to solicit some detail...') was specifically answered in a letter to Mr Bedford (who wrote on behalf of the Ashby Civic Society) dated 22nd January 2017 (the information was actually requested before that and not on the 23rd January as suggested).
4. In relation to Mr Webb's paragraph commencing '*In recent correspondence with the Chief Executive of North West Leicestershire District Council, I have been advised*

that... it is not the case that the sum of £133,372 has been 'lost from the people of Ashby' as stated.

The land for the new Heath Centre on Burton Road was provided for through the section 106 agreement. The £133,000 would have been an *alternative* contribution made under the agreement should the land have *not* been required (planning reference 13/00486/OUTM – Hollywell Spring Farm). The alternative contribution was not required as the Health Centre was built on the land.

In conclusion, enquiries, complaints and requests for information from Mr Webb (and his colleague Mr Bedford) have been handled in a timely manner with all information provided where appropriate. This has included providing the same information on multiple occasions.

WLCCG

3rd September 2018

Appendix 1

Statement/question to HOSC – Ian Webb

'WHY has the WLCCG posted such a disingenuous report to the LCC HOSC.

It is typical of the spin & out-right misinformation that comes from the WLCCG. I have asked repeatedly for information to be told I have what WLCCG are prepared to offer, ie no detail.

In early 2016 the Ashby Civic Society expressed a genuine interest in how S106 monies were managed by the WLCCG & the 2 Councils. This was a mixture of letters, Emails and attendance at a Loughborough Seminar asking how the process was managed. Councils & CCGs are controlled by procedures. We asked for a copy of these procedures. These requests were ignored at a detail level, with continuous references to the ethereal vision of working togetherness. Today's agenda is the first time I have seen a process flow diagram. I presume there is also a procedure that accompanies this, if not I am sure the HOSC would be alarmed. Repeated requests for detail resulted in me being branded vexatious. Generalised money statements as shown in today's report were created, but none that answered detail specifics. As S106 monies is in fact local community money there is every right to understand that it is managed competently. (In fact this perceived lack of competence was why we were here at the last HOSC meeting concerned about the WLCCG activities.) As a sop to engagement a meeting was organised between the County Council, WLCCG & the Ashby Civic Society where a diet of platitudes was served & no evidence presented. To move this on Ashby Civic Society asked the following specific question

'At the meeting, to solicit some actual detail about what positive activity NWLDC & WLCCG were doing together for the benefit of Ashby de la Zouch the 3 named players above were asked, as an example, to use the S106 monies available to improve/create lost clinic services in Ashby de la Zouch and place them in the North St GP surgery, or other suitable venue. An answer to this question was what was asked for. I would mention that this answer, asked for on 23rd Jan, might be most helpful ASAP and certainly well before the May HOSC meeting.'

This question was never answered.

On 29 March in a response to a Freedom of Information Act request, WLCCG provided the following information in respect of nine S106 agreements for primary care in Ashby de la Zouch, having a total value of £587,658.71. Of these 5 agreements were not time lapsed, totalling £370,593.67. The other 4 agreements were time lapsed and therefore potentially lost, having a value of £217,065.04.

The WLCCG report to the HOSC makes no reference to the important aspect of agreements that are time lapsed and therefore potentially lost. The report fails to include detailed information of all S106 healthcare funds secured, whether or not

time expired, and spending. The report merely listing certain so called 'notable' projects. No Ashby projects are referred to.

In recent correspondence with the Chief Executive of North West Leicestershire District Council, I have been advised that £133,372 of developer funding towards a new health centre in Ashby cannot now be secured, the centre having been provided instead under a PFI arrangement. The £133,372 is lost from the people of Ashby.

In my attempts to obtain more information on the question of S106 funds for health care by requesting copies of the procedures and minutes of the meetings between the WLCCG and NWLDC & LCC, I have been advised by NWLDC that no formal minutes of these meetings are taken.

I therefore consider that the HOSC should ask for more detailed information on these matters and that there should be more openness by both WLCCG and County and District Councils.

Surely to counter this abuse of the community is an example what the HOSC is set up for'

04 September 2018

Hello HOSC & Euan

This is a typical letter of diversion from WLCCG

Frank Bedford & I could play ping pong on multiple WLCCG answers that were the same as previous but offered to different different questions, as previous answers were insufficient.

But

My main issue has always been the lack of visibility of how WLCCG & LCC & NWLDC work together.

I repeatedly asked to see the Joint Procedures that controlled this. Latterly Bev Smith Chief Exec. NWLDC has told me there is none & no minutes of how decisions that affect the people of Ashby are taken.

Frank nor I can find any letter referred to as being sent to him dated 22 January 2017 or any letter or email he himself had sent to WLCCG requesting information in relation to S106 monies in the period leading up to that date referred to in point 3 of WLCCGs response, despite all correspondence being saved in both paper and electronic form. Perhaps it can be resent.

As I understand WLCCGs response point 4 - S106 monies from a Developer reflect the size of the new development and its take of existing resources, to boost the same. The fact that money is not taken confuses me. Further, in respect of WLCCG's point 4, I attach a copy of the S106 agreement. It will be noted, unless I am reading this incorrectly, that the £133,000 contribution is not payable in lieu of the land not being required, but payable to provide health facilities elsewhere, should the health centre not be provided within the development site. i.e. **it is still required to be paid.**

__Anyway

The bulk of the remarks from the previous Ashby Civic Society question remain unchallenged by WLCCG and require addressing at the HOSC cttee meeting.

This is still of major concern to Ashby Civic Society.

Thankyou

Ian Webb & Frank Bedford

This page is intentionally left blank