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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The population of the Shire of Busselton and Augusta-Margaret River is growing rapidly with an estimated population of 55,000 by 2016. This equates to an additional 20,000 people over the next 10 years. This population growth and the ageing population will place increasing demands on health services in the area.

Due to the increasing population in the region, it is critical that a new Hospital and Health Centre is provided. In November 2005, the Minister for Health announced that the government has allocated $65 million for the replacement of Busselton Hospital and the Kevin Cullen Community Health Centre. The aim is have a facility up and running by 2010.

A public consultation process was undertaken to provide the community with an opportunity for providing feedback about the proposed replacement of the hospital and Health Centre. The public consultation process began in December 2005 and finished in early April 2006. It involved a desk study, public presentations, stakeholder interviews and focus group discussions.

The public consultation process aimed to engage a diverse selection of stakeholders to obtain feedback about the proposed Hospital and Health Centre replacement and to understand stakeholder issues, concerns and priorities.

A desk study involving the review of all existing documentation referring to or discussing the Busselton Hospital and Health Centre replacement has been conducted to understand the existing information available and the debate surrounding the issue.

A series of public presentations were held throughout December 2005 to March 2006 to inform the community and key stakeholders of the proposed new Hospital and Health Centre facility (see Appendix A). The presentations were followed by a question and answer session to understand the community’s views and preferences for site selection.

Submission forms were prepared by the Department of Health and made available to participants at various locations. The forms explored stakeholder preferences for developing the new Hospital and Health Centre on the current site and the Vasse site and to identify any key issues and concerns (see Appendix A). Public submissions on the issue were accepted until 31 March 2006.

A total of 978 submission forms were received. The vast majority of respondents (67.7%, 653) were from Busselton and the second largest group (10.5%, 101) were from Dunsborough. Demographic questions about respondents’ age and gender were not included, making it difficult to analyse associations between the responses and demographic characteristics.

Focus group discussions and stakeholder interviews were conducted during March to April 2006 with a range of key stakeholder groups in the Shire of Busselton and Augusta-Margaret River including health professionals, special interest groups and the community. The focus groups and stakeholder interviews aimed to engage a diverse range of community members to scope stakeholder sentiment and opinion on the site selection for the Busselton Hospital and Health Centre and to gain an understanding of the issues associated with this choice (see Appendix C).
**Consultation Outcomes**

Achieving the best health outcome for the community and the region was the primary concern for all stakeholders. Medical staff, special interest groups and the community requested a demonstrated healthcare model that will achieve improved health outcomes.

Participants are willing to make several trade-offs including travelling an extra distance and losing the beachside location in order to obtain a facility that is new, improved and offers a larger range of services.

The community was unwilling to accept the relocation of the hospital and the potential loss of the Busselton Hospital and Health Centre land if they were not going to obtain a newer and improved facility that demonstrates improved health outcomes for the community and the region.

The proposed facility and site selection needs to demonstrate:

- An improved facility with additional services;
- A health care model based on best practice with a demonstrated rationale;
- A regionally compatible and complimentary facility; and
- Site characteristics including accessibility, centrality, local environment and the ownership, size and future of the current hospital and Health Centre land.

**Facilities and Services**

- Stakeholders identified a need to upgrade the existing hospital and provide additional facilities and services including:
  - Additional and upgraded theatres;
  - Casualty/emergency department;
  - X-ray department;
  - Rooms for visiting specialists at the hospital;
  - Upgrade to obstetrics and theatres;
  - Improved labour ward;
  - Theatres with lamina flow;
  - Increased number of beds;
  - Longer term planning for not just the next 10 to 15 years but out to 30 years;
  - High dependency unit;
  - Intensive care unit;
  - Additional storage space;
  - Mental health;
  - Better palliative care facilities and cancer treatment opportunities;
24 hour care and a doctor on site; and
- Enough parking to satisfy future demands.

- Special interest groups and the general community requested that research be conducted to identify the health needs of the area and that experts in these fields decide what the best health facility and site should be.

- There are concerns that the community-built and run hospice could not be recreated at an alternative site and that relocation of this facility would result in a loss of a community-owned facility, detracting from the identity of the area.

**Health Care Outcomes**

- The various organisational structures need to be assessed and the model selected that best suits the health model, is responsive to future health needs and able to deliver the optimum health care to the community most efficiently and cost effectively now and into the future.

- Stakeholders were supportive of co-location with a private facility and believed that this could occur on the existing site as well as on alternative sites. They believe that co-location would result in better health outcomes because:
  - facilities and services are shared;
  - resources are maximised;
  - costs and resources are shared;
  - specialists are attracted to work within these environments; and
  - additional services are offered.

- The extent to which some or all the services are provided within one site needs to be assessed and the model selected that meets the needs and level of service that is feasible to provide on the site. This service should not impact on the overall level of care that is provided throughout the region.

**Regional Context and Integration**

- It is critical that in fulfilling the staffing needs for the new hospital and Health Centre, the potential impact it may have on existing hospitals in the area including Bunbury and Augusta-Margaret River are considered. Staff being withdrawn from these facilities to work at the new Busselton Hospital should be avoided.

- The new facility should be considered within the regional context. The facilities and services provided should be complimentary to the other health services in the region. There should be a clear rationalisation of all health facilities in the South West Region and a justification of where and why the new hospital fits in with and compliments the health needs of the region.
Site Characteristics

- Traffic and access to the main roads is a critical consideration. It is important that the hospital is easily accessible and that there are no major traffic issues.

- A new site must take into consideration proximity to population centres, the airport for the flying doctors and proximity to ambulances.

- Easy access to the hospital must be provided on the existing site or an alternative site with easier entry and a drive-in/drive-out facility.

- Stakeholders are concerned that if the hospital is to be relocated, there will be additional travel time and distance to the new facility. There are concerns that Busselton doctors will not visit their patients in hospital because the additional travel time and distance will adversely impact on them financially.

- There is also a concern that volunteers and staff may be lost if the hospital is moved beyond walking distance or a short driving distance.

- It was suggested that if the hospital is relocated, it should be no more than five minutes away and central to Busselton and projected population growth.

Local Environment

- The natural and beachside location of the current hospital is perceived to be therapeutic and relaxing for patients and visitors. On the other hand, medical staff mentioned that the increasing healthcare trend is to treat patients as quickly as possible and release them within the shortest time possible, leaving little time to enjoy these natural settings.

- Protecting the possums on the current site is seen as important by a small group of respondents. Hospital staff explained that possums create problems because they get into the air-conditioning vents.

- If there are no health benefits for relocating the hospital, the community believe that the current site is too precious and significant to lose.

- There are concerns that the Vasse site is a swamp that is prone to flooding. The community urge that the likelihood for flooding on any proposed site is investigated thoroughly.

Land Ownership, Size and Future

- It is critical to stakeholders that the land selected for the new hospital and Health Centre has appropriate room for expansion to meet future demands including parking.

- Although the land was not gifted, stakeholders have a perception that the land was gifted to the community by the Lilly family and should remain in the community’s possession. Most people believe that the proposed upgrade to the hospital can occur on the current site.
• If the hospital is to be relocated, a clear justification needs to be provided and the remaining land should be used for health or public purposes.

Other Issues Raised
• There was concern that the decision about the site of the hospital has already been made and that the community consultation outcome will have little or no influence.
• The vast majority of stakeholders enquired about the decision making process for selecting the hospital site and facility. All stakeholder groups asked if the community consultation, technical and financial reports will be public documents.
1. INTRODUCTION

The population of the Shire of Busselton and Augusta-Margaret River is growing rapidly with an estimated population of 55,000 by 2016. This equates to an additional 20,000 people over the next 10 years. This population growth and the ageing population will place increasing demands on health services in the area.

The Western Australian Country Health Service has identified a number of key issues as part of health planning for the region including consideration of the increasing demand that will be placed on Busselton Hospital and Health Centre as a result of population increases. It is well recognised that the community needs to be provided with improved health services that can be easily accessed to ensure that they are confident with the services provided.

Due to the increasing population in the region, it is critical that a new Hospital and Health Centre is provided. In November 2005, the Minister for Health announced that the government has allocated $65 million for the replacement of Busselton Hospital and the Kevin Cullen Community Health Centre. The aim is have a facility up and running by 2010.

The minister also announced a public consultation process to provide the community with an opportunity for providing feedback about the proposed replacement of the hospital and Health Centre.

The public consultation process aimed to:

- Engage a diverse selection of stakeholders to obtain feedback about the proposed Hospital and Health Centre replacement;
- Understand stakeholder issues, concerns and priorities regarding the Hospital and Health Centre replacement; and
- Identify preferences for the hospital site and the key issues to be considered during the site selection process.

The public consultation process began in December 2005 and involved:

- Presentations to the community outlining the positive and negative impacts of building a new Hospital and Health Centre on the current site, at new site at Vasse, or on a site yet to be identified. The presentations were made in Busselton and Dunsborough throughout December 2005 to March 2006;
- Submission forms requesting feedback from the community about the proposed replacement were distributed to participants at presentations and were available online; and
- Stakeholder interviews and focus group discussions were held with a diverse range of stakeholders from March to April 2006.
2. METHODOLOGY

The diagram below illustrates the methodology used to consult with the community and stakeholders from the Shire of Busselton and surrounding areas.

2.1 Desk Study

A review of all existing documentation referring to or discussing the Busselton Hospital and Health Centre replacement has been conducted to understand the existing information available and the debate surrounding the issues. Documents reviewed include:

- Newspaper articles including press releases and editorials;
- Background papers; and
- Health related research documents.

The main themes emerging from this documentation has been summarised at Section 3.
2.2 Public Presentations

A series of public presentations were held throughout December 2005 to March 2006 to inform the community and key stakeholders of the proposed new Hospital and Health Centre facility (see Appendix A). The presentations were followed by a question and answer session to understand the community’s views and preferences for site selection.

2.3 Submission Forms

Submission forms were prepared by the Department of Health and made available to participants at various locations including:

- Public presentations;
- GP practices in the region;
- Busselton Hospital and Health Centre;
- Libraries;
- Shire offices;
- Local MP offices; and
- Western Australian Country Health Services Offices in Busselton.

Feedback could also be provided using the ‘Have Your Say’ address at haveyoursay@health.wa.gov.au.

The forms explored stakeholder preferences for developing the new Hospital and Health Centre on the current site and the Vasse site and to identify any key issues and concerns (see Appendix A).

Public submissions on the issue were accepted until 31 March 2006.

2.4 Focus Group Discussions and Stakeholder Interviews

Focus group discussions and stakeholder interviews were conducted with a range of key stakeholder groups in the Shire of Busselton and Augusta-Margaret River including health professionals, special interest groups and the community.

The focus groups and stakeholder interviews aimed to engage a diverse range of community members to scope stakeholder sentiment and opinion on the site selection for the Busselton Hospital and Health Centre and to gain an understanding of the issues associated with this choice.

The following stakeholder groups were consulted:

- Busselton Hospital and Health Centre Staff;
- Medical Services (Busselton, Dunsborough, Bunbury, Margaret River and Augusta);
- Volunteer Organisations;
• Local Community Groups;
• Shire of Busselton Community (West Ward, Central Ward, East Ward); and
• Developers.

Refer to Appendix C for a detailed outline of focus group and stakeholder interview participation.

A discussion guide was developed to ensure that the following key consideration areas were explored (see Appendix A):

• Centrality of site;
• Accessibility to site;
• Environment / atmosphere of site;
• Facilities and services;
• Future population growth and demands on current services;
• Use of existing land;
• Other considerations; and
• Information requirements.

2.5 Analysis and Reporting

Quantitative data derived from the submission forms was entered into an Excel spreadsheet for data analysis.

Qualitative data was categorised into common themes and issues. These categories were coded and entered into Excel to be included in the data analysis. Frequency analysis was conducted to identify general perceptions about the Hospital and Health Centre replacement, as well as emerging issues and concerns.

Qualitative data derived from the stakeholder interviews and focus group discussions were recorded and analysed using a variety of analytical tools. Analysing the qualitative data included noting patterns and themes emerging from the data, clustering similar patterns and themes together in order to discuss the data in terms of categories rather than individual cases or ideas and finally identifying conceptual and theoretical trends in the data.
3. DESK STUDY FINDINGS

One of the major issues and points of discussion amongst the community has been centred on the location of the new facility. The two sites that have dominated public debate are Vasse Newton and the existing Hospital Site. The key differences between these sites include:

- **Site Characteristics**: Vasse is located on flat pastoral land with occasional mature trees. The existing site is located on raised land on the coastal strip. The area between the hospital and Geographe Bay is densely vegetated and includes a recreational walking path.

- **Land Ownership**: The Vasse site is privately owned land. The owner supports the relocation of the hospital to this site. The existing hospital site is Crown Land with no ownership issues.

- **Accessibility by Road**: Accessibility by vehicles to the Vasse site is considered to be very good, with excellent visibility. For the existing site, accessibility and visibility are considered to be good.

- **Accessibility to Catchment (qualitative impression only)**: Vasse has been identified as a growth area, and supports both local and district catchments. The existing site supports the local Busselton catchment well, but the district catchment is perceived to be less well catered for.

- **Proximity to Support Services**: At the Vasse location, it is envisioned that local support services (including aged persons accommodation, medical centre and private hospital) could be provided on site. At the Busselton site, the majority of support services will be located in the town centre, but not within walking distance of the major facility.

If the hospital is located to the Vasse site, it will enable the land at the existing site to be sold. It is estimated that the land is worth $30 million.

There has been significant coverage of this issue in the media including articles in the local papers, letters to the editor (The Mail) and stories on ABC radio and ABC Online. Some of the key issues that have emerged are summarised below:

**Support for the existing site**

- The existing hospital site should be kept to “allow public use and enjoyment ... these areas should not become the sole domain of those able to afford high cost residences or holidays in luxury resorts” (Letters to the Editor, 22 March 2006).

- The attractiveness of the existing site is “unsurpassed anywhere in Australia for the magnificent views enjoyed by all who are convalescing and recuperating from their illness” (Letters to the Editor, date unknown).

- Removing the hospital from the existing site is letting “developers take away a beautiful location just because the land is priceless”. Hospitals should be built at both locations (Letters to the Editor, 29 March 2006).

- The current Busselton site has more opportunity for expansion than the proposed Vasse site. There are a number of subdivisions proposed for the
area defined by Georgina Molloy School, to the cemetery, to Queen Elizabeth Avenue. This will be a larger, more populated area than Vasse, and makes the use of the existing site appropriate as it is more centralised (Letters to the Editor, date unknown).

- There is enough land to build a new hospital at the existing site, and the site has worked successfully for more than 30 years (Jill Riley, ABC News Online, 23 February 2006).

- It has been suggested that if the hospital is relocated to Vasse, doctors will not service the new facility and patients (many without private vehicles) will have to travel too far. Participants at the meeting on 21 February noted that “we want the new hospital built on the same site with twice the capacity we’ve got today”.

- The Vasse site sits on a floodplain.

**Support for relocation to the Vasse site**

- If the hospital is relocated, the sale of the land could go towards the expansion of the new facility. This would “give our region a much better facility worth $95 million” (Letters to the Editor, 22 March 2006).

- Given rising sea levels associated with global warming, the hospital should be relocated from its current oceanfront location, particularly as much of Busselton is located on a low lying coastal strip. Essential services including hospitals should be relocated to higher ground (Letters to the Editor, 29 March 2006).

- Building a hospital at Vasse creates opportunities for collaboration with other services including aged care health facilities. “This could be a demonstrative project of national significance. It requires people to understand that you can achieve a great deal when working together” (Russell Halpern, St Ives Director, TM, 15 March 2006).

- The hospital should be for the whole region, not just for Busselton. Locating it at Vasse would make it easier for the whole region to be accessed.

- It is taking regional visitors an increasingly longer time to access emergency services at Busselton Hospital. One doctor has noted that it used to take 12 minutes to travel from Dunsborough to Busselton; it now takes 25 minutes.

**Other**

The State Government should provide an extra $15 million (to give a total of $80 million funding) with $20 million going towards upgrading the Busselton Hospital and the remainder going towards a new hospital in Dunsborough (Letters to the Editor, 15 March 2006).
4. CONSULTATION OUTCOMES

4.1 Submission Forms

A total of 978 submission forms were received by the closing date of 31 March 2006.

The forms did not ask demographic questions about respondents such as gender or age. For this reason, it is difficult to determine any association between demographic characteristics and submission form responses.

As illustrated in the table below, the vast majority of respondents (67.7%, 653) were from Busselton and the second largest group (10.5%, 101) were from Dunsborough.

It is important to note that the results are mostly reflective of Busselton residents, followed by a smaller proportion of Dunsborough residents and an even smaller number of respondents from various other localities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suburb</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abbey</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augusta</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridgetown</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadwater</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bunbury</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Busselton</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>67.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capel</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowaramup</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunsborough</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographe</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret River</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Geographe</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Most people (861, 95.9%) do not have any objections to being included on a register of submissions.

Only 4.1% (37) have an objection.

95.1% (842) believe that they have sufficient information to make an informed decision.

Only 4.9% (43) believe they do not have enough information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suburb</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quindalup</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vasse</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Busselton</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yallingup</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (max. of two people from a range of 55 suburbs)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>965</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Do you have any objections to being included on a register of submissions?**

- Yes: 4.1%
- No: 95.9%

**Do you believe you have sufficient information to make an informed decision?**

- Yes: 95.1%
- No: 4.9%
Do you support the new hospital being built at Vasse?

- 28.2% (274) support the new Hospital/Health Centre being built in Vasse and 71.8% (696) do not.

Do you support the new hospital being built on the current site?

- 73.3% (656) support the new Hospital/Health Centre being built on the current site and 26.7% (239) do not.

**Reasons for supporting new Hospital and Health Centre in Vasse**

The majority of respondents (22.3%, 109) who support the development of a new Hospital and Health Centre in Vasse believe that Vasse is a better location for a regional Hospital and Health Centre as it is more central to residents of Dunsborough, Margaret River and the surrounding areas.

Other reasons for supporting the new hospital in Vasse include:

- The site will better accommodate longer term demands resulting from population growth (9.6%, 47);
- The facility will attract specialist services as it will have a private facility and specialists prefer to operate within this environment (9.6%, 47);
- Vasse will allow the co-location of Hospital and Health Centres that would enable the sharing of ancillary services and the opportunity for extending medical facilities (8.8%, 43);
- There is excellent access from the Bypass for emergency vehicles and the general public (8.6%, 42);
There are regional benefits. The site selection should be based on regional benefits and not just benefits to Busselton residents (8.4%, 41);

The site is clean and unencumbered providing an opportunity for a new beginning (8.4%, 41);

The new site is close to the university, providing opportunity for lecturers and students to use the Hospital and Health Centre and vice versa (8%, 39).

8.2% of respondents (40) mentioned that adequate public transport needs to be provided if the new hospital is built in Vasse.

8.2% of respondents (40) also mentioned that research needs to be conducted to ensure that the proposed upgrade to the Hospital and Health Centre will meet future needs such as population growth.

Reasons for not supporting new Hospital and Health Centre in Busselton

The largest proportion (22.7%, 177) of respondents who did not support the new Hospital and Health Centre in Busselton felt it was not accessible and central to surrounding regional areas and towns. 10.5% (82) of these respondents consider Vasse to be the fastest growing area in the Shire of Busselton.

A large proportion of respondents (20%, 156) believe that the land at the existing site is prime real estate which should not be used for a Hospital and Health Centre. Funds from the sale of the Hospital and Health Centre land could be more effectively utilised elsewhere.

Other reasons for not supporting the new Hospital and Health Centre in Busselton are:

- The noise and dust from constructing a new Hospital and Health Centre next to the old Hospital and Health Centre may adversely affect patients (10%, 78);
- The Vasse site has better accessibility for emergency vehicles and the general public because it is located near the Bypass (9.7%, 76);
- The current location is not easily accessible as it is located near the very busy Bussell Highway (9.7%, 76);
- It would be more cost effective to build a new Hospital and Health Centre on an alternative site. Older structures are more costly to work on (9.5%, 74);
- A Hospital and Health Centre at the Vasse site would provide specialist services that are currently unavailable in the Busselton area. This would avoid long trips to Bunbury or Perth for specialist services (9.3%, 73);
- New growth in the Vasse Newtown area will attract industrial areas. The Hospital and Health Centre need to be close by as there is potential for accidents in industrial areas (9.2%, 72).

10% of respondents (78) would like the existing Hospital and Health Centre to be retained as a long-term healthcare facility (including services such as aged care) as well as the construction of a new hospital in Vasse to service future demands.
Summary of Comments

The Vasse site provides excellent access from the highway for all vehicles, especially for ambulances and other emergency vehicles. In addition, there are no traffic lights which may decrease travelling time.

On the other hand, the Busselton site has limited and slower access due to the increasingly busy Bussell Highway and the set of lights in the approach to the Hospital. It is essential that if Vasse is the preferred site, adequate public transport for patients and visitors be provided.

Respondents suggested that research should be conducted to ensure that the upgrade of the hospital is capable of meeting future needs resulting from population growth. The decision to relocate the hospital should be based on regional benefits and not just on benefits to Busselton residents.

Respondents felt that the existing site was prime land for development. The funds generated by selling the land could be utilised to develop a central state-of-the-art hospital at Vasse. Some respondents felt that the present hospital could also be retained as a healthcare facility such as an aged care home.

As the present healthcare system aims to get people in and out of hospital as quickly as possible, a seaside outlook is unnecessary. Patients will not have time to go and sit by the beach.

Reasons for supporting new Hospital and Health Centre in Busselton

The largest proportion of respondents (15.5%, 125) who support the new Hospital and Health Centre in Busselton do so because they believe that the current site has plenty of land to extend and upgrade the existing Hospital and Health Centre or to build a new Hospital and Health Centre.

Respondents (14.7%, 119) explained that the current site is central to present and future Busselton residents and visitors. 10% (81) said there is existing infrastructure in place as it is close to shops and facilities including doctors’ surgeries, chemists and clinics.

10.4% (84) explained that the population of Busselton requires a central Hospital and Health Centre due to expanding housing developments in the region including the south, east and west regions. While 10.1% (82) explained that the present Hospital and Health Centre is centrally located for all the surrounding regional areas.

Other reasons for supporting the new Hospital and Health Centre in Busselton are:

- Established tranquil surroundings that are therapeutic and conducive to improved patient recovery. Visitors to Hospital and Health Centre also benefit from the beachside environment (13.7%, 111);
- Patients are familiar with the departments and the staff at the existing Hospital and Health Centre (10.8%, 87);
- Upgrading the existing Hospital and Health Centre is more cost effective than building a new Hospital and Health Centre on a new site (10%, 81);
- Concerns about losing the community-built hospice which is a self funded facility supported by the community and general public. There have been
no offers from the government with regards to the funding for this facility (10%, 81);

- Busselton TAFE and Senior High School campuses are within walking distance for students undertaking health studies (9.9%, 80);
- Concerns about losing the Busselton Hospital and Health Centre land which is designated for public use to a private developer (9.9%, 80);
- Additional travelling distance and time for volunteers (9.9%, 80);
- Not enough proposed beds at the Vasse site (9.9%, 80);
- No structural problems have been given for existing Hospital and Health Centre to be replaced, so why move it? (9.9%, 80).

A proportion of respondents (10.4%, 84) believe that the government, developers and Councillors are not thinking about the best health outcomes for the community because they are only thinking of making money out of the Hospital and Health Centre land.

9.9% of respondents (80) found it difficult to support either way as there have been no plans drawn up for the new Hospital and Health Centre on the existing site.

Reasons for not supporting new Hospital and Health Centre in Vasse

Respondents did not support the new hospital being built in Vasse because they believe the proposed site is:

- Not central to Busselton. It is too far for staff, patients and visitors, especially the elderly and disadvantaged. It is not central to doctors in case of an emergency, the airport for the flying doctors or to shops and chemists (9.5%, 173);
- Not good value for money. The proposed site at Vasse is smaller than the existing site at Busselton and there are not enough beds, medical facilities or operating theatres for the costs involved. The funds that are on offer from the government fall short of the projected cost of the building (9.5%, 173);
- The Vasse site is inappropriate because it is a wetland area and floods quite regularly. There are also swarms of mosquitoes which can be a health issue as they can carry Ross River Virus and other diseases (5.5%, 100);
- Relocating the Hospital and Health Centre to Vasse would cause disruption to existing facilities (5.2%, 94);
- Noise levels at the proposed site due to residential housing and busy roads is an issue (5.2%, 94);
- The ambulance centre is close to Busselton Hospital and Health Centre. The relocation of the Hospital and Health Centre would make the ambulance journey longer and more dangerous as the distance from the ambulance centre to the Hospital and Health Centre is critical in an emergency (5.2%, 94);
• Concerns by the community about loss of doctors and volunteers if the Hospital and Health Centre site changes as it is too far for existing volunteers and doctors to travel (5.2%, 94);

• The Vasse site disadvantages East Busselton, Geographe, Port Geographe and Capel residents (5.2%, 94);

• Amenities such as doctors, chemists, shops and transport are not available at the proposed site (5.1%, 93);

• Concern that the proposed facility on the Vasse site will not meet the needs of future population in the area (5.1%, 93).

Respondents did not support the new Hospital and Health Centre in Vasse because they believe:

• The current site has established tranquil surroundings that are therapeutic and conducive to improved patient recovery. Visitors to Hospital and Health Centre also benefit from the beachside environment (6.5%, 119);

• The existing hospital site works well and respondents questioned the need to change the site (6.1%, 112);

• The current site is designated for public use and respondents are concerned that it will be lost to the community and taken by developers (5.3%, 97);

• Concerns about losing community-built hospice (5.2%, 94).

Other reasons for not supporting the new hospital at Vasse include:

• Concerns that the developers, the government and the wealthy and not the general public will be the ones to benefit from the relocation of the Hospital and Health Centre (5.9%, 107);

• The costs and time involved in establishing a new Hospital and Health Centre at a new site is too high and timelines are a factor (5.1%, 93).

Several respondents (5.3%, 97) suggested the strengthening of hospitals in the area by retaining the existing site and building a new Hospital and Health Centre at an alternative location.

Summary of Comments

Respondents expressed concern about increased costs associated with travelling to a new site. Taxi fares may be prohibitive for pensioners and the unemployed. Retired and low income volunteers have also indicated that they would be unable to absorb the extra costs associated with travel expenses.

The environment at the current site is perceived to be irreplaceable. The hospital’s proximity to the ocean is considered to be very therapeutic and beneficial to the wellbeing and healing of patients and visitors. The tranquillity of the surroundings gives an opportunity for patients, especially the terminally ill, to sit quietly and enjoy nature.

It is believed that the Busselton Hospital land was donated to the Busselton community by the Lilly family. There were grave concerns that this donated land, designated for public use, would be lost to developers. It was perceived that the
developers and the government are seizing an opportunity for making money instead of thinking of the needs of the community.

Respondents believed that the deal had already been done between Government and the developers and that public consultation and submissions are a waste of time. On the other hand, respondents requested additional consultation, especially with doctors and other health service providers.

The following suggestions and comments were made by a small number of respondents:

- A complimentary clinic, specialist department or a second hospital should also be provided on the Vasse site to cater for the growing population in the whole area;
- Neither the present site nor the Vasse site should be selected and other sites should be considered;
- A psychiatric section should be added to the present hospital;
- The St Ives nursing home is too expensive for the average person; and
- The habitat of the endangered Ringtail Possum at the current site should be retained.

4.2 Stakeholder Interviews

Stakeholders requested that the future Busselton hospital be considered by a proper business case considering the expenses associated with the various options. All stakeholders believe that it is important to plan and build a hospital that will provide the best regional healthcare outcomes for the area and the region now and in the future.

It was suggested that the following considerations be explored when selecting the site for the new hospital:

- Clinical services plan outlining health needs including regional healthcare implications;
- Medical workforce planning including attracting and retaining staff;
- Models in healthcare including co-location of services and types of combined facilities agreements that may be needed;
- Site selection taking into account centrality to population and staff and room for expansion;
- Access to the site including the provision of adequate public transport to the Hospital and Health Centre;
- Easy to find and good visibility;
- Sufficient parking;
- Appropriate number of beds (not too many, not too few);
• Associated health services including costs to service providers such as florists, funeral homes, allied health, doctors rooms etc;
• Potential reduction in business to shops that currently service Hospital and Health Centre staff, patients and visitors;
• Construction of the facility and the potential disruption to services;
• Planning and approvals;
• Conference rooms for conferences, meetings and to facilitate patient complaint sessions;
• The potential for flooding on the site;
• Mosquitoes and midges on the site.

One stakeholder suggested that the Peel health campus model be explored as an example of an alternative public/private operational model facility.

To following points were also made by respondents during the interviews:

• The potential for co-locating a private and public facility should be considered in order to share health services, specialist staff and the recurrent costs such as heating and cooling. The opportunity for creating a teaching hospital should also be explored.

• Several choices for funding should be explored including leasing the Hospital and Health Centre. This would have advantages such as provision of state-of-the-art equipment and a good level of maintenance.

• The hospital needs to be considered within the regional context and its role should be clearly defined. It should be able to meet increased summer demand while focusing on in-home care including mobile nursing and GP services.

• The hospital site should be central to the bulk of the population and close to other services including fire, police and allied health services. It should also be close to aged care facilities including the hospice.

• There is a belief amongst stakeholders that the aesthetic value of the beachside location of the site is good for staff, patients and their visitors. It was also mentioned that the beachside location is a community asset that should remain a community asset whether the hospital remains on the current site or is relocated to an alternative site.

• If the new hospital is built on the current site, it should be constructed closer to the road to avoid disrupting current services. A single-storey facility is preferred as it is better for staffing, accessibility and evacuation.

• Some stakeholders believed that the current site is more suited to accommodate future expansion in comparison to the Vasse site. It was also suggested that the allocated $65M be invested in building a better hospital facility and not on purchasing new land.

• The space, power and telecommunications at the current site require upgrading. The following are needed to ensure that state-of-the-art services are provided:
High-speed broadband communications throughout the Hospital and Health Centre, for tele-medicine (prefer 50MB line);

Adequate numbers of telephones;

Reliable power supplies and adequate back supply enough to run the MRI and CT (MRI will be needed within the next 10 years);

X-ray needs to be next to Emergency Department;

Deep sewerage for nuclear medicine;

Good access to nuclear medicine to get the supplies in quickly and safely;

Room for growth in radiology; and

A single provider to avoid limitation of services due to the high cost of equipment.

4.3 Focus Group Discussions

Focus group discussions were conducted with a range of key stakeholder groups in the Shire of Busselton and Augusta-Margaret River including health professionals, special interest groups and the community. The outcomes of the focus group discussions are outlined in the tables below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>BUSSELTON MEDICAL PRACTICES</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACCESSIBILITY</strong></td>
<td><strong>FACILITIES &amp; SERVICES</strong></td>
<td><strong>LOCAL ENVIRONMENT</strong></td>
<td><strong>SITE LOCATION &amp; LAND</strong></td>
<td><strong>OTHER COMMENTS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased distance and travel time to a new site will be an issue for ambulance drivers and volunteers because:</td>
<td>There is a need for the hospital to be upgraded. Suggested improvements include:</td>
<td>The Vasse site has less available land to accommodate future expansion. The current site has sufficient land to accommodate future expansion. There are no perceived limitations to the height or width of the building on this site.</td>
<td>The hospital should remain at the existing site. Proximity to the hospital is crucial for Busselton GPs as they have homes and surgeries within five minutes from the present hospital site, making emergency situations and call-outs easier to accommodate.</td>
<td>The standard of care provided by Busselton doctors may diminish due the financial impact of having to travel the extra distance to visit patients, especially those who require multiple visits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Busselton ambulance drivers will have to travel from the existing site to pick up patients, drive to the new hospital and then return to the existing site.</td>
<td>• Quality theatres with lamina flow to alleviate the need for local patientsto go to Bunbury or Perth for some procedures</td>
<td>• There is also close to the beach creating a therapeutic environment for both patients and their families.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Doctors spoke of the model used by Dunsborough doctors who share hospital visits. One doctor from a practice will see all patients in the hospital. This is seen as providing less of a service than being seen by your own doctor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Many volunteers walk to the hospital. If the hospital is relocated beyond a short walking distance from the Busselton Town Centre, there is a risk that many of these people will be unable to continue volunteering.</td>
<td>• Casualty/ emergency department</td>
<td>• If the hospital is to be relocated, the land should be sold and the money should be utilised for health purposes.</td>
<td></td>
<td>There are concerns that the current proposal only replaces the existing services and that this is short sighted. More facilities are needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relocation of the hospital should not be more than five minutes from the present site to ensure that it stays close to the population centre.</td>
<td>• X-ray department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>It is important that the rationale behind the decision is clearly communicated to the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to the existing site is problematic for emergency vehicles because the right hand turn requires that you slow down to turn this corner. However, they feel this can be managed with improvements to the road layout.</td>
<td>• Rooms for visiting specialists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A better labour ward It was assumed that the future hospital will be staffed with GPs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It is important that the rationale behind the decision is clearly communicated to the community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# MARGARET RIVER AND AUGUSTA MEDICAL SERVICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACCESSIBILITY</th>
<th>FACILITIES &amp; SERVICES</th>
<th>LOCAL ENVIRONMENT</th>
<th>SITE LOCATION &amp; LAND</th>
<th>OTHER COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site must have space for future expansion. Traffic and access to main roads are important issues.</td>
<td>It should not just be an upgrade of the structure of the hospital; it should be an upgrade of the services provided. Additional services should include: • Increased number of beds; • High dependency Unit; • Intensive Care Unit; and • Upgrade to obstetrics and theatres. Support co-location model.</td>
<td>The site should be retained by the Health Department to meet longer term health care needs for the area. Vasse as a site is too small to allow for future expansion.</td>
<td>Location is not seen as the central issue. Preference is for present site. If the hospital is to be relocated, they want the Health Department to retain the land with the possibility of using it for • Aged care; and • Mental Health Care facilities</td>
<td>Upgrade Bunbury Health Campus to a tertiary hospital and Busselton should become a regional hospital. This would reduce patient travel to Bunbury and Perth. Look at the workload currently sent to Perth. Use this information to determine what services could be located in the region. Continue functioning of the hospital on the present site during the construction stage. Community wants transparency in decision making. Ongoing community consultation is necessary. Medical model needs to be discussed. Will the reports become public documents?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LOCAL COMMUNITY ORGANISATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACCESSIBILITY</th>
<th>FACILITIES &amp; SERVICES</th>
<th>LOCAL ENVIRONMENT</th>
<th>SITE LOCATION &amp; LAND</th>
<th>OTHER COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The key criteria are:</td>
<td>Concerned that the Vasse site is too small to cater for expansion and the predicted population growth. The present location is central to volunteers and it needs to remain central. The stakeholders were in favour of co-location of public and private hospitals because this will improve the quality and range of service offered. It will also result in cost saving opportunities from sharing facilities. It is possible to co-locate on the present site. Do not want to see the hospital moved. Do not want the land sold or developed into residential.</td>
<td>Stakeholders felt strongly that the $65M that has been set aside should be spent on the upgrade of the hospital – both upgrading the building and extending services. Concerned that buying land at Vasse would diminish the amount left for investing in badly needed infrastructure. The planned hospital has no increased bed allocation. The hospital should be bigger with more technology.</td>
<td>The Vasse site is a swamp. It is only 1.5 metres above sea level. Stakeholders believe that money will best be spent building a new facility on the current site. Concerned that the health fund will be spent on land fill. The area surrounding the hospital is therapeutic and an asset to the community, especially the hospice patients.</td>
<td>Are prepared to accept expansion of facility on current site including height and width. The current location would support a two-storey building if necessary. Want accountability of the decision making process. The decision about the need for services should be made by medical experts. The community needs more services and hope the money will be spent upgrading the hospital and the services. The stakeholder would like to be informed of the rationale behind the decision.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VOLUNTEER ORGANISATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACCESSIBILITY</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits of the Vasse site:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Multiple entry points to the hospital;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Close to main highways and population centres.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The current site has the following access problems:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Bussell Highway can get very busy making access to the hospital difficult;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The problem is particularly acute for the ambulance drivers who traverse a difficult stretch of uneven road from Dunsborough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The right hand turn into the hospital is very tight and ambulances must slow to a crawl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy access to the hospital is a major design feature that must be addressed in the new hospital plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access into the hospital building made easier with a drive-in/drive-out facility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most of these concerns can be addressed at the present site with modifications to the roads.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FACILITIES &amp; SERVICES</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The new hospital needs to allow for future expansion. The Vasse site is too small to accommodate future growth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred option is to upgrade the facilities on the present site as the land surrounding the existing hospital is large enough to accommodate future expansion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not want the land sold. The land should remain in the hands of the community, possibly for public open space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOCAL ENVIRONMENT</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The stakeholders would like to see the infrastructure of the hospital substantially upgraded with provision of additional services including:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• More beds;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improved emergency department;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Better palliative care facilities;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cancer treatment opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SITE LOCATION &amp; LAND</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The environment at the present location is viewed as perfect for a hospital.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The present location is viewed as central and will continue to be central given the proposed residential developments in the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location is considerably important to the volunteers that operate from the hospital. For example, Meals on Wheels is situated at the hospital, as they use the kitchen to cook the meals and their clients are central to the hospital.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ambience is conducive to better health outcomes and proximity to the beach is seen as an asset that would be difficult to replace.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders do not believe it is worth losing this site. In contrast, the Vasse site is seen as less than ideal as it is small and will be surrounded by residential developments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER COMMENTS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The stakeholders are somewhat cynical about the process and would like more public debate and community consultation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The would like the decision and rationale very clearly made public.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The stakeholders see this as an opportunity to get the healthcare system they require now and for the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not want to see a short-term solution.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Most of the volunteers at the hospital are residents of the immediate vicinity. The volunteer population is elderly. If the new site is too far from the volunteer population, there may be a reduction in the volunteer workforce. Elderly may be disadvantaged if the hospital is moved from the present site as they are familiar with the existing site/route and trying to negotiate a new facility may be stressful.
**BUSSELTON HOSPITAL STAFF**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACCESSIBILITY</th>
<th>FACILITIES &amp; SERVICES</th>
<th>LOCAL ENVIRONMENT</th>
<th>SITE LOCATION &amp; LAND</th>
<th>OTHER COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Vasse was not strongly favoured because:  
• It is too small to accommodate future growth;  
• Parking demand alone will require a bigger site;  
• New site needs to consider the proximity to the airport for the Royal Flying Doctors. 
The stakeholders suggested the abattoir site as an alternative site for the hospital. | The existing hospital cannot simply be upgraded. New facilities are also needed including:  
• More theatres;  
• More storage;  
• An emergency department;  
• X-ray facilities;  
• Mental Health facilities. 
Stakeholders believe that the correct facilities would attract surgeons to the area.  
Co-location was fully supported as this would result in additional services.  
Staff are feeling the strain of working in an old hospital and look forward to the new facility.  
Do not believe they can maintain services at the present site during the construction phase. | Possums are a problem for hospital as they get into the air conditioning.  
The beachfront location of the existing site is not seen as a major asset.  
With good landscaping, hospitals can be made pleasant wherever they are located. | For most people, the site was not the major issue.  
Although the current site is convenient, a move to another site in close proximity was the preferred option.  
If the hospital moves, they do not want the land sold to developers for residential development.  
Would prefer the land to be public open space, a park or community space.  
Providing the community with the land would mitigate the loss of the hospital. | This it a perfect time to develop a healthcare plan for the region.  
The decision on the location of the hospital must be transparent with ongoing community input.  
They would like the report made public. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMUNITY – WEST WARD</th>
<th>ACCESSIBILITY</th>
<th>FACILITIES &amp; SERVICES</th>
<th>LOCAL ENVIRONMENT</th>
<th>SITE LOCATION &amp; LAND</th>
<th>OTHER COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concern that the current site has limited accessibility due to traffic volumes and a busy Bussell Highway and that this may get worse as the population increases. The Busselton Bypass would provide the best accessibility option for a hospital. Stakeholders particularly requested that ambulance access is improved.</td>
<td>Concern that the new hospital will be no bigger and offer no more services than is currently available. There is a need to upgrade services and this is an ideal time. The hospital should provide similar services to those available in Perth. A new hospital needs better: • Obstetric services; • 24 hour emergency department; • Imaging facilities; • Cancer treatment facilities. The stakeholders are excited about the potential for public-private partnerships as this will attract specialists to the area and increase the services available.</td>
<td>Selection of the site needs to consider the event of large-scale emergencies. For this reason, the hospital should be located in a safe place. Vasse is not considered a safe site because: • It is low lying and prone to flooding; • It is a swampy environment which attracts mosquitoes. The Vasse site is perceived to be unacceptable for a two-storey building. Stakeholders believed a two-storey building is better than a sprawling one-storey building.</td>
<td>They believe that valuable beachfront land could be utilised better. They recognise the site is therapeutic but suggested landscaping can provide a similar environment at any location. The area of the hospital site needs to be large enough for future expansion. The preference is to locate the hospital closer to Dunsborough on the Busselton Bypass. They doubt the suitability of the Vasse site, although they like the developer’s vision for the area. If the hospital is relocated, the land should be given to the community. They acknowledge that the existing site is large and development of the front parcel of land as residential may be an acceptable solution.</td>
<td>This is an opportunity to evaluate the health needs of the whole area. They would like to see Bunbury become a tertiary hospital and for Busselton to become a regional hospital. Would like to see the decisions for the future hospital being made by professionals with good intentions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### COMMUNITY – CENTRAL WARD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACCESSIBILITY</th>
<th>FACILITIES &amp; SERVICES</th>
<th>LOCAL ENVIRONMENT</th>
<th>SITE LOCATION &amp; LAND</th>
<th>OTHER COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The following are the considerations in determining the location:  
  - That it is centrally located;  
  - Has easy access for the whole of Busselton (which will develop inland from the current site);  
  - Provides good access to the main roads;  
  - The site must be close to ambulance facilities.  
Stakeholders believe the current site meets all these criteria.  
The Vasse site is perceived to be:  
  - Too small to allow for future development;  
  - Has inferior access to airport and the ambulance centre.  
The existing site is preferred but will consider another site that  
  - Is close to the present site;  
  - Is big enough to allow for future development.  
Building a two-storey hospital at the present site is less of an issue than at Vasse because of the surrounding residential properties. | Level of service needs to improve to ensure that patients are not required to travel to Bunbury or Perth for treatment.  
Would like increased facilities and services at the hospital.  
Would prefer that the hospital becomes a regional hospital even if this requires relocation.  
The hospital should include an upgraded emergency room.  
Strongly support a public-private hospital.  
They believe this will:  
  - Increase services through cost sharing; and  
  - Attract specialists which will in turn improve service availability. | The environment at the present site is seen as particularly beautiful and, therefore, appropriate for the hospice where patients and families can take advantage of the therapeutic setting. | The present site is the preferred location for the new hospital.  
The land should be retained for health purposes, or given to the community for a park or community facilities.  
There is strong opposition to the land being sold for residential development. | Concern that if the hospital relocates to Vasse, other services will follow.  
Increased services and facilities are the main issues for consideration.  
Would like a copy of the final report.  
Would like to know what the options are and how to provide input to the options. |
COMMUNITY – EAST WARD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACCESSIBILITY</th>
<th>FACILITIES &amp; SERVICES</th>
<th>LOCAL ENVIRONMENT</th>
<th>SITE LOCATION &amp; LAND</th>
<th>OTHER COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The current site does not appear to have any access problems, especially when compared to Perth metropolitan hospitals. Stakeholders feel that any potential access issues associated with the site can be addressed with traffic control mechanisms. If the hospital is relocated, it should be central to the population (which they believe is east of the current hospital location). It would be preferable to locate the hospital near the bypass, no further than two minutes away from the current site. | Stakeholders believe that they will get more value for money by upgrading the existing site. The upgrade should provide additional services and not simply replace the existing facility. Additional services that should be provided include:  
- A full emergency department;  
- Doctor onsite 24/7;  
- Improved palliative care;  
- Mental health facilities;  
- Sufficient parking. Stakeholders believe that there would be no disruption to services if the hospital is rebuilt on-site. Stakeholders believe that the co-location of private and public facilities would result in improved services and healthcare system. | The current site is perceived as beneficial for patients and family members of the hospice because of its beachside environment. | The hospital should remain at the present site as there are no perceived advantages to moving to an alternative site. Any decision to move the hospital to an alternative site must consider the benefits and disadvantages to the community. If the benefits outweigh the disadvantages, stakeholders have no issue with relocating the hospital. If the hospital is relocated, the land must remain in public hands, either as an aged care facility, public open space or an asset for the community. It should not be sold for residential purposes. The selected site must have room for future expansion. For this reason, the current site is preferred as there is more land available. There are concerns that if room for expansion is not provided, the hospital may need to be relocated again in 5–10 years. There are no perceived limitations to the height or width of the building on this site. | The decision must consider more than financial implications, and should take into account the character of Busselton and the longer term health needs of the region. Any new facilities should be bigger and better than the current hospital, and stakeholders want to see the same facilities that are available to Perth residents. |
5. KEY CONSIDERATIONS

Achieving the best health outcomes for the community and the region was the primary concern for all stakeholders.

Participants are willing to make several trade-offs including travelling an extra distance and losing the beachside location in order to obtain a facility that is new, improved and offers a larger range of services.

Medical staff, special interest groups and the community requested a demonstrated healthcare model that will achieve improved health outcomes. This model needs to be communicated appropriately to all the different types of stakeholders, providing the relevant level of information for each of these groups.

The community was unwilling to accept the relocation of the hospital and the potential loss of the Busselton Hospital and Health Centre land if they were not going to obtain a newer and improved facility that demonstrates improved health outcomes for the community and the region.

The diagram below illustrates the key issues and concerns emerging from the community consultation.

The proposed facility and site selection needs to demonstrate:

- An improved facility with additional services;
- A healthcare model based on best practice with a demonstrated rationale;
• A regionally compatible and complimentary facility; and
• Site characteristics including accessibility, centrality, local environment and the ownership, size and future of the current Hospital and Health Centre land.

5.1 Facilities and Services
All stakeholders identified a need to upgrade the existing hospital including the provision of additional services.

The most requested improvement was additional and upgraded theatres and it was felt that this would attract surgeons to the area. These services would also alleviate the need for patients to travel to Bunbury or Perth for common or minor surgical procedures.

Respondents felt that the hospital should be bigger and better than the existing one with new and improved technology. The facilities and services requested were:

• Casualty/emergency department;
• X-ray department;
• Rooms for visiting specialists at the hospital;
• Upgrade to obstetrics and theatres;
• Improved labour ward;
• Theatres with lamina flow;
• Increased number of beds;
• Longer term planning for not just the next 10 to 15 years but out to 30 years;
• High dependency unit;
• Intensive care unit;
• Additional storage space;
• Mental health;
• Better palliative care facilities and cancer treatment opportunities;
• 24 hour care and a doctor on-site; and
• Enough parking to satisfy future demands.

Stakeholders were concerned that if the hospital was relocated to a new site, the allocated $65M would be spent purchasing new land and not on improving the hospital facility or expanding the services provided.

Special interest groups and the general community expressed uncertainty about what health services are needed. They requested that research be conducted to identify the health needs of the area and that experts in these fields decide what the best health facility and site should be.
The hospice that is on the current site has been built and managed by the community. There are concerns that this hospice could not be recreated at an alternative site and that relocation of this facility would result in the loss of a community-owned facility, detracting from the identity of the area.

5.2 Health Care Outcomes

Organisational Structure
Stakeholders discussed the need to explore various organisational structures. This should include consideration of all degrees and variations of public and private relationships.

These options would need to be assessed and the model selected that best suited the health model. The selected model should be responsive to future health needs and able to deliver the optimum health care to the community most efficiently and cost effectively now and into the future.

Co-location
Medical staff assumed that the new hospital would continue to be staffed by GPs similar to the existing healthcare model at the current Hospital and Health Centre. Alternative models were also suggested with regional staff or hospital-employed doctors providing services.

Stakeholders were supportive of co-location with a private facility and believed that this could occur on the existing site as well as on alternative sites. They believe that co-location would result in better health outcomes because:

- Facilities and services are shared;
- Resources are maximised;
- Costs and resources are shared;
- Specialists are attracted to work within these environments; and
- Additional services are offered.

Integrated Health Services
Different models and levels of integration were discussed. These included the fully integrated Vasse model with the co-location of public and private hospitals, retirement village, aged care, hospice, allied health services, doctors’ rooms and health education. Another model discussed involves less integration, similar to the current model that has private services such as radiology provided within the public hospital.

The extent to which some or all of the services are provided within one site needs to be assessed and a model selected that meets the needs and level of service that is feasible to provide on the site. This service should not impact on the overall level of care that is provided throughout the region.
5.3 Regional Context and Integration

**Staff**

Medical staff believe that if new and improved facilities are provided at the Hospital and Health Centre, there will be no major impediments to attracting staff to the area.

It is critical that in fulfilling the staffing needs for the new Hospital and Health Centre, the potential impact it may have on existing hospitals in the area, including Bunbury and Margaret River, is considered. Staff being withdrawn from these facilities to work at the new Busselton Hospital should be avoided.

**Regional Integration**

The new facility should be considered within the regional context and the facilities and services provided should be complimentary to the other health services in the region.

There should be a clear rationalisation of all health facilities in the South West Region and a justification of where and why the new hospital fits in with and compliments the health needs of the region.

5.4 Site Characteristics

**Accessibility**

Traffic and access to the main roads is a critical consideration. It is important that the hospital is easily accessible and that there are no major traffic issues.

A new site must take into consideration proximity to population centres, the airport for the flying doctors and proximity to ambulances. The abattoir site was suggested as a favourable alternative site.

It was mentioned that the Bussell Highway gets congested when there is a lot of traffic, creating access problems from the highway, particularly for ambulance drivers. Stakeholders were concerned that access to the current site may become increasingly problematic as population in the region grows.

Additionally, all ambulance drivers slow down to 5km to enter the hospital as it is a sharp 90-degree turn. Easy access to the hospital must be provided on the existing site or at an alternative site with easier entry and a drive-in/drive-out facility.

It was felt that traffic management treatments could be implemented to solve these issues. Access to the bypass or a main arterial road was seen as an advantage to the Vasse site proposal.

There is a concern that elderly people may be disadvantaged by moving the hospital as they will experience further stress while trying to negotiate their way to a new and unfamiliar facility.
**Centrality**

Stakeholders are concerned that if the hospital is to be relocated, there will be additional travel time and distance to the new facility. There are concerns that Busselton doctors will not visit their patients in hospital because the additional travel time and distance will adversely impact on them financially.

Additional travel time and distance may be especially problematic for emergency situations and aged persons. On the other hand, some community members and Dunsborough doctors suggested that this additional travel time and distance would not have a significant impact on Busselton doctors, explaining that they also visit their patients in hospital with no financial consequences. They also suggested that the majority of GPs servicing the hospital are not Busselton doctors.

There were concerns that additional travel time would create problems for ambulances and volunteers. Busselton ambulances will have to travel extra distances to the new site, time that may be critical in an emergency. On the other hand, Dunsborough doctors have a particularly difficult stretch of uneven road to travel to the existing hospital site. In some instances, ambulance drivers have had to slow down to prevent their patients from experiencing the bumps on the road.

There is also a concern that volunteers and staff may be lost if the hospital is moved beyond walking distance or a short driving distance. Most of the volunteers currently servicing the hospital are residents of the immediate vicinity to the current site. The volunteer population is mainly elderly and without very good public transport. If the hospital is relocated to an alternative site, there may be a diminution of volunteers.

If the hospital is relocated, it should be no more than five minutes away from and central to Busselton and projected population growth. Stakeholders believe that the hospital should be centrally located to allow for easy access to the whole of Busselton and projected population increases, which they believe will increase directly inland or east from the current site.

**Local Environment**

The natural and beachside location of the current hospital is perceived to be therapeutic and relaxing for patients and visitors. This is seen to be especially beneficial for hospice and longer term patients.

On the other hand, medical staff mentioned that the increasing healthcare trend is to treat patients as quickly as possible and release them within the shortest time possible, leaving little time to enjoy these natural settings. It was suggested that an alternative hospital could have landscaped gardens to provide a pleasant environment.

Protecting the possums on the current site was seen as important by a small group of respondents. However, hospital staff explained that possums create problems because they get into the air-conditioning vents and the smell of their urine has been known to make staff and patients ill, particularly on hot and humid days. This issue needs to be considered when planning for the new facility and selecting a site.

If there are no health benefits for relocating the hospital, the community believes that the current site is too precious and significant to lose. They believe that the current site with its beachside location should remain a community asset.
There are concerns that the Vasse site is a swamp that is prone to flooding. The community urges that the likelihood for flooding at any proposed site be investigated thoroughly.

It has been mentioned that the current site is four metres above sea level, the highest level in the region, and that the proposed Vasse site is 1.5 metres above sea level making it very prone to flooding. The community believes that money used to prevent flooding could be better invested in the facility itself on an alternative site that is not prone to flooding.

**Land Ownership, Size and Future**

It is critical to stakeholders that the land selected for the new Hospital and Health Centre has appropriate room for expansion to meet future demands, including parking.

The current site is perceived to have sufficient land to build a new Hospital and Health Centre that will meet these future demands. The amount of land allocated for the hospital site at Vasse is smaller than the present site. There is also concern that the site is landlocked by residential development.

The community is not at all concerned about the size of the facility on the current site. Most people believe that the proposed upgrade to the hospital can occur on the current site and they are flexible with regards to the height and spread of the building.

Although the land was not actually gifted, stakeholders had a perception that the land was gifted to the community by the Lilly family and should remain in the community’s possession.

If the hospital is to be relocated, a clear justification needs to be provided for this and the remaining land should be used for health or public purposes. The land could be used for a health facility such as aged care or disability services, a park or an entertainment centre. There is strong opposition to the land being sold for residential development. The community was only willing to consider the selling of the land if it could be guaranteed that the money raised would be invested for local health and community needs.

### 5.5 Other Issues Raised

There was concern that the decision about the site of the hospital has already been made and that the community consultation outcome will have little or no influence.

The community felt that they wanted to believe that the ‘right thing’ is being done about the future planning for the health facility. If the decision made reflects rational decision-making based on good information and research, then the community will believe that the deal had not been made and the best outcome was achieved.

The vast majority of stakeholders enquired about the decision-making process for selecting the hospital site and facility. All stakeholder groups asked if the community consultation, technical and financial reports will be public documents.
## Appendix A: Public presentations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presentation</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>No. Attendees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duchess St and Busselton Medical Practice</td>
<td>2/12/05</td>
<td>12.45 pm</td>
<td>Duchess St</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent St</td>
<td>6/12/05</td>
<td>12.00 pm</td>
<td>Kent St</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meals on Wheels</td>
<td>7/12/05</td>
<td>10.45 am</td>
<td>Community Health Centre</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospice</td>
<td>7/12/05</td>
<td>2.00 pm</td>
<td>Hospice</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital and Health Centre Staff</td>
<td>8/12/05</td>
<td>9.30 am / 1.00 pm</td>
<td>Hospital and Health Centre</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St John’s Ambulance</td>
<td>9/12/05</td>
<td>10.00 am</td>
<td>Hospital and Health Centre grounds</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunn Bay Surgery</td>
<td>9/12/05</td>
<td>1.00 pm</td>
<td>Dunsborough</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Meeting</td>
<td>10/12/05</td>
<td>9.30 am</td>
<td>Busselton Churchill Park</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Meeting</td>
<td>10/12/05</td>
<td>1.00 pm</td>
<td>Dunsborough – Recreation Centre</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbey Progress Association</td>
<td>13/12/05</td>
<td>7.30 pm</td>
<td>Esplanade Hotel Busselton</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Busselton Lions</td>
<td>4/1/06</td>
<td>7.00 pm</td>
<td>Esplanade</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masonic Lodge</td>
<td>10/1/06</td>
<td>11.15 am</td>
<td>West St Busselton</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Busselton Rotary</td>
<td>10/1/06</td>
<td>6.30 pm</td>
<td>Esplanade</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Citizens</td>
<td>12/1/06</td>
<td>10.00 am</td>
<td>Busselton</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Busselton Elderly Support Scheme</td>
<td>24/1/06</td>
<td>3.00 pm</td>
<td>Busselton Hwy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Busselton Professional Business Women</td>
<td>9/2/06</td>
<td>7.00 pm</td>
<td>Busselton – Ship Hotel</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probis</td>
<td>13/2/06</td>
<td>9.00 am</td>
<td>Dunsborough</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zonta</td>
<td>13/2/06</td>
<td>7.00 pm</td>
<td>Assisi Rest – Dunsborough</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Meeting</td>
<td>21/2/06</td>
<td>5.30 pm</td>
<td>Busselton Uniting Church</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Busselton CWA</td>
<td>3/3/06</td>
<td>3.00 pm</td>
<td>Busselton CWA</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Meeting</td>
<td>9/3/06</td>
<td>7.00 pm</td>
<td>Recreation Centre · Dunsborough</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Staff · Busselton</td>
<td>23/3/06</td>
<td>2.00 pm</td>
<td>Busselton Hospital/Health Centre</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladies Auxiliary · Busselton</td>
<td>24/3/06</td>
<td>2.00 pm</td>
<td>Busselton Hospital/Health Centre</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Submission Form

Submission Form – Site for New Busselton Hospital and Health Centre

If you wish to submit a response, you must do so no later than 5.00 pm, Friday 31st March 2006.

Name: ______________________________________
Address: _____________________________________
_____________________________________________
Phone: __________________________ Email: ___________

Please tick what best describes you:

☐ Local Government    ☐ State Government
☐ Non-Government      ☐ Member of Public
☐ Other, please specify: ______________________________________

1. Do you have any objections to being included on a register of submissions?
   ☐ Yes        ☐ No

2. Do you believe you have sufficient information to make an informed decision?
   ☐ Yes        ☐ No

3. Do you support the new hospital being built in Vasse?
   ☐ Yes        ☐ No

Reason:

______________________________________________
4. Do you support the new hospital being built on the current site in Busselton?

☐ Yes ☐ No

Reason:

Freedom of Information:

Unless marked private and confidential, all correspondence and submissions will be regarded as public documents and may be made available to members of the public on request.
Appendix C: Focus Group and Stakeholder Interview Participation

C.1 Focus Group Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Groups</th>
<th>Representation</th>
<th>Invited</th>
<th>Number Attended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Busselton Hospital and Health Centre Staff</td>
<td>A representative from each department</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Busselton Medical Services</td>
<td>Busselton Specialist Medical Centre, Busselton</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kent Street Surgery, Busselton</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Busselton Medical Practice, Busselton</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Duchess Medical Practice, Busselton</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dentist David McDonald, Busselton</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Community Groups</td>
<td>Bibelmun Mia Aboriginal Corporation</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business &amp; Professional Women's Association</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Busselton Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Busselton Senior Citizens Centre</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Busselton Family Playgroup</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gnuraren Aboriginal Corporation</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Port Geogrape Landowners Association</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residents of Eagle Bay Association</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rotary Club of Busselton-Geographe Bay</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lions Club of Busselton</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Safer WA Busselton Committee</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cape Naturaliste Tourism Association</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wonnenup Residents' Association</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yallingup Residents' Association</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Groups</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>Invited</td>
<td>Number Attended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lions Club of Dunsborough</td>
<td></td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunsborough &amp; Districts Progress Association</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunsborough Yallingup Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td></td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower South West Family Day Scheme</td>
<td></td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilyabrup Progress Association</td>
<td></td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yallingup Residents Association</td>
<td></td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zonta Club of Dunsborough Area</td>
<td></td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbey Progress Association</td>
<td></td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray Village</td>
<td></td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Carey Court</td>
<td></td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer Organisations</td>
<td>St Vincent De Paul</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West People Care</td>
<td></td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvation Army</td>
<td></td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naturaliste Care Services (Inc)</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Busselton Hospital and Health Centre Auxiliary</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Busselton Hospice</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leeming About Mental Problems (LAMP)</td>
<td></td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Busselton Meals on Wheels</td>
<td></td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Busselton Dunsborough Volunteers</td>
<td></td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Busselton Cancer Support Group</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Red Cross – Naturaliste</td>
<td></td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Red Cross – Busselton</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Emergency Service</td>
<td></td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambulance · Busselton</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambulance Service – Dunsborough</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Groups</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>Invited</td>
<td>Number Attended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret River and Augusta Health Services</td>
<td>Augusta Clinic, Augusta</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Augusta Medical Centre, Augusta</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Margaret River Medical Centre, Margaret River</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Margaret River Surgery, Margaret River</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Forest Health Centre, Margaret River</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Margaret River Hospital and Health Centre, Margaret River</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Western Australia Country Health Services, Clinical Educator</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Augusta Hospital and Health Centre</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shire of Busselton Community Residents – West Ward</td>
<td>Random Selection</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shire of Busselton Community Residents – Central Ward</td>
<td>Random Selection</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shire of Busselton Community Residents – East Ward</td>
<td>Random Selection</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## C.2 Stakeholder Interview Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder Interviews</th>
<th>Invited</th>
<th>Number Attended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bunbury Health Campus</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St John of God, Bunbury</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imaging the South, Bunbury</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spokesperson for the committee opposing the relocation of Busselton Hospital and Health Centre</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Ives, Perth</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunn Bay Surgery, Dunsborough</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naturaliste Medical Practice, Dunsborough</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanson Property and Marketing</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D: Focus Group and Stakeholder Interview Discussion Guide

BUSSELTON HOSPITAL AND HEALTH CENTRE AND HEALTH CENTRE SITE SELECTION CONSULTATION
Focus Group Discussion Guide
March 2006

[10 min] Introduction and purpose
- Introduce facilitator + Estill
- Explain purpose of focus group including three part analysis (technical, social and financial), confidentiality and outcomes of research
- Group introductions (name + suburb / organisation)
- Group guidelines (one person talk at a time, respect others’ opinions, etc…)
- (Explain project given) As population grows, health demands will also increase. It has been recognised that there is a need to expand the current services at Busselton Hospital and Health Centre to meet the future demands of the district. (PROJECT GIVEN) This increasing demand includes additional beds, access to specialist services, aged care services, etc.

[05 min] Current Position
INSTRUCTION: Please complete page 1 of the questionnaire
- Some people support the Hospital and Health Centre / Health Centre being upgraded at the current site. If you support this view, why? Would you consider the relocation of the Busselton Hospital and Health Centre / Health Centre to an alternative site and why?
- What concerns or issues do you have about relocating the Busselton Hospital and Health Centre / Health Centre?
- Some people support the Hospital and Health Centre / Health Centre being upgraded at an alternative site. If you support this view, why?
- What concerns or issues do you have about maintaining the Busselton Hospital and Health Centre / Health Centre on the existing site?

[10 min] Site Selection Considerations – Overall
There are several things that need to be considered when selecting the future site of the Busselton Hospital and Health Centre / Health Centre such as how central it is to
the population, how easy it is to access, the services and facilities near the Hospital and Health Centre.

- What are the most important considerations to you when selecting a site for the proposed upgraded Hospital and Health Centre / Health Centre?
- Why are these considerations important to you?
- If the Hospital and Health Centre / Health Centre were to be relocated, what should be considered when selecting an alternative site?
- Why are these considerations important to you?

[10 min] Site Selection Considerations – Centrality
- How important to you is it that the Hospital and Health Centre / Health Centre is central to the local population? District population?
- Why is it important to you that the Hospital and Health Centre / Health Centre is central to the local / district population?
- Draw a circle around the existing site to indicate acceptable positioning of the new site and explore sensitivities.
- Why have you selected this area?

[05 min] Site Selection Considerations – Accessibility
- What are the key accessibility considerations (vehicles and pedestrians) on the current site (parking, turning pockets, shuttle bus, bike and pedestrian access, public transport, subsidised transport)?
- What accessibility considerations need to be made if selecting an alternative site for the Hospital and Health Centre / Health Centre? (vehicular + pedestrian)

[10 min] Site Selection Considerations – Environment / Atmosphere
- We have received feedback from the community about the environment and atmosphere at Busselton Hospital and Health Centre / Health Centre. What characteristics of the atmosphere / environment at Busselton Hospital and Health Centre / Health Centre are important to you and why?
- If considering an alternative site for the Hospital and Health Centre / Health Centre, what aspects of the environment / atmosphere are important to you and why? (explore trade-offs and sensitivities)

[05 min] Site Selection Considerations – Facilities and Services
- What, if any, are the gaps in the current services?
- Are there any additional facilities and services that should be considered?
- What additional facilities and services will be needed to meet future demands?
[10 min]  
**Site Selection Considerations – Population Growth**

- If the Hospital and Health Centre / Health Centre is to be upgraded on the current site, it may have to increase in height. Is this acceptable? Why? Test sensitivity.

- If the Hospital and Health Centre / Health Centre is to be upgraded on the current site, it may have to expand outwards. Is this acceptable? Why? Test sensitivity.

- If the Hospital and Health Centre / Health Centre is to be upgraded on the current site, it may increase traffic. Is this acceptable? Why? Test sensitivity.

- If the Hospital and Health Centre / Health Centre is to be upgraded on the current site, do you have any concerns about its impact on the environment? Is this acceptable? Why? Test sensitivity.

[05 min]  
**Site Selection Considerations – Use of existing land**

- If the Hospital and Health Centre / Health Centre were to be relocated, how would you like the current site to be used?

[05 min]  
**Site Selection Considerations – Other**

- Are there any other considerations when selecting the site for the Hospital and Health Centre / Health Centre that have not yet been discussed?

**INSTRUCTION:** Please complete page 2 of the questionnaire

[05 min]  
**Project Information**

- What information do you think is necessary to help you make an informed decision about the site selection for Busselton Hospital and Health Centre / Health Centre?

- Do you feel that you have had enough information to make an informed decision about the site selection for Busselton Hospital and Health Centre / Health Centre? What information did you find useful? What kind of information would you like more of?

[10 min]  
**Summary and Closing**

- If you could choose the top two considerations or qualities that should be considered when selecting the new site for the Hospital and Health Centre / Health Centre, what would they be?

- Next Steps – reports (mid April 2006), submission to Minister (late April 2006), Minister makes announcement (June 2006)

- Thank you.

**INSTRUCTION:** Please complete remaining pages of the questionnaire

**End**