Prior to the consideration of business, the Chairperson asked members if they had an interest in any of the applications to be discussed or if they were associated with a person who had a personal interest in the applications to be considered by the Committee.

No declarations of interest were made.

1. **APOLOGIES**

Apologies were received on behalf of Patricia Cox.

2. **MINUTES**

The Minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday 7th December 2004 PPC[M]2004/04 were approved as a correct record, subject to the following amendment:-

Paragraph 4, Sub-paragraphs (vi) (v) Carntyne Pharmacy, 137 Abbeyhill Street, to be deleted from the minute.
3. ANY OTHER BUSINESS NOT INCLUDED IN AGENDA

None.

Section 1 – Applications Under Regulation 5 (10)

4. APPLICATION FOR INCLUSION IN THE BOARD’S PHARMACEUTICAL LIST

i) Case No: PPC/INCL/01/2005
    C M Razwan Shafi, 34 Bridge Street, Glasgow G5 9HU

I. The Committee was asked to consider an application submitted by Mr Shafi, to provide general pharmaceutical services from premises situated at 34 Bridge Street, Glasgow G5 9HU under Regulation 5(2) of the National Health Service (General Pharmaceutical Services) (Scotland) Regulations 1995 as amended.

II. The Committee had to determine whether the granting of the application was necessary or desirable to secure the adequate provision of pharmaceutical services in the neighbourhood in which the applicant’s proposed premises were located.

III. The Committee, having previously been circulated with all the papers regarding the application from Mr Shafi, were satisfied that the application could be determined based on the written representations and that an oral hearing was not required.

IV. The Committee members had individually made visits to the site at 34 Bridge Street, Glasgow G5 9HU.

V. The Committee considered views and representations received from

   a) Chemist contractors within the vicinity of the applicant’s premises namely:
      i) Boots the Chemist – Various Branches;
      ii) Moss Pharmacy – 155 Crown St, G5 9;
      iii) Hughes Chemists – 16 Admiral St, G41 1;
      iv) Munro Pharmacy – Crown St, G5 9;
   b) the Greater Glasgow Area Pharmaceutical Committee (General Practitioner Sub-Committee);
   c) the Greater Glasgow Area Medical Committee (GP Sub-Committee);
d) Robert Thomson, Head of Maintenance and Design, Glasgow City Council;

e) Fiona Burns, Area Planning Officer, Glasgow City Council;

The Committee also considered:-

f) The location of the nearest existing pharmaceutical services;

g) Demographic information regarding post code sectors G5 9 and G1 4;

h) Patterns of public transport, and;

i) Greater Glasgow NHS Board plans for future development of services.

CONCLUSION

VI. The Committee noted that the applicant had applied for inclusion in the Board's Pharmaceutical List for the provision of pharmaceutical services from premises situated at 34 Bridge Street, Glasgow G5 9HU. The premises were constructed and the lease of the property was available to the applicant.

VII. In considering this application, the Committee was required to take into account all relevant factors concerning the definition of the neighbourhood served and the adequacy of existing pharmaceutical services in the neighbourhood in the context of Regulation 5(10).

VIII. The Committee referred to the map (provided by the Division) at page 34 of the papers. The Committee noted that the two pharmacies plotted at 8 and 9 on the map, were sited in the wrong location. The Committee further noted that the pharmacy plotted as 8 should have been plotted on the corner of Earl Gardens and Crown Street. The pharmacy plotted as 9 should have been sited on the “R” of Crown Street as it appeared on the map. The Committee agreed that this would have no bearing on the decision of the application and on considering the application the Committee took into account the actual location of these two pharmacies.

IX. In forming an opinion on the neighbourhood, the Committee referred to the map (provided by the Division) at page 34 of the papers and defined the neighbourhood as the area bound to the North, by the River Clyde, to the East by Crown Street and Laurieston, to the South by Pollokshaws Road and to the West by Shields Road and the M8.
X. Having reached that conclusion the Committee were then required to consider the adequacy of existing pharmaceutical services in the defined neighbourhood and whether the granting of the application was necessary or desirable in order to secure adequate provision of pharmaceutical services in that neighbourhood.

XI. The Committee noted that within the neighbourhood as defined by the Committee there were no pharmacies. The Committee, however recognised that within the one mile radius used by the Board to determine the statutory consultation exercise, there were 13 pharmacies.

XII. The Committee considered that the level of existing services within the one mile radius could be considered to provide adequate pharmaceutical services to this wider area. They did however recognise (as they had done in relation to previous applications for premises in adjacent localities) that there was an unmet need in respect of methadone services within both the identified neighbourhood, and the wider locality.

XIII. Having considered the applicant’s justification for additional pharmaceutical services in this area, the Committee agreed that there was evidence of a sufficient desirability to justify the granting of an additional NHS dispensing contract. The Committee recognised that the granting of an additional contract may not be necessary, however they agreed that due to the previous difficulties experienced within the area relating to methadone, that overall pharmaceutical services would be desirable within the neighbourhood.

XIV. As part of the Committee’s discussion regarding this application, they noted that 11 previous applications had been submitted for an additional pharmaceutical contract in this locality, centred around premises at Eglinton Toll and some distance from this site. The Committee consequently felt that the premises contained in this particular application would serve a different neighbourhood than applications previously considered.

XV. In addition previous applications for this locality had not been granted, due to the location of the premises which tended to be at Eglinton Street, which the Committee had agreed was not situated within a discreet neighbourhood, but rather lay at the fringes of four separate neighbourhoods. The Committee considered that the premises in this most recent application was located in a more discreet neighbourhood which would serve a defined population.

XVI. The Committee considered the applicant’s proposed premises to be in a highly deprived area, with a population who have specific health needs, and where only 20% of the population are car owners.

XVII. While the Committee accepted that all of the pharmacies are outwith the defined neighbourhood they were not sufficiently remote to cause them to be discounted. The pharmacies within a one mile radius of the
proposed premises offer Supervised Methadone Administration, Domiciliary Oxygen Therapy Services, Needle Exchange and Advice to Nursing Homes. The Committee however agreed that the provision of pharmaceutical services within the defined neighbourhood would be desirable to address the

In accordance with the statutory procedure the Chemist Contractor members of the Committee Gordon Dykes and Alasdair MacIntyre were excluded from the decision process:

XVIII. In summary, the Committee concluded that the granting of an additional NHS contract for the premises situated at 34 Bridge Street, Glasgow G5, was not necessary but was desirable in order to secure the adequate provision of pharmaceutical services in the neighbourhood in which the premises were situated. The Committee further felt that the application was not necessary but was desirable, as despite there being no pharmacies within the defined neighbourhood there are 13 pharmacies within a one mile radius of the proposed premises. The Committee considered pharmaceutical services within the neighbourhood to be inadequate and there was evidence to suggest a desirability to justify the granting of an additional NHS contract.

DECIDED/-

The Committee agreed that the granting of the application was not necessary. A majority decision by the Committee members agreed that the granting of the application was highly desirable, in order to secure the adequate provision of pharmaceutical services in the neighbourhood of the proposed premises and accordingly that the application seeking inclusion in the Greater Glasgow NHS Board's Pharmaceutical List at 34 Bridge Street, Glasgow, G5 9HU for the provision of general pharmaceutical services be granted.

The chemist contractor members of the Committee rejoined the meeting at this stage

ii) Case No: PPC/INCL/02/2005
Semple & Semple, 63-65 Main Street, Torrance G64 4EL

XIX. The Committee was asked to consider an application submitted by Semple & Semple, to provide general pharmaceutical services from premises situated at 63-65 Main Street, Torrance G64 4EL under Regulation 5(2) of the National Health Service (General Pharmaceutical Services) (Scotland) Regulations 1995 as amended.

XX. The Committee had to determine whether the granting of the application was necessary or desirable to secure the adequate provision of pharmaceutical services in the neighbourhood in which the applicant’s proposed premises were located.
XXI. The Committee, having previously been circulated with all the papers regarding the application from Semple and Semple, were satisfied that the application could be determined based on the written representations and that an oral hearing was not required.

XXII. The Committee members had individually made visits to the site at 63-65 Main Street, Torrance G64 4EL.

XXIII. The Committee considered views and representations received from

a) the Greater Glasgow Area Pharmaceutical Committee (General Practitioner Sub-Committee);

b) the Greater Glasgow Area Medical Committee (General Practitioner Sub-Committee);

c) Jim McCulloch, Principal Engineer, East Dunbartonshire Council,

The Committee also considered:

d) Demographic information regarding post code sectors G64 4;

e) Patterns of public transport, and

f) Greater Glasgow NHS Board plans for future development of services;

CONCLUSION

XXIV. The Committee noted that the applicant had applied for inclusion in the Board’s Pharmaceutical List for the provision of pharmaceutical services from premises situated at 63-65 Main Street, Torrance G64 4EL. The premises were constructed and the lease of the property was available to the applicant.

XXV. In considering this application, the Committee was required to take into account all relevant factors concerning the definition of the neighbourhood served and the adequacy of existing pharmaceutical services in the neighbourhood in the context of Regulation 5(10).

XXVI. In forming an opinion on the neighbourhood, the Committee referred to the map (provided by the Division) at page 48 of the papers and defined the neighbourhood as the one mile radius circle on the map, namely Torrance and Environs.

XXVII. The Committee noted that there were no pharmacies or GP surgeries within the one mile radius circle map.
XXVIII. Having considered the applicant’s justification for additional pharmaceutical services in this area, the Committee did agree that there was evidence of a sufficient need or desirability to justify the granting of an additional NHS dispensing contract.

XXIX. As part of the Committee’s discussion regarding this application, they considered the applicant’s proposed premises to be in an area, with no pharmaceutical or GP services. The Committee also considered the fact that an NHS dispensing contract had been granted to another contractor in 1998 and the fact that this contract was never implemented.

In accordance with the statutory procedure the Chemist Contractor members of the Committee Gordon Dykes and Alasdair MacIntyre were excluded from the decision process:

XXX. In summary, the Committee concluded that the granting of an additional NHS contract for the premises situated at 63-65 Main Street, Torrance, G64, was necessary and desirable in order to secure the adequate provisions of pharmaceutical services in the neighbourhood in which the premises were situated. The Committee felt that the application was necessary and desirable, as there were no pharmacies within the defined neighbourhood, which was considered to be the one mile radius of the proposed premises. The Committee considered pharmaceutical services within the neighbourhood to be inadequate and there was evidence to suggest it was necessary and desirable to justify the granting of an additional NHS contract.

DECIDED-/

The Committee unanimously agreed that the granting of the application was necessary and desirable, to secure the adequate provision of pharmaceutical services in the neighbourhood of the proposed premises and accordingly that the application seeking inclusion in the Greater Glasgow NHS Board’s Pharmaceutical List at 63-65 Main Street, Torrance, G64 4EL, for the provision of general pharmaceutical services be granted.

The chemist contractor members of the Committee rejoined the meeting at this stage.

5. MATTERS CONSIDERED BY THE CHAIRMAN SINCE THE LAST MEETING

The Committee having previously been circulated with Paper 2005/03 noted the contents which gave details of an application considered by the Chairman outwith the meeting since Tuesday 7th December 2004.

i) Case No: PPC/MRELOC/01/2005 – Boots the Chemist, 71 Gordon Street, Glasgow G1 3SL
The Committee considered the action taken by the Chairman on an application for a minor relocation of a NHS Dispensing contract currently held by Boots the Chemist, at the above address.

The Committee noted that the application fulfilled the criteria for a minor relocation under Regulation 5 (4) of the National Health Service (General Pharmaceutical Services) (Scotland) Regulations 1995 as amended.

The Committee noted that the Chairman had granted the application with effect from 1\textsuperscript{st} April 2005, having been satisfied that the application fulfilled the requirements laid down in the Pharmaceutical Regulations.

6. SUSPENSION OF CONTRACT

Case No: PPC/SUS01/2005 – Paper No: 2005/04
Safeway Pharmacy, The Triangle, Kirkintilloch Road, Bishopbriggs G64 2TR

Paper 2005/04 was tabled for consideration by the Committee.

The Committee was asked to consider an application submitted by Safeway Stores PLC seeking a temporary suspension of their NHS dispensing contract for a period of 4 days to allow a complete refurbishment of the shop to be carried out. The proposed closure would be effective from 6.00pm on Saturday 5\textsuperscript{th} March 2005 and re-open at 8.30am on Thursday 10\textsuperscript{th} March 2005.

The Committee noted that there are three other pharmacies within a one mile radius of the above pharmacy premises. The Committee further noted that the pharmacist would liaise with local contractors to provide out of hours service/methadone, liaise with drug dependency unit and local doctors, display posters/flyers to advise patients of short term arrangements and of alternative pharmacies within the area, whilst the refurbishment of the premises is being carried out, thus minimising the disruption to the service.

DECIDED/-

The Committee agreed to grant a temporary suspension of contract for a period of 4 days from 5\textsuperscript{th} March 2005 to 10\textsuperscript{th} March 2005.

7. ANY OTHER COMPETENT BUSINESS

The Director of Pharmacy advised the Committee of his concerns regarding the continued pharmaceutical commitment of Safeway Stores PLC following the transfer of their business to Morrison’s Stores.

DECIDED/-

The Committee agreed that the Director of Pharmacy should write to Safeway Head Office to seek re-assurance of their continued...
commitment to provide pharmaceutical services in the Board’s area.

8. **DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

Scheduled for Tuesday 5\textsuperscript{th} April 2005 at 1.30pm. Easterhouse Health Centre, 9 Auchinlea Road, Glasgow G34 9HQ

The Meeting ended at 2.50p.m.