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 from David Thomson and Gordon Dykes.

2. **MINUTES**

   The Minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday 1\textsuperscript{st} June 2004 PPC[M]2004/02 were approved as a correct record.

3. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS NOT INCLUDED IN AGENDA**

   There was no other business not already included on the Agenda.
4. APPLICATION FOR INCLUSION IN THE BOARD’S PHARMACEUTICAL LIST

i) Case No: PPC/INCL/09/2004
Boots the Chemist Ltd, Units 21-23 Glasgow Fort Retail Park, Auchinlea Road, Glasgow G33 5AT

I. The Committee was asked to consider an application submitted by Boots the Chemist Ltd to provide general pharmaceutical services from premises situated at Units 21 – 23 Glasgow Fort Retail Park, Auchinlea Road, Glasgow G33 5AT 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 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 Boots the Chemist Ltd, 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 site visits to the site at Unit 21-23 Glasgow Fort Retail Park, Auchinlea Road, Glasgow G33 5AT.

V. The Committee considered views and representations received from;

a) Chemist Contractors within the vicinity of the applicant’s premises, namely:-

   i) Neeraj Salwan – 11 Mossvale Cres, G33.5 (Provisional List).
   
   ii) Lloyds Pharmacy – Unit 38, Shandwick Square, G34.9 and - Unit 2, Hallhill Road, G33.4.
   
   iii) Easterhouse Health Centre Pharmacy – 9 Auchinlea Road, G34.9.

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

c) the Greater Glasgow Area Medical Committee (General Practitioner Sub-Committee);
The Committee also considered:-

d) The location of the nearest existing pharmaceutical services;

e) The location and level of general medical services in the area;

f) Demographic information regarding post code sectors G33.4, G33.5 and G34.9;

g) Patterns of public transport, and

h) 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 Units 21-23 Glasgow Fort Retail Park, Auchinlea Road, Glasgow G33.5. The premises are currently under construction with a proposed completion date of October 2004. The lease of one unit has already been confirmed to the applicant. The lease of the other unit is still under negotiation.

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

VIII. In forming an opinion on the neighbourhood, the Committee referred to the map at page 44 of the papers and defined the neighbourhood as the area bound to the North by Tillycairn Road, along Tillycairn Drive, to the West by Tattershall Road, along the South by the M8 Motorway and East by Wardie Road around the college complex through Westerhouse Road and Conisborough Road.

IX. 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.

X. The Committee noted that within the neighbourhood as defined there were two pharmacies.

XI The current pharmaceutical network provided Domiciliary Oxygen Therapy Service, Supervised Methadone and collection and delivery services.
XII. Members noted that there had been a previous application for a new pharmaceutical contract from this location. The application had been considered by the PPC on 22 January 2004 and had been rejected, the Committee being satisfied that the existing pharmaceutical network continued to provide an adequate service to the neighbourhood population. In considering this most recent application the Committee were satisfied that neither the applicant, nor any other interested party had demonstrated that this situation had changed since the last application was considered. They therefore, did not agree that the granting of the application was necessary.

XIII. The Committee considered the applicants comments on the development of housing in the area, and were satisfied that this issue had already been taken into consideration when they determined the previous application. The Committee did not agree that there was evidence of a sufficient need or desirability to justify the granting of an additional NHS dispensing contract.

XIV. Having regard to the overall services provided by the existing contractors within the vicinity of the proposed pharmacy, and the number of prescriptions dispensed by those contractors in the preceding 12 months, the Committee agreed that the neighbourhood was already adequately served.

XV. In summary, the Committee concluded that the granting of an additional NHS contract for the premises situated at Units 21-23, Glasgow Fort Retail Park, Auchinlea Road, G34, was not necessary or desirable in order to secure the adequate provisions of pharmaceutical services in the neighbourhood in which the premises were situated as there are 4 pharmacies within a one mile radius of the proposed premises. The Committee noted that two of the pharmacies are located in the neighbourhood as defined by the Committee. The pharmacies within a one mile radius of the proposed premises offer Supervised Methadone Administration, Domiciliary Oxygen Therapy Services and Advice to Nursing Homes. The Committee considered that the pharmaceutical services within the neighbourhood to be adequate and there was no evidence to suggest a sufficient need or desirability to justify the granting of an additional NHS contract. The Committee were aware that the area is undergoing a redevelopment plan, with a potential for proposed new housing within the area, however, they felt that in considering the application for a new contract, they could not take into account potential new housing in the area until occupied by residents. The Committee noted the applicant's comments regarding new residential development, however, the Committee also felt that no significant change had taken place in the area in relation to housing since the Committee had considered the last application in January 2004 and that the proposed development of housing had been taken into consideration when they considered the previous application in 2004.
In accordance with the statutory procedure the Chemist Contractor member of the Committee Alasdair MacIntyre was excluded from the decision process.

DECIDED/-

Unanimously that the granting of the application was not necessary or 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 Units 21-23 Glasgow Fort Retail Park, Auchinlea Road, Glasgow, G33 5AT for the provision of general pharmaceutical services be refused.

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

ii) Case No: PPC/INCL/10/2004
Neeraj Salwan, 6 Lamlash Cres, Glasgow G33 3LH

XVI. The Committee was asked to consider an application submitted by Neeraj Salwan, to provide general pharmaceutical services from premises situated at 6 Lamlash Cres, Glasgow G33 3LH under Regulation 5(2) of the National Health Service (General Pharmaceutical Services) (Scotland) Regulations 1995 as amended.

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

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

XIX. The Committee members had individually made visits to the site at 6 Lamlash Cres, Glasgow G33 3LH.

XX. The Committee considered views and representations received from

a) Chemist contractors within the vicinity of the applicant’s premises namely:

i) Shettleston Pharmacy Ltd – Shettleston Health Centre, G32. 7.

ii) David L L Robertson Pharmacy – 1122 Shettleston Rd, G32.7.

iii) Lightburn Pharmacy – 977 Carntyne Road, G32.6.
iv) Robertson Chemist – 248 Smithycroft Road, G33.2.

v) Carntyne Pharmacy – 137 Abbeyhill St, G32.6.

vi) Moss Pharmacy – 1033 Shettleston Road, G32.7.

vii) National Co-operative Chemists Ltd – 1020 Shettleston Rd, G32.7.

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

c) the Greater Glasgow Area Medical Committee (GP Sub-Committee);

d) Robert Thomson, Roads Operations Manager, Glasgow City Council;

e) David Mowat, Senior 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 G32.6, G33.3, G33.5;

h) Patterns of public transport, and;

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

CONCLUSION

XXI. 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 6 Lamlash Cres, Glasgow G33.3 The premises are constructed and the lease of the property is available to the applicant

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

XXIII. In forming an opinion on the neighbourhood, the Committee referred to the map at page 68 of the papers and defined the neighbourhood as the area bound to the North, by the M8 Motorway, to the East by
Stepps Road, across Edinburgh Road and along Springboig Road, to the South by Greenfield Ave and Inveresk Street and the West by Ruchazie Road to the M8 Motorway. The Committee were mindful that in recent years Edinburgh Road could previously have been seen as a major barrier. They did not consider that Edinburgh Road posed such a significant barrier as there existed along the road pedestrian crossings at regular intervals, which made the area south of the road more accessible. For this reason the Committee agreed that the neighbourhood would extend beyond Edinburgh Road.

XXIV. 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.

XXV. The Committee noted that within the neighbourhood defined by the Committee there was one pharmacy; This pharmacy provides Supervised Methadone and Domiciliary Oxygen Therapy Services.

XXVI. The Committee considered that the level of existing services ensured that satisfactory access to services existed, to the identified neighbourhood. The Committee therefore considered that the existing pharmaceutical services in the neighbourhood were adequate.

XXVII. Having considered the applicant’s justification for additional pharmaceutical services in this area, the Committee did not agree that there was evidence of a sufficient need or desirability to justify the granting of an additional NHS dispensing contract.

XXVIII. Having regard to the overall services provided by the existing contractors within a one mile radius of the proposed pharmacy, and the number of prescriptions dispensed by those contractors in the preceding 12 months, the Committee agreed that the neighbourhood was already adequately served.

XXIX. As part of the Committee’s discussion regarding this application, they considered the applicant’s proposed premises to be in an area of high deprivation, the level of local authority housing was also high, with only 30% of the population being car owners. The shopping pattern of the patients suggests they need to cross Edinburgh Road to access essential services and concluded that this main road would not act as a barrier to patients, accessing pharmaceutical services.

XXX. In summary, the Committee concluded that the granting of an additional NHS contract for the premises situated at 6 Lamlash Cres, Glasgow, G33, was not necessary or desirable in order to secure the adequate provisions of pharmaceutical services in the neighbourhood in which the premises were situated. The Committee were aware that the area is undergoing a redevelopment plan, with a potential for proposed new housing within the area. The Committee felt that on
considering the application for a new contract, they could not take into account potential new housing in the area until occupied by residents. The Committee also felt that the application was not necessary or desirable as there are 10 pharmacies within a one mile radius of the proposed premises. While the Committee accepted that some of these pharmacies are outwith the defined neighbourhood they were not sufficiently remote to cause them to be discounted. The Committee noted that one pharmacy is located in the neighbourhood as defined by the Committee. The pharmacies within a one mile radius of the proposed premises offer Supervised Methadone Administration and Domiciliary Oxygen Therapy Services and Advice to Nursing Homes. The Committee considered pharmaceutical services within the neighbourhood to be adequate and there was no evidence to suggest a sufficient need or desirability to justify the granting of an additional NHS contract.

In accordance with the statutory procedure the Chemist Contractor member of the Committee Alasdair MacIntyre was excluded from the decision process:

DECIDED/-

The Committee unanimously agreed that the granting of the application was not necessary or 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 6 Lamlash Cres, Glasgow, G33 3LH for the provision of general pharmaceutical services be refused.

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

iii) Case No: PPC/INCL/11/2004
Faisal Khan & Yasser Shaheen, 290 Faifley Road, Faifley, G81 5EY

XXXI. The Committee was asked to consider an application submitted by Faisal Khan & Yasser Shaheen to provide general pharmaceutical services from premises situated 290 Faifley Road, Faifley, G81 5EY under Regulation 5(2) of the National Health Service (General Pharmaceutical Services) (Scotland) Regulations 1995 as amended.

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

XXXIV. The Committee members had individually made visits to the site at 290 Faifley Road, Faifley G81 5EY.

XXXV. The Committee considered views and representations received from

a) Chemist Contractors within the vicinity of the applicant’s premises, namely;
   Clan Chemists Ltd, - Hardgate Cross, G81.5.

b) The Greater Glasgow Area Pharmaceutical Committee (GP Sub-Committee);

c) The Greater Glasgow Area Medical Committee (GP Sub-Committee);

d) Glasgow City Council, Development & Regeneration Services;

e) West Dunbartonshire Council, Land Services;

The Committee also considered

f) The location of the nearest existing pharmaceutical services

g) The location and level of general medical services in the area

h) Demographic information regarding post code sectors G81 5

i) Patterns of public transport, and

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

CONCLUSION

XXXVI 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 290 Faifley Road, Faifley G81 5EY. The premises are constructed and the lease of the property is available to the applicant.

XXXVII. In considering this application, the Committee was required to take into account all relevant factors concerning the definition of the neighbourhood served and adequacy of the existing pharmaceutical services in the neighbourhood in the context of Regulation 5(10).
XXXVIII. In forming an opinion on the neighbourhood, the Committee referred to the map at page 87 of the papers and defined the neighbourhood as beginning North along Cochno Road, East along the postcode boundary as identified on the map, South West along Great Western Road, bound to the West by Kilbowie Road through the West of Hardgate Cross roundabout and continuing up to Cochno Road.

XXXIX. Members considered the Applicant’s response to written representations received and did not agree with their assertion that the proposed neighbourhood should be regarded wholly as Faifley and should exclude the Hardgate area. The Committee took into consideration a number of factors in defining the neighbourhood, including the presence of boundaries, the sense of community and the pattern of movement for those who lived in the area. Having regard to public transport provision and the position of shopping and educational facilities the Committee agreed that the area commonly known as Faifley was not discreet from Hardgate. Glasgow Road in the Committee’s opinion did not form a barrier between the two areas and those resident in Faifley would easily move between the two, as part of their daily routine.

XL. Having reached that conclusion the Committee were then required to consider the adequacy of existing pharmaceutical services in that neighbourhood and whether the granting of the application was necessary or desirable in order to secure adequate provision of pharmaceutical services in that neighbourhood.

XLI. The Committee noted that one pharmacy is located within the neighbourhood as defined by the Committee. The Committee also noted that the existing pharmacy provides a collection and delivery service to patients within the G81 area.

XLII. The Committee noted that there were no GP surgeries located within the G81 5 postcode area, however, they did not consider that this had a significant bearing on their consideration of the application. The Committee took into consideration the fact that the National Appeal Panel recently held an oral hearing in respect of an application for a new contract in the Duntocher area, which the PPC granted in June 2004. The neighbourhood defined by the National Appeal Panel in respect of that application, is similar to the neighbourhood defined by the Committee in respect of this application. The National Appeal Panel concluded that the granting of an additional NHS dispensing contract was not necessary to secure adequate general pharmaceutical services in the area.

XLIII. The Committee considered socio-economic factors in the area and were made aware that much of the housing is council housing and only 47% of residents are car owners.

XLIV. In summary, the Committee concluded that the granting of an
additional NHS contract for the premises situated at 290 Faifley Road, Faifley, G81, was neither necessary or desirable in order to secure the adequate provisions of pharmaceutical services in the neighbourhood in which the premises were situated. The Committee felt that Faifley was not a discreet neighbourhood with different needs from that of Clydebank and considered that the application was not necessary or desirable as there is one pharmacy within a one mile radius of the proposed premises, which is also in the neighbourhood as defined by the Committee. The Committee also felt that as the pharmacy located within the defined neighbourhood of the applicant’s proposed premises offers Supervised Methadone Administration and Domiciliary Oxygen Therapy Services, there was no evidence to suggest an unmet need of pharmaceutical services in the area, which would demonstrate a sufficient need or desirability to justify the granting of an additional NHS contract.

In accordance with the statutory procedure the Chemist Contractor member of the Committee Alasdair MacIntyre was excluded from the decision process.

DECIDED/-

In a unanimous decision, the Committee agreed that the granting of the application was neither necessary or 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 290 Faifley Road, Faifley, G81 5EY for the provision of general pharmaceutical services be refused.

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

iv) Case No: PPC/INCL/12/2004
National Co-operative Chemists Ltd, 1158 Shettleston Road, Glasgow G32 7PQ

XLV. The Committee was asked to consider a relocation (not deemed minor) application submitted by National Co-operative Chemists Ltd to provide general pharmaceutical services from premises situated at 1158 Shettleston Road., Glasgow, G32 7PQ under Regulation 5(2) of the National Health Service (General Pharmaceutical Services) (Scotland) Regulations 1995 as amended.

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

The Committee members had individually made visits to the site at 1158 Shettleston Road, Glasgow G32 7PQ.

The Committee considered views and representations received from:

a) Chemist contractors within the vicinity of the applicant's premises, namely:
   i) Macbon Chemist – 1049 Tollcross Rd, G32.8
   ii) Rowlands Pharmacy – 1322 Shettleston Rd, G32.7
   iii) David L L Robertson Chemist – 1122 Shettleston Rd, G32.7
   iv) Shettleston Pharmacy Ltd – 420 Old Shettleston Rd, G32.7
   v) Moss Pharmacy – 1033 Shettleston Rd, G32.7

b) the Greater Glasgow Area Pharmaceutical Committee (GP Sub-Committee);

c) the Greater Glasgow Area Medical Committee (GP Sub-Committee);

d) Glasgow City Council, Development & Regeneration Services;

The Committee also considered:

e) The location of the nearest existing pharmaceutical services;

f) The location and level of general medical services in the area;

g) Demographic information regarding post code sector G32.7;

h) Patterns of public transport, and

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

L. The Committee noted that the applicant had applied for a relocation (not deemed minor) in the Board’s Pharmaceutical List for the provision of pharmaceutical services from premises situated at 1158 Shettleston Road, Glasgow, G32 7PQ. The premises are constructed and in possession of the applicant.

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

LII. In forming an opinion on the neighbourhood, the Committee referred to the map at page 113 of the papers and agreed to encompass a wide area bound to the North by Inveresk Street, East by Hollowglen Road and Killin Street, South by Tollcross Road and West by Muiryfauld Drive and Cardowan Road.

LIII. 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.

LIV. The Committee noted that the applicants existing premises were within the neighbourhood defined by the Committee. The proposed relocation although within the same area would be to an area within the Co-operative supermarket, with improved premises and increased facilities, this would also allow patients to combine shopping with pharmaceutical services.

LV. The Committee noted that within the neighbourhood, as defined by the Committee there were six pharmacies, one of whom is the applicant.

LVI. The current pharmaceutical network provided supervised methadone, domiciliary oxygen, advice to nursing homes, needle exchange, 24 hour dispensing and collection and delivery services.

LVII. The Committee considered that the current level of existing services ensured that satisfactory access to pharmaceutical services existed, to the identified neighbourhood. The Committee therefore considered that to sustain the current level of service to patients, it was necessary to retain the existing number of pharmacies within the defined neighbourhood.

LVIII. Having considered the applicant’s reasons for a relocation of pharmaceutical services within the area, the Committee agreed that the pharmacy could provide an improved level of service to patients from the proposed location.
LIX. Having regard to the overall services provided by the existing contractors within the vicinity of the proposed pharmacy, and the number of prescriptions dispensed by those contractors within the preceding 12 months, the Committee agreed that the current level of service within the neighbourhood should not be reduced.

LX. In summary, the Committee concluded that the granting of a relocation of the NHS contract for the premises currently situated at 1020 Shettleston Road, Glasgow, G32 to premises situated at 1158 Shettleston Road, Glasgow, G32 was necessary in order to ensure the continued adequacy of pharmaceutical services in the neighbourhood in which the premises were situated.

**In accordance with the statutory procedure the Chemist Contractor member of the Committee Alasdair MacIntyre was excluded from the decision process.**

**DECIDED/-**

That the granting of the application was necessary to secure the adequate provision of pharmaceutical services in the neighbourhood of the proposed premises and accordingly that the application seeking a relocation in the Board’s Pharmaceutical List at 1158 Shettleston Road, Glasgow, G32 7PQ for the provision of general pharmaceutical services be granted.

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

v) **Case No: PPC/INCL/13/2004**

P B Devlin Ltd, 2 Bain Street, Glasgow G40 2LA

LXI. The Committee was asked to consider an application submitted by P. B. Devlin Ltd to provide general pharmaceutical services from premises situated at 2 Bain Street, Glasgow, G40 2LA, under Regulation 5(2) of the National Health Service (General Pharmaceutical Services) (Scotland) Regulations 1995 as amended.

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

LXIII. The Committee, having previously been circulated with all the papers regarding the application from P. B. Devlin Ltd, were satisfied that the application could be determined based on the written representations and that an oral hearing was not required.
LXIV. The Committee members had individually made site visits to the site at 2 Bain Street St, Glasgow, G40 2LA.

LXV. The Committee considered views and representations received from:

a) Chemist Contractors within the vicinity of the applicant’s premises, namely:
   i) J & JG Dickson & Son Ltd – 6/8 Tullis St, G40.1.
   ii) Townhead Pharmacy Ltd – 16 Alexandra Parade, G31.2.
   iii) Lloyds Pharmacy – 26 Bridgeton Cross, G40.2.
   iv) Bridgeton Health Centre Pharmacy – 201 Abercromby St, G40.2.
   v) Boots the Chemist – Various Pharmacies
   vii) Moss Pharmacy – 155 Crown St, G5.9.
   viii) Munro Pharmacy – various Pharmacies.
   ix) Abbey Chemist – 144 Trongate, G1.5.

b) the Greater Glasgow Area Pharmaceutical Committee (GP Sub-Committee);

c) The Greater Glasgow Area Medical Committee (GP Subcommittee);

The Committee also considered:

d) The location of the nearest existing pharmaceutical services;

e) The location and level of general medical services in the area;

f) Demographic information regarding post code sectors G1.5 and G40.2;

g) Patterns of public transport, and

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

CONCLUSION
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 2 Bain Street, Glasgow, G40 2LA. The premises are constructed and are available for lease to the applicant if approval is granted to the application.

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

Members agreed with the neighbourhood as defined by the applicant. The neighbourhood defined as being bound to the North by Duke Street, East, along Bellgrove Street, Abercromby Street and Arcadia Street, South along the River Clyde to Saltmarket and High Street on the West (Map at page 138 of the papers refers).

The Committee considered that the neighbourhood was largely of high deprivation, where much of the housing is council housing and only 32% of residents are car owners. The Committee noted that the proposed pharmacy is situated within close proximity to a homeless persons health centre, the Committee further recognised that this specific group of patients is a transient population, although different from those who pass through the area en route to the main Argyle Street shopping thoroughfare. They would have specific health needs and in addition to general pharmaceutical services, often require supervised methadone and needle exchange services. The Committee were of the opinion that although not resident in the neighbourhood, this element of the population would require access to pharmaceutical services to augment the overall provision of care offered by the homeless facility.

Having reached that conclusion the Committee were then required to consider the adequacy of existing pharmaceutical services in that neighbourhood, and whether the granting of the application was necessary or desirable in order to secure adequate provision of pharmaceutical services in that neighbourhood.

The Committee noted that fourteen pharmacies were located within a one mile radius of the proposed premises, however, within the neighbourhood as defined by the Committee there was only one pharmacy, which provided Supervised Methadone, Needle Exchange, Domiciliary Oxygen Therapy Service, Advice to Nursing Homes, and collection and delivery services. The Committee agreed that this pharmacy would most likely provide services to the residential population within the defined neighbourhood and also to passing trade from those accessing the main shopping areas.

Having considered the applicant's justification for additional
pharmaceutical services in this area, the Committee agreed that there was evidence to suggest the desirability to justify the granting of an additional NHS dispensing contract. The Committee noted the applicant’s case regarding the nearby homeless persons health centre facility and gave consideration to the specific needs of this particular client group, number of patients attending and the level of services provided.

LXXIII. The Committee noted that approximately 220 patients are currently registered with the homeless persons health centre, with a further 2791 having attended since the centre opened in October 2003. Approximately 110 patients attend the homeless persons health centre each week to access GP services. The GPs provide general medical services from the Centre for a total of 17 hours each week. The Committee further noted that there are currently 36 Methadone dependency patients attending the centre. Members considered the Applicant’s response to the written representations received and noted the suggestion that a number of patients attending the nearby homeless centre experience difficulty accessing full pharmaceutical services.

LXXIV. Having regard to the overall services provided by the existing contractor within the neighbourhood of the proposed pharmacy, and the number of prescriptions dispensed by this contractor in the preceding 12 months, the Committee agreed that an additional pharmacy contract in the neighbourhood would be desirable to provide an adequate network of support for the homeless persons centre client group, as well as the resident and other transient populations.

LXXV. In summary, the Committee concluded that the application was not necessary as there were fourteen pharmacies within the one mile radius, the Committee however, considered that the application was desirable to secure adequate pharmaceutical services, to ensure that full pharmaceutical services would be available to the full population and all social client groups.

In accordance with the statutory procedure the Chemist Contractor member of the Committee Alasdair MacIntyre was excluded from the decision process:

DECIDED/-

In a unanimous decision, the Committee agreed that the granting of the application was not necessary but was 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 2 Bain Street, Glasgow, G40 2LA for the provision of general
pharmaceutical services be granted, with the proviso that the applicant increase the opening hours to comply with the Model Hours Scheme, which are defined as 9.00am to 5.30pm, Monday to Saturday, with the flexibility to allow up to 2 half days per week, one week day and a Saturday afternoon, from 100pm.

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

5. SUSPENSION OF CONTRACT

Case No: PPC/SUS02/2004 – Paper No: 2004/21
Leslie Doherty Ltd, T/A J K Leslie Ltd, 222 Main Street, Cambuslang G72 7EN

The Committee was asked to consider an application submitted by J K Leslie Ltd seeking a temporary suspension of their NHS dispensing contract for a period of 10 days to allow a complete refurbishment of the shop to be carried out. The proposed closure would be effective from 5.30pm on Friday 15th October 2004 until 8.30am on Tuesday 26th October 2004.

The Committee noted J K Leslie Ltd have another pharmacy which is situated within approximately 200 yards of the above pharmacy premises. The Committee further noted that the pharmacist and staff would be transferred to the other pharmacy 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 10 days from 15th October 2004 to 26th October 2004.

6. MATTER CONSIDERED BY THE CHAIRMAN SINCE THE LAST MEETING

The Committee having previously been circulated with Paper 2004/22 noted the contents which gave details of an application considered by the Chairman outwith the meeting since Tuesday 1st June 2004.

Case No: PPC/COO/02/2004 – Fittleworth Medical Ltd, T/A Fittleworth Medical Ltd, Unit 1, Riverside Business Park, 45 Moffat Street, Glasgow G5 0

The Committee considered the action taken by the Chairman on an application for the transfer of an NHS Dispensing contract previously held by TVM Healthcare Ltd, with effect from 1st August 2004, having been satisfied that the application fulfilled the requirements laid down in the Pharmaceutical Regulations.
DECIDED/-

That the Chairpersons actions in the above application in accordance with Regulations 5 (3) and 5 (b) of the National Health Service (General Pharmaceutical Services) (Scotland) Regulations 1995 as amended be homologated.

7. NATIONAL APPEALS PANEL

The Committee having previously been circulated with Paper 2004/23 noted the contents which gave details of the National Appeal Panel’s determination of appeals lodged against the Committee’s decision in the following case;

i) Brendan J Semple & James B Semple, 11 Fieldhead Square, Glasgow G43

The Committee having previously been circulated with Paper 2004/24 noted the contents which gave details of the National Appeal Panel’s determination of appeals lodged against the Committee’s decision in the following case;

ii) M & D Green Dispensing Chemist, 80 Dumbarton Road, Duntocher, G81

8. ANY OTHER COMPETENT BUSINESS

There was no other competent business.

9. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

Scheduled for Tuesday 7th December 2004 at 1.30pm in the Boardroom, Divisional HQ, Gartnavel Royal Hospital.

The Meeting ended at 3.10 p.m.