

NOT YET ENDORSED AS A CORRECT RECORD

Pharmacy Practices Committee (07)

Minutes of a Meeting held on

Wednesday 2nd May 2007

Seminar Room, Townhead Health Centre, Phase 1 16 Alexandra Parade,
Glasgow G31

PRESENT:

Andrew Robertson	Chairman
Mr W Reid	Deputy Lay Member
Prof J McKie	Deputy Lay Member
Mrs Kay Roberts	Deputy Non Contractor Pharmacist Member
Gordon Dykes	Contractor Pharmacist Member

IN ATTENDANCE

Dale Cochran	GPS Contracts Assistant
Robert Gillespie	Interim Lead Pharmacist – Community Pharmacy Development
Janine Glen	Contracts Manager – Community Pharmacy Development
Mrs Agnes Stewart	Vice-chair

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 Alasdair MacIntyre, Dr James Johnson and David Thomson.

2. MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday 29th March 2007 **PPC[M]2007/05** and Tuesday 10th April 2007 **PPC[M]2007/06** were approved as a correct record.

3. ANY OTHER BUSINESS NOT INCLUDED IN AGENDA

There were no matters to discuss not already included in Agenda.

Section 1 – Applications Under Regulation 5 (10)

4. APPLICATION FOR INCLUSION IN THE BOARD'S

ACTION

PHARMACEUTICAL LIST

Case No: PPC/07/2007

**Lisa Christie, LG Pharmacy Ltd, Unit 12 19 Kennedy Path,
Townhead, Glasgow G4 0PP**

The Committee was asked to consider an application submitted by Mrs Lisa Christie, to provide general pharmaceutical services from premises situated at Unit 12 19 Kennedy Path, Townhead, Glasgow G4.0 under Regulation 5(2) of the National Health Service (Pharmaceutical Services) (Scotland) Regulations 1995 as amended.

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.

The Committee, having previously been circulated with all the papers regarding the application from Mrs Christie, agreed that the application should be considered by oral hearing.

The hearing was convened under paragraph 2(2) of Schedule 3 to the National Health Service (Pharmaceutical Services) (Scotland) Regulations 1995 as amended ("the Regulations"). In terms of this paragraph, the PPC "shall determine an application in such a manner as it thinks fit". In terms of Regulation 5(10) of the Regulations, the question for the PPC is whether "the provision of pharmaceutical services at the premises named in the application is necessary or desirable to secure adequate provision of pharmaceutical service in the neighbourhood in which the premises are located by persons whose names are included in the Pharmaceutical List."

The Applicant was represented in person by Mrs Lisa Christie ("the Applicant") assisted by Mr Michael Christie. The interested parties who had submitted written representations during the consultation period, and who had chosen to attend the oral hearing were Mr Asgher Mohammed (Abbey Chemist), Mr Paul Martin (Townhead Health Centre Pharmacy) assisted by Ms Gillian Tarbet and Mr Charles Tait (Boots the Chemist) ("the Interested Parties").

Prior to the hearing, the Panel had collectively visited the vicinity surrounding 19 Kennedy Path, Glasgow G4.0, the pharmacies, GP surgeries and facilities in the immediate neighbourhood, and the wider areas of Duke Street, Alexandra Parade, Port Dundas and the City Centre.

The procedure adopted by the PPC at the hearing was that the Chairman asked the Applicant to make her submission. There followed the opportunity for the Interested Parties and the PPC to ask questions. The Interested Parties and the Applicant were then given the opportunity to sum up.

The Applicant's Case

Mrs Christie commenced her presentation by thanking the Committee for inviting her to the hearing to put forward her case.

She advised that she was confident that the area of Townhead did not currently enjoy access to adequate pharmaceutical services from the current network or in relation to the new guidelines issued under the new pharmacy contract.

She described what she had defined as the neighbourhood that would be served by the new pharmacy, if granted. She pointed out that this was also the neighbourhood as defined by the Greater Glasgow Area Pharmaceutical GP Sub-committee. This was:

- East side – High Street
- West side – Port Dundas Road
- North side – M8 Motorway
- South side – George Street

Mrs Christie asserted that there was only one contractor currently within the defined neighbourhood, namely Boots the Chemist, Buchanan Galleries. This pharmacy was situated in the busy shopping area of Buchanan Galleries and did not directly serve the specific population of Townhead. The location of the Boots pharmacy did not allow for easy access to the local community as it was situated up on the first floor of the busy Buchanan Galleries shopping centre.

Townhead was a discreet neighbourhood similar to Royston, Anderston or Sighthill which all had their own community pharmacies. The population of the defined area was some 7,082 people (taken from the 2001 census), with 78% of the population not owning a car and 20% being over the age of 60. The area was bordered by the busy M8 motorway and congested town streets making access to nearby pharmacies extremely difficult for the elderly, who amounted to 20% of the defined population or disabled, which amounted to 6% of the defined population. In the Applicant's opinion this made it necessary to have adequate pharmaceutical services available on their door step, including Saturday and Sunday when Townhead Health Centre Pharmacy was closed.

Mrs Christie then advised the Committee that the local Councillor (Gordon Mathieson) had met with Townhead Community Council and the Property Division of Glasgow City Council, of whom all three were supportive of the proposals of a pharmacy. Councillor Mathieson had stated that the range of services offered by a modern community pharmacy would widely benefit the community in Townhead, and that the service would be in keeping with the thrust of the Community Planning Partnership (CPP) policy in relation to Townhead. The area was already under the spotlight as part of the groundbreaking new health study called

“Go Well” which was aiming to improve and regenerate the area over the next 10 years. Councillor Mathieson believed that a new pharmacy in the heart of the local community would only add to this initiative.

Mrs Christie advised that the current services available to the residents within the defined neighbourhood were inadequate as the residents had to travel to Townhead Pharmacy or Boots to access the current network. Using the Google maps webpage, the four pharmacies in opposition were 0.6 mile (Boots, Buchanan Galleries), 1.0 miles (Townhead Health centre Pharmacy and Abbey Chemists), and 1.1 miles (Lloyds Pharmacy, Huntingdon Square) from the proposed site. She pointed out that three of the four pharmacies were outwith her defined neighbourhood. By definition, as Lloydspharmacy was more than one mile from the proposed premises, outwith the defined neighbourhood, and across the busy M8 motorway, it was not viably accessible by the Townhead community and therefore the granting of a new contract would not affect their business.

In the Applicant’s opinion, Townhead Health Centre Pharmacy also fell outwith the neighbourhood as defined. The access to the pharmacy was around 1.0 miles and was again across the busy M8 motorway. It therefore did not lend itself to easy access to the Townhead community. In addition, the pharmacy was not visible from the street, and was, the Applicant suggested closer in proximity to the community along Alexandra Parade than it was to the Townhead community.

The Applicant proposed opening on a Saturday and Sunday which would be of benefit to the local community who could have greater local access to pharmacy services if her application was granted. This again was borne out by comments from Councillor Mathieson who advised the Community Planning partnership (CPP) policy sees the need for local facilities and services and that the application was in keeping with their vision.

The Applicant suggested that Boots the Chemist, Buchanan Galleries was situated in a busy thoroughfare and the fact that 20% of the Townhead population were over 60 meant that they would have the arduous trip to access this pharmacy. Councillor Mathieson had suggested that the Townhead Community needed to have facilities and services fir its use based in the community itself and the granting of this contract would provide this.

With regard to Abbey Chemist, the Applicant suggested that this pharmacy was not in alignment with the GP Subcommittee’s definition of the neighbourhood. Being approximately 1.0 mile from the proposed premises, and being situated across the busy town centre and steep incline, the Applicant suggested that it was not viably accessible by the local Townhead community. The granting of a new contract would not adversely affect this contractor.

The Applicant was aware that Mr Mohammed was opposing this

application for new contract from Abbey Chemists at 144 Trongate and, as such suggested that his new premises at 140 High Street (which were due to open later this year) should not be considered in this application as they were outwith the neighbourhood defined by the Applicant.

All the existing pharmacies (apart from Boots in Buchanan Galleries) offered a full collection and delivery service to the area. The Applicant intended to offer the same service with the key difference being that she would see it as imperative that the patient had face to face contact with the pharmacist. It was her intention to conduct the deliveries in person on at least the first visit to the patient. She would also ensure that patients had her contact details and were encouraged to contact her for advice at any time. The Applicant believed that face to face contact was crucial in developing confidence and trust in the pharmacist.

The Applicant illustrated that the new contract advocated that patients should be able to readily access their pharmacist in the pharmacy for advice. She believed this focus on local care was reinforced by the Scottish Executive's "Delivering for Health" 10 year plan, which stressed the importance of preventative health care based in local communities, with community pharmacists as key members of the primary care team. It is the Scottish Executive's drive to use pharmacies as healthy living walk-in centres and to get healthy lifestyle messages across to local communities like Townhead. The Applicant suggested that for these reasons, this application was both necessary and desirable.

The Applicant advised that she was experienced in and would be keen to provide a supervised methadone and buprenorphine service, having been advised by Duncan Hill (Addictions Service) that spaces were tight outwith the city centre for supervised methadone services. She advised that it had been shown in many papers on addiction that people were more stable on substitution programmes when they didn't have to travel a significant distance to access treatment. The Applicant believed that asking patients to travel through the busy shopping centre to Boots and across the M8 motorway to Townhead put a barrier in the way of their treatment. Providing the service in their own area would encourage them to continue with their daily programme and so increase their chances of recovery. In the Applicant's opinion this would have a positive health and social impact on the entire neighbourhood. There was no pharmacy providing a needle exchange within the defined neighbourhood and the Applicant was willing to provide this service.

The Applicant advised that the proposed pharmacy would have three consultation rooms, two of which would be available to other health and social care professionals. The proposed plan shows the unit to be 850 square feet which is sufficient to meet the needs of the population. The Applicant's intention was to provide a wide range of services which would include but would not be limited to: smoking cessation, head lice project, blood pressure testing, cholesterol testing, diabetes testing, emergency hormonal contraception, pregnancy testing, minor ailments, methadone and needle exchange and also other health board led model

scheme initiatives.

She intended to open from 8.30am – 6.00pm on weekdays, 9.00am – 5.00pm on Saturdays and 12.00pm – 2.00pm on Sundays. She expected there to be a high demand for services, particularly with the level of student accommodation in the area. She noted that Townhead Health Centre Pharmacy was closed on a Saturday and Sunday, Abbey Chemists at 144 Trongate was open from 9.00am – 5.30pm on weekdays and closed on a Sunday and Lloydspharmacy, Huntingdon Square was closed at 1.00pm on a Saturday and all day on a Sunday. The Applicant felt that her proposed hours of service would provide an increased service to the neighbourhood than was available at present.

Strathclyde University had more than 22,000 full and part time students, 3,200 staff and 1,840 students living on campus in the neighbourhood. Glasgow Caledonian University presently had approximately 15,000 students, 1,500 staff and 660 students living on campus in the neighbourhood. Currently the needs of the student population were being underprovided and this could be demonstrated by the significant numbers of EHC encounters being undertaken by the pharmacies within the city centre. It would be useful to have increased provision in the area to ensure ease of access to the current population.

The Applicant concluded by advising that the national pharmacy strategy “The Right Medicine” made it clear that wide-ranging modern pharmaceutical services should be readily available to all communities in Scotland. Access to quality, local pharmaceutical care would dramatically improve the health of the Townhead neighbourhood and help to contribute to the continuing development of a community spirit. Mrs Christie reiterated that it had been recognised that a community pharmacy was one of the core services which help stimulate the development of a community. She asked the Committee to consider that the existing community of Townhead, which is to be developed extensively over the next few years by government initiatives, has been deprived of adequate, accessible, patient centred pharmaceutical care.

The Applicant asked the Committee to confirm its acceptance of the defined neighbourhood boundaries. She advised that she was personally committed to the project. She felt that with the experience and dedication that would bring to the project, the new contract and enhanced services she could bring about a positive health change to the community. She thanked the Committee for allowing her to present her application and trusted it would be given due consideration and be viewed within the context of the requirements of the new pharmacy contract and the Scottish Executive guidelines.

The Interested Parties’ Question and Applicant

In response to questioning from Mr Martin, the Applicant advised that she had not included Townhead Health Centre Pharmacy in her defined neighbourhood, as she felt that it was outwith the area. She felt the

eastern boundary to be High Street. On further questioning from Mr Martin, the Applicant advised that she would define a neighbourhood by the existence of natural boundaries. She listed the amenities existent in her defined neighbourhood and these included churches, a citizen's advice bureau and shops. She advised that some of the amenities had been depleted because of the close proximity to the city centre, and pointed to the plans to develop amenities in the area. She reiterated that her defined neighbourhood was one for all purposes.

In response to further questioning from Mr Martin, the Applicant agreed that she did not have any firm evidence of deficiencies in the current service, but had formed this view through personal viewpoint. She did not have any evidence that the current network could not meet current demand. She did not believe that the quality of service provided by the current network could be challenged. She believed her's to be the first application for an additional contract in this area.

In response to further questioning from Mr martin, the Applicant suggested that while some may agree that access to Townhead Health Centre Pharmacy, and Boots, Buchanan Galleries was easy for those resident in the Townhead area, she would point out that Townhead Health Centre Pharmacy was closed on Saturdays and Sundays, and that on these days, the population would need to travel further afield to access services. In response to Mr Martin's question as to whether it was acceptable for patients to have a 5-10 minute walk to access services, the Applicant suggested that the walk to Townhead Health Centre Pharmacy was more around the 12-15 minute mark and while the length of time taken to walk to the nearest pharmacy may be accepted, the route to the pharmacy from Townhead was not acceptable for pensioners and young mothers. This was also true of Boots in Buchanan Galleries. She also accepted that the population of Townhead could access public transport within a 3-4 minute walk, but asserted that they should not need to travel outwith their community to access essential services.

On further questioning from Mr Martin, the Applicant asserted that a best case scenario would be for services to be accessed by a walk across flat ground. This was especially true where significant elements of the population were either elderly or disabled.

In response to further questioning from Mr Martin, the Applicant advised that she may not be able to improve on the delivery service provided by Townhead Health Centre Pharmacy, as they already offered a face to face pharmacist service, but she was confident that she could improve on the service provided by Boots.

In response to final questioning from Mr Martin, the Applicant did not agree that patients on the lists of the GP practices who had recently moved to Petershill Road were well looked after by the current pharmacy network who provided a collection and delivery service. The Applicant asserted that there should be a healthcare presence within the

community in which the patients lived.

In response to questioning from Mr Mohammed, the Applicant agreed that her defined neighbourhood and the population statistics quoted had included Glasgow Caledonian University. She had included this as the University had the same post-code as Townhead and she saw Port Dundas Road as a natural boundary to the area.

In response to further questioning from Mr Mohammed, the Applicant advised that she had reconsidered her initial plan not to open on a Sunday. She felt that the potential demand from the student population at Strathclyde and Glasgow Caledonian Universities required a pharmaceutical service on a Sunday, and therefore she had decided to open for two hours on Sundays.

The Applicant responded to Mr Mohammed's question around the percentage of the population over 60 years, by advising the Committee that approximately 1,840 people within the Townhead area were over 60. The Applicant also advised the Committee that she was aware that specific authorisation was needed from the Health Board in order for her to provide some of the additional services mentioned in her submission.

The Applicant disagreed with Mr Mohammed's assertion that there was some overlap between the population covered by her application and that which would be served by Mr Mohammed's new pharmacy at 140 High Street. She felt that Mr Mohammed's new premises would ostensibly serve the tourist population and the homeless units in the area, rather than the resident population of Townhead. The Applicant also felt that the viability issue should not be the first consideration for the Committee in their determination of the new application. She was confident that the new application, if granted would not adversely affect any other contractor in the area. She suggested, however that the needs of the patients in the area should come first. She agreed with Mr Mohammed's assertion that there was an importance for rational distribution of pharmacy services, and suggested that this was not present in the Townhead area.

In response to questioning from Mr Tait, the Applicant confirmed that the distances provided by the Google mapping site were calculated by car. She was aware that there were paths through the Townhead area leading to the City Centre, however she disputed that the shortest route to Boots the Chemist at Buchanan Galleries would take only 5 minutes

The PPC Question the Applicant

In response to questioning from Mr Reid, the Applicant confirmed that she would provide patients with her mobile telephone number so that they could make contact with her. She had done this for patients attending her pharmacy in Anderston, and felt it had worked well.

In response to further questioning from Mr Reid, the Applicant confirmed

that she considered the proposed new pharmacy at High Street to be outwith her defined neighbourhood. She was confident that if her application was not granted, that the resident population of Townhead would not travel to the pharmacy at High Street for services related to minor ailments.

In response to questioning from Professor McKie, the Applicant considered that the resident population of Townhead would be registered with GP practices in Townhead Health Centre, Springburn Health Centre, Woodside Health Centre and the new GP practice in Petershill Road. She was confident that the population's registration would be spread amongst several practices in different areas.

In response to further questioning from Professor McKie, the Applicant confirmed that the new developments mentioned in her initial application would be situated within the area defined. She confirmed that there would be a mixture of replacement housing, and new housing. She further confirmed that she had chosen George Street as her southern boundary because of the student and staff population of Strathclyde University. She advised that she could have chosen Cathedral Street, but considered George Street to be more appropriate.

In response to questioning from Mrs Roberts, the Applicant confirmed that she intended to provide face to face contact for at least the first delivery visit to patients using the new pharmacy. She provided this service at the moment for her pharmacy in Anderston and considered this to work well. She intended to transfer the employment of her pharmacist currently working in the Anderston pharmacy to the new pharmacy. She would work there also, providing a delivery service in the evening, thus allowing her to provide the service personally.

In response to Mrs Roberts' assertion that she seemed to be unsure as to what the local community wanted in terms of services, the Applicant reiterated that Councillor Mathieson had canvassed opinion from the local community around their support for a pharmacy in the area. He had spoken to the Housing Department and the local community council, before agreeing to meet the applicant and before he had agreed to lend his support to the proposal.

In response to questioning from Mr Dykes, the Applicant asserted that in her experience students wishing to access EHC services wished to do so as soon as possible, and while she accepted that the medication was effective up to 72 hours after the episode of unprotected sex, she was of the opinion that the sooner the service could be accessed the better.

In response to further questioning from Mr Dykes, the Applicant asserted that mothers with pushchairs would be reluctant to travel to Boots in Buchanan Galleries to access services around minor ailments. The route was difficult to navigate for the elderly and the disabled population and she was confident that these elements of the population would be better served by the provision of services within the area in which they

lived.

In response to questioning from Mr MacIntyre, the Applicant confirmed that she was aware that she would require authorisation from the Health Board before she could undertake some of the services specified in her application. She advised that she would honour her commitment to open on Sundays even if she was not successful in securing authorisation to provide some of the services.

There were no questions to the Applicant from the Chair or Mr Gillespie.

The Interested Parties' Case – Mr Paul Martin (Townhead Health Centre Pharmacy)

Mr Martin commenced his presentation by advising the Committee that Townhead Health Centre Pharmacy considered the application should be rejected. In terms of the legal test set out in the current pharmaceutical regulations, the Committee had to take into consideration factors present within the neighbourhood, and only if they considered the existing services to be inadequate could they then give consideration to the issue of necessity or desirability.

Mr Martin reminded the Committee that the 1995 regulations did not define a neighbourhood, and that indeed the judiciary had shied away from placing a definition on this. Judicial guidance had, however been handed down in the form of judicial reviews. Lord Nimmo-Smith had suggested that the work "neighbourhood" within the regulations should have an ordinary interpretation applied to it, i.e. vicinity or nearness. It should be an area for all purposes. The National Appeals Panel had considered a neighbourhood to include a wide range of services including GP practices, Post Office, banks, and libraries. Bearing this definition in mind, Mr Martin disputed that the area defined by the Applicant could be considered to be a neighbourhood, given that it included only a few of the services mentioned previously.

Mr Martin put forward an alternative neighbourhood, namely: to the north, the M8 motorway and Baird Street, to the west, Port Dundas Road, Aitken Road, West Nile Street, to the south, Cathedral Street along Cathedral Square, and to the east, Wishart Street and Alexandra Parade, including Glasgow Royal Infirmary.

Mr Martin suggested that within this defined neighbourhood, the current services were entirely adequate. There were two contractors providing readily accessible, high quality services. Boots in Buchanan Galleries was open seven days per week. An additional contract in the area could only be considered on the grounds of convenience; however Mr Martin suggested that this was not appropriate as it would dilute an already adequate service.

Mr Martin reiterated that the population within his defined neighbourhood currently enjoyed access to adequate services and that once this test

was applied to the redefined neighbourhood, the application should be rejected.

The Applicant Questions Mr Martin

In response to questioning from the Applicant, Mr Martin advised that patients using Townhead Health Centre Pharmacy would need to access other pharmacies for minor ailments services on Saturdays and Sundays.

In response to further questioning from the Applicant, Mr Martin advised that he did not consider the journey between the Townhead area and Townhead Health Centre Pharmacy to be difficult for the elderly or disabled. He disagreed with the Applicant's description of the journey as "torturous". He agreed that Townhead Health Centre Pharmacy was not visible from the street, but did not consider this to be an issue.

In response to final questioning from the Applicant, Mr Martin did not have any firm details around the numbers of students registered with practices within Townhead Health Centre. He suggested that numbers would not be significant as many would access services provided by the Student Advisory Service.

There were no questions to Mr Martin from Mr Mohammed or Mr Tait

The PPC Question Mr Martin

In response to questioning from Professor McKie, Mr Martin advised that there would be no question of Townhead Health Centre Pharmacy closing if the application were granted, but it would suffer a reasonable loss of business.

In response to questioning from Mrs Roberts, Mr Martin advised that most elements of the population would welcome a pharmacy situated "on their doorstep"; however he considered this to be a question of convenience rather than desirability. Mr Martin was confident that Townhead Health Centre Pharmacy provided ready access to services to those elements of the population who might find it difficult to visit the pharmacy in person, via their collection and delivery service.

In response to further questioning from Mrs Roberts, Mr Martin advised that minor ailments services could not be provided through a collection and delivery service.

In response to questioning from Mr Dykes, Mr Martin advised that many students registered with GPs as temporary residents. They were a transient population, and would register with a GP recommended by the Student Advisory Service. He couldn't quantify the numbers of students registered with practices within Townhead Health Centre.

In response to questioning from Mr MacIntyre, Mr Martin confirmed that the granting of a new contract would not affect Townhead Health Centre Pharmacy's capacity to invest in pharmaceutical services. He had advised that the pharmacy had always been proactive in looking at the services they provide and that this would continue.

There were no questions to Mr Martin from Mr Reid, or the Chair.

The Interested Parties' Case – Mr Asgher Mohammed (Abbey Chemist)

Mr Mohammed advised the Committee that in his opinion the defined neighbourhood should not include Glasgow Caledonian University. Most students and staff attending this university would access services in Boots the Chemist, Buchanan Galleries. They were therefore adequately served by the existing network. Those students at Strathclyde University would be served by Mr Mohammed's new pharmacy which would be situated at 140 High Street. This, Mr Mohammed suggested left a small population in Townhead who at present accessed services which were spread across the locality. The current pharmacies were not difficult to get to. For those elements of the population that may find it difficult to travel to the pharmacy on foot, there was ready access to public transport links.

Mr Mohammed suggested that the services proposed by the Applicant were similar to those which would be offered from his new pharmacy in High Street. This was a clear overlap. Mr Mohammed advised the Committee that the opening of his new pharmacy would have an effect on the population of Townhead, but accepted that some pockets of the population would continue to find it difficult to access services.

The Applicant Questions Mr Mohammed

In response to questioning from the Applicant, Mr Mohammed advised that he could not quantify how many patients from the Townhead area visited his pharmacy at 144 Trongate.

The Interested Parties Question Mr Mohammed

In response to questioning from Mr Martin, Mr Mohammed advised that his new pharmacy at High Street would serve some elements of the population in Townhead. He suggested that it was difficult to ensure easy access to services for 100% of the population, but that a substantial amount would be served.

There were no questions to Mr Mohammed from Mr Tait.

There were no questions to Mr Mohammed from the Committee.

The Interested Parties' Case – Mr Charles Tait (Boots the Chemist)

Mr Tait advised the Committee that it was extremely difficult to define neighbourhoods in city centre areas. He considered that most of the boundaries around the area could be crossed except to the north, the M8 motorway. The Townhead area was encapsulated by the city centre, and was one of a small population around 3,000 (according to the 2001 Census statistics).

He considered that Townhead Health Centre Pharmacy should be included in the defined neighbourhood as it provided services to the residents of Townhead. It was easily accessible via a walkway. Patients could access the other pharmacies in the area within 10 mins travelling time. The current network provided adequate services, including emergency hormonal contraception which was provided from Boots the Chemist, Queen Street Station, which was busy due its location.

Mr Tait concluded that the services currently available in the area were adequate and therefore the application should fail.

The Applicant Questions Mr Tait

In response to questioning from the Applicant, Mr Tait confirmed that Boots the Chemist currently did not provide a delivery service from its pharmacies. This may change in the future.

The Interested Parties Question Mr Tait

In response to Mr Martin, Mr Tait advised that he had had no indication that patients experienced difficulty in accessing services provided by Boots in the city centre. There was no effort in accessing the Boots pharmacy in Buchanan Galleries, due to the availability of escalators and lifts.

In response to questioning from Mr Mohammed, Mr Tait confirmed that Boots did not provide needle exchange services from the two pharmacies closest to the Applicant's proposed premises. Boots had consulted with the Health Board around this service, and the Health Board had expressed a preference that this service be provided by the Charing Cross branch.

The Committee Question Mr Tait

In response to questioning from Mr Reid, Mr Tait advised that the current network of services was easily accessible for those who were able to travel normal distances. For those with severe disabilities the access to the current pharmacies would prove no more difficult than the access to the proposed pharmacy, given the lack of mobility.

In response to further questioning from Mr Reid, Mr Tait advised that he could not quantify how many patients from Townhead visited the

Boots branches. He knew there was a steady stream, but not exact numbers.

In response to questioning from Professor McKie, Mr Tait advised that the viability of the Boots branch in Buchanan Galleries would not be affected. The branch in Queen Street station dispensed a low number of prescriptions and relied heavily on income from NHS dispensing. He considered that this branch would be affected if the application were granted.

In response to questioning from Mrs Roberts, Mr Tait agreed that a neighbourhood should have access to at least one healthcare professional. He contended however that the population of Townhead already had adequate access to such services from GP practices at Woodside and Townhead Health Centres.

In response to questioning from Mr Dykes, Mr Tait advised that he thought the Boots branch at Queen Street station provided a high level of EHC services, due to the anonymity afforded to patients visiting the pharmacy and the convenience of the locality.

There were no questions to Mr Tait from Mr MacIntyre or the Chair.

In response to follow up questioning from Professor McKie, Mr Tait advised that Queen Street station was a popular choice for people accessing EHC services as it was busy, and was outwith many patients area of residence. This was attractive to patients. He did not have any personal knowledge of numbers visiting from outside the area, but was aware that the branch attracted patients from all over Glasgow.

The Interested Parties Sum Up

Mr Martin advised the Committee that the neighbourhood defined by the Applicant was a settlement and not a neighbourhood in terms of the regulations. There was no suggestion that the currently services were less than adequate and reminded the Committee not to confuse convenience with desirability.

Mr Mohammed advised the Committee that the Applicant's defined neighbourhood was very small. There was access to services close by. His pharmacy in Trongate already provided services to this population, and his new pharmacy in High Street would increase the choice. Overall the application was not necessary or desirable.

Mr Tait advised the Committee that he had little to add. There was no need for an additional contract. Access to current services was good.

The Applicant Sums Up

Ms Christie advised that she often thought as a student attending

Strathclyde University that there should have been a pharmacy in the heart of the Townhead community. A great deal of thought, effort and passion had gone into her application and she believed that an additional pharmacy with a broad range of service was both necessary and desirable in the area she had defined. The area required another pharmacy offering methadone and needle exchange services. The student needs were currently being underprovided and a pharmacy offering EHC and other services would be necessary to meet the student population requirements. A further pharmacy would provide improved access, and would offer the population choice, thus addressing the changing demands of the new contract. The idea of the Public Health agenda was to use the pharmacy network to provide healthy lifestyle messages to local communities like Townhead. The Scottish Executive's drive was to use pharmacies as health living walk-in centres and this would be exactly like the pharmacy the Applicant proposed to run. The proposal had support from the local councillor and Townhead Community Council who stressed the importance of services to the area. The granting of the contract would breathe life into Townhead and continue the regeneration that was currently underway. The proposed layout provided for three consultation rooms, which meant the Applicant could liaise with the Health Board and other social care professionals to provide extra health services for the community. Finally, the Applicant felt that patients should have access to core services in their area and not have to travel across natural boundaries such as motorways, busy roads or high density shopping areas.

DECISION

The PPC was required and did take into account all relevant factors concerning the issue of:-

- a) Neighbourhood;
- b) Adequacy of existing pharmaceutical services in the neighbourhood and, in particular, whether the provision of pharmaceutical services at the premises named in the application was necessary or desirable in order to secure adequate provision of pharmaceutical services in the neighbourhood in which the premises were located.

The PPC took into all account all written representations and supporting documents submitted by the Applicant, the Interested Parties and those who were entitled to make representations to the PPC, namely:

- a) Chemist contractors within the vicinity of the Applicant's premises;
- b) The Greater Glasgow Area Pharmaceutical Committee (General Practitioner Sub-Committee);
- c) The Greater Glasgow Area Medical Committee (GP Sub-Committee).

The Committee also considered;-

- d) The location of the nearest existing pharmaceutical services;
- e) Demographic information regarding post code sectors G1.2, G4.0, G21.2 and G31.2;
- f) Patterns of public transport; and
- g) NHS Greater Glasgow and Clyde plans for future development of services; and

Having considered the evidence presented to it, and the PPC's observation from the collective site visit, the PPC had to decide first the question of the neighbourhood in which the premises to which the application related, were located.

The Committee considered the differing neighbourhoods put forward by the Applicant, and the Interested Parties. Taking all information into consideration, the Committee considered that the neighbourhood should be defined as follows:

North – the M8 motorway and Baird Street

South – Cathedral Street (north side)

East – Castle Street (west side), to its meeting with Cathedral Street

West – North Hanover Street to its meeting with Baird Street

The Committee noted that the area of Townhead was bound on all four sides by particular physical boundaries. It was in the Committee's opinion a discreet neighbourhood.

Adequacy of Existing Provision of Pharmaceutical Services and Necessity or Desirability

Having reached that decision, the PPC was then required to consider the adequacy of 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.

Within the neighbourhood as defined by the PPC there were no existing pharmacies. The nearest pharmacies lay outwith the area defined by the Committee. The Committee considered the views expressed by the Interested Parties that the current pharmaceutical network was easily accessible. The Committee did not agree entirely with these assertions. The area defined by the Committee was a clearly defined residential area, and as such had its own demography, which did not currently enjoy access to adequate pharmaceutical services.

Having come to this conclusion, the Committee agreed that an additional contract in the area was desirable to secure the adequate provision of pharmaceutical services for the entire population within the defined neighbourhood.

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

DECIDED/-

The PPC was satisfied that the provision of pharmaceutical services at the premises of the Applicant was desirable in order to secure adequate provision of pharmaceutical services in the neighbourhood in which the premises were located by persons whose names were included in the Pharmaceutical List and in the circumstances, it was the unanimous decision of the PPC that the application be granted.

The Chemist Contractor Member of the Committee Gordon Dykes, Alasdair MacIntyre and Board Officers rejoined the meeting at this stage.

**Contractor
Services
Supervisor**

5. NATIONAL APPEALS PANEL DETERMINATION

The Committee having previously been circulated with paper 2007/19 noted the contents which gave details of the National Appeals Panel's determination of appeals lodged against the Committee's decision in the following cases:

**Mr Mohammed Rashid – 641 Hawthorn Street, Glasgow G22.6
(Case No: PPC/INCL06/2006)**

The Committee noted that the National Appeals Panel had dismissed the Appeal submitted against the PPC's decision to refuse Boots the Chemist's application to establish a pharmacy at the above address. As such Boots the Chemists' name was not included in the Board's Provisional Pharmaceutical List, and the file on the application had been closed.

6. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

Scheduled for Tuesday 8th May 2007 at 12.30pm in LMC Offices, 40 New City Road, Glasgow.

The Meeting ended at 4.15p.m.