

NOT YET ENDORSED AS A CORRECT RECORD

Pharmacy Practices Committee (09)

Minutes of a Meeting held on

Monday 18th June 2007

Seminar Room, Glasgow Homoeopathic Hospital, Great Western Road
Glasgow, G12

PRESENT:

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

IN ATTENDANCE

Trish Cawley	Contractor Services Supervisor
Robert Gillespie	Interim Lead – Community Pharmacy Development
Janine Glen	Contracts Manager
Agnes Stewart	Deputy 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 declaration of interest was made by any member of the Committee.

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received on behalf of David Thomson and Alasdair MacIntyre.

2. MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday 2nd May 2007 **PPC[M]2007/07** and Thursday 24th May 2007 **PPC[M]2007/08** were approved as a correct record with the following amendment:

24th May – Sederunt should be amended to reflect Agnes Stewart's attendance.

3. ANY OTHER BUSINESS NOT INCLUDED IN AGENDA

ACTION

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 PHARMACEUTICAL LIST

Case No: PPC/INCL07/2007

Lloydspharmacy – Unit 3 The Monument, 130 Gallowgate, Glasgow G1 5AE

The Committee was asked to consider an application submitted by Lloydspharmacy Ltd, to provide general pharmaceutical services from premises situated at Unit 3 The Monument 130 Gallowgate, Glasgow G1.5 under Regulation 5(10) 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 Lloydspharmacy Ltd, 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 Mr James McKeaver ("the Applicant"). The interested parties who had submitted written representations during the consultation period, and who had chosen to attend the oral hearing were Ms Lesley Dunn (Abbey Chemists), assisted by Mr Asgher Mohammed and Mr Charles Tait (Boots the Chemist) ("the Interested Parties").

Prior to the hearing, the Panel had collectively visited the vicinity surrounding The Monument, Glasgow G1 5AE, the pharmacies, and facilities in the immediate neighbourhood, and the wider areas of Dennistoun, Bridgeton, Calton and Saltmarket.

The procedure adopted by the PPC at the hearing was that the Chairman asked the Applicant to make his 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

Mr McKeaver commenced his presentation by thanking the Committee for giving him the opportunity to present his case. He advised the Committee that the Applicant believed that their defined neighbourhood was currently absent of pharmacy services and that on those grounds they would ask the Committee to view that pharmacy services to patients in the neighbourhood were inadequate and a pharmacy contract should be granted. Mr McKeaver advised that a major part of his presentation would be taken up with discussion on neighbourhood and that he would then go on to address adequacy in that neighbourhood.

Mr McKeaver asserted that the Applicant believed they had a strong argument for each of the neighbourhood boundaries defined and that he would discuss each of the adjacent neighbourhoods and the reasons why the Applicant felt the Gallowgate area to be discrete from areas such as the Merchant City and Bridgeton where the majority of the persons who had objected to the application had pharmacy contracts.

The Applicant's neighbourhood was defined as:

- North – the boundary of the Gallowgate (A89)
- West – Saltmarket
- South – The river Clyde
- East – Green Street

Within this neighbourhood, the Applicant advised there was no current pharmaceutical provision.

Mr McKeaver went on to expand on the neighbourhood and the reasons for choosing these boundaries.

West – Saltmarket – Mr McKeaver advised that a visit around the area of the Saltmarket and north up High Street showed clear distinct populations. The Applicant's argument was that patients on the west side of High Street were quite clearly living in the area commonly known as the "Merchant City". Glasgow Council had taken the step of distinguishing the area by erecting a number of notices stating "Merchant City". These included one situated at Glasgow Cross where Ingram Street meets High Street and one on the western boundaries at George Square. He stated that the Merchant City quite clearly wasn't part of Gallowgate and suggested that residents would not welcome being

considered as such. Within the area known as Merchant City there was one pharmacy – Abbey Chemists at 144 Trongate.

North – Gallowgate (A89) - the area to the north of the Gallowgate was on the whole a mixture of derelict and run down commercial premises and formed a different environment than that to the south of the road, with its large number of residential homes.

The Applicant believed that this constituted a clear boundary, although not in the manner of a river or a busy road. Instead this was a boundary of environment. The area to the north was zoned for redevelopment and work had already started in the area near Duke Street and High Street.

South – the River Clyde – This formed a clear natural boundary separating new Gorbals from the north side of the river and was only passable at the Saltmarket bridge.

East – Green Street – The Applicant had marked the eastern boundary as the area commonly known as Calton. The house style was markedly different from the tenements of Bridgeton. The Applicant had considered Abercromby Street to be too far east and quite clearly part of the Bridgeton area. Green Street was considered by the Applicant to be the west boundary of Bridgeton.

Mr McKeaver reiterated that within the defined neighbourhood currently there were no pharmacy contracts.

The Unit that the Applicant had secured was 246sqm in size and heads of terms had been agreed. The premises were situated in a prominent location central to the defined neighbourhood and would have DDA compatible access. There were two inexpensive car parks directly opposite the premises which served to reduce the difficulty in parking in the city centre.

Within the unit, the Applicant intended to create a state of the art modern pharmacy in line with the unit Lloydspharmacy had recently opened in Perth. The unit would contain:

- a large modern dispensary;
- three care rooms (used to support healthcare professionals);
- a needle exchange/methadone area; and
- a meeting room.

Within the premises, the Applicant would offer:-

- private eMAS consultations;
- dedicated methadone supervision;
- needle exchange;
- blood pressure monitoring;

- diabetes screening;
- cholesterol testing;
- coronary risk, assessment;
- domiciliary oxygen service;
- prescription collection and delivery;
- INR testing for patients receiving warfarin;
- weight management; and
- smoking cessation.

Mr McKeaver explained that the population within the Gallowgate neighbourhood defined by the Applicant were exceptionally deprived and required a high level of medical and pharmaceutical care. The area scored highly in the deprivation index and currently had no face to face pharmacy services. It was within such areas that Health Boards would have to focus on when producing their Pharmaceutical Care Services Plans and focus pharmacy services in deprived areas.

On this basis, the Applicant would view the awarding of the pharmacy contract at Unit 3, The Monument to be necessary and at the very least desirable, to secure adequate provision of pharmaceutical services in the neighbourhood.

Mr McKeaver suggested that the objections to the application were based around services the interested parties currently provided. Although they listed a large number of services, they did not provide any direct contact or counselling with the patients within the defined neighbourhood as they were all situated outwith the neighbourhood. The provision of pharmaceutical services was necessary for an area that was one of Glasgow's most deprived. The Applicant intended to provide these services in premises that would be at the centre of the community.

The Interested Parties Question and Applicant

In response to questioning from Ms Dunn, the Applicant reiterated that he felt the area on the west side of High Street to be distinct from the Gallowgate. He pointed to the steps taken by Glasgow City Council to identify the area as a discreet area known commonly as "Merchant City".

On further questioning from Ms Dunn, the Applicant advised that the area of Gallowgate merged into the area known as Calton as opposed to being completely distinct. He conceded that the company's premises while described as being central to Gallowgate was in fact to the west of centre of the defined neighbourhood.

In response to Ms Dunn's question around population statistics, the Applicant advised that he could not give any firm numbers, but estimated the population of Gallowgate and Calton as being between 3-4 thousand.

In response to further questioning from Ms Dunn, the Applicant

confirmed that the housing at the west boundary of Gallowgate could be described as modern/traditional flatted accommodation. He reiterated however that this did not preclude the residents from expecting to be able to access pharmaceutical services in their neighbourhood.

In response to further questioning from Ms Dunn, the Applicant advised that Abbey Chemists in Trongate was probably a three or four minute walk from the Applicant's proposed premises. He advised however that a higher density of pharmacies would be expected in an urban setting such as a city centre. He further confirmed that residents in Green Street could easily access services by taking public transport into the City Centre. He reiterated that there was no pharmacy services currently located within the neighbourhood.

On further questioning from Ms Dunn, the Applicant advised that the nearest medical practice was situated at Gorbals and Bridgeton Health Centres. Both of these were approximately ten minutes travelling time from the Applicant's proposed premises.

In response to final questioning from Ms Dunn, the Applicant accepted that Ms Dunn provided face to face services to her patients, but reiterated that there was no face to face service provision available within the neighbourhood as defined by the Applicant. He also confirmed that Lloydspharmacy had a branch at Bridgeton Cross, but did not consider that this could be considered as being "close" to the proposed premises. He did not consider that residents in Gallowgate would walk to Bridgeton Cross to access services.

In response to questioning from Mr Tait, the Applicant reiterated his points around the identification of the Merchant City as a distinct area. He considered this area to be of different demography from Gallowgate and reiterated his point around Glasgow City Council's deliberate advertising of the area as separate from others.

In response to further questioning from Mr Tait, the Applicant disagreed that the housing to the west of High Street was comparable to that in Gallowgate. He confirmed that Green Street had been chosen as the east boundary because Abercromby Street had been deemed too far to the east of the area. He did not consider that residents in Gallowgate would walk to Bridgeton Cross to access services.

The PPC Question the Applicant

In response to questioning from Mr Reid, the Applicant confirmed that he did not have any confirmed population figures for the area, but guessed it to be in the region of 3-4 thousand. He confirmed that his comment around no face to face contact in the defined neighbourhood was the same as saying there was no pharmacy in the defined neighbourhood.

In response to questioning from Mrs Roberts, the Applicant advised that he was aware that a new pharmacy contract had been granted for premises situated in High Street. He quoted Lord Drummond Young's opinion that proposed pharmaceutical services should not be taken into account when considering applications for the provision of new services.

In response to further questioning from Mrs Roberts, the Applicant confirmed that there were no GP services within the defined neighbourhood. The nearest services were located in Bridgeton.

In response to final questioning from Mrs Roberts, the Applicant declined to answer what he considered a hypothetical question as to whether Lloydspharmacy would have lodged an objection if the application had been submitted by another party.

In response to questioning from Mr Dykes, the Applicant confirmed that the pharmacy would be built on one floor of the proposed premises. It would be fully DDA compliant. He confirmed that he had not actually been in the premises, but had seen drawings.

The Applicant responded to questioning from Professor McKie around the types of accommodation in the area, by confirming that he thought the housing on the east side of High Street i.e. Gallowgate was more affordable than in other areas. He did not consider the residents in St Andrews Square as being deprived, but perhaps not as affluent as those resident within the area commonly known as the Merchant City. This view was borne out by the differential in housing prices between both areas.

In response to further questioning from Professor McKie, the Applicant reiterated that he would not consider the whole of his defined neighbourhood as being deprived, but certainly those resident on the east side of the neighbourhood. He confirmed that the east boundary of the neighbourhood had been chosen arbitrarily and that the decision had relied on the description of those living there, rather than anything else.

In response to final question from Prof McKie, the Applicant advised that those living in Moncur Street could access the proposed premises from the numerous walkways into the neighbourhood. He estimated that approximately 1/3 of the population of the neighbourhood resided east of Bain Street with 2/3 residing to the west.

In response to questioning from the Chair, the Applicant advised that he did not have any official deprivation statistics for the neighbourhood.

There were no questions to Mr McKeever from Mr Gillespie.

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

Mr Tait thanked the Committee for giving him the opportunity to put his case, and advised that Boots the Chemist did not accept the Applicant's definition of the neighbourhood. He disagreed with the boundaries defined by the Applicant and suggested that there was complete ease of access to pharmaceutical services within four or five minutes of the Applicant's proposed premises, plus a further contract about to commence later in the year (170 High Street). He advised the Committee that the Applicant had quoted a legal argument for not considering the new pharmacy about to open and suggested that as the pharmacy was included in the Provisional Pharmaceutical List, even though it did not exist in terms of physicality the Committee had a right to consider what was in existence and what reasonable would occur. As the pharmacy was due to open in the next few months, Mr Tait suggested that it should be taken into account.

He considered that there was no distinct neighbourhood adjacent to the Applicant's proposed premises. The Bridgeton area extended through Calton and into the area, while the city centre did the same from the other side. Services in both these areas were adequate.

There were no questions to Mr Tait from the Applicant or Ms Dunn.

The PPC Question Mr Tait

In response to questioning from Mr Reid, Mr Tait confirmed that he would place the eastern boundary to the neighbourhood probably beyond Abercromby Street. He advised that Argyle Street/Trongate extended into Merchant City and that the two areas met in the middle.

There were no questions to Mr Tait from Mrs Roberts, Mr Dykes, Mr Gillespie, Prof McKie or the Chair.

The Interested Parties Case – Ms Lesley Dunn (Abbey Chemists)

Ms Dunn advised the Committee that her pharmacy served customers who walked from the Gallowgate area with no complaints. Abbey Chemists was well established having been in Chisholm Street and then in Trongate for nearly 100 years. Abbey was soon to open a new store on High Street which would be open seven days per week from 8.30am – 6.00pm. In addition there was already a branch of Lloydspharmacy nearby (Bridgeton Cross). Ms Dunn reminded the Committee that Lloydspharmacy had been one of the objectors to Abbey Chemists application for a contract on High Street when it was initially submitted in October 2006. It was Abbey Chemists' opinion that there was no need for a further pharmacy in this location.

There were no questions to Ms Dunn from the Applicant or Mr Tait.

The PPC Question Ms Dunn

In response to questioning from Mr Reid, Ms Dunn confirmed that she had taken the opportunity of walking from Abbey Chemists to the Applicant's proposed premises which had taken only 3-4 minutes.

In response to questioning from Mrs Roberts, Ms Dunn confirmed that she was familiar with the population in the area and confirmed that she did dispense some prescriptions for residents in St Andrews Square. She would not consider them as young urban professionals, but more middle income and retired.

In response to questioning from Mr Dykes, Ms Dunn requested that Mr Mohammed be allowed to respond on the issue raised. The Chair confirmed with all present that they had no objection to Mr Mohammed being allowed to speak for this one issue. All confirmed that they had no objection.

In response to Mr Dyke's question Mr Mohammed advised that Abbey Chemist had in place a contingency plan which would secure the on-going provision of pharmacy services in the event that the proposed plan for Selfridges to open a store directly behind Abbey's current premises, came to fruition.

There were no questions to Ms Dunn from Professor McKie, Mr Gillespie or the Chair.

The Interested Parties Sum Up

Ms Dunn advised the Committee that she felt she provided a comprehensive service to her patients with face to face contact with customers from the Applicant's defined neighbourhood. She did not consider the application to be necessary or desirable.

Mr Tait advised the Committee that there was no inadequacy of service in the area. There was ease of access in all direction except south.

The Applicant Sums Up

Mr McKeaver advised the Committee that he disagreed with the Interested Parties assertions. He believed that Lloydspharmacy had defined a reasonably strong neighbourhood. He pointed to the significant retail development that was taking place around the area and asserted that this would change the requirements for services. He reiterated that the Merchant City was quite different to Gallowgate which had no current pharmaceutical provision. The application was necessary and desirable.

Before the Applicant and the Interested Parties left the hearing, the

Chair asked them to confirm that they had had a full and fair hearing. All confirmed that they had.

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 NHS Greater Glasgow & Clyde Area Pharmaceutical General Practitioner Sub-Committee;
- c) The Greater Glasgow & Clyde 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 G1.5, and G40.2;
- f) Patterns of public transport; and
- g) NHS Greater Glasgow and Clyde plans for future development of services.

DECISION

Having considered the evidence presented to it, and the PPC's observation from the 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 neighbourhood put forward by the Applicant. Taking all information into consideration, the Committee agreed that the neighbourhood should be defined as follows:

North: Duke Street (A8 trunk road) to its meeting with Abercromby Street;
East: Abercromby Street, south crossing London Road to the Green and King's Drive;
South: from King's Drive following the line of the River Clyde to Crown Street;
West: Saltmarket and High Street to its junction with Duke Street.

The Committee concluded this neighbourhood as being appropriate. To the east Abercromby Street was the boundary into the area commonly known as Bridgeton. This area was significantly different from the area surrounding the Applicant's proposed premises both in terms of demographics and housing stock. The River Clyde formed a clear physical boundary to the south.

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 was an adequate provision of pharmaceutical services provided by the existing contractors located within the neighbourhood. There was no evidence available to the PPC that accessibility to services provided by the current pharmaceutical network was not adequate. While there was evidence of development in the area, the Committee were confident that those people coming into the area would have access to adequate services either from Abbey Chemists to the west of the neighbourhood or from Bridgeton HC Pharmacy and Munros to the east. The current pharmaceutical contractors provided all services expected by a local community including needle exchange, supervised methadone and domiciliary oxygen.

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.

In accordance with the statutory procedure the Chemist Contractor Member of the Committee Gordon Dykes 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 neither necessary nor desirable in order to secure adequate provision of pharmaceutical services in the neighbourhood in which the premises were located by persons whose names are included in the Pharmaceutical List and in the circumstances, it was the unanimous decision of the PPC that the application be refused.

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

5. MINOR RELOCATION OF EXISTING PHARMACEUTICAL SERVICES

The Committee having previously been circulated with Paper 2007/26 considered the undernoted applications for a minor relocation of existing pharmaceutical services:

Minor Relocation of Existing Pharmaceutical Services

i) Case No: PPC/MRELOC01/2007 – Boots the Chemist, 71 Gordon Street, Glasgow G1.3

The Board had received an application from Boots the Chemist Ltd seeking to relocate from 71 Gordon Street, Glasgow G1.3 to alternative premises situated at Unit 13, Caledonia Centre, Central Station, Glasgow G1.3.

The Joint Lead, Community Pharmacy Development recommended that the application fulfilled the criteria for a minor relocation, as did the Greater Glasgow & Clyde Area Pharmaceutical General Practitioner Sub-committee.

Given the above, the Committee agreed that the application could be granted in terms of Regulation 5(4) of the current Pharmaceutical Regulations.

ii) Case No: PPC/MRELOC02/2007 – Lloydspharmacy Ltd, 29 Dunkenny Square, Glasgow G15.8

The Board had received an application from Lloydspharmacy Ltd seeking to relocate from 29 Dunkenny Square, Glasgow G15.8 to alternative premises situated at 24 Dunkenny Square, Glasgow G15.8

The Joint Lead, Community Pharmacy Development recommended that the application fulfilled the criteria for a minor relocation, as did the Greater Glasgow & Clyde Area Pharmaceutical General Practitioner Sub-committee.

Given the above, the Committee agreed that the application could be granted in terms of Regulation 5(4) of the current Pharmaceutical Regulations.

iii) Case No: PPC/MRELOC03/2007 – J&JG Dickson & Sons, 6-8 Tullis Street, Glasgow G40.1

The Board had received an application from J&JG Dickson & Sons seeking to relocate from 6-8 Tullis Street, Glasgow G40.1 to alternative premises situated at 31 Main Street, Glasgow G40.1.

The Joint Lead, Community Pharmacy Development recommended that the application fulfilled the criteria for a minor relocation, as did the Greater Glasgow & Clyde Area Pharmaceutical General Practitioner Sub-committee.

Given the above, the Committee agreed that the application could be granted in terms of Regulation 5(4) of the current Pharmaceutical Regulations.

iv) Case No: PPC/MRELOC04/2007 – Pollok Pharmacy, Unit 38 Pollock Centre, Glasgow G53.8

The Board had received an application from Pollok Pharmacy seeking to relocate from Unit 83 Pollok Centre, Glasgow G453.8 to alternative premises situated at Unit M3/M4 Silverburn Centre, Glasgow G53.8.

The Joint Lead, Community Pharmacy Development recommended that the application fulfilled the criteria for a minor relocation, as did the Greater Glasgow & Clyde Area Pharmaceutical General Practitioner Sub-committee.

Given the above, the Committee agreed that the application could be granted in terms of Regulation 5(4) of the current Pharmaceutical Regulations.

5. MATTERS CONSIDERED BY THE CHAIR SINCE THE DATE OF THE LAST MEETING

The Committee having previously been circulated with Paper 2007/27 noted the contents which gave details of matters considered by the Chair since the date of the last meeting:

Minor Relocation of Existing Pharmaceutical Services

Case No: PPC/MRELOC05/2007 – Apple Pharmacy, 1056 Argyle Street, Glasgow G3.8

The Committee considered the action taken by the Chairman on an application for a minor relocation of a NHS Dispensing contract currently held by Apple Pharmacy, 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, having been satisfied that the application fulfilled the requirements laid down in the Pharmaceutical Regulations.

Transfer of NHS Dispensing Contract Where a Change of Ownership has Taken Place

Case No: PPC/CO13/2007 – Kennyhill Pharmacy Ltd, 140 Cumbernauld Road, Galsgow G31.4

The Board received an application from M&D Green Dispensing Chemist Ltd for inclusion in the Board's Pharmaceutical List at the pharmacy previously listed as Kennyhill Pharmacy Ltd, at the address given above with effect from 1st June 2007. The trading name of the pharmacy will be Kennyhill Pharmacy.

The Committee was advised that the level of service was not reduced by the new contractor and that the new contractor was suitably registered with the Royal Pharmaceutical Society of Great Britain.

Given the above, the Chairman agreed that the criteria required by the Regulations were fulfilled, and accordingly approved the application.

NOTED/-

7. NATIONAL APPEALS PANEL DETERMINATION

The Committee having previously been circulated with paper 2007/28 noted the contents which gave details of the National Appeals Panel's determination of appeals lodged against the Committee's decision in the following case:

Dr Saduf Riaz, Premichem Pharmacy Ltd – 151 Oxford Street, Glasgow G5 9JE (Case No: PPC/INCL04/2007)

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

8. REVIEW OF PROCESSES FOR NEW APPLICATIONS

The Committee having previously been circulated with papers regarding the Review of Processes for New Applications provided Board Officers with comments and amendments. Mrs Glen advised that the Processes would come into force once the amendments had been made.

Mrs Glen also undertook to provide the Committee with a copy of the updated remit.

9. ANY OTHER COMPETENT BUSINESS

There was no other competent business.

10. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

Scheduled for Wednesday 4th July 2007 at 12.30pm. Venue to be confirmed.

The Meeting ended at 4.15p.m.

**Contracts
Manager**