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.

The Chair welcomed Mr Daniels and Mr Irvine to their first Pharmacy Practice Committee and thanked them for accepting membership of the Committee.

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received on behalf of Robert Gillespie and Mrs Agnes Stewart.

2. 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)

3. APPLICATION FOR INCLUSION IN THE BOARD’S PHARMACEUTICAL LIST
Case No: PPC/INCL15/2007
Premichem Pharmacy Ltd, represented by Dr Riaz Unit 102, 1 Rutherglen Road, Glasgow G73 1SX

The Committee was asked to consider an application submitted by Dr Riaz, to provide general pharmaceutical services from premises situated at Unit 102, 1 Rutherglen Road, Glasgow G73.1 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 Premichem Pharmacy 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 by Dr Saduf Riaz (“the Applicant”), assisted by Mr James Semple. The interested parties who had submitted written representations during the consultation period, and who had chosen to attend the oral hearing were Mr Charles Tait, (Boots the Chemist), Mrs Carol Burns (Burns Pharmacy), and Mr Stephen Dickson (Dickson Chemists) (“the Interested Parties”).

Prior to the hearing, the Panel had collectively visited the vicinity surrounding 1 Rutherglen Road, Glasgow G73.1, the immediate neighbourhood and the pharmacies, GP surgeries and facilities in the wider areas of Hutchesontown, Bridgeton, Dalmarnock, Rutherglen and Toryglen.

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. Thereafter each of the interested parties would make their submission with the opportunity for the Applicant and the PPC to ask questions after each submission. The Interested Parties and the Applicant were then given the opportunity to sum up.
Prior to the Applicant commencing his presentation, the Chair asked those present to confirm that they had received notification of the additional information submitted by the Applicant in support of the application, and that they had been given the opportunity of viewing the additional information prior to the meeting. All confirmed that they had. The Chair asked the Applicant to sign the schedule provided to the Interested Parties in confirmation that it provided an accurate record of the 397 pages submitted. The Applicant gave this confirmation.

**The Applicant's Case**

The Applicant advised the Committee that before applying the legal test, he would like to spend a couple of minutes to tell the Committee about the company’s plans for their proposed pharmacy in Oatlands. He advised that the pharmacy would be in what was currently an industrial unit. This gave the company a current retail space of 800 square feet. The Applicant advised that in the event of the application being granted, the company intended to acquire the adjacent unit which would increase the space to 1,600 square feet.

The Applicant further advised that there was excellent car parking and good disabled access to the premises and that the company would install a wheelchair ramp.

The Applicant accepted that as they stood the premises did not look like a pharmacy, but the Applicant was keen to point out that he intended to spend a considerable amount of money in transforming the site into a state-of-the-art modern healthcare facility. The company would participate in the four core contractual services –eMAS (Minor Ailment Service) PHS (Public Health Service), CMS (Chronic Medication Service) and AMS (Acute Medication Service). They would also participate in any local initiatives as well as providing innovative services to the local community.

The intended opening hours were: Monday – Friday: 9.00am – 6.00pm; Saturday: 9.00am – 5.00pm. These hours would be kept under constant review. As society no longer worked 9-5 and the demographics of the Oatlands development may be such that the residents would require a service in the evenings. The company would provide this, if demand required it.

The Applicant advised that he would now apply the Legal Test.

The Applicant asked the Chair’s permission to pass round copies of an aerial photograph of the area surrounding the proposed premises. The Chair asked those present if they had any objections and all agreed that the picture could be tabled.

The Applicant advised that the neighbourhood in which the premises were located was very clearly defined;
North: the River Clyde to the first bend at Caledonia Road, and then Caledonia Road to Cathcart Road. This main road was a boundary between Oatlands and Hutchesontown, and one which had been used on numerous occasions by both the PPC and the NAP (National Appeals Panel).

South: the railway line until it reached Cathcart Road. This boundary would also be the route to the M74 extension which would run alongside the railway.

West: Cathcart Road.

East: a line from the point where Glasgow Road crossed the railway to the second bend on the Clyde.

The Applicant advised that for the sake of clarity he would describe this area as Oatlands, although to be strictly accurate the area also contained the small area of Shawfield.

The Applicant asserted that although the neighbourhood as defined currently had few amenities, the following were planned: a school, a community centre and shops.

Existing Services to the Neighbourhood – The Applicant advised that currently pharmaceutical services were provided by a range of pharmacies in a number of adjacent neighbourhoods: Gorbals, Crosshill, Bridgeton, Govanhill and Rutherglen. The Applicant advised that he was sure the current network provided an excellent service, however none of them were situated within the neighbourhood as defined by the Applicant, and the closest pharmacy to the proposed premises was actually situated across the river in Bridgeton. The other pharmacies were a considerable distance from the proposed site.

Adequacy of existing service – The Applicant advised that the neighbourhood at present had a population of 2,400 (according to Scottish Neighbourhood Statistics - 2005). There was no pharmaceutical service in the neighbourhood. The Applicant advised that this in itself would justify the granting of an NHS pharmaceutical contract. However, the Applicant suggested that there was more to be considered. He pointed the Committee’s attention to the guidance document produced by the NAP “The Legal Test”.

The Applicant advised the Committee that the Oatlands Regeneration began in April 2005. Phases 1 and 2 comprised approximately 50 new homes and was due for completion at the end of this year. With an average of 2.5 persons per home, this equated to at least 1,000 additional heads of population.

Phases 3 and 4 were expected for completion in late 2008 and would add a further 210 homes. Applying the same average occupancy rate, this would equate to a further 500 heads of population.
The Applicant advised that by the end of the project there would be a total of 1,275 new homes in the neighbourhood, giving an increase over the present population of around 3,000 people. This would bring the population of the neighbourhood in a reasonably short period to around 5,500 persons.

The Applicant advised the Committee that Oatlands had a significant transient population. There were 237 businesses in the neighbourhood, with an estimated 500 people visiting the area on a daily basis to work.

These circumstances had caused the Applicant to conclude that the services were not adequate. The delivery of modern pharmaceutical services weren’t just about dispensing prescriptions, and they were independent of GP services. One of the biggest successes of the past year had been the electronic minor ailment service which in the Applicant’s opinion encapsulated what community pharmacy was all about. It was about being a convenient and instantly accessible NHS service within communities. The Applicant advised that everyone deserved a community pharmacy in their neighbourhood. Oatlands was growing and it would soon have a large and mixed population of around 5,500 people. There was no reason why this population should be deprived of their own local pharmacy, accordingly it is necessary to grant the application and it followed thereafter that it was also desirable.

**The Interested Parties’ Question the Applicant**

In response to questioning from Mr Tait, the Applicant confirmed that the shops and the school would be developed in Phase 4 which would be complete by the end of 2008. He did not know where this development would be located.

In response to further questioning from Mr Tait, the Applicant advised that he had chosen one side of Caledonia Road as a boundary as this had been used by the PPC and NAP at previous hearings. He accepted that neighbourhoods could change over time, but asserted that at present one side of Caledonia Road would be identified as Hutchesontown and the other as Oatlands. The Applicant did not consider that residents would consider themselves neighbours.

In response to further questioning from Mr Tait, the Applicant advised that Phases 1 and 2 would be complete by of the end of 2007. 182 houses were currently under construction, with 437 planned for the end of the year. The land had been purchased, including the serving of compulsory purchase orders and a £4m infrastructure programme was currently being put in place.

In response to questioning from Mrs Burns, the Applicant confirmed that he considered the current identified residential population which he had given as being 2,400 (according to 2005 estimates) was concentrated around the main road and the railway.
In response to questioning from Mr Dickson, the Applicant advised that he did not have any information around the housing that had been demolished in the area. He advised that his population statistics illustrated the population at April 2005; the houses had been demolished in May 2005.

**The PPC Question the Applicant**

In response to questioning from Mrs Roberts, the Applicant confirmed that he considered his proposed premises would allow for convenience of access to pharmaceutical services. The development would finish within 100-200 yards from the proposed premises. In response to comments from Mrs Roberts around the safety aspect to the proposed premises, the Applicant advised that he would make the area surrounding the premises safe by installing lighting, and CCTV cameras. This would be a priority if the application were granted.

In response to further questioning from Mrs Roberts, the Applicant advised that he had submitted his application at this point and had not waited until the development of the new retail premises was complete as he was aware there was a waiting list for the shops. Spaces were limited and he was keen to ensure the community had access to pharmaceutical services within their neighbourhood and this meant applying for a contract in available premises to secure services for the area.

In response to questioning from Mr Fergusson, the Applicant considered that patients would travel to the proposed pharmacy by car and on foot depending on whether they had access to their own transport.

In response to questioning from Mr Irvine, the Applicant advised that he had used physical and demographic boundaries to define his neighbourhood. He had borne in mind the guidance issued by the NAP and Judicial Review.

In response to further questioning from Mr Irvine, the Applicant advised that he considered there to be over 200 businesses within the neighbourhood as defined. He advised that extending the area to Aikenhead Road and Porterman Road would increase this number by around 500.

In response to further questioning from Mr Irvine, the Applicant advised that he was not aware of the average house price within the new development. He advised that it would depend on the market and the type of person who would purchase the house. He confirmed that 213 of the proposed residences were social housing.

In response to questioning from Mr Thomson, the Applicant confirmed his east boundary as being Shawfield Street.
In response to further questioning from Mr Thomson, the Applicant advised that the premises and the other units on the site were actively being promoted as retail units. He was confident that as the development progressed the existing retail units would become more attractive. The Applicant further confirmed that the company would have security of tenure on the premises through lease.

In response to questioning from Mr Daniels the Applicant explained that he considered the existing service to be inadequate as the nearest facility was 0.8 miles from the proposed premises. This was across the river in a different neighbourhood. The area surrounding the Applicant's proposed premises was more deprived and had less access to their own transport.

In response to questioning from Mrs Lynch, the Applicant confirmed that there were retail units planned within the new development. These would be built as part of Phase 4. He advised that those living in the area may obtain their general shopping from these facilities depending on which companies move into the units, other than that residents may need to travel to larger areas such as Rutherglen to obtain their general shopping.

There were no questions to the Applicant from the Chair.

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

Mr Tait advised the Committee that he would like to suggest a different neighbourhood; only part of which was the same as the Applicant’s.

North: the Clyde;
East: the railway line;
West: Shawfield Drive, the industrial area at Rosyth Street and Rosyth Road to the railway line;
South: the railway line.

Mr Tait informed the Committee that this whole area was a quasi-wholesale area filled with retail industrial units. There were some offices, however most of the businesses were wholesale and there was no attractions for the general public. He asserted that there was no population within the neighbourhood defined by the Applicant. He did not agree that the proposed premises could be defined as being in Oatlands and suggested that from the edge of his proposed neighbourhood the area of Gorbals was closer to Oatlands than the Applicant's proposed premises. Mr Tait advised that he would also question the inclusion of the future developments. He pointed to the guidance provided by the NAP which suggested that future developments be considered only where they were “probable”. In this instance Mr Tait pointed out that full planning permission had not been granted for much of the new development, only outline permission. He questioned over what period of time the Committee could consider development to be probable. He suggested that adequacy might be
adequate only to a certain point in time, and asserted that services to
this neighbourhood were adequate and would continue to be adequate
for the foreseeable future as the proposed developments were a long
way from fruition. If the area were fully developed the question of
adequacy may change but not for some time.

Mr Tait advised that his own definition of neighbourhood was sound,
given that it was based in law and guidelines issued. He did not believe
this application to be necessary or desirable and urged the Committee
not to grant the application.

There were no questions to Mr Tait from the Applicant.

The Interested Parties’ question Mr Tait

In response to questioning from Mr Dickson, Mr Tait advised that there
was no centre of population within the neighbourhood he defined.

There was no questions to Mr Tait from Mrs Burns

The Committee Question Mr Tait

In response to questioning from Mrs Roberts, Mr Tait advised that in his
opinion anyone living in the area would travel to the Gorbals for their
everyday requirements. Most would be registered with a GP in the
Gorbals area, however he reiterated that there would be very few living
in the area and those who had lived there prior to the redevelopment
would also have travelled to Gorbals.

In response to questioning from Mr Fergusson, Mr Tait advised that
there was sound precedent for not considering those who worked in an
area when determining adequacy. He advised that these people would
have come from a neighbourhood and would have passed through a
neighbourhood to get to their area of work. In all probability this
neighbourhood would already have a pharmacy. This assertion had
been upheld by Judicial Review in the case of Bank of Scotland complex
at Gogarburn, Edinburgh.

In response to questioning from the Chair, Mr Tait advised that the
western boundary to his defined neighbourhood was the retail industrial
area to the south and east of Rosyth Road.

In response to questioning from Mr Thomson, Mr Tait confirmed that he
represented Boots the Chemist in the consideration of this application
and that on previous occasions visiting populations had been included in
the consideration of applications. He did not agree that the visiting
population should be considered in this case as the numbers visiting the
area was not large enough to warrant consideration. Mr Tait was aware
of only one application having been granted for a retail park. In that case
the numbers visiting the area was approximately 15,000; a different
situation totally to the scenario around this application.
There were no questions to Mr Tait from Mr Irvine, Mr Daniels and Mrs Lynch.

**The Interested Parties’ Case – Mrs Carol Burns (Burns Pharmacy)**

Mrs Burns advised the Committee that she wished to object to the granting of the application for inclusion on the Pharmaceutical List at the Applicant’s proposed premises.

She advised the Committee that the criteria for inclusion in the pharmaceutical list was dictated by Regulations which stated “that the provision of services at the premises is necessary or desirable in order to secure adequate provision of Pharmaceutical services in the neighbourhood in which the premises are located.” Mrs Burns did not believe that the Applicant met these criteria.

She advised that a deficiency of existing services must exist if an application was to be granted. The area of the proposed site had very limited residential population and so could not be regarded as having a deficiency as there was no neighbourhood within the vicinity which would require pharmaceutical services. The area was primarily a commercial area and did not sustain a population which would attract people to come to the area either by foot or by car to seek pharmaceutical services. There was therefore no necessity for a new contract at this site.

The next consideration was that of desirability. As the area, as it stood did not have a significant residential population, there could be no desirability to fulfil a need which did not exist. As such Mrs Burns did not believe that a new contract would be a viable entity. A new contract could not be seen as providing ‘best value for money’ for Greater Glasgow & Clyde Health Board as a new contract would be an extra financial burden on the Board’s resources without meeting any unmet need.

Mrs Burns was aware of the building developments of the Oatlands Regeneration Project and the new housing developments further down Rutherfrood Road towards Polmadie. This development would progress over the next several years to include residential properties and also retail units. The plans were to develop a new neighbourhood to replace the previous housing which had been demolished over the past few years. This proposed new neighbourhood would still be separated from the Applicant’s proposed site by the construction of the ‘East End Regeneration Route’. This would be a major trunk route linking the area from Polmadie to the M8 and as such would be a defining boundary which would separate the opposed site from the Oatlands regeneration project.

These were all future proposals which would continue to develop until around 2010 to 2011, and as such any potential lack of pharmaceutical
services which may be perceived to occur over this period should under no circumstances be considered at this stage of development. Mrs Burns believed that the application must be rejected.

**The Applicant Questions Mrs Burns**

In response to questioning from the Applicant, Mrs Burns advised that it was the responsibility of the Applicant to define deficiency within the neighbourhood.

In response to further questioning from the Applicant, Mrs Burns advised that a new contract would cost the Health Board money as the contractor would receive fees for undertaking services. When advised that funding for such services was made centrally, Mrs Burns responded that regardless of where the funding existed, a new contract in the area would not represent value for money.

**The Interested Parties’ question Mrs Burns**

In response to questioning from Mr Dickson, Mrs Burns confirmed that the East End Regeneration Route would create a boundary through the area in which the Applicant’s proposed premises were situated. This would be a major trunk road and would separate the proposed premises from the new developments in Oatlands.

There were no questions to Mrs Burns from Mr Tait.

There were no questions to Mrs Burns from the Committee.

**The Interested Parties’ Case – Mr Stephen Dickson (Dickson Chemists)**

Mr Dickson advised the Committee that he agreed with the other two interested parties. He believed that the application had been made on the assumption that a retail unit would become available within the new development, and the Applicant would then apply for a minor relocation from the proposed premises. Mr Dickson did not believe that a contract, if granted, would be viable until the residential development was complete and questioned the viability if the potential population of 5,000 was reached. He believed that the proposed premises was suitable for other uses i.e. internet pharmacy, or delivery only pharmacy. The premises were situated in an area full of warehouses and industrial units. The area was dangerous and it was inconceivable that patients would travel to the premises on foot. He was aware that Tesco was planning a major development between Dalmarnock and Rutherglen and questioned whether the Applicant may propose a major relocation to this site. Mr Dickson felt the focus of the application was either this or a minor relocation to a site which would be dissected by the M74 extension.

Mr Dickson advised that if the contract were granted it would serve an
area which had no residential population. The Applicant would therefore need to obtain population from making deliveries or by taking business away from nearby pharmacies. This would obviously have an effect on the other contractors.

Mr Dickson suggested that the Applicant’s comments around the e-MAS service were irrelevant given that this service was designed to cater for patients who were not in employment and most of the population within the Applicant’s defined neighbourhood were employees within the various businesses.

Mr Dickson believed the granting of the contract was not necessary or desirable as it would have a significant effect on neighbouring pharmacies. It would have borderline viability.

**The Applicant Questions Mr Dickson**

In response to questioning from the Applicant, Mr Dickson confirmed he was aware of the barrier to internet pharmacy within the Scottish Contract.

In response to further questioning from the Applicant, Mr Dickson confirmed that the Applicant’s proposed premises would be separated from Oatlands by the East End Regeneration Route and not the M74 extension.

**The Interested Parties’ question Mr Dickson**

In response to questioning from Mrs Burns, Mr Dickson agreed that the East End Regeneration Route was a major trunk route that would dissect the area in which the Applicant’s proposed premises were situated.

There were no questions to Mr Dickson from Mr Tait.

**The Committee Question Mr Dickson**

In response to questioning from Mr Fergusson, Mr Dickson advised that a pharmacy with a patient registration of 5,000 would only be viable where this was added to the provision of other services.

There were no questions to Mr Dickson from Mrs Roberts, Mr Irvine, Mr Thomson, Mr Daniels, Mrs Lynch or the Chair.

**The Interested Parties Sum Up**

Mr Tait advised the Committee that he did not believe that the proposed unit was located in Oatlands. The defined neighbourhood was mainly retail/industrial in nature. There was a low throughput of people visiting the area and at the weekends the population would shift. There was no reason for the application to be granted.
Mrs Burns advised the Committee that there was no residential population in the area; therefore there was no desirability to meet any unmet need. A new contract would not be best value for money for NHS. And therefore the criteria for the granting of a new contract had not been met. The application should be refused.

Mr Dickson advised the Committee that the granting of the application was not necessary as there was no local population, the area and the unit were unsuitable and access to the proposed premises was dangerous. It wasn’t desirable as the granting of the contract would damage existing contractors.

The Applicant Sums Up

The Applicant advised the Committee that Mr Tait’s neighbourhood was a contrivance purely to separate the premises from the new development taking place. He was not applying for a contract only to serve the transient population, as was the case with the Gogarburn application, but this did not mean that the needs of the transient population should be ignored. The application was for a single premise. There was no suggestion that the contact would be relocated if granted. He was not aware of the Tesco development and this had no bearing on his application. In terms of viability, his business model was sound.

The Applicant advised that Mr Dickson thought he might be planning an internet pharmacy. The Scottish contract did not allow an internet only pharmacy, unlike the English contract. In terms of the East End Regeneration Route, the Applicant advised that this was merely a road through the neighbourhood which could not be defined as a boundary at the moment as no-one knew what it looked like.

The Applicant advised that the application was fundamentally about the future, not a possible future, but a definite future. The premises would serve a new community, currently without services, and the Applicant invited the Committee to grant the application.

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. The Applicant and All Interested Parties confirmed 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 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 G40.1, G40.3, G42.0 and G73.1;

f) Patterns of public transport;

g) NHS Greater Glasgow and Clyde plans for future development of services; and

h) Additional information submitted by the Applicant.

The additional information consisted of:-

- Map of area - 1 page
- Letter from South Lanarkshire Counsellor - 1 page
- Information from South Lanarkshire Council - 3 pages
- Information from Gladedale - 2 pages
- Rutherglen Community Area Summary - 4 pages
- Camglen – A Community Health and Well-being profile - 41 pages
- 1 mile radius map of proposed premises - 1 page
- List of Dental Surgeons, GP’s and Nursing Homes in area - 5 pages
- List of Pharmacies in surrounding area - 18 pages
- Housing Land Audit - 5 pages
- Information – Clyde Waterfront Regeneration - 2 pages
- Maps of Rutherglen Area - 4 pages
- Applications Decided – Cambuslang/Rutherglen Area Office - 8 pages
- Housing information - 1 page
- Future Plans and Funding - 4 pages
- Progress to Date information - 9 pages
- Population profile for Rutherglen - 2 pages
- Ward 12 information – Rutherglen Central & North - 3 pages
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 various neighbourhoods put forward by the Applicant, the Interested Parties, and the GP Sub-Committee. Taking all information into consideration, the Committee considered that the neighbourhood should be defined as follows:

**North:** The river Clyde past Richmond Park;

**West:** from the River Clyde, through Richmond Park, to Polmadie Road (east side) to the railway line;

**East:** the elbow of the River Clyde, crossing Glasgow Road to the Railway line (at Quay Road); and

**South:** the railway line.

The Committee felt that this was a distinct neighbourhood. The River Clyde to the north formed a significant physical boundary, beyond which lay the areas of Dalmarnock and Bridgton which were separate from the area in which the premises were situated. The railway to the south again formed a physical boundary. The area to the west of Polmadie Road, differed in demographic terms and had, in the Committee’s opinion more in common with the Gorbals area. Within the defined area there was currently little residential population. Most of the area was taken up with commercial/industrial/retail units, which separated it from surrounding areas.

**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 were situated within the surrounding areas of population e.g. Gorbals, Bridgeton, Dalmarnock and Rutherglen. The small residential population within the defined neighbourhood would have access to adequate services within the
areas where they would visit to undertake their day to day living e.g. Gorbals, Rutherglen.

The Committee noted that the current pharmaceutical network provided adequate services including all elements of the pharmacy contract.

Taking all information into consideration, the Committee agreed that the population within the defined neighbourhood had access to adequate provision of pharmaceutical services within the areas they visited as part of their everyday life. The granting of a further contract was therefore not necessary or desirable.

Separately, the Committee questioned whether the nature and location of the proposed premises within a commercial estate could provide the appropriate location for a pharmacy service to meet community needs.

In accordance with the statutory procedure the Chemist Contractor Members of the Committee Colin Fergusson and Kenny Irvine 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 not necessary or 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 Members of the Committee Colin Fergusson and Kenny Irvine and Board Officers rejoined the meeting at this stage.

5. APPLICATIONS STILL TO BE CONSIDERED

The Committee having previously been circulated with Paper 2007/46 noted the contents which gave details of applications received by the Board and which had still to be considered. The Committee agreed the following applications should be considered by means of an oral hearing:

Mr Razwan Shafi – 25 Main Street, Howwood PA9.1

AGREED/-

6. ANY OTHER COMPETENT BUSINESS

i) Amendment to Hours of Service – Pollokshields Pharmacy,
198 Albert Drive, Glasgow G41.2

Janine advised the Committee that Pollokshields Pharmacy applied for approval to amend the hours of service provided from the above pharmacy on Saturday 13th October 2007.

The community in Pollokshields were holding a celebration for the festival of Eid on this day and the pharmacy was seeking permission to open from 10.00am – 12.00pm instead of the usual opening hours of 9.00am – 5.00pm.

Both Joint Leads had recommended approval of the application.

DECIDED/-

That Pollokshields Pharmacy’s application for an amendment to the hours of service at 198 Albert Drive is approved, and that the contractor is asked to ensure that a notice is displayed advising patients of the change.

ii) Temporary Suspension of Contract – Bannerman’s Pharmacy, 220-222 Saracen Street, Glasgow G22.5

Janine advised the Committee that Bannerman’s Pharmacy had applied for approval to temporarily suspend the contract held at the above address.

The company were due undergo a refit to the pharmacy. They were seeking authorisation to close on Saturday 20th October to allow for the construction work to take place and a temporary dispensary to be established and again on Saturday 27th October 2007 to allow the temporary dispensary to be removed and the new dispensary to be restocked. The Committee noted that the company had another pharmacy approximately 80 metres away and arrangements would be made with this pharmacy to provide services to patients. They also intended to extend the opening hours of this pharmacy to 5.00pm on both days. The Committee noted that posters would be placed in the windows of the pharmacy and that regular clients would be provided with a written reminder during the week before the closure.

Both Joint Leads had recommended approval of the application.

DECIDED/-

That Bannerman’s Pharmacy’s application for a suspension of contract at 220-222 Saracen Street, Glasgow G22.5 is approved.

7. DATE OF NEXT MEETING
Scheduled for Tuesday 16th October 2007 at 12.30pm. Venue to be confirmed.

The Meeting ended at 4.30p.m.