NOT YET ENDORSED AS A CORRECT RECORD

Pharmacy Practices Committee (03)
Minutes of a Meeting held on
Friday 22\textsuperscript{nd} February 2008
Meeting Room, Glynhill Hotel, Paisley Road, Renfrew PA4 8XB

PRESENT: Mr Peter Daniels Vice Chair
          Professor J McKie Lay Member
          Mr Alan Fraser Lay Member
          Mrs Kay Roberts Non Contractor Pharmacist Member
          Mr Colin Fergusson Deputy Contractor Pharmacist Member

IN ATTENDANCE: Trish Cawley Contractor Services Supervisor
                Richard Duke Contracts Manager, Community Pharmacy Development
                David Thomson Deputy Lead, Community Pharmacy Development
                Elaine Ward Community Pharmacy Development Pharmacist

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

None were offered.

2. MATTERS ARISING NOT INCLUDED IN AGENDA

None.

3. Section 1 – Applications Under Regulation 5 (10)

APPLICATION FOR INCLUSION IN THE BOARD’S PHARMACEUTICAL LIST

Case No: PPC/INCL08/2008
Mr Razwan Shafi, 25 Main Street, Howwood PA9 1AR
The Committee was asked to consider an application submitted by Mr Razwan Shafi, to provide general pharmaceutical services from premises situated at 25 Main Street, Howwood PA9 1AR 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 Mr Razwan Shafi, 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 Razwan Shafi (“the Applicant”). The interested parties who had submitted written representations during the consultation period, and who had chosen to attend the oral hearing were Mr Andrew Mooney (Alliance Pharmacy) (“the Interested Party”).

Prior to the hearing, the Panel had collectively visited the vicinity surrounding the Applicant’s premises, pharmacies, GP surgeries and facilities within the immediate neighbourhood, and the wider area around Johnstone, Spateston and Kilbarchan.

The procedure adopted by the PPC at the hearing was that the Chair asked the Applicant to make his submission. There followed the opportunity for the Interested Party and the PPC to ask questions. The Interested Party would then give his presentation, with the opportunity for the Applicant and PPC to ask questions. The Interested Party and the Applicant were then given the opportunity to sum up.

**The Applicant’s Case**

Mr Shafi commenced his presentation by thanking the Committee for inviting him to speak at this hearing.
Mr Shafi stated the village of Howwood was a neighbourhood in its own right surrounded by greenbelt and bound in the North West by A737. Its entrance is at Beith Road meeting Torbracken Street and ends where the B787 joins the A737. Renfrewshire Council reference this as a locality (133021).

The neighbourhood includes two churches, primary school, village hall, an active community council (which runs its own website), post office, licensed newsagent, village store (with coffee shop), garage, hotel & country club and two inns. There are various social clubs such as bowling and girl guides however; there is no pharmacy, general medical practitioner, dental practice or any other medical services within this village. The nearest medical practitioner is situated in Kilbarchan, some 1.7 miles away.

The Applicant stated that the population in 1991 was 1035, which had increased too 1502 by 2001. He currently estimated the population to be 1960. In addition, there were also surrounding farms, which would increase his total estimated population.

The local councillor had advised the Applicant that there were 1620 residents recorded on the electoral roll plus, 340 people in the under 16’s age category. The under 16’s age category amounted to 20% of all residents - a dependent, vulnerable group often requiring immediate healthcare attention. Parents were required to travel significant distances to access pharmaceutical care. The long journey to Johnstone was further compounded by car-parking difficulties around the town’s pharmacies.

He said that the closest pharmacy for Howwood residents was Spateston (1.1 miles away) designated as an area of deprivation (category 6), which Howwood villagers avoided. Furthermore, he advocated that there was no logical reason for villagers to use this pharmacy as their general medical practitioners were not based there. Residents therefore, travelled significant distances to access a pharmacy using, private/public transport or walking. Public bus services ran every 30 minutes resulting in an unacceptable return journey of upwards to one hour and the unnecessary expense of fares or fuel.

The Applicant said that Howwood pedestrians accessing the Spateson Pharmacy had two potential routes of travel:

1. A 20 minute walk (for a young healthy male) along the Beith Road, which had a national 60mph speed limit. The route had no street lighting, requiring pedestrians to cross the road twice as the single pavement was not continuous. Mr Shafi suggested that over grown hedge rows would require a mother and pram to walk along the edge of edge of the pavement. From his personal experience he stated that when he had walked it, he had in fact needed to step off the pavement to avoid overhanging brambles.

2. Along Midton Road, which he said had the same obstacles
however, the final part of the road turned into a country lane and lead to an underpass within Spateston.

During this part of the presentation the Applicant referred to the photographs included within the additional information sent to the Board on 22 February.

Mr Shafi referred to the objections raised against his application.

1. Alliance Pharmacy. He did not know why the Bridge of Weir pharmacy had raised this objection as it was located some 4.5 to 4.9 miles away from his proposed site and not within of the Board’s consultation area. He was surprised that no objection had been received from their Johnstone pharmacy, some 2.9 miles away.

2. Spateston Pharmacy. In response to the letter he said he thought it unlikely that Howwood residents would use the Kilbarchan & Lochwinnoch pharmacies as most of the doctors were in Johnstone.

3. Boots Pharmacy. He contested Boots claim that the population of Howwood had been stable since 1991. The Local Council had provided him with an Electoral Role total of 1534 as at 1 December 2007.

He stated that it was often argued that healthy populations did not support pharmaceutical services and referred to successful contract applications in Milton of Campsie, Torrance, Twechar and Carmunnock. He noted that the majority of these areas had similar depcat scores ranging from 1 to 2.

Mr Shafi said that at the recent Carmunnock hearing, Mr Semple had argued a strong case that a new pharmacy’s viability should be considered. His key calculations stated were: 1.254 (2006/7) average numbers of prescriptions/person/month dispensed; a break even point of 2,300 items equating to 1834 population. For Howwood, he estimated that the population was well in excess of this break even point therefore answering the point raised by an objector that the village would not support a pharmacy service. He also pointed out that Carmunnock’s population was approximately 22.5% lower than the Howwood population and the Board had approved that application. The majority of Howwood resident’s doctors were in Johnstone. He added that unless this application was approved, patients would continue to travel over 5 miles to access a pharmacy. Due to these difficulties patients may be tempted to make a doctor’s appointment instead which was at odds with the principles of new Pharmaceutical Care Contract, which encouraged development of services locally to make a pharmacy the first point of contact for basic healthcare requirements.

Mr Shafi stated that he intended to provide a seven day-a-week service.
that would be open at lunchtimes, providing a level of service access that exceeded objectors current opening hours. He believed that Sunday opening would also prove to be of benefit to the wider community as the nearest pharmacy open on a Sunday was Asda in Linwood.

The Applicant believed the Minor Ailment Service (MAS) would be seen as an enormous benefit to Howwood patients. The later introduction of the Chronic Medication Service (CMS), would further suggest that the need for a pharmacy in the village was paramount. He added that the introduction of electronic prescription transmission would enhance local pharmaceutical care services in Howwood. He believed these services were best provided closest to the homes of patients and not closest to their doctors. The need to travel to Johnstone for all healthcare needs was at odds with national health care policy.

The Applicant referred to the village support for his application. This support had been included within the additional information sent to the Board:
- a petition from 279 residents, which represented 14% of the village population;
- a letter from the Community Council
- a letter from local councillor Tracie McGhee

In addition, he also noted the Board’s Area Pharmaceutical Committee had supported this application.

In summary, Mr Shafi stated that Howwood did not have pharmaceutical services in the village. Access to these services required residents to travel which generated a range of associated transport issues. He had the support from the Community Council and local residents and therefore he believed this application was both desirable and necessary to secure adequate pharmaceutical services for the neighbourhood of Howwood. He therefore asked the Committee to approve his application for a pharmacy in Howwood.

The Interested Parties Question the Applicant

In response to questioning from Mr Mooney, the Applicant advised that he did consider Howwood to be a neighbourhood for all purposes as he believed that residents used the two local shops for their weekly shopping and the village had a mobile library.

In response to further questioning from Mr Mooney, the Applicant said that he believed that patients would be happy obtaining MAS from a local pharmacy rather than having to travel to Johnstone where a doctor’s appointment might instead be sought. He therefore believed that services provided by the pharmacy would result in benefits to the wider NHS.
In response to further questioning from Mr Mooney the Applicant said that although the Community Council had raised possible concerns on methadone provision in their email of 4 February, he believed he would offer a full pharmaceutical service and was therefore confident of the pharmacies viability.

In response to further questioning from Mr Mooney, the Applicant explained he had worked in the Salwan Pharmacy, Johnstone since 2003. He therefore knew local staff who would help him establish the extended opening hours service and would therefore not need to recruit externally.

In response to further questioning from Mr Mooney, the Applicant said that he was familiar with the car parking facilities at Houston Square/William Street as he regularly used the swimming facilities nearby. From experience he had only been able to secure a car parking place within this immediate area after 5.30pm.

In response to further questioning from Mr Mooney, the Applicant said he was unaware of whether any Howwood residents had made any representations to their Local Council or the Board in respect of problems accessing health services. He added that he believed that no one would walk or cycle to Johnstone for services. They would either use public or private transport with would entail a return journey of at least one hour.

In response to further questioning from Mr Mooney concerning the proposed collection & delivery service, the Applicant said he assumed the Community Councillor did know this was a service currently available from Johnstone pharmacies. He added that he planned to introduce himself to patients and to listen to their issues. He believed that such an approach would ensure that the pharmacy would meet their needs and thus remain viable.

In response to further questioning from Mr Mooney the Applicant advised that the proposed premises would be shared with the shop which had a 25 years lease on the property. He confirmed that he had prepared plans to fit-out of the pharmacy which met the specifications of the Royal Pharmaceutical Society.

In response to final questioning from Mr Mooney, the Applicant advised that the petition had been placed in the shop and also the nursery but not in the village newsagent.

**The PPC Question the Applicant**

In response to questioning from Mr Fraser, the Applicant advised that:

- the lease holder of the shop did have permission to sub-let the
he was unaware if residents signing the petition knew whether the pharmacy would offer a methadone service but he did not believe this service was required for the neighbourhood;
- from past experience, the Applicant said that if a pharmacy offered a Sunday service, the demand for it would follow. He added that the shop would be open and therefore residents would also be aware that the pharmacy was open.

In response to further questioning from Mr Fraser, the Applicant said he did not see a significant increase in the population in the near future. He expected small construction developments to continue but he was not aware of plans for any new large scale developments. He went on to say that he understood that the school was to be levelled with the land planned for housing. Although a high percentage of residents owned cars, the Applicant still believed he had the communities support for his application.

In response to questioning from Mr Reid, about petition signatures appearing from residents of Kilbarchan and Stirling, the Applicant said that he had only reviewed the petition to identify duplicate signatures.

In response to further questioning from Mr Reid, Mr Shafi advised that he expected the Monday to Saturday service to be provided with the help of his wife and other family members who were pharmacists. He saw the Sunday service being provided by a different pharmacist.

In response to questioning from Mr Thomson, the Applicant stated the pharmacy would be secured by shutters within the shop and that only the pharmacy area would be registered with Royal Pharmaceutical Society.

In response to further questioning from Mr Thomson in respect of the pharmacy’s management of health improvement when tobacco was available within the general store, the Applicant believed this to be a similar position to a pharmacy located within a supermarket.

In response to questioning from Mrs Roberts, the Applicant advised that the pharmacy would not compete with the shop in respect of personal care products, he planned to have the dispensary in the back and would sell prepared medications/GSL/vitamins, coughs and cold remedies. Mrs Roberts said that she noted the shop currently offered common GSL remedies for minor ailments and asked the Applicant how he would manage these two sources of products within the one premises. Mr Shafi responded saying he believed this situation would be no different to one that exists within supermarkets.

In response to further questioning from Mrs Roberts, the Applicant advised that the shops opening hours were from 7am to 9pm, he proposed that the pharmacy would open from 8.30am to 6pm (Monday
to Saturday) and 10am to 1pm on a Sunday.

In response to questioning from Mr Daniels, the Applicant confirmed: the shop was open for 90 hours and he proposed that the pharmacy would open for 60 hours; he was unaware of the percentage of residents contributing to the Community Council ‘spontaneous’ petition.

In response to final questioning from Mr Daniels, Mr Shafi said he was unable to confirm how real the walking problem was from Howwood to Johnston but he had walked to Spateston and was aware of the problems.

There were no questions from Mr Fergusson.

The Interested Parties’ Case – Mr Andrew Mooney (Alliance Pharmacy)

Mr Mooney thanked the Committee for the opportunity for Alliance Pharmacy to have representation at the hearing. He started his presentation by defining the neighbourhood as the village of Howwood as previously defined by the Applicant. He stated the neighbourhood boundaries as being:

North: A737
East: Beith Road meeting Torbracken Street or extremity of Midton Road
South: Most Southern point of Hill Road
West: Where B787 (Bayview/Main Street) and the A737 meet

Mr Mooney said that Howwood was a Renfrewshire rural community, predominantly inhabited by individuals in the 16 to 65 age range, with good health status and high employment levels. The population obtained local pharmaceutical services from locations that were convenient commuting distances from the village. Therefore, although the Applicant had discussed some local amenities, Howwood could not be considered a neighbourhood for all purposes. By way of example, he advised that children travelled for secondary schooling and that residents undertook their weekly shopping in the neighbouring towns of Johnstone & Linwood with the A737 providing easy access to these towns.

Mr Mooney advised that that the last census recorded a population in Howwood of 1502. There were significantly lower population numbers in the under 16s and over 65s groups than the Scottish National Average. There was also a higher proportion within the Social Grade AB. 60% of the population worked, with only 12% of households with no access to a car and 32% of households, had two cars.

Mr Mooney referred to the NHS Health & Wellbeing Profile and the Scottish Neighbourhood Statistics for Howwood, which revealed low levels of both deprivation and health inequality within this area. He
therefore argued the need for additional services in the neighbourhood adding that additional resources should be targeted to areas & priority groups where need was the greatest. Although a small majority of residents may be less able and therefore challenging to access services by foot, he pointed out there was a good availability of public transport; adequate parking in Johnstone and established collection & delivery services with the opportunity for domiciliary visiting when required.

Mr Mooney said that although there were no pharmaceutical services providers within the defined neighbourhood, it was not necessary or desirable to secure adequate service provision. There were five pharmacies easy accessible within 3 miles from the village and he believed residents would travel 5 miles for supermarket shopping where there were a further four pharmacies. One of these operated over extended hours.

Mr Mooney said that when considering adequacy of service provision he would highlight the Crammond Application (Edinburgh) decided upon by National Appeal Panel (NAP) in February 2006. NAP decided that adequacy can be secured by the provision of services out-with the area and that the viability of contractors within the area should also be considered.

He advised that the Alliance Pharmacy in Johnstone provided a full and comprehensive range of services: MAS/PHS/AMS(currently introducing the infrastructure)/free collection & delivery service/addiction services/provision of compliance aids and associated domiciliary visits where applicable/smoking cessation/blood monitoring/emergency hormonal contraception/ urgent supply- Patient Group Directive/stoma services and domiciliary oxygen. In addition, an array of service leaflets were offered to supplement the pharmacist’s public health advice. Opening hours: Monday to Friday 9am to 5.30pm and Saturday 9am to 5pm.

In summary, Mr Mooney said a new contract was not necessary or desirable to secure adequate provision of pharmaceutical services within the neighbourhood of Howwood and if approved, may be detrimental to the development of new and existing services at a critical stage of the new Contract.

**The Applicant Questions Mr Mooney**

In response to questioning from the Applicant, Mr Mooney said:
- he understood the GP Practice in Bridge of Weir was a satellite surgery;
- Howwood residents would probably need to travel though two neighbourhoods to use the Alliance Pharmacy in Johnstone;
- he believed that patients were used to making the journey to Johnstone for medical services;
- he was unable to comment why Kibarchan had a pharmacy with the same dep cat as Howwood other than historic reasons;
- the Johnstone Pharmacy provided a 6 day-a-week delivery service, which was contracted to a local distribution company;
- he confirmed that this company had been inducted on standard community pharmacy service procedures;
- he said he did not believe it was unreasonable to expect patients to travel 10 minutes on public transport to access pharmaceutical services

The PPC Question Mr Mooney

In response to questioning from Mr Fergusson, Mr Mooney advised that the Johnstone Pharmacy had 70 patients who weekly used the delivery and collection service.

In response to questioning from Professor McKie, Mr Mooney stated that the Alliance Head Office was attempting to improve their pharmacy’s infrastructure to improve services. A new contract would place pressure on these improvements as it would dilute the market.

In response to further questioning from Professor McKie, Mr Mooney confirmed there were five pharmacies in Johnstone and the population of the area was approximately 30,000. He believed that access to six pharmacies to the residents of Howwood was reasonable and accepted that travelling time would be longer than suggested after allowing for waiting time and parking or public transport. He was unaware how the Regulations could support the targeting of resources to area of deprivation but believed there should be a system to support areas of greatest need.

In response to questioning from Mr Thomson in respect of ideas for innovative practice, Mr Mooney suggested targeting the elderly with house visits if needed. He added that he would expect there to be a negotiation with the Board to agree a fee for this possible service.

In response to further questioning from Mr Thomson, Mr Mooney said it was open to debate if the redistribution of pharmacies would be easier than offering delivery and collection services.

In response to questioning from Mrs Roberts, Mr Mooney expressed concern that although only 70 patients used the delivery and collection service, any loss of service brought financial pressures. He was unable to respond to Mrs Roberts question on how long a public transport journey might be after taking the time to get to the bus stop into consideration.

Mr Daniels said that he was struck by many of the supporting comments by the petition signatures. In response to Mr Daniels
question as to whether this service was really needed, Mr Mooney said that people would always say yes if asked if they wanted a pharmacy however, this did not prove the need for adequacy.

There were no questions to Mr Mooney from Mr Fraser.

The Interested Parties Sum Up

Mr Mooney said that Alliance Pharmacy considered the current pharmaceutical service provision for Howwood to be adequate with services provided by nine pharmacies out-with the neighbourhood. The neighbourhood’s population was small, mobile, healthy and unlikely to support a viable community pharmacy. The accessibility issues raised by the Applicant related to a small minority of residents, which could be effectively managed through the development of new services to supplement existing services by example, the delivery and collection service.

Mr Mooney said that a new contract was not necessary or desirable to secure adequate provision of pharmaceutical services in the area and therefore the Committee should reject the application.

The Applicant Sums Up

Mr Shafi said that current pharmaceutical services within Johnstone were established historically but the new Pharmacy Contract was now driving a redistribution of pharmacies. Howwood patients currently had to travel over 5 miles to access the Johnstone pharmacies.

The neighbourhood had a population close to 2000 and he noted that applications had been granted for populations half this size. He said Howwood residents suffering from acute and chronic conditions had no immediate access to services within the neighbourhood. He therefore believed that current services were inadequate and the granting of a contract was both necessary and desirable.

Before the Applicant and the Interested Party 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) Pharmacy 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 the village of Howwood;
f) 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 firstly define the neighbourhood in which the premises, to which the application related, were located.

The Committee noted that the Applicant, the Interested Party and the GP Sub-Committee had all identified the neighbourhood as the village of Howwood. After taking these views into consideration, the Committee agreed with this definition of neighbourhood as follows:

North: A737
East: Beith Road meeting at Torbracken Street
South: Most Southern point of Hill Road
West: Where B787 and the A737 meet

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 defined neighbourhood there were no healthcare services.
The nearest pharmacy was over one mile away in Spateston with a further six pharmacies and GP medical services in Johnstone, three miles away. The Committee accepted that pedestrians would experience a difficult journey by foot in order to reach pharmaceutical services and therefore it was likely they would rely on public and/or private transport. The Committee considered the issue of viability raised by the Interested Party but were unable to support his argument. The Committee therefore considered that access to pharmaceutical services within the defined neighbourhood was not adequate and therefore necessary.

In accordance with the statutory procedure the Chemist Contractor Members of the Committee Colin Fergusson 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 necessary in order to secure adequate provision of pharmaceutical services in the neighbourhood in which the premises were located. It was a majority decision of the PPC that the application be granted.

The Chemist Contractor Members of the Committee Colin Fergusson and Board Officers rejoined the meeting at this stage.

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

The Committee having previously been circulated with Paper 2008/05 noted the contents which gave details of matters considered by the Chair since the date of the last meeting:

Minor Relocation

Case No: PPC/MRELOC01/2008 – David Wyse 11 – 13 Fore Street, Port Glasgow

The Committee considered the action taken by the Chair on an application for a minor relocation of a NHS Dispensing contract currently held by David Wyse, 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 (Pharmaceutical Services) (Scotland) Regulations 1995 as amended.

The Committee noted that the Chair had granted the application, having been satisfied that the application fulfilled the requirements laid down in the Pharmaceutical Regulations.
5. **NATIONAL APPEALS PANEL DETERMINATION**

The Committee having previously been circulated with Paper 2008/10 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:

**Ms Farzana Rasool and Mr Aziz Rasool – 111 Cambridge Street, Glasgow (Case No: PPC/INCL06/2007)**

The Committee noted that the National Appeals Panel had upheld the Appeal submitted against the PPC’s decision to refuse Ms Farzana Rasool and Mr Aziz Rasool application to establish a pharmacy at the above address. As such Ms Farzana Rasool and Mr Aziz Rasool names were not included in the Board’s Provisional Pharmaceutical List, and the file on the application had been closed.

During the Committee’s discussions inaccuracies in statements recorded within the Minutes were identified. The Committee agreed that these should be advised to NAP and ways should be explored how this position can be averted in future.

**Mr Neeraj Salwan – 3/5 Dunvagan Quadrant, Renfrew PA4 9BS (Case No: PPC/INCL19/2007)**

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

6. **APPLICATIONS STILL TO BE CONSIDERED**

The Committee having previously been circulated with Paper 2008/11 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 did not require an oral hearing and that consideration could be made based on the written representations:

**Mr Adill Sheikh, Albert Cross Ltd, 672 Eglington Street, Glasgow G5 9RP**

**Ms Angela Mackie, 3 Budhill Avenue, Springboig, Glasgow G32 0PW**

7. **ANY OTHER COMPETENT BUSINESS**
None.

8. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

Scheduled for Tuesday 26th February 2008 at 12.30pm. Venue to be confirmed.

The Meeting ended at 4.00p.m.