

NOT YET ENDORSED AS A CORRECT RECORD

Paper No 06/52

Pharmacy Practices Committee (03)

Minutes of a Meeting held on

Tuesday 13th June 2006

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

PRESENT:	Andrew Robertson	Chairman
	Mrs Patricia Cox	Lay Member
	Prof J McKie	Deputy Lay Member
	William Reid	Deputy Lay Member
	Prof James Johnson	Non Contractor Pharmacist Member
	Gordon Dykes	Contractor Pharmacist Member
	Alasdair Macintyre	Contractor Pharmacist Member
IN ATTENDANCE	Trish Cawley	Contractor Services Supervisor
	Robert Gillespie	Chief Pharmacist
	Janine Glen	Contractor Services Manager
	David Thomson	Director of Pharmacy

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 any person who had a personal interest in the applications to be considered by the Committee.

Gordon Dykes declared an interest in application PPC/INCL/2006 – Agenda item

Before the consideration of business, the Chair welcomed the Committee to the first meeting of the integrated NHS Greater Glasgow & Clyde PPC. He also extended a warm welcome to Robert Gillespie, Chief Pharmacist to his first meeting of the Committee.

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received on behalf of Alan Fraser and Richard Duke.

2. MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday 6th April 2006 **PPC[M]2006/02** were approved as a correct record.

ACTION

3. ANY OTHER BUSINESS NOT INCLUDED IN AGENDA

There was no other business not already included in the Agenda.

Section 1 – Applications Under Regulation 5 (10)

4. APPLICATION FOR INCLUSION IN THE BOARD'S PHARMACEUTICAL LIST

**i) Case No: PPC/INCL14/2005
C&A Fergusson, 194 Petershill Road, Glasgow G21.4**

The Committee was asked to consider an application submitted by C&A Fergusson, to provide general pharmaceutical services from premises situated at 194 Petershill Road, Glasgow G21.4 under Regulation 5(2) of the National Health Service (General 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 Applicants' proposed premises were located.

The Chairman, Lay Members and Director of Pharmacy had previously received notice of the application, along with associated information including:

- i) The application form and supporting statement;
- ii) The map and information contained at **Appendix 4** of the papers;
- iii) Notification of decisions taken on previous applications received in respect of premises in the same post-code area; and
- iv) Other information the Board felt was relevant to allow them to consider whether the application should be considered by oral hearing.

Having considered the information, the Chairman, Lay Members and Director of Pharmacy had agreed that it was not necessary to consider the application by oral hearing.

The Committee, having previously been circulated with all the papers regarding the application from C&A Fergusson, agreed with the initial decision and reiterated that the application should be considered by the written representations.

Prior to the hearing, the Panel had individually made visits to the site at 194 Petershill Road, Glasgow G21.4.

The Committee noted that they had initially considered a similar application from the same Applicants for the same premises in April 2005. This application had been considered by means of an oral hearing

and subsequent to their deliberations, the Committee had concluded that the provision of pharmaceutical services at the premises at which the Applicants had applied, was necessary and desirable. The application was therefore granted. Several of the interested parties in the initial application had appealed against the Committee's decision. The National Appeals Panel had upheld the appeals, determining that pharmaceutical services were currently adequate in the area, and that therefore the application was not necessary.

This most recent application had been presented to the Committee in February 2006, however at that time the Committee had questioned the propriety of Applicants re-submitting applications which had already been tested and where there appeared to be no material difference in circumstances since the original determination of the application. The Committee had been mindful that the National Appeals Panel had given their consideration to the Applicants' initial application less than one year ago, and had questioned whether it would be appropriate for the Pharmacy Practice Committee to determine the application again. The Committee had decided to defer consideration of the application pending receipt of Central Legal Office opinion on the issue.

The Committee having previously been circulated with a copy of the Central Legal Office opinion relating to this issue agreed that while the response from the CLO was not as definitive as they would have hoped, it was sufficiently robust to allow the Committee to conclude that the application required to be considered.

After comprehensive discussion, the Committee agreed that the arguments relating to the application had been fully rehearsed by the National Appeals Panel when they considered the case in September 2005. The National Appeals Panel had concluded that an additional pharmacy in the neighbourhood in which the premises were located was neither necessary or desirable to secure the adequate provision of pharmaceutical services. While the Pharmacy Practices Committee continued to fully support the Applicant's view that an additional pharmacy was needed to alleviate the concentration of services in Springburn town centre, and provide capacity to address the long waiting times currently being experienced by patients, it recognised that the National Appeals Panel's decision was relatively recent, and no evidence had been provided by the Applicant or any of the interested parties, which would incline the Committee to overturn the NAPs decision. should be

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

DECIDED/-

The Committee agreed by unanimous decision that the granting of the application was not necessary or desirable, in order to secure the

**Contractor
Services**

adequate provision of pharmaceutical services in the neighbourhood of the proposed premises and accordingly that the application seeking inclusion in the NHS Greater Glasgow & Clyde's Pharmaceutical List at 194 Petershill Road, Glasgow G21.4 for the provision of general pharmaceutical services be refused.

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

- ii) **Case No: PPC/INCL06/2006**
Apple Healthcare Group, 258 Faifley Road, Faifley, Glasgow G81.5

The Committee was asked to consider an application submitted by Apple Healthcare Group, to provide general pharmaceutical services from premises which are situated at 258 Faifley Road, Faifley, Glasgow G81.5 under Regulation 5(2) of the National Health Service (General 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 Chairman, Lay Members and Director of Pharmacy had previously received notice of the application, along with associated information including:

- i) The application form and supporting statement;
- ii) The map and information contained at **Appendix 4** of the papers;
- iii) Notification of decisions taken on previous applications received in respect of premises in the same post-code area; and
- iv) Other information the Board felt was relevant to allow them to consider whether the application should be considered by oral hearing.

Having considered the information, the Chairman, Lay Members and Director of Pharmacy had unanimously agreed that it was unnecessary to consider the application by oral hearing.

The Committee, having previously been circulated with all the papers regarding the application from Apple Healthcare Group, agreed with the initial decision and reiterated that the application could be determined based on the written representations and that an oral hearing was not required.

The Committee members had individually made visits to the site at 258 Faifley Road, Faifley, Glasgow G81.5.

The Committee considered views and representations received from

- a) Chemist contractors within the vicinity of the Applicant's premises namely:
Clan Chemists Ltd – 3 Rockbank Place, Hardgate Cross, Clydebank G81.5.
- b) the Greater Glasgow Area Medical Committee (GP Sub-Committee).

The Committee also considered:-

- c) The location of the nearest existing pharmaceutical services;
- d) Demographic information regarding post code sector G81.5;
- e) Patterns of public transport;
- f) NHS Greater Glasgow & Clyde plans for future development of services; and
- g) A tabled letter from the Applicant in response to the written representations received during the consultation period.

CONCLUSION

The Committee noted that the Applicant had applied for inclusion in the Board's Pharmaceutical List for the provision of pharmaceutical services from premises situated at 258 Faifley Road, Faifley, Glasgow G81.5. The premises were already constructed, and the Applicant had satisfied the Board that they were in pursuit of the lease.

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

The Committee noted that they had previously considered an application for premises in this area in October 2006. At that time the Committee had considered the evidence presented to it, and from their own observations from site visits, had decided the neighbourhood should be defined as follows:

In forming an opinion on the neighbourhood, the Committee referred to the map at page 64 of the papers and defined the neighbourhood as beginning North along Cochno Road, East along the postcode boundary as identified on the map, South West along Great Western Road, bound to the West by Kilbowie Road through the West of Hardgate Cross roundabout and continuing up to Cochno Road.

Having reached that conclusion the Committee were then required to consider the adequacy of existing pharmaceutical services in that

neighbourhood, and whether the granting of the application was necessary or desirable in order to secure adequate provision of pharmaceutical services in that neighbourhood.

The Committee looked at the application to ascertain whether there had been any material changes since the last application was considered. When considering the initial application the Committee concluded that there was an adequate provision of pharmaceutical services provided by the existing pharmaceutical network. The Committee had found no evidence at that time that accessibility to the existing network was not adequate. Based on this consideration, the Committee had refused the application.

In considering this most recent application, the Committee did not consider that circumstances in the area had changed materially that they would reconsider their initial decision. The Committee did not consider the granting of an additional contract to be necessary. The Committee noted that an additional pharmacy contract had been granted by the National Appeals Panel for premises (Duntiglennan Road, Duntocher) which were situated just outwith the one mile radius that the Board used for consultation purposes. The Committee considered that this pharmacy would provide additional capacity within the wider area. The Committee therefore reiterated their initial conclusion that the existing network provided adequate services to the neighbourhood, and that an additional contract in the area was not desirable.

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

DECIDED/-

The Committee agreed by unanimous decision that the granting of the application was not necessary or desirable, in order to secure the adequate provision of pharmaceutical services in the neighbourhood of the proposed premises and accordingly that the application seeking inclusion in the NHS Greater Glasgow & Clyde's Pharmaceutical List at 258 Faifley Road, Faifley, Glasgow G81.5 for the provision of general pharmaceutical services be refused.

As Gordon Dykes had declared an interest in the next application, only Alasdair MacIntyre rejoined the meeting at this stage.

**iii) Case No: PPC/INCL07/2006
Mr M Rashid, 641 Hawthorn Street, Glasgow G22.6**

The Committee was asked to consider an application submitted by Mr M Rashid, to provide general pharmaceutical services from premises which were situated at 641 Hawthorn Street, Glasgow G22.6 under Regulation 5(2) of the National Health Service (General Pharmaceutical Services) (Scotland) Regulations 1995 as amended.

**Contractor
Services
Supervisor**

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 Chairman, Lay Members and Director of Pharmacy had previously received notice of the application, along with associated information including:

- i) The application form and supporting statement;
- ii) The map and information contained at **Appendix 4** of the papers;
- iii) Notification of decisions taken on previous applications received in respect of premises in the same post-code area; and
- iv) Other information the Board felt was relevant to allow them to consider whether the application should be considered by oral hearing.

Having considered the information, the Chairman, Lay Members and Director of Pharmacy had unanimously agreed that it was unnecessary to consider the application by oral hearing.

The Committee, having previously been circulated with all the papers regarding the application from Mr Rashid, agreed with the initial decision and reiterated that the application could be determined based on the written representations and that an oral hearing was not required.

The Committee members had individually made visits to the site at 641 Hawthorn Street, Glasgow G22.6.

The Committee considered views and representations received from

- a) Chemist contractors within the vicinity of the Applicant's premises namely:

Lloydspharmacy – 42/44 Huntingdon Square, Glasgow G21.1
Bannerman's Pharmacy – 171-173 Saracen Street, Glasgow G22.5 and 220-222 Saracen Street, Glasgow G22.5; and
Westray Pharmacy – 9 Westray Circus, Glasgow G22.7.
- b) the Greater Glasgow Area Pharmaceutical Committee (General Practitioner Sub-Committee).
- c) the Greater Glasgow Area Medical Committee (GP Sub-Committee).

The Committee also considered:-

- c) The location of the nearest existing pharmaceutical services;
- d) Demographic information regarding post code sectors G21.1 and

G22.6;

- e) Patterns of public transport; and
- f) NHS Greater Glasgow & Clyde plans for future development of services.

CONCLUSION

The Committee noted that the Applicant had applied for inclusion in the Board's Pharmaceutical List for the provision of pharmaceutical services from premises situated at 641 Hawthorn Street, Glasgow G22.6. The premises were already constructed, and the Applicant had satisfied the Board that they were in pursuit of the lease.

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

The Committee noted that they had previously considered an application for premises in this area in October 2005. At that time the Committee had considered the evidence presented to it, and from their own observations from site visits, had decided the neighbourhood should be defined as follows:

East – Railway line, across Chestnut Street to Carrisdale Street and Springburn Road, South along Springburn Road to its junction with Keppochill Road, West along Keppochill Road to Craighall Road leading onto Saracen Street and Balmore Road, to its meeting with the railway line to the North.

The Committee agreed that this was a neighbourhood for all purposes, and included all elements that would normally be associated with a neighbourhood e.g. schools, leisure facilities etc.

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

The Committee looked at the application to ascertain whether there had been any material changes since the last application was considered. When considering the initial application the Committee concluded that there was an adequate provision of pharmaceutical services provided by the existing pharmaceutical network. The Committee found no evidence at that time that accessibility to the existing network was not adequate. They had found no evidence of a significant increase in population within the area, and in fact it was noted that the current population was in fact in decline. While it was recognised that some development would take

place in the surrounding area, the Committee were satisfied that this was some time in the future and any subsequent reversal of the declining population should be reconsidered when the various redevelopments had been completed. Based on these considerations, the Committee had refused the application.

In considering this most recent application, the Committee did not consider that circumstances in the area had changed materially that they would reconsider their initial decision. The Committee therefore reiterated their initial conclusion that the existing network provided adequate services to the neighbourhood, and that an additional contract in the area was not necessary or desirable.

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

DECIDED/-

The Committee agreed by unanimous decision that the granting of the application was not necessary or desirable, in order to secure the adequate provision of pharmaceutical services in the neighbourhood of the proposed premises and accordingly that the application seeking inclusion in the NHS Greater Glasgow & Clyde's Pharmaceutical List at 641 Hawthorn Street, Glasgow G22.6 for the provision of general pharmaceutical services be refused.

**Contractor
Services
Supervisor**

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

iv) **Case No: PPC/INCL08/2006
Invercoast Ltd, Sandymount Post Office, 18 Grantlea
Terrace, Mount Vernon, Glasgow G32.9**

The Committee was asked to consider an application submitted by Invercoast Ltd, to provide general pharmaceutical services from premises which are situated at Sandymount Post Office, 18 Grantlea Terrace, Glasgow G32.9 under Regulation 5(2) of the National Health Service (General 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 Chairman, Lay Members and Director of Pharmacy had previously received notice of the application, along with associated information including:

i) The application form and supporting statement;

- ii) The map and information contained at **Appendix 4** of the papers;
- iii) Notification of decisions taken on previous applications received in respect of premises in the same post-code area; and
- iv) Other information the Board felt was relevant to allow them to consider whether the application should be considered by oral hearing.

Having considered the information, the Chairman, Lay Members and Director of Pharmacy had unanimously agreed that it was unnecessary to consider the application by oral hearing.

The Committee, having previously been circulated with all the papers regarding the application from Invercoast Ltd, agreed with the initial decision and reiterated that the application could be determined based on the written representations and that an oral hearing was not required.

The Committee members had individually made visits to the site at 18 Grantlea Terrace, Glasgow G32.9.

The Committee considered views and representations received from

- a) Chemist contractors within the vicinity of the Applicant's premises namely:

Lloydspharmacy – Unit 2, 317 Hallhill Road, Glasgow G32.6; and
National Co-op Chemists – 171-177 Baillieston Road, Glasgow G32.0 and 1158 Shettleston Road, Glasgow G32.7.
- b) the Greater Glasgow Area Pharmaceutical Committee (General Practitioner Sub-Committee);
- c) the Greater Glasgow Area Medical Committee (GP Sub-Committee).

The Committee also considered:-

- d) The location of the nearest existing pharmaceutical services;
- e) Demographic information regarding post code sectors G32.0, G32.6, G32.7 and G32.9;
- f) Patterns of public transport;
- g) NHS Greater Glasgow & Clyde plans for future development of services;
- h) A tabled letter from the Applicant in response to the written representations received during the consultation period; and
- i) Unsolicited representations received from members of the public.

CONCLUSION

The Committee noted that the Applicant had applied for inclusion in the Board's Pharmaceutical List for the provision of pharmaceutical services from premises to be situated at Sandymount Post Office, 18 Grantlea Terrace, Mount Vernon, Glasgow G32.9. The premises were already constructed, and the Applicant had satisfied the Board that they were in pursuit of the lease.

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

The Committee noted that they had considered applications for premises in this area on 4 previous occasions. The last time an application was considered was in 1994.

For the purposes of considering the application, the Committee defined the neighbourhood as the area bound to the North by the railway line to the north of Shettleston and Baillieston Roads. The west boundary being the B765 trunk road, running from Carmyle Avenue north to Killin Street across Shettleston Road and north to the railway line. The east boundary being Mount Vernon Avenue north across Baillieston Road, to the railway line. The south boundary being the A74 London Road between Carmyle Avenue and Mount Vernon Avenue.

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

- i) Within the neighbourhood, as defined by the Committee there was one pharmacy;
- ii) The current pharmacy was located in the main shopping area, which the Committee considered residents in the defined neighbourhood would access.
- iii) The Committee noted that the resident population within the area was declining in the post-code sector where the proposed premises were situated. There was higher than average owner occupied housing, and lower than average households with no car. The Committee concluded that the area was mobile and could access pharmaceutical services where they were currently located.
- iv) The Committee considered that the level of existing services ensured that satisfactory access to pharmaceutical services existed to the residential homes in the identified neighbourhood. The

Committee therefore considered that the existing pharmaceutical services in the neighbourhood were adequate;

- v) 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 view of the above, the Committee concluded that the granting of an NHS Contract for the premises situated at Sandymount Post Office, 18 Grantlea Terrace, Mount Vernon, Glasgow G32.9 was not necessary or desirable in order to secure the adequate provisions of pharmaceutical services in the neighbourhood in which the premises were situated.

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

DECIDED/-

The Committee agreed by unanimous decision that the granting of the application was not necessary or desirable, in order to secure the adequate provision of pharmaceutical services in the neighbourhood of the proposed premises and accordingly that the application seeking inclusion in the NHS Greater Glasgow & Clyde's Pharmaceutical List at Sandymount Post Office, 18 Grantlea Terrace, Mount Vernon, Glasgow G32.9 for the provision of general pharmaceutical services be refused.

**Contractor
Services
Supervisor**

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

- v) **Case No: PPC/INCL09/2006
Lloyds Pharmacy Ltd, Unit 2, Drumsagard Village, Hallside,
Cambuslang, Glasgow G72.7**

The Committee was asked to consider an application submitted by Lloyds Pharmacy Ltd, to provide general pharmaceutical services from premises which are situated at Unit 2, Drumsagard Village, Hallside, Cambuslang, Glasgow G72.7 under Regulation 5(2) of the National Health Service (General 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 Chairman, Lay Members and Director of Pharmacy had previously received notice of the application, along with associated information including:

- i) The application form and supporting statement;
- ii) The map and information contained at **Appendix 4** of the papers;
- iii) Notification of decisions taken on previous applications received in respect of premises in the same post-code area; and
- iv) Other information the Board felt was relevant to allow them to consider whether the application should be considered by oral hearing.

Having considered the information, the Chairman, Lay Members and Director of Pharmacy had unanimously agreed that it was unnecessary to consider the application by oral hearing.

The Committee, having previously been circulated with all the papers regarding the application from Lloyds Pharmacy Ltd, agreed with the initial decision and reiterated that the application could be determined based on the written representations and that an oral hearing was not required.

The Committee members had individually made visits to the site at Drumsagard Village, Glasgow G72.7.

The Committee considered views and representations received from

- a) Chemist contractors within the vicinity of the Applicant's premises namely:

Alliance Pharmacy – 233 Hamilton Road, Glasgow G72.7.
- b) the Greater Glasgow Area Pharmaceutical Committee (General Practitioner Sub-Committee);
- c) the Greater Glasgow Area Medical Committee (GP Sub-Committee);
- d) the Area Pharmaceutical Committee, NHS Lanarkshire.

The Committee also considered:-

- e) The location of the nearest existing pharmaceutical services;
- f) Demographic information regarding post code sectors G72.7;
- g) Patterns of public transport; and
- h) NHS Greater Glasgow & Clyde plans for future development of services;

CONCLUSION

The Committee noted that the Applicant had applied for inclusion in the Board's Pharmaceutical List for the provision of pharmaceutical services from premises to be situated at Unit 2, Drumsagard Village, Hallside, Cambuslang, Glasgow G72.7. The premises were partially constructed, and the Applicant had satisfied the Board that they were in pursuit of the lease.

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

The Committee noted that they had considered applications for premises in this area on 4 previous occasions. The last time an application was considered was in 2005.

In forming an opinion on the neighbourhood, the Committee referred to the map (provided by the Board) at page 127 of the papers. The Committee noted that the Applicant's proposed premises would be situated within a new industrial/retail facility which was adjacent to relatively new residential developments in the area. The area of Hallside lay beyond the area commonly known as Halfway, and before the boundary of Lanarkshire Health Board and South Lanarkshire Council. The Committee gave consideration to the merits of including the area of Halfway in the neighbourhood definition, as Halfway contained the nearest existing amenities to the Applicant's proposed site. After a comprehensive discussion, the Committee agreed that the area of Halfway should not be included. Hallside was a residential area, comprising houses which were likely to attract second time buyers, young families, and professionals. The Committee agreed that most of the residents would have access to their own transport, given the distance of the various developments to the nearest amenities and urban areas. For this reason the Committee agreed that those living in Hallside would not consider themselves to live in the same neighbourhood as Halfway. The neighbourhood was therefore defined as: North – Village Road, South – Hamilton Road, East – Manse Brae, West – Hallside Road.

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

The Committee noted that within the neighbourhood as defined by the Committee there were no pharmacies. The Committee however did not agree that this in itself was justification to approve the application. It was agreed that the residents within the Hallside area would have made a conscious decision to move there in the full knowledge that they would need to travel outwith the area for most of their daily needs e.g. work, GP, church, shops etc. The Committee believed that development within

the area was too recent to have developed any significant demand for pharmaceutical services. The Committee therefore did not consider that the granting of the application was necessary.

The Committee considered the potential effect that the planned industrial/retail development may have on the area. They were aware that Tesco had just opened an Express store within the facility. The Committee considered how this would affect the topography of the area, and agreed that the opening of the Express facility would offer less of an opportunity of joining the Hallside and Halfway areas than a supermarket. The Tesco Express would in all probability continue to provide services to the relatively small population of Hallside with the residents of Halfway continuing to use the current amenities in their area.

Given this limited development the Committee did not feel that the granting of the application was desirable.

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

DECIDED/-

The Committee agreed by unanimous decision that the granting of the application was not necessary or desirable, in order to secure the adequate provision of pharmaceutical services in the neighbourhood of the proposed premises and accordingly that the application seeking inclusion in the NHS Greater Glasgow & Clyde's Pharmaceutical List at Unit 2, Drumsagard Village, Hallside, Cambuslang, Glasgow G72.7 for the provision of general pharmaceutical services be refused.

**Contractor
Services
Supervisor**

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

- vi) **Case No: PPC/INCL10/2006
Ms Suman Barhaya, 672 Eglinton Street, Glasgow G5.9**

The Committee was asked to consider an application submitted by Ms Suman Barhaya, to provide general pharmaceutical services from premises which are situated at 672 Eglinton Street, Glasgow G5.9 under Regulation 5(2) of the National Health Service (General 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 Chairman, Lay Members and Director of Pharmacy had previously received notice of the application, along with associated information including:

- i) The application form and supporting statement;
- ii) The map and information contained at **Appendix 4** of the papers;
- iii) Notification of decisions taken on previous applications received in respect of premises in the same post-code area; and
- iv) Other information the Board felt was relevant to allow them to consider whether the application should be considered by oral hearing.

Having considered the information, the Chairman, Lay Members and Director of Pharmacy had unanimously agreed that it was unnecessary to consider the application by oral hearing.

The Committee, having previously been circulated with all the papers regarding the application from Ms Barhaya, agreed with the initial decision and reiterated that the application could be determined based on the written representations and that an oral hearing was not required.

The Committee members had individually made visits to the site at 672 Eglinton Street, Glasgow G5.9.

The Committee considered views and representations received from

- a) Chemist contractors within the vicinity of the Applicant's premises namely:

Alliance Pharmacy – 155 Crown Street, Glasgow G5.9, 639 Cathcart Road, Glasgow G42.8, 426 Victoria Road, Glasgow G42.8;

Pollokshields Pharmacy – 198 Albert Drive, Glasgow G41.2;

Munro Chemists – Unit 2, Kwiksave Unit, Crown Street, Glasgow G5.9;

Lloydspharmacy – 491 Victoria Road, Glasgow G42.8;

Hughes Chemist, 16 Admiral Street, Glasgow G41.1;

Govanhill Pharmacy Ltd – Govanhill Health Centre, 233 Calder Street, Glasgow G42.7;

Gajree Pharmacy – 617 Pollokshaws Road, Glasgow G41.2 and

Boots the Chemist – 417 Victoria Road, Glasgow G42.8 and 55 St Enoch Centre, Glasgow G1.4.

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

The Committee also considered:-

- d) The location of the nearest existing pharmaceutical services;

- e) Demographic information regarding post code sectors G41.2, G42.7 and G5.9;
- f) Patterns of public transport;
- g) NHS Greater Glasgow & Clyde plans for future development of services; and
- h) A tabled letter from the Applicant in response to the written representations received during the consultation period.

CONCLUSION

The Committee noted that the Applicant had applied for inclusion in the Board's Pharmaceutical List for the provision of pharmaceutical services from premises situated at 672 Eglinton Street, Glasgow G5.9. The premises were constructed, and the Applicant had satisfied the Board that they were in pursuit of the lease.

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

The Committee noted that they had considered applications for premises in this area on 11 previous occasions. The last time an application was considered was in 2005.

In forming an opinion on the neighbourhood, the Committee referred to the map (provided by the Board) at page 158 of the papers. The Committee defined the neighbourhood as the area bound to the West by St Andrew Drive, to the North by the M8 Motorway, to the East by the River Clyde, and to the South by Queens Park.

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

- i) Within the neighbourhood, as defined by the Committee there were several pharmacies. The area in which the Applicants proposed premises were situated lay on the edge of four distinct neighbourhoods, each of which enjoyed the adequate provision of services provided by the current network. Currently there were two community pharmacies within the neighbourhood known as Gorbals, there were three within the area of Kinning Park, six within Govanhill and three within Pollokshields;
- ii) The current pharmaceutical network provided domiciliary oxygen, supervised methadone, needle exchange and extended hours;

- iii) The Committee considered that the level of existing services ensured that satisfactory access to pharmaceutical services existed, to the small level of residential homes in the identified neighbourhood. The Committee therefore considered that the existing pharmaceutical services in the neighbourhood were adequate;
- iv) That there had been no significant increase to population within the neighbourhood since the Committee last considered an application for these premises in September 2001;
- v) 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 view of the above, the Committee concluded that the granting of an NHS Contract for the premises situated at 672 Eglinton Street was not necessary or desirable in order to secure the adequate provisions of pharmaceutical services in the neighbourhood in which the premises were situated.

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

DECIDED/-

The Committee agreed by unanimous decision that the granting of the application was not necessary or desirable, in order to secure the adequate provision of pharmaceutical services in the neighbourhood of the proposed premises and accordingly that the application seeking inclusion in the NHS Greater Glasgow & Clyde's Pharmaceutical List at 672 Eglinton Street, Glasgow G5.9 for the provision of general pharmaceutical services be refused.

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

- vii) **Case No: PPC/INCL11/2006
Mr N Salwan, 6 Lamlash Crescent, Cranhill, Glasgow
G33.3**

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

**Contractor
Services
Supervisor**

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 Chairman, Lay Members and Director of Pharmacy had previously received notice of the application, along with associated information including:

- i) The application form and supporting statement;
- ii) The map and information contained at **Appendix 4** of the papers;
- iii) Notification of decisions taken on previous applications received in respect of premises in the same post-code area; and
- iv) Other information the Board felt was relevant to allow them to consider whether the application should be considered by oral hearing.

Having considered the information, the Chairman, Lay Members and Director of Pharmacy had unanimously agreed that it was unnecessary to consider the application by oral hearing.

The Committee, having previously been circulated with all the papers regarding the application from Mr Salwan, agreed with the initial decision and reiterated that the application could be determined based on the written representations and that an oral hearing was not required.

The Committee members had individually made visits to the site at 6 Lamplash Crescent, Cranhill, Glasgow G33.3.

The Committee considered views and representations received from

- a) Chemist contractors within the vicinity of the Applicant's premises namely:

Robertson Chemist – 1122 Shettleston Road, Glasgow G32.7;
National Co-op Chemists – 1158 Shettleston Road, Glasgow G32.7;
Lightburn Pharmacy – 977 Carntyne Road, Glasgow G32.6;
Rowlands Pharmacy – 69 Gilbertfield Street, Glasgow G33.3 and 1322 Shettleston Road, Glasgow G32.6 and
Alliance Pharmacy – 1035-1041 Shettleston Road, Glasgow G32.8 and 137 Abbeyhill Street, Glasgow G32.6.
- b) the Greater Glasgow Area Pharmaceutical Committee (General Practitioner Sub-Committee);
- c) the Greater Glasgow Area Medical Committee (GP Sub-Committee).

The Committee also considered:-

- d) The location of the nearest existing pharmaceutical services;
- e) Demographic information regarding post code sector G33.3, G33.5, and G33.6;
- f) Patterns of public transport;
- g) NHS Greater Glasgow & Clyde plans for future development of services; and
- h) A tabled letter from the Applicant in response to the written representations received during the consultation period.

CONCLUSION

The Committee noted that the Applicant had applied for inclusion in the Board's Pharmaceutical List for the provision of pharmaceutical services from premises situated at 6 Lamlash Crescent, Cranhill, Glasgow G33.3. The premises were already constructed, and the Applicant had satisfied the Board that they were in pursuit of the lease.

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

The Committee noted that they had previously considered an application for premises in this area in October 2004. At that time the Committee had considered the evidence presented to it, and from their own observations from site visits, had decided the neighbourhood should be defined as follows:

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

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

The Committee looked at the application to ascertain whether there had been any material changes since the last application was considered.

When considering the initial application the Committee concluded that there was an adequate provision of pharmaceutical services provided by the existing pharmaceutical network. The Committee had found no evidence at that time that accessibility to the existing network was not adequate. Based on this consideration, the Committee had refused the application.

In considering this most recent application, the Committee did not consider that circumstances in the area had changed materially that they would reconsider their initial decision. The Committee did not consider the granting of an additional contract to be necessary. The Committee noted that an additional pharmacy contract had been granted within the last two years for premises situated just outwith the one mile radius that the Board used for consultation purposes. The Committee considered that this pharmacy had had some effect on the existing pharmacies lying to the north of the neighbourhood defined for this particular application. The Committee therefore concluded that an additional contract would further fragment the distribution of services, and therefore reiterated their initial conclusion that the existing network provided adequate services to the neighbourhood, and that an additional contract in the area was not desirable.

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

DECIDED/-

The Committee agreed by unanimous decision that the granting of the application was not necessary or desirable, in order to secure the adequate provision of pharmaceutical services in the neighbourhood of the proposed premises and accordingly that the application seeking inclusion in the NHS Greater Glasgow & Clyde's Pharmaceutical List at 6 Lamlash Crescent, Cranhill, Glasgow G33.3 for the provision of general pharmaceutical services be refused.

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

viii) **Case No: PPC/INCL12/2006
M&D Green, Twechar Healthy Living & Enterprise Centre,
Unit 1AZ, St John's Way, Main Street, Twechar, G65.9**

The Committee was asked to consider an application submitted by M&D Green, to provide general pharmaceutical services from premises to be situated at Twechar Healthy Living & Enterprise Centre, Main Street, Twechar, Glasgow G65.9 under Regulation 5(2) of the National Health Service (General Pharmaceutical Services) (Scotland) Regulations 1995 as amended.

The Committee had to determine whether the granting of the application

**Contractor
Services
Supervisor**

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 Chairman, Lay Members and Director of Pharmacy had previously received notice of the application, along with associated information including:

- i) The application form and supporting statement;
- ii) The map and information contained at **Appendix 4** of the papers;
- iii) Notification of decisions taken on previous applications received in respect of premises in the same post-code area; and
- iv) Other information the Board felt was relevant to allow them to consider whether the application should be considered by oral hearing.

Having considered the information, the Chairman, Lay Members and Director of Pharmacy had unanimously agreed that it was unnecessary to consider the application by oral hearing.

The Committee, having previously been circulated with all the papers regarding the application from M&D Green, agreed with the initial decision and reiterated that the application could be determined based on the written representations and that an oral hearing was not required.

The Committee members had individually made visits to the site at Main Street, Twechar, Glasgow G65.9.

The Committee considered views and representations received from

- a) the Greater Glasgow Area Pharmaceutical Committee (General Practitioner Sub-Committee);
- b) the Greater Glasgow Area Medical Committee (GP Sub-Committee);
- c) the Area Pharmaceutical Committee, NHS Lanarkshire and
- d) Chemist contractors consulted by NHS Lanarkshire.

The Committee also considered:-

- e) The location of the nearest existing pharmaceutical services;
- f) Demographic information regarding post code sector G65.5;
- g) Patterns of public transport;
- h) NHS Greater Glasgow & Clyde plans for future development of services; and

- j) A tabled letter from the Applicant in response to the written representations received during the consultation period.

CONCLUSION

The Committee noted that the Applicant had applied for inclusion in the Board's Pharmaceutical List for the provision of pharmaceutical services from premises to be situated at Twechar Healthy Living & Enterprise Centre, Main Street, Twechar, Glasgow G65.5. The premises were already constructed, and the Applicant had satisfied the Board that they were in pursuit of the lease.

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

The Committee noted that the Applicant's premises were situated within the area commonly known as the village of Twechar. The Committee concluded that this was a neighbourhood for all purposes, given that it contained all amenities associated with a neighbourhood i.e. schools, shops, post-office and community facilities. The defined neighbourhood was agreed to be the village of Twechar.

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

The Committee noted that the application related to premises within a Healthy Living Centre which was being developed within the village of Twechar. The facility was supported by the local Health Board, Local Authority and other stakeholders. The development of the facility was seen as being integral to the re-introduction of health services to the local community, as the previous GP surgery had withdrawn from the area several years ago. It was anticipated that the facility would provide dental and medical services once established.

At present those resident in the neighbourhood were required to travel outwith to access most health services. Public transport to the area was not overly regular, and car ownership was average. After comprehensive discussion, the Committee agreed that the granting of a pharmaceutical contract in the area was necessary given the lack of services currently available.

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

DECIDED/-

The Committee agreed by unanimous decision that the granting of the application was necessary, in order to secure the adequate provision of pharmaceutical services in the neighbourhood of the proposed premises and accordingly that the application seeking inclusion in the NHS Greater Glasgow & Clyde's Pharmaceutical List at Twechar Healthy Living & Enterprise Centre, Unit 1AZ, St John's Way, Main Street, Twechar, Glasgow G65.5 for the provision of general pharmaceutical services be granted.

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

5. MATTERS CONSIDERED BY THE CHAIRMAN SINCE THE LAST MEETING

The Committee having previously been circulated with Paper 2006/24 noted the contents which gave details of an application considered by the Chairman outwith the meeting since Thursday 6th April 2006.

Minor Relocation of Existing Pharmaceutical Services

i) Case No: PPC/MRELOC02/2006 – Rowlands Pharmacy, 179-181 Springburn Way, Glasgow G21.1

The Committee considered the action taken by the Chairman on an application for a minor relocation of a NHS Dispensing contract currently held by Rowlands 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.

ii) Case No: PPC/MRELOC03/2006 – National Co-operative Chemists, 48 Lyndoch Street, Greenock

The Committee considered the action taken by the Chairman on an application for a minor relocation of a NHS Dispensing contract currently held by National Co-operative Chemists, 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.

DECIDED/-

That the Chairman's action in approving the above applications in accordance with Regulation 5(3) of the National Health Service (General Pharmaceutical Services) (Scotland) Regulations 1995 as amended be homologated.

6. AMENDMENT TO MODEL HOURS OF SERVICE

Case No: PPC/ALT02/2006 – William Wood & Co Ltd – 63 Glenmanor Avenue, Moodiesburn, Glasgow G69.0 and 16 Blackwoods Crescent, Moodiesburn, Glasgow G69.0.

The Committee were asked to consider an application submitted by William Wood & Co Ltd, seeking an alteration to the hours of service recorded in the Pharmaceutical List for the pharmacies situated at 63 Glenmanor Avenue, Moodiesburn, Glasgow G69.0 and 16 Blackwoods Crescent, Moodiesburn, Glasgow G69.0

In considering the application in accordance with Regulation 8(3) of the National Health Service (General Pharmaceutical Services) (Scotland) Regulations 1995 as amended, the Committee had to determine whether the alteration of hours would affect the adequacy of services in the neighbourhood in which the premises were located.

The Committee agreed that the hours of service proposed by the Applicant fell short of the minimum required by the Model Hours of Service scheme. While the Committee recognised that the Applicant had developed their hours of service to accommodate local surgery times, they were nevertheless mindful that pharmaceutical services involved more than the dispensing of prescriptions. The Committee were aware that all contractors who were currently deemed to be providing services outwith the current Model Hours Scheme had been contacted and asked to submit their plans to bring their hours of service in line with the Scheme. Of the ten that had been contacted, seven had immediately amended their hours in accordance with the Scheme. The Committee had refused an application from one of the three remaining contractors at their last meeting, and the contractor had immediately amended his hours in line with the current arrangements. Taking this into consideration, the Committee concluded that they could not approve this application given the effort put in by other contractors to adhere to the scheme. The Applicant should be requested to reduce the lunch time closing in line with the Model Hours of Service Scheme.

DECIDED/-

That the application is refused and the Applicant urged to provide hours in line with the current Model Hours of Service Scheme.

**Contractor
Services
Supervisor**

7. PHARMACEUTICAL SERVICES CARE PLAN

The Committee noted the presentation given by David Thomson (Director of Pharmacy) which outlined what was currently known of the new arrangements that would come in later in the year in relation to the planning and management of pharmaceutical services in Scotland.

The Committee learned that this process would be underpinned by a Pharmaceutical Services Care Plan which would inform the future planning of pharmacy services in Glasgow. It was hoped that the primary legislation needed to amend the current arrangements could be passed in September. Thereafter it would be the responsibility of Boards to form local Steering Groups which would take this issue forward.

The membership of the Steering Group would be extensive, and would include: the Area Pharmacy Contractors Committee, Finance, CHP representation, Public Health etc.

The Pharmacy Services Care Plan would be supported by a computer software system which David demonstrated to the Committee. The Committee noted that the programme was able to aid planning with the plotting of demographic information and disease prevalence in a given area.

The Committee noted these developments, and expressed their keenness to learn further details of the new arrangements.

NOTED/-

8. ANY OTHER COMPETENT BUSINESS

i) Potential Charges for Information – East Dunbartonshire Council

The Committee were advised that the Planning Department of East Dunbartonshire Council had intimated that in future they would apportion a charge of £94.00 for information relation to planning developments in the Council's area.

Janine advised the Committee that only few applications were received for premises in this particular Council's area, and sought the Committee's advice on whether the Board should pay the charge.

DECIDED/-

The Committee decided that the situation should be monitored in relation to future applications. The new arrangements to be introduced may have implications for the way in which future applications were considered.

**Contractor
Services
Supervisor**

9. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

Scheduled for Tuesday 8th August 2006 at 1.30pm. Venue to be confirmed.

The Meeting ended at 3.30pm