

**NOT YET ENDORSED AS A CORRECT RECORD**

**Pharmacy Practices Committee (23)**  
Minutes of a Meeting held on  
Monday 1<sup>st</sup> December 2008  
The Moray Suite, Glynhill Hotel,  
Junction 27, M8 Motorway, Paisley Road,  
Renfrew PA4 8XB

<b>PRESENT:</b>	Ms Agnes Stewart	Chair
	Mrs Charlotte McDonald	Deputy Lay Member
	Mrs Maura Lynch	Deputy Lay Member
	Mrs Jean Coote	Deputy Non Contractor Pharmacist Member
	Mr Kenneth Irvine	Deputy Contractor Pharmacist Member
<b>IN ATTENDANCE:</b>	Dale Cochrane	Community Pharmacy Development Supervisor
	Robert Gillespie	Lead - Community Development Pharmacist
	Janine Glen	Contracts Manager – Community Pharmacy Development

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.

**ACTION**

No declarations of interest were made.

**1. APOLOGIES**

There were no apologies.

**2. MATTERS ARISING NOT INCLUDED IN AGENDA**

None.

**Section 1 – Applications Under Regulation 5 (10)**

**3. APPLICATION FOR INCLUSION IN THE BOARD'S PHARMACEUTICAL LIST**

**Case No: PPC/INCL19/2008**

**Boots UK Ltd – 10 Canal Street, Renfrew PA4 8QD**

The Committee was asked to consider an application submitted by Boots UK Ltd (trading as Alliance Pharmacy) to provide general pharmaceutical services from premises situated at 10 Canal Street, Renfrew PA4 8QD 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 noted that Boots UK Ltd had initially applied to relocate to the premises under Regulation 5(4). This application had been refused on the grounds that it did not fulfil the criteria required. A subsequent application was submitted for consideration under Regulation 5(10). The Committee, having previously been circulated with all the papers regarding the application from Boots UK Ltd agreed that the application should be considered by oral hearing.

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

The Applicant was represented in person by Mr Andrew Mooney ("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 Paul Nightingale (National Co-operative Chemists Ltd), and Mr David Young (Rowlands Pharmacy Ltd) ("the Interested Parties").

The Committee noted that there were no parties assisting.

Prior to the hearing, the Panel had collectively visited the vicinity surrounding the Applicant's proposed premises, pharmacies, GP surgeries and facilities in the immediate area and the surrounding areas of Porterfield Road, Craigielea Road, Oxford Road, Sandy Road, Cockels Loan, Glasgow Road, Mayo Avenue, King's Inch Road, Ferry Road and Canal Street.

The Committee noted that the Applicant had provided access to the premises. The Committee was able to view the size and layout of the

site. The Committee did not have access to the basement area.

The procedure adopted by the PPC at the hearing was that the Chair asked the Applicant to make their submission. There followed the opportunity for the Interested Parties and PPC to ask questions. Each of the Interested Parties would then in turn make their submission. There followed the opportunity for the Applicant and PPC to ask questions of each Interested Party. The Interested Parties and the Applicant were then given the opportunity to sum up.

### **The Applicant's Case**

**Mr Mooney** thanked the Committee for providing Boots UK Ltd the opportunity to have representation at the hearing. He advised that in terms of the neighbourhood Boots would define this as:

**North:** River Clyde;

**West:** White Cart Water;

**South:** M8;

**East:** From Junction 26 of the M8 to King's Inch Road to River Clyde.

Mr Mooney advised that this definition was supported by both the NHS Greater Glasgow & Clyde Area Pharmaceutical Community Pharmacy Sub-committee and National Co-operative Chemists. In essence the neighbourhood was the town of Renfrew designated by the PA4 postcode. Given this definition the Applicant's relocation was to a location within the same neighbourhood they currently served to improve service quality for the same population. In the Applicant's view there would be no appreciable effect on existing contractors.

In terms of existing service provision within the neighbourhood there were currently four pharmacy contracts.

The population of Renfrew was 20,020 (GRO 2006 mid year estimates) and the population was relatively stable (GRO 2001 Census – 20,240). The demography was mixed and relatively similar to Scotland as a whole.

The Applicant advised that Boots UK Ld were not arguing that there was a need for an additional pharmacy in Renfrew, however they were arguing that they could improve access and the quality of available health facilities. Their application centred on bringing the existing contracts up to a standard more appropriate to pharmacy in 2008.

They were aware that the application would be determined under the legal test contained in the current pharmacy regulations, but wished to remind the PPC that the application was for relocation and not a new contract.

Mr Mooney advised that Boots UK Ltd consistently worked to bring their portfolio up to the standard required for health facilities today as defined by Health Facilities Scotland – Planning Note 36. The Chief Pharmaceutical Officer said of this report *“This Planning Note captures much of the progress made to date (referring to premises improvement) and outlines a set of aspirational standard for premises of CP contractors in Scotland in a similar way to arrangements for other primary care contractors.”*

The Boots properties in Renfrew had been reviewed against the standards contained in the Planning Note as part of Boots UK Ltd’s on-going review of their property portfolio and a view formed as to how they could be improved. One of the contracts (142-144 Paisley Road) could be re-developed in the current site, however due to inherent property constraints, the premises at 118-120 Paisley Road could not be re-developed. There were limits to the improvements that could be made due to an existence of a major structural wall.

Mr Mooney advised that any planned major refurbishments to premises required full compliance with DDA requirements before a building warrant could be issued. In addition, the current unit did not allow for patient/pharmacist interaction; there was a lack of useable space, distinct areas for storage, accessible facilities, lack of basic staff facilities and the unit did not comply with the waiting area guidance contained in the Planning Note. The consultation room required upgrading as it was probably not DDA compliant and security and functionality issues for staff needed to be addressed.

Issues regarding storage would become more acute as CMS (Chronic Medication Service) was implemented with the possible requirement for up to 12 months worth of medicines to be stored. Current staff feedback highlighted difficulties with storage for MDTs (Monitored Dosage Trays) and Needle Exchange equipment.

Mr Mooney believed that access and health facilities in the defined neighbourhood were less than desirable as they did not fulfil or comply with current public and staff expectations or Government guidance. This application was about rectifying this situation.

Mr Mooney reiterated that the application was not for a new contract, but an attempt to improve the pharmaceutical care services in Renfrew and bring them up to a standard that was expected today. Mr Mooney put it to the Committee that the application should be granted at the very least on the basis of being desirable to secure adequacy in the neighbourhood.

### **The Interested Parties Question the Applicant**

In response to questioning from **Mr Nightingale**, the Applicant advised

that Boots UK Ltd had owned the present premises for some time. They had undertaken some refit of the premises but were constrained from making any major changes to allow them to comply with Government guidelines. He further confirmed that the timing of the relocation application was due to the company's portfolio refurbishment programme. 232 branches had already been completed.

In response to further questioning from Mr Nightingale, the Applicant advised that the proposed premises offered Boots UK Ltd improved opportunity to meet the Government guidelines. It was a much larger unit at 145 square metres as opposed to the 70 square metres in the existing premises. There were many partition walls that could be removed to allow better design of space and the unit also offered basement space.

In response to Mr Nightingale's question on whether the timing of the relocation application was coincidental to the relocation of the Health Centre, the Applicant advised that as primary care and social care modernised GPs faced the same challenges as community pharmacies. The relocation of Boots premises was designed to address some of these challenges. It would provide benefits to provide a flexible and adequate property solution, making services easily accessible and providing a high quality physical environment for service users and staff. These were the same issues faced by GPs and the relocation application was coincidental.

In response to further questioning from Mr Nightingale, the Applicant confirmed that the company would have been willing to relocate in the opposite direction to where the Health Centre was to be cited, if adequate premises had been available. He advised that the company had a minimum specification for premises with the optimum size being 120 square metres. Mr Mooney's role was to find suitable premises in collaboration with the company's development partners. If there had been others these would have been considered, however in terms of size the proposed premises offered the best solution.

In response to further questioning from Mr Nightingale, the Applicant advised that 120 square metres was the minimum size considered to allow the company to deliver their optimum service. He confirmed this would include OTC medicines and toiletries. He accepted that these items could be omitted from the company's merchandising list, but reiterated that the advice from the company's store planners suggested the proposed premises allowed optimal service provision.

In response to further questioning from Mr Nightingale, the Applicant confirmed that if unsuccessful in securing the relocation, the company would continue to trade from both premises in Paisley Road. He could not say at this point whether the branches would suffer from loss of business when the Health Centre moved. The branch at 118-120

Paisley Road did not have a lot of walk-in business. The majority of its business came from repeat prescriptions, so Mr Mooney did not foresee this reducing. In addition, both branches provided services to care home and addiction services.

In response to further questioning from Mr Nightingale, the Applicant accepted that there were other models of working which could be adopted within the existing premises and which could result in improvements. He clarified that such models had been considered however the limitations of the premises would always constrain any major development. There were always going to be barriers within the existing premises.

In response to further questioning from Mr Nightingale, the Applicant confirmed that monitored dosage systems weren't part of the current pharmacy contract however the issues around this service were complex. It has been suggested that only 1 in 5 people currently receiving monitored dosage systems actually require them. Alliance Pharmacy had always undertaken patient assessment for this service and so MDS were appropriate for most of the patients who were receiving this service. He stated that the NPA's (National Pharmaceutical Association) guidance that community pharmacies should have three metres of work bench for every person working. Within the present premises there was 4.5 metres in total. It was challenging to deliver all services. He accepted that a "hub and spoke" model of working could be adopted but advised that there were issues around IT solutions and PMR systems that made such a model difficult to implement.

In response to further questioning from Mr Nightingale regarding DDA compliance, the Applicant advised that there was level access into the present premises. He clarified that in his experience many local authorities required full DDA compliance before issuing a building warrant. This was certainly the case for Boots UK Ltd when it developed its branch in Brechin. The building warrant was rejected because of a non-compliant toilet. He advised that healthcare facilities were expected to fully comply with DDA.

In response to final questioning from Mr Nightingale, the Applicant clarified his comments about holding medicines for 12 months for CMS. He advised that with CMS the demand for medicines may be more predictable. There may be a need to store medicines for a considerable period of time. Storage was a major issue in the existing premises. He confirmed that he had merely used this as an example of the constraints within the existing premises, which also related to lack of space for staff and poor facilities.

In response to questioning from **Mr Young** as to whether he could provide any evidence of inadequacy of service, Mr Mooney advised

when looking at the traditional concept of pharmacy services there may be adequacy. He reminded the hearing that adequacy was a key point which had been addressed in Judicial Review. There was no spectrum of adequacy. Services were either adequate or not. Adequacy might change over time and Mr Mooney suggested that pharmacy services were expected to change. The Government expected change and development. The existing network may be adequate in terms of numbers; however in terms of the Planning Note produced by Health Facilities Scotland it was not adequate. There were premises issues that needed to be addressed. There were inherent structural defects within the existing premises which would prevent Boots UK Ltd with complying with the guidance produced. Mr Mooney was also aware that Rowlands Pharmacy had premises issues.

In response to further questioning from Mr Young, the Applicant did not agree that moving the branch at 118-120 Paisley Road would leave a gap in service provision at one end of the town. He advised that the branch at 142-144 Paisley Road would be redeveloped as part of the total portfolio redevelopment and patients not wanting to travel to the new premises would be able to transfer to this branch. He did not agree that patients would be disadvantaged if the branch moved. The move was designed to improve health facilities for the whole of Renfrew. Patients could be disadvantaged if they had built a strong relationship with their pharmacist, however the company were looking to relocate within the same neighbourhood. He did not feel it to be an issue.

### **The PPC Question the Applicant**

In response to questioning from **Mrs McDonald**, the Applicant confirmed that the wall within the existing premises which was causing difficulty was a load bearing wall. The company had looked at its removal. Although this was an option, the cost was prohibitive,.

In response to further questioning from Mrs McDonald regarding staff security in the consultation room, the Applicant agreed that an alarm could be fitted to the room. He confirmed that it was not possible to make an exit into the store room at the back of the premises. He reiterated however the guidance published in the Health Facilities Scotland Planning Note which advocated two exits. There was no means to make the necessary adjustments within the current premises.

In response to questioning from **Mr Irvine**, the Applicant advised that the proposed premises were 0.6 – 0.7 miles from the current premises by Autoroute.

In response to further questioning from Mr Irvine, the Applicant confirmed that Boots UK Ltd had undertaken a comparison between the cost of redeveloping the current premises and moving to the

existing premises. He advised that the company would rather move to the new premise as it would allow them to have a blank canvas to plan the design and layout of the branch and provide them with capacity for the future.

In response to final questioning from Mr Irvine, the Applicant advised that it was difficult to quantify the effect the move would have on the existing contractors in the area. He reminded the Committee that the number of pharmacies was not changing. If the Health Centre moved it would be easier for patients to access services from the new premises. He advised that there were four pharmacies for a population of approximately 20,000 which was favourable against the national average. The main issue was that the current premises struggled with capacity. The new premises would provide the added benefit of creating capacity while allowing continuity of care for patients. The new premises were in the same neighbourhood and would create capacity to improve the services on offer. Mr Mooney advised that the relocation of the Health Centre would have capacity implications for the existing contractors and they may find it difficult to contend with the increase in business.

In response to questioning from **Mrs Lynch**, the Applicant confirmed his belief that the current service provision was not adequate when the expectation of healthcare facilities and staff expectations were taken into consideration. Boots UK Ltd were looking to future-proof their service provision by meeting the guidance provided by the Government. He advised that Rowlands were facing the same issues around compliance with the guidance as was National Co-operative Chemists.

In response to further questioning from Mrs Lynch, the Applicant advised that concerns regarding storage centred on the storage of pharmacy items such as monitored dosage trays and prescriptions. He advised that the branch was continually struggling against the constraints of the space.

In response to questioning from **Mrs Coote**, the Applicant confirmed that the Consultation Room within the existing premises was under utilised. He said that the consultation room was too far away from the counter and was operationally difficult to use. .

In response to final questioning from Mrs Coote, the Applicant confirmed that the branch provided services to three care homes.

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

**The Interested Parties' Case – National Co-operative Chemists (Mr Paul Nightingale)**



**Mr Nightingale** advised the Committee that he would clarify a few points before beginning of his presentation.

He advised that the branch at 4 High Street was currently operating as Parkinson (Chemists) Ltd, which was a wholly owned subsidiary of National Co-operative Chemists. The intention was to make the branch a full part of the company at which time it would be rebadged and refitted. Within the pharmacy the dispensary was a reasonable size and space was used as effectively as possible. The pharmacy was able to deal with the increase in prescriptions that would come with the relocation of the Health Centre. The pharmacy had disabled access and as part of a national programme being undertaken by the company would be fitted with DDA compliant automatic doors in 2009.

Mr Nightingale advised that National Co-operative Chemists considered Renfrew to be a neighbourhood. The town centre was where the majority of shops were and was separated from the existing premises by a distance of 0.72 miles. He advised that the existing premises stood in a separate small shopping area with residential areas and parkland nearby. This overlapped with shopping and trading areas. There was a distinction between the two separate locations.

He advised that Boots UK Ltd claimed the cost to refit their existing premises at 118-120 High Street were prohibitive, yet in his opinion the cost to refit the Nationwide would be just as expensive if not more so. He suggested this was a smokescreen.

The existing premises could be redesigned and converted into a face to face model. Other models of working were available as well. The relocation would not improve access to a community pharmacy. There was no justification for granting the application. It was not necessary or desirable. In Mr Nightingale's opinion the unsuitability of the existing premises was a smokescreen. The real reason for the application was the relocation of the health centre. This would make Boots UK Ltd the closest community pharmacy and would result in leapfrogging other contractors.

### **The Applicant Questions Mr Nightingale**

In response to questioning from **the Applicant**, Mr Nightingale agreed that premises development was an important element in terms of delivering the pharmacy contract. He reiterated however that this could be done by looking at the existing premise and developing a creative solution. The display facilities could be looked at to gain improvements. The range of front shop merchandise could also be rationalised,. Improvements could be gained by focusing on a smaller range of products. He advised that it was not necessary to have "gold standard" premises. It was desirable that community pharmacies were seen as centres of excellence, however smaller pharmacies would find

it difficult to aspire to such standards. The aim was to have an all-inclusive contract and at present, there is no requirement to have a consultation area.

In response to further questioning from the Applicant, Mr Nightingale confirmed that National Co-operative Chemists had looked at a relocation option on a number of occasions, but for varying reasons; either business or ethical, they had not gone ahead.

I missed this bit

In response to further questioning from the Applicant, Mr Nightingale advised that General Medical Practitioners although working to the same agenda as community pharmacies, were governed by separate regulations and under a different contract framework. He agreed that GPs should be encouraged to improve their premises, but suggested that they would find it easier as the Health Board would provide financial support for some of their improvements. This support was not available to community pharmacies.

There were no questions to Mr Nightingale from Mr Young.

#### **The PPC Question Mr Nightingale**

In response to questioning from **Mr Irvine**, Mr Nightingale advised that he did not know the size of National Co-operative's premises in High Street. He confirmed that the shop was approximately one third dispensary and two third front shop. There was potential to extend the dispensary forward.

In response to questioning from **Mrs Lynch**, Mr Nightingale advised that there were other solutions that could be adopted to address the effect of the relocation of the health centre. He advised that if the contract were granted, prescription numbers might reduce, but the pharmacy would carry on. Other working models might need to be considered, including a reduction in staff.

There were no questions to Mr Nightingale from Mrs McDonald, Mrs Coote, Mr Gillespie or the Chair.

#### **The Interested Parties' Case – Rowlands Pharmacy (Mr David Young)**

**Mr Young** thanked the Committee for giving him the opportunity to present his case.

He advised that he would define the neighbourhood as follows:

**North:** River Clyde;  
**West:** White Cart Water;  
**South:** M8;

**East:** From Junction 26 of M8 to King's Inch Road to River Clyde.

He advised that there were currently five pharmacies within this neighbourhood, including Boots at Braehead Shopping Centre. There had been no demonstration of an inadequacy of services. Indeed looking at a bird's eye view of the map, it could be seen that the geographical location of the current network meant that Renfrew was very well served. There were two pharmacies at the River Clyde end, two at M8 and Boots at Braehead. All areas were covered.

Mr Young advised the Committee that Boots UK Ltd had applied for this relocation for one reason and one reason only. The Health Centre which was currently directly opposite from the two Boots UK Ltd stores was moving to the opposite end of town. The proposed relocation site at 10 Canal Street was almost next door to the new Health Centre site. Furthermore the current premises had been fit for purpose up until recently. Both branches had consultation rooms and the front shop areas were reasonable sizes. Mr Young suggested that removing the gondolas carrying OTC stock would allow the dispensaries to come forward and help facilitate the new dispensary operating model.

There had been no demonstration of inadequacy of pharmaceutical services in the neighbourhood. This view was shared by the CP Subcommittee. Relocating one of the Boots branches to 10 Canal Street would be of no benefit and if anything, could potentially leave a gap in service at the present site. Patients that had used this pharmacy for years may well be disadvantaged by the move. The application was neither necessary nor desirable and as such Mr Young asked that the application be rejected.

#### **The Applicant Questions Mr Young**

In response to questioning from **the Applicant** regarding the removal of OTC stock, Mr Young agreed that every pharmacy should have an element of self care products and health care information, but his comments regarding removal of stock had been around toiletries.

In response to questioning from the Applicant, Mr Young confirmed that Rowlands were currently looking to install a consultation area in their Hairst Street branch. The shop was not fitted with automated doors. Patients in wheelchairs could access the branch with no effect to the customer flow. Rowlands were looking to realign their product range.

There were no questions to Mr Young from Mr Nightingale.

#### **The PPC Question Mr Young**

In response to questioning from **Mrs McDonald**, Mr Young did not

agree that Boots at Braehead would be considered to be in Glasgow rather than Renfrew.

In response to questioning from **Mrs Lynch**, Mr Young confirmed that Rowlands had been looking to relocate their branch, as structural issues with the flatted accommodation above the branch constrained the company from refurbishing the premises. They were looking to install a consultation room in the near future.

There were no questions to Mr Young from Mr Irvine, Mrs Coote, Mr Gillespie or the Chair.

### **Summing Up**

The Applicant and Interested Parties were then given the opportunity to sum up.

**Mr Young** advised that it was clear why the application had been made. Boots would be leapfrogging to the health centre location. This would have a detrimental effect on existing community pharmacies and the geographical configuration. It was not necessary or desirable.

**Mr Nightingale** advised that he had nothing to add to his presentation. The Committee should reject the application.

**Mr Mooney** advised that the Committee had an opportunity to modernise and improve community pharmacy premises in Renfrew as a whole.

He had explained how the physical environment would affect the patient experience and the quality of service that can be provided. To improve access, maximise efficient and effective service delivery and provide the facilities required and expected by users, staff and Government guidance, Boots UK Ltd needed the PPC's support to approve the application.

The application, in Boots UK Ltd's view was desirable as it would facilitate the improvement of the quality of the health facilities available in Renfrew in support of the Scottish Government's commitment to modern, accessible, fit for purpose healthcare facilities. This was the whole reason for the move of Health Centre. Furthermore the granting of the application would enable premises investment in both the Boots contracts in Renfrew. This they felt would secure the adequate provision of pharmaceutical services going forward.

Before the Applicant and Interested Parties left the hearing, the Chair asked each to confirm that he 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.

In addition to the oral submissions put forward before them, the PPC also 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 Community Pharmacy Subcommittee;
- c) The Greater Glasgow & Clyde Area Medical Committee (CP Subcommittee);

The Committee also considered;-

- d) The location of the nearest existing pharmaceutical services;
- e) Demographic information regarding Renfrew;
- f) Information from Renfrewshire Council's Department of Land and Environment regarding future plans for development within the area; and
- g) NHS Greater Glasgow and Clyde plans for future development of services.

### **DECISION**

Having considered the evidence presented to it, and the PPC's observation from the site visits the PPC had to decide firstly 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 Community Pharmacy Subcommittee in relation to the application. The Committee also noted the neighbourhood put forward by the PPC in relation to a previous

application in 2007 for premises situated in Dunvegan Quadrant. Taking all information into consideration, the Committee considered that the neighbourhood should be defined as follows:

**South: M8 motorway;**

**East: from Junction 26 of the M8 to King's Inch Road to River Clyde;**

**North: the River Clyde;**

**West: White Cart Water.**

The Committee considered this to be a logical neighbourhood. The River and the M8 motorway formed significant physical boundaries. The River to the West also formed a boundary. King's Inch Road marked a differentiation between residential and industrial/retail 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 within 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 within the neighbourhood as defined by the PPC there were five pharmacies. These pharmacies provided the full range of pharmaceutical services including supervised methadone. The Committee considered that the level of existing services ensured that satisfactory access to pharmaceutical services existed within the defined neighbourhood. The Committee therefore considered that the existing pharmaceutical services in the neighbourhood were adequate.

The Committee was satisfied that no evidence had been produced by the Applicant, or had been made available to the Committee via another source which demonstrated that the services currently provided to the neighbourhood were inadequate.

Having regard to the overall services provided by the existing contractors within the vicinity of the proposed pharmacy, the number of prescriptions dispensed by those contractors in the preceding 12 months, and the level of service provided by those contractors to the neighbourhood, the committee agreed that the neighbourhood was currently adequately served.

**In accordance with the statutory procedure the Chemist Contractor Members of the Committee Kenneth 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 rejected.

**The Chemist Contractor Members of the Committee Kenneth Irvine and Board Officers rejoined the meeting at this stage.**

**5. ANY OTHER COMPETENT BUSINESS**

None.

**6. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

The next scheduled meeting was to be confirmed.