

NOT YET ENDORSED AS A CORRECT RECORD

Pharmacy Practices Committee (6)
Minutes of a Meeting held on
Monday 31st August 2009
The Mackintosh Suite, Glynhill Hotel,
Junction 27, M8 Motorway, Paisley Road,
Renfrew PA4 8XB

PRESENT:	Mr Peter Daniels	Chair
	Prof Joe McKie	Lay Member
	Mr William Reid	Deputy Lay Member
	Prof Howard McNulty	Deputy Non Contractor Pharmacist Member
	Mr Kenneth Irvine	Deputy Contractor Pharmacist Member
IN ATTENDANCE:	Miss Dale Cochran	Supervisor - Community Pharmacy Development
	Mr Richard Duke	Contracts Manager – Community Pharmacy Development
	Mr Robert Gillespie	Lead - Community Pharmacy Development

Prior to the consideration of business, the Chair, Mr Peter Daniels asked members if they had an interest in any of the applications to be discussed or if they were associated with a person who had a personal interest in the applications to be considered by the Committee.

No declarations of interest were made.

Mr Daniels advised the members that Mrs Charlotte MacDonald had resigned from the Committee and that he wished to take the opportunity to record the Pharmacy Practices Committee thanks for the services that she had given.

1. APOLOGIES

There were no apologies.

2. MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting held on Monday 27th July 2009 **PPC[M]2009/05** was approved as a correct record.

APPROVED/-

ACTION

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

None.

Section 1 – Applications Under Regulation 5 (10)

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

Case No: PPC/INCL02/2009

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

The Committee was asked to consider an application submitted by Boots UK Ltd 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 previously applied to provide pharmaceutical services from these premises. Initially an application was made to relocate to these premises under Regulation 5(4). This application had been refused on the grounds that it did not fulfil the criteria required.

An application was then submitted for consideration under Regulation 5(10), which was refused by the Committee and the subsequent appeal was dismissed. In respect of this application, the Committee had previously been circulated with all the papers from Boots UK Ltd and 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 Charles Tait ("the Applicant") assisted by Mr Andrew Mooney. The interested parties who had submitted written representations during the consultation period and who had chosen to attend the oral hearing were Mr Alan Harrison

(National Co-operative Chemists Ltd), and Mr David Young (Rowlands Pharmacy Ltd) (“the Interested Parties”).

The Chair asked Mr Mooney to confirm that he was not appearing before the Committee in the capacity of solicitor, counsel or paid advocate. Mr Mooney confirmed that he was not.

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, Craigmyle Road, Oxford Road, Sandy Road, Cocks Loan, Afton Drive, Dead Park Road, Glasgow Road, Mayo Avenue, King’s Inch Road, Ferry Road, Canal Street, Kirklandneuk Road, Inchinnan Road and Paisley Road.

Although the Committee did not gain access to the proposed premises, the Committee was able to view the size and layout of the site through the windows of the premises.

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 Tait stated that this application was for a new contract in the neighbourhood defined as the town of Renfrew. A neighbourhood which he said had previously been defined and general agreed by all interested parties at the Committee hearing for the previous application in December 2008 as:

North: River Clyde;

West: Black and White Cart Waters;

South: Where the M8 crosses White Cart Waters and west to Junction 26;

East: A736, along Mayo Avenue and across open land to River Clyde.

Mr Tait stated there were four pharmacies currently in the neighbourhood serving a population of between 20,000 to 21,000 patients. He said that Boots UK Ltd had previously been unsuccessful in relocating one of their existing contracts within the neighbourhood and therefore the company had decided that they would need to close one of these pharmacies. At this point, he took the opportunity to reiterate that this application was for a new contract. Mr Tait stated that when in the future the existing Boots UK Ltd pharmacy closed it would affect the

adequacy of pharmaceutical service provision within the neighbourhood.

The Applicant referred to the 2004 Lloyds v National Appeal Panel Stranraer case in which Lord Drummond Young stated that it was not sufficient to simply consider the adequacy of existing provision of services when it was known there were future changes, which would result in an inadequacy of pharmaceutical service provision. He therefore requested the Committee to take this guidance into their considerations as it was known that the numbers of pharmacies within the neighbourhood would reduce from four to three in the future. A change in service provision that would result in an inadequacy in pharmaceutical service.

Mr Tait suggested to the Committee that this application was therefore necessary and desirable to secure the adequacy of future service provision within the neighbourhood of Renfrew and should therefore be granted.

The Interested Parties Question the Applicant

In response to questioning from **Mr Harrison**, the Applicant stated that Boots UK Ltd had decided that it would be no longer be possible to sustain both contracts following the relocation of the Health Centre. The loss of business would require one pharmacy to close.

In response to further questioning from Mr Harrison, Mr Tait advised that staff in the closed pharmacy would be redeployed wherever possible but he realised there could be redundancies if staff chose not to move. It also added that it was possible some staff may be offered positions in the new pharmacy but he could not make any further comment as he was not involved with staff employment. He was also unable to comment further on staffing and how the transfer of staff may be viewed by customers.

In response to questioning from **Mr Young**, Mr Tait advised that the site of the new pharmacy was approximately 3 to 5 minutes walking distance from the new Health Centre and he expected that the move to the new premises would occur at the end of the calendar year.

In response to further questioning from Mr Young, the Applicant believed that the existing four pharmacies principally served different parts of the neighbourhood. The Rowlands and National Co-operative pharmacies served the town centre where as the Boots and Alliance pharmacies served the Health Centre. If patients were not visiting the Health Centre, he saw no reason for them to visit these pharmacies. He did not support the view that the Boots at Braehead served the neighbourhood. Braehead had always been considered a separate neighbourhood.

In response to further questioning from Mr Young, Mr Tait reiterated that Boots UK Ltd had decided to close one of their pharmacies as two could not be sustained within 100 yards of each other when the Health Centre closed. He believed that the resulting three pharmacies would be unable to provide an adequate service provision for Renfrew.

In response to final questioning from Mr Young, the Applicant said that he was not applying to open a fifth pharmacy, as he had already stated that one of the current Boots pharmacies would close. He again referred to Lord Drummond Young's guidance and the need to take into consideration changing future circumstances within the neighbourhood. He confirmed that the status quo of four pharmacies would remain.

The PPC Question the Applicant

In response to questioning from **Mr Irvine**, the Applicant confirmed that one of the Boots pharmacies would close by 1 April 2010.

In response to further questioning from Mr Irvine concerning the percentage of prescription repeats and prescription collections from the Health Centre, the Applicant said that it was very low - about 20%, the pharmacy was currently being supported by work being directed to it. He elaborated further as to what this work was by giving an example as support to a new Care Home.

In response to final questioning from Mr Irvine, Mr Tait agreed that the pharmacy would provide services to the same population in its new location.

In response to questioning from **Mr Reid**, the Applicant stated that only 20% of the pharmacy business was related to repeat prescriptions and therefore the remaining 80% of the business would be lost when the Health Centre moved.

In response to final questioning from Mr Reid, the Applicant advised that the new pharmacy would serve the same people and that although the new premises were nearer to the new Health Centre, the pharmacy would not be as close, as the current premises, to the existing Health Centre.

In response to questioning from **Prof McKie**, the Applicant confirmed that Boots UK Ltd had not formally written to the Board indicating when the contract would be surrendered but this could be arranged if required as the Divisional Director had already approved this decision. Mr Tait added that Boots UK Ltd were seeking a new contract before cancelling the old contract because another party might apply for a contract before Boots UK Ltd could reapply.

In response to further questioning from Prof McKie, the Applicant stated he believed the new pharmacy would enhance patient access to services through improved pharmacy distribution within Renfrew.

In response to questioning from **Prof McNulty**, Mr Tait stated that residents of Renfrew had good access to the town centre through regular bus services and the town centre was fundamental to residents accessing general services. He therefore did not support the view that pharmacies should be distributed within Renfrew's different localities. He added that in his experience, deprived areas were less likely to support a pharmacy due to the limited likelihood of the pharmacy attracting new customers.

In response to final questioning from Prof McNulty, the Applicant confirmed that after the existing pharmacy closed, all existing business services would be provided by the remaining pharmacy.

In response to questioning from **Mr Daniels** concerning the possible inadequacy of some existing pharmacies, Mr Tait would not name any particular pharmacy but stated, in his opinion, he believed there existed Disability Discrimination Act (DDA) access issues, and restrictions in dispensing and patient areas.

There were no questions to Mr Tait from Mr Gillespie.

The Interested Parties' Case – National Co-operative Chemists (Mr Alan Harrison)

Mr Harrison firstly thanked the Committee for the opportunity of speaking on behalf of National Co-operative Chemists.

He advised that National Co-operative Chemists considered the town of Renfrew to be the neighbourhood. A neighbourhood previously defined and agreed by all parties when considering the 2008 application, which was not significantly different from the neighbourhood defined by Mr Tait today.

Mr Harrison stated that he believed the existing services provided by current pharmacies in Renfrew were adequate. In respect of the National Co-operative Chemists pharmacy, it offered an extensive range of services that included: MAS; AMS; public health; oxygen; palliative care; methadone addiction services, long term condition services and collection & delivery services - which were free and unconditional. In addition, he said that in the adjacent neighbourhood of Braehead, some services were provided due to the ease of access provided by good public transport services.

In Mr Harrison's opinion he said that nothing had changed since the last application, there was no change in neighbourhood and he

therefore requested the Committee refuse the application, as it was neither necessary nor desirable to secure an adequate provision of pharmaceutical services to the neighbourhood.

There were no questions to Mr Harrison from the Applicant and no questions from Mr Young.

The PPC Question Mr Harrison

In response to questioning from **Prof McNulty**, Mr Harrison explained that the Co-operative pharmacy was part of an acquisition a few years ago. To date, he said that the shop front that had been rebranded but a full internal refit was planned for the first part of 2010, which would address current DDA issues.

In response to questioning from **Prof McKie**, Mr Harrison advised that once the refit had been undertaken, there would no longer be a need to use the disabled ramp. National Co-operative Chemists intended to work with the local council to address the level access problem.

In response to further questioning from Prof McKie, Mr Harrison confirmed the pharmacy would be able to support a 30% increase in prescription activity following the Health Centre relocation. They planned to transfer staff from other branches until the full impact of the increased business was known.

In response to further questioning from Prof McKie, Mr Harrison advised that the refit will provide more patient space emphasising the pharmacy would focus on dispensing needs and the Pharmacy Contract implementation, which would result in the removal of products like shampoos. He added the pharmacy would continue to provide its collection and delivery service.

In response to final questioning from Prof McKie, Mr Harrison was unable to advise the main localities where the pharmacy's patients lived.

In response to questioning from **Mr Reid** about the pharmacy's collection and delivery service, Mr Harrison confirmed that the collection amounted to 37% but he was unable to quote the percentage for the delivery service. He anticipated that once the Health Centre moved, this would lead to an increase in prescription dispensing.

In response to questioning from **Mr Irvine**, Mr Harrison did not accept that increasing prescription activity would necessarily require a second pharmacist. He added that the pharmacy did however sometimes have two pharmacists but this was usually to facilitate the training of pre registration graduates.

In response to final questioning from Mr Irvine, Mr Harrison confirmed the pharmacy did have the capacity to respond to the need for increased pharmaceutical services.

In response to questioning from **Mr Daniels**, Mr Harrison said that he believed that this application represented 'leapfrogging' (i.e. moving between the surgery and existing pharmacies) and it was submitted by Boots to pre-empt applications from others.

There were no questions to Mr Harrison from Mr Gillespie.

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

Mr Young said that he would firstly define the neighbourhood for this application as:

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, which included the Boots at Braehead Shopping Centre. He added there had been no demonstration of an inadequacy of current services and indeed looking at a bird's eye view of the map, it could be seen that the geographical spread of the current network meant that Renfrew was very well served.

Mr Young advised the Committee that Boots UK Ltd had applied for this relocation/new contract for one reason and one reason only and that was to relocate close to the site of the new Health Centre. He added that there were good bus services and Boots UK Ltd had not provided any evidence to support why the two Boots pharmacies were not sustainable.

He advised that the current Health Centre was directly opposite the two Boots pharmacies but would be moving to the opposite end of town. He said the new building was actually complete and understood one of the practices were planning to relocate in December. Mr Young stated that the Applicant's proposed relocation site at 10 Canal Street was in fact, almost next door to the new Health Centre.

Mr Young said a similar application had already been refused by the Pharmacy Practices Committee on 1 December 2008 and he advocated that nothing had changed. He added that the National Appeal Panel had concluded that the PPC had fully and properly reviewed all available evidence with no real grounds for an appeal.

Mr Young believed the application was in fact proposing a fifth pharmacy within the neighbourhood. He believed the application asked the Committee to consider the future provision of service so that one pharmacy could close if a new contract was approved, which he stated as an attempt of blatant manipulation of the system.

Mr Young stated that the Applicant had not demonstrated an inadequacy of pharmaceutical services in the neighbourhood. A view that he believed was shared by the CP Subcommittee. The application was neither necessary nor desirable and as such, Mr Young asked that the application be rejected.

There were no questions to Mr Young from the Applicant and no questions from Mr Harrison.

The PPC Question Mr Young

In response to questioning from **Mr Gillespie**, Mr Young advised that the Board's Premises Development Grants for consultation rooms were part of the Rowlands Pharmacy rolling refit policy. The Renfrew pharmacy was planned for refit next year.

In response to questioning from **Mr Irvine**, Mr Young advised that the pharmacy size was approximately 100 square metres and 50% of their business came from the collection of prescriptions from Renfrew Health Centre.

In response to final questioning from Mr Irvine, Mr Young said he was unable to confirm if the opening of Braehead had greatly impacted on the pharmacy as this pharmacy was not owned by Rowlands at that time.

In response to questioning from **Mr Reid**, Mr Young said that he believed that people would use the local Renfrew stores for their general shopping needs. They would only go to Braehead for specific shopping.

In response to final questioning from Mr Reid, Mr Young advised that the Rowlands pharmacy would be closer to the new Health Centre.

In response to questioning from **Prof McKie**, Mr Young confirmed the pharmacy currently did have level access for the disabled patients but advised that the pharmacy did not have automatic doors. A door upgrade would be part of the planned refit.

In response to questioning from **Prof McNulty**, Mr Young confirmed that Rowlands Pharmacy offered the same services as those stated by National Co-operative Chemists but not the supply of oxygen.

In response to further questioning from Prof McNulty, Mr Young admitted that he was unable to increase the size of the premises but the refit would place a focus service provision in respect of medical and healthcare therefore the removal of other products would help to open-up the shop.

There were no questions to Mr Young from the Chair.

Summing Up

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

Mr Young stated that everything he wished to say had been included within his submission; he had nothing further to add.

Mr Harrison also said that he had nothing to add to his presentation.

Mr Tait advised that the Boots pharmacy in Braehead did actually dispense low numbers of prescriptions for Renfrew patients.

Mr Tait reiterated that the town of Renfrew was defined as the neighbourhood for the application.

Mr Tait referred to the statements made by the interested parties which had advised on the future premise development plans for their respective pharmacies. But he emphasised that these plans were no different from Boots UK Ltd plans to close a pharmacy adding, they were all future changes. The case that Boots UK Ltd had made was that the closure of this pharmacy will result in the inadequate provision of pharmaceutical services within the neighbourhood. He said that this application for a new contract would fulfil that inadequacy of service provision but will also overcome DDA and other pharmacy shortfalls that exist in the current Boots premises.

Mr Tait accepted the application addresses the future service situation but if Boots UK Ltd did not make this application now, someone else will make an application later. He stated the application was both necessary and desirable to the provision of future pharmaceutical services in Renfrew and advocated that nobody could argue any different.

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 noted that the neighbourhoods put forward by the Applicant, the Interested Parties, and the Community Pharmacy Subcommittee in relation to the application were all principally in agreement. The Committee also noted the neighbourhoods put forward by the PPC in relation to previous applications in: 2007 for premises situated in Dunvegan Quadrant and in 2008 for 10 Canal

Street. Taking all information into consideration, the Committee considered that the neighbourhood should be defined as follows:

North: the River Clyde;

West: Black and White Cart Waters;

South: M8 motorway - where it crosses the White Cart Waters and west along the motorway to Junction 26;

East: from Junction 26 of the M8 motorway north along A736, Mayo Avenue and across open land to the River Clyde.

The Committee considered this to be a logical neighbourhood. The River, Waters and the M8 motorway formed significant physical boundaries. A736 marked a differentiation between residential and industrial/retail areas. Mayo Avenue also formed a boundary.

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 four 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.

The Committee had taken note that Boots UK Ltd had verbally stated a future intention to close one of their Renfrew pharmacies. This intention had not been formally made to the Board. Furthermore, the Committee agreed that the Applicant had not provided any evidence to support the Boots UK Ltd claim that a closure of one pharmacy would necessarily result in an inadequacy of service provision within the neighbourhood, **the**. The interested parties having advised the Committee that they had the ability to increase service capacity.

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 Member 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 Member of the Committee Kenneth Irvine and Board Officers rejoined the meeting at this stage.

**Supervisor-
Community
Pharmacy
Development**

5. APPLICATIONS STILL TO BE CONSIDERED

The Committee having previously been circulated with Paper 2009/26 noted the contents which gave details of applications received by the Board and which had still to be considered. The Committee agreed the following applications should be considered by means of an oral hearing:

- Mr Denis Houlihan – Unit 2, Greenlaw Village, Newton Mearns, Glasgow G77.6

- Lloyds Pharmacy Ltd – Unit 6b, Lamdash Crescent, Cranhill, Glasgow G33 3QL

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

The Committee having previously been circulated with Paper 2009/27 noted the contents which gave details of matters considered by the Chair since the date of the last meeting:

Minor Relocation

Case No: PPC/MRELOC04/2009 – Lloydspharmacy, 18 – 20 Burnbrae Avenue, Linwood PA3 3DD

The Committee considered the action taken by the Chair on an application for a minor relocation of a NHS Dispensing contract currently held by Lloydspharmacy, at the above address.

The Committee noted that the application fulfilled the criteria for a minor relocation under Regulation 5 (4) of the National Health Service (Pharmaceutical Services) (Scotland) Regulations 2009.

The Committee noted that the Chair had granted the application, having been satisfied that the application fulfilled the requirements laid down in the Pharmaceutical Regulations.

Case No: PPC/MRELOC06/2009 – Boots UK Ltd, 567 Duke Street, Glasgow G31 1PY

The Committee considered the action taken by the Chair on an application for a minor relocation of a NHS Dispensing contract currently held by Boots UK Ltd, at the above address.

The Committee noted that the application fulfilled the criteria for a minor relocation under Regulation 5 (4) of the National Health Service (Pharmaceutical Services) (Scotland) Regulations 2009.

The Committee noted that the Chair had granted the application, having been satisfied that the application fulfilled the requirements laid down in the Pharmaceutical Regulations.

Case No: PPC/MRELOC08/2009 – J & JG Dickson & Son Ltd, 1024 Tollcross Road, Glasgow G32 8UW

The Committee considered the action taken by the Chair on an application for a minor relocation of a NHS Dispensing contract currently held by J & JG Dickson & Son Ltd, at the above address.

The Committee noted that the application fulfilled the criteria for a minor relocation under Regulation 5 (4) of the National Health Service (Pharmaceutical Services) (Scotland) Regulations 2009.

The Committee noted that the Chair had granted the application, having been satisfied that the application fulfilled the requirements laid down in the Pharmaceutical Regulations.

HOMOLOGATED /-

7. MINOR RELOCATION

Case No: PPC/MRELOC07/2009 – Boots UK Ltd, 1630 Great Western Road, Glasgow G13 1HH

The application was not considered by the Committee as it had been withdrawn by Boots UK Ltd, due to unforeseen property issues, prior to the meeting's commencement.

8. THE NATIONAL HEALTH SERVICE (PHARMACEUTICAL SERVICES) (SCOTLAND) REGULATIONS 2009

The Committee having previously been circulated with Paper 2009/29 noted that the instrument took effect from 1 July 2009 and noted the main changes from the 1995 Regulations had been identified.

9. ANY OTHER COMPETENT BUSINESS

None.

10. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

To be arranged.