

NHS Greater Glasgow & Clyde	PPC(M) 20/03
Meeting:	Board Meeting
Date of Meeting:	30th June 2020
Purpose of Paper:	For Noting
Classification:	Board Official
Name of Reporting Committee	Pharmacy Practices Committee
Date of Reporting Committee	Thursday 12th March 2020
Committee Chairperson	Mr Ross Finnie

Paper Title:

Application for Inclusion in the Board's Pharmaceutical List – Mr Masood Ulhaq & Ms Aisha Ihsan, 1195 Govan Road, Glasgow, G51 4PW

Recommendation:

That the Board note the decision taken at the recent meeting of the Pharmacy Practices Committee as set out below

12 Discussion

- 12.1 The Committee in considering the evidence detailed above submitted during the period of consultation, presented during the hearing and recalling observations from the site visit, first had to decide the question of the neighbourhood in which the premises, to which the application related, were located.
- 12.2 The Committee considered the neighbourhoods as defined by the Applicants, by each of the Interested Parties and the Area Pharmaceutical CP Sub-Committee; examined the maps of the area and considered what they had seen on their site visit.
- 12.3 The Committee noted that the Applicants' defined neighbourhood had a very low population, and although it included two primary schools the majority of the residents

had to travel outwith the neighbourhood to access amenities including GP and pharmaceutical services.

- 12.4 They noted that both of the Interested Parties and the APC had described larger neighbourhood areas which included a wider range of amenities including the GP practices and pharmacies. They also included Govan Cross which the Committee thought had been artificially cut off by the Applicants' boundary.
- 12.5 After considering all relevant factors and seeking to identify natural boundaries, the Committee agreed that the neighbourhood should be:
- 12.6 West Renfrew Road from River Clyde to M8;
- 12.7 North The River Clyde;
- 12.8 East Broomloan Road which avoided splitting Govan;
- 12.9 South M8.
- 12.10 The PPC was satisfied that this could be a neighbourhood for all purposes as it included schools, shops, GP practices, churches, community facilities and four pharmacies, with its boundaries defined by major roads and the river Clyde that was a physical barrier.
- 12.11 Having reached a conclusion as to neighbourhood, the Committee was then required to consider the adequacy of pharmaceutical services within or to that neighbourhood and, if the Committee deemed them inadequate, whether the granting of the application was necessary or desirable in order to secure adequate provision of pharmaceutical services in the neighbourhood.

Turning first to the CAR, it was noted:

- The response rate was extremely small at 49
- The answers were all very similar and about 50% of the comments referred to convenience rather than need. The Applicant had acknowledged this.
- Question 3 on pharmacy services showed that 71% of respondents did not think that dispensing was adequate. However, no evidence was provided during the hearing to support that view.

In summary, the Committee did not think the Car had neither demonstrated inadequacy of pharmaceutical services within the Applicant's neighbourhood nor demonstrated public support for a new pharmacy

- 12.12 The Committee discussed the evidence offered by the Applicants, during the hearing, on the need for a pharmacy in the neighbourhood. At times the Committee found the description of current services to be vague and occasionally inaccurate, based on the Applicants' superficial shopping casual conversations with residents and shopkeepers in the proposed neighbourhood. Overall in relation to a factual description of the services currently offered the Committee preferred the testimony of the interested parties
- 12.13 The Committee also noted that the claim of major new housing developments in the short and medium term within the neighbourhood was not supported by the

information received from Glasgow City Council.

- 12.14 Both interested parties who attended offered a full range of services from their pharmacies, both core and non-core and had indicated that they were far from being at capacity. Other pharmacies in the area all offered a range of services.
- 12.15 The Committee noted that opening hours of the existing pharmacies were covered by the model hours with some opening for longer. The Applicants had stated that there was no provision of needle exchange in the area. However, during their site visit, Harmony Row Pharmacy had confirmed that they offered this service. The Applicants had made much of the proposed need for a Travel Clinic, which one of the Interested Parties confirmed was already available and for which there appeared to be little demand and was a non-core service.
- 12.16 Looking at the complaints information from all pharmacies within a 1 mile radius of the applicant's proposed location in relation to dispensing data, the Committee noted that given the number of items dispensed in the pharmacies in the area, these were not significant.
- 12.17 In considering accessibility, the Committee felt that walking distances were not an issue and all existing pharmacies could be accessed on foot. In addition, there was high car ownership and public transport was very good. Depending on where in the neighbourhood someone lived, they could be closer to one of the existing pharmacies than the proposed pharmacy.
- 12.18 Applicants

In accordance with the statutory procedure the Pharmacist Members of the Committee left the room while the decision was made.

13. **DECISION**

- 13.1 In determining 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).
- 13.2 Taking into account all of the information available, and for the reasons set out above, it was the view of the Committee that the provision of pharmaceutical services in or to the neighbourhood (as defined by it in Paragraphs 12.1 – 12.10 above) and the level of service provided by the existing contractors in the neighbourhood, was currently adequate and it was neither necessary nor desirable to have an additional pharmacy.

It was the unanimous decision of the PPC that the application be refused.