

NHS Greater Glasgow & Clyde	Paper 23/92
Meeting:	Board Meeting
Purpose of Paper:	Awareness
Classification:	Board Official
Name of Reporting Committee:	Pharmacy Practice Committee
Date of Reporting Committee:	Monday 11 th September 2023
Committee Chairperson:	Mr John Matthews

Paper Title:

Application for Inclusion in the Board's Pharmaceutical List – CASE No: PPC/INCL02/2023 – TC Trading (Scotland) Ltd, 4 Blackford Road, PAISLEY, PA2 7EP

Recommendation:

That the board note the decision taken at the recent meeting of the Pharmacy Practice Committee as set out below.

11. Deliberations

- 11.1. The Committee in considering the evidence submitted during the period of consultation, presented during the hearing and recalling observations from site visits, first had to decide the question of the neighbourhood in which the premises, to which the application related, were located.
- 11.2. In discussing the Neighbourhood, the Committee noted the following points:
- The Area Pharmaceutical Committee did not support the proposed Neighbourhood nor the Application;
 - The Applicants use of school catchment boundary;
 - White Cart River remains a natural boundary as does Todd Burn;
 - Dual carriageway road is very busy and crossing it to include Blackhill is a physical barrier;
 - Applicant was suggested to amend neighbourhood from previous 2018 application to include Dykebar;

- Since previous application new housing was being built / in ground clearing but no new roads / dual carriageways / railways to service these.

- 11.3. The Committee agreed that the neighbourhood should be defined as follows:
- North: White Cart River until Hawkhead Road
- East: Hawkhead Road down A726 Barrhead Road to Lochfield Road
- South: Lochfield Road to Neilston Road
- West: Neilston Road along Causeyside Street, Gordon Street, Mill Street to White Cart River
- 11.4. Whilst agreeing with the Applicant that the White Cart River was an obvious natural boundary to the north of the neighbourhood the PPC believed the Applicant's other boundaries to be somewhat contrived. The PPC noted that the Applicant had used Saucelhill Park as a natural boundary. However, the Committee did not consider this to be a natural neighbourhood boundary as a deviation from a major road i.e. the A726 at Ardgowan Street would need to be made for the park to be located. The PPC believed the use of Hawkhead Road on to Lochfield Road then on to Neilston Road and then north to Causeyside to the White Cart River via Mill Street provided a much more natural boundary for the Neighbourhood.
- 11.5. The neighbourhood proposed by the PPC embraced the traditional communities of Blackhall, Hunterhill, Charleston and Lochfield and included Dykebar.
- 11.6. The Committee was satisfied that the neighbourhood contained amenities frequently used by residents that contributed to the fabric of the community and included schools, places of worship, community centres, shops, parks, medical, dentists and pharmacies as well as plans for development.
- 11.7. 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.
- 11.8. The Committee noted all of the current network of pharmacies provided core services and several contractors referenced in the CAR have changed ownership since the consultation exercise. There is an

expectation that service levels will increase, although it is too early to expect any meaningful uplift yet. All Interested Parties in attendance while reassuring the Committee that they had capacity to increase their service provision to meet the demand of any increase in population, did not provide any evidence to support this claim. Although not part of the Core Service it was noted that pharmacies in the current network offered a delivery service.

11.9. The PPC considered the CAR, the Committee noting that there were 366 responses. Given that the CAR is not a survey and is dependent on people in the Neighbourhood being aware of the newspaper advertisement and then deciding to engage, or not, with the consultation exercise, the level of response is, in the Committee's opinion satisfactory in the light of experience with other consultations.

11.10 The responses came from a wide range of respondents, and it was clear that the Applicant had engaged with the community to encourage a high response.

11.11 The Committee discussed the CAR in detail and considered the narrative responses to questions 5, 6, and 7 which could better assist them in determining adequacy of the existing pharmaceutical services. Mr Woods (Lay Member) detailed an analysis that stripped-out indeterminate and convenience comments from the text responses for each question leaving proxy views on adequacy/inadequacy as below:-

Question 5: "Do you believe that existing pharmaceutical services provided in/to the defined neighbourhood are adequate?"

Adequate = 10% Inadequate = 90%

Question 6: "What is your current level of satisfaction/dissatisfaction with current provision..."

Satisfied = 13% Dissatisfied = 87%

Question 7: "What are your views on the provision of...services proposed by the Intended Applicant?"

Negative view = 17% Positive view = 83%

The consistency of the outcomes gave the PPC some confidence in the weight to be given to the CAR responses.

11.12 It was noted that a significant majority of the CAR pointed towards inadequacy from local pharmacies, particularly Abbey Chemist, and that

there was evidence of patients without medicines, or exceptionally long waiting times which could be articulated as an inadequacy.

- 11.13 Although Abbey, Lonend, had installed a robot, had a 24/7 facility for collection, and had re-modelled the pharmacy layout, the PPC considered that this has been to the detriment of the patient experience of the quality of service, as evidenced in the CAR. From NHS Open Data sources presented by the Applicant and supplemented by Primary Care dispensing figures, the pharmacy at Lonend would probably dispense the best part of a quarter of a million prescriptions this year. The Committee felt that this was a considerable challenge for a pharmacy which has, commendably, developed its premises and service offering over the years, but has now reached the point of being unable to provide an adequate quality of service within the constraints of the premises.
- 11.14 To some extent Mr Mohammed acknowledged these issues in his evidence to the Committee.
- 11.15 The Committee were mindful that pressure on Community Pharmacies will only increase due to the additional services that they are being required to provide.
- 11.16 This combined with low car ownership and ongoing limited public transport would demonstrate a need and requirement within the Applicant's defined neighbourhood. It was felt that on the basis of such negative reviews within the CAR (more than any committee member had ever seen) the PPC had to give appropriate weight and credibility to the detail and tone in which these had been put. The committee felt that this was evidence of current services within the neighbourhood being inadequate.
- 11.17 Whilst during the hearing interested parties noted that they all had capacity, the information within the CAR and evidence provided during the Hearing demonstrated that there is a growing need for additional pharmaceutical services in the neighbourhood.
- 11.18 The PPC were aware that due to their revision of the Neighbourhood, and the developments in Cather Crescent and Lonend, the population will be higher than the Applicant's figure of 6,403. There was an exchange with the Boots representative about the frequency of pharmacist at Neilston Road. The applicant felt that three pharmacists in the last four years may have a negative effect on pharmacy care to patients
- 11.19 The Committee noted that a variety of bus routes and times were noted in the CAR for residents who were able to use a bus, the likelihood was that

the citizen would need to wait an hour for the return bus if they could not get off the bus, walk to the pharmacy, get their prescription and walk back to the bus stop. The committee recognised the recent large investments in new technology made by Abbey Pharmacy but noted this had reduced the space available for clients and some CAR comment were made about a reduction in privacy when talking to the pharmacist about sensitive matters.

- 11.20 For patients with young children or those with mobility issues, the access route between the proposed premises and surrounding areas was challenging due to large flights of steps from one area and a very busy road with very few crossing points from another.
- 11.21 Although car ownership was noted to be around 31% very few houses in the neighbourhood had access to garages or driveways.
- 11.22 Following the withdrawal of Mr Josh Miller, Mr Gordon Dykes and Mr Colin Fergusson in accordance with the procedure on applications contained within Paragraph 6, Schedule 4 of the National Health Service (Pharmaceutical Services) (Scotland) Regulations 2009, as amended, the Committee, for the reasons set out above, that the provision of pharmaceutical service in and to the Neighbourhood were inadequate.
- 11.23 The Committee considered whether granting this Application was necessary in order to secure adequate provision of pharmaceutical services in and to the Neighbourhood. The Committee agreed that it was necessary and desirable to grant the Application in order to secure adequate provision of pharmaceutical services within the neighbourhood in which the premises were located by persons whose names were included in the pharmaceutical list, and accordingly the Application was granted. This decision was made subject to the right of appeal as specified in Paragraph 4.1, Regulations 2009, as amended.