

Meeting:	Trust Management Team (07)
Date:	2nd October 2003
Paper No:	2003/096
Subject:	Pharmacy Practices Committee of 18th September 2003
Presented by:	Charles Scott, Committee Chairman

ITEM No. 13

PPC[M]2003/04

Minutes of the Meeting of the Pharmacy Practices Committee
held on Thursday 18 September 2003 at 1.30pm
in Meeting Room 2, Trust HQ, Gartnavel Royal Hospital, 1055 Great Western Road, Glasgow.

PRESENT:

Charles Scott	Chairman
Mrs Susan Robertson	Lay Member
Mrs Patricia Cox	Lay Member
Alan Fraser	Lay Member
Gordon Dykes	Contractor Pharmacist Member
Dr James Johnson	Non-contractor Pharmacist Member
Colin Fergusson	Deputy Contractor Pharmacist Member

IN ATTENDANCE:

David Thomson	Director of Pharmacy
Grace Watson	Family Health Services Officer (Pharmaceutical)
Mrs Kate McGloan	Family Health Services Officer (Medical)
Mrs Carol Anderson	The Applicant
Charles Tait	Objector
James Patterson	Objector

Prior to the consideration of business, the Chairman asked members if they had an interest in the application to be discussed.

No declaration of interest was made.

1. APOLOGIES

No apologies were received.

2. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the PPC meeting held on 17 April 2003, PPC[M] 2003/03 were approved as a correct record.

3. MATTERS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MINUTES.

- i) Case no: PPC/INCL/04/2003. The PPC noted that a previous application for inclusion in the pharmaceutical list made by Boots the Chemist for Queen Street Station, Dundas Street, Glasgow, G1, granted by the PPC in April 2003, had been withdrawn by the Applicant.
- ii) The PPC noted that a previous application for inclusion in the pharmaceutical list by Mrs Carol Anderson for Unit 1, St Andrews Cross had been withdrawn by the Applicant.

7(i) Documentation Paper Flow - Attempts have been made to reduce the paperflow for PPC members and staff. Packages of PPC papers have been made more secure and sent in appropriate envelopes.

7(iii) Kate McGloan has been in contact with NHS Board and was awaiting further information from them.

4. APPLICATION FOR INCLUSION IN THE PRIMARY CARE TRUST'S PHARMACEUTICAL LIST**Case No: PPC/INCL/04/2003 – Carol Anderson, 672 Eglinton Street, Glasgow G5.9**

Application by Mrs Carol Anderson ("the Applicant") seeking inclusion in the Trust's Pharmaceutical List at 672 Eglinton Street, Glasgow G5 ("the Premises").

- I) The Committee ("the PPC") considered the application by the Applicant seeking inclusion in the Trust's Pharmaceutical List to provide pharmaceutical services from the Premises.
- II) The hearing was convened under paragraph 2(2) of Schedule 3 to the National Health Service (General Pharmaceutical Services) (Scotland) Regulations 1995 as amended ("the Regulations"). In terms of this paragraph, the PPC "shall determine an application in such 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."
- III) The Applicant appeared in person. Objectors who were entitled to and did attend the hearing were Mr Charles Tait on behalf of Boots the Chemist and Mr James Patterson on behalf of Joyce Morrison Pharmacy. ("the Objectors").
- IV) The procedure adopted by the PPC was that the Chairman asked the Applicant and the Objectors to each make a submission to the Panel. Each submission was followed by the opportunity for other parties and the PPC to ask questions. The parties were then given an opportunity to sum up. Before the parties left the hearing, the Chair of the Committee asked them if they felt they had a full and fair hearing. All confirmed that they had, and they had nothing further to add to their submissions.
- V) The PPC was required and did take into account all relevant factors concerning the issues 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.

VI) The PPC took into account all written representations and supporting documents submitted by the Applicant, the Objectors and those who were entitled to make representations to the PPC. Namely:

- (a) Pharmacy contractors within the vicinity of the applicant's proposed premises;
- (b) the Greater Glasgow Area Pharmaceutical (General Practitioner Sub-Committee);

The Committee also considered:-

- (d) the location of the nearest existing pharmaceutical services and the level of NHS dispensing carried out during the preceding 12 months;
- (e) the location and level of general medical services in the area;
- (f) demographic information regarding post-code sectors G5.9 and G41.2 and G42.7;
- (g) patterns of public transport;
- (h) Primary Care Trust plans for the future development of services;
- (i) Unsolicited written support for the application from GPs within Gorbals Health Centre;
- (j) Information from Glasgow City Council, Department of Land Services regarding future developments within the locality of the applicant's proposed pharmacy at 672 Eglinton Street.

The Applicant's Case

VII) The Applicant commenced her presentation by informing the PPC why she considered the granting of the contract to be necessary. The Applicant firstly acknowledged that the PPC had considered 13 previous applications for inclusion in the Pharmaceutical List for various premises in Eglinton Street and her desire was not to go over old ground, but to consider the changes and differences since the last application which was submitted by Mr John Gilbride, and considered by the PPC at an oral hearing on 23 January 2003. The Applicant believed there was an unmet pharmaceutical need in this area and there had been significant changes within the immediate neighbourhood itself since the last application by Mr Gilbride. She had both visited and worked within this location and felt the area had developed and would continue to do so. The area known locally as Old Gorbals and Tradeston were in her opinion, problem areas. Public can choose to shop and obtain medical goods in either place. The most notable change to the neighbourhood has been within the previously industrial sites which are now being developed into residential housing. There have been major developments on Pollokshaws Road to revert properties back to residential housing again and it is anticipated that the Plaza Ballroom site on Victoria Road will revert back to residential use also. Glasgow City Council Roads Department will reconfigure the roads around Eglinton Street, Gorbals Street and Cumberland Street an area resembling a triangle. She felt that considerable change had taken place and that development would continue. This development had, in the Applicant's opinion, led to the establishment of a separate neighbourhood, which she described as Eglinton. She did however, accept that the PPC had defined a neighbourhood in

relation to previous applications and she had no wish to contest this. She also felt that a small community had already developed in this triangle and for this reason her application differed from the previous applications. The Applicant felt there was a lack of pharmaceutical care in this neighbourhood especially with regard to services and treatments for drug addicts. The Applicant had had the opportunity to check the progress made at Florence Street Clinic and believed that it has still not yet reached its full potential. The Primary Care Trust estimated that there were over 300 drug abusing patients who required services but the Applicant felt that this figure did not accurately represent the true needs and numbers of drug abusing patients. She asked that the PPC understand that current methadone patients receiving treatment were in her opinion, not causing any problem, but the Applicant felt that the drug abusing patients not yet in treatment were the main concern. The numbers of methadone patients participating in methadone programmes via pharmacies was high and this fact was recognised by the local GPs, this was illustrated by the particular GP's who felt compelled to support this application to the PPC. The Applicant recognised that the methadone review carried out by the Trust was quite in depth in assessing the needs of the patients, yet the subsequent plan did not address all the needs of the service users. The Applicant believed that a new pharmacy contract would allow those patients who did not yet have access to services, to be included. She acknowledged that comprehensive services were provided by other pharmacies in the area, but the Applicant planned to offer a broad and extended range of services for the new residents within the area. The Applicant believed the new residents required this contract to be granted.

The Objectors Question the Applicant

- VIII) On questioning by Mr James Patterson (Objector), the Applicant confirmed that there were a variety of shops in the area including a pub, a Post Office, GP surgery, a pharmacy and two major industrial pockets. The Applicant felt it would be difficult to define the area into a 'neighbourhood' but believed there were natural neighbourhoods developing all the time. The Applicant had experienced difficulty finding suitable vacant premises in the area and felt this was a clear indication to the PPC that business in the area was progressing and expanding. The Applicant further clarified what she felt was a 'perceived problem', that pharmacists had a responsibility to educate and respond to the concerns of the community who feel there were many drug abusing patients not yet receiving treatment. The Applicant also felt that patients from the South East should be considered within this application too. There has been much pressure from Local Councillors to open a pharmacy in Eglinton Street. The Applicant acknowledged that Eglinton Street was not an ideal site, but was the only possibility given that there are no other business premises available at the moment. She felt that the local residents would appreciate the Applicant providing a professional and discreet service. The Applicant would help to address the drug problem that has been building up for around four years. The Applicant commented that Florence Street Clinic would have a capacity for 60 patients and clarified that the basis of her application was not solely on methadone services. The Applicant wanted to provide a comprehensive service to all and felt the granting of this contract would not jeopardise the neighbouring pharmacy network, but enhance the quality of care to current residents. The Applicant felt that it would also be advantageous to the residents who would have less distance to travel for pharmaceutical services.
- IX) On questioning by Mr Charles Tait, the Applicant defined the area as Eglinton and said she felt the patients from the South Side would agree. The Applicant felt that to define the neighbourhood as St Andrew's, may cause confusion. She clarified that the proposed premises are approximately 580 square feet which is similar in size to her previous pharmacy on Victoria Road. The Applicant acknowledged that this was not an ideal size, but she proposed that the design would maximise the space available.

The Committee Question the Applicant

- X) On questioning from the PPC regarding the size of the proposed premises, the

Applicant stated she would not provide many cosmetic products but focus on providing medicines, vitamins and health products. Potential customers already had a good choice of retail outlets from which to buy cosmetic items. Although the fit of the shop had not been decided, the proposed pharmacy would follow the principles of the model pharmacy at Saracen Street, with a dispensary, a consultation area and discreet and semi-discreet areas. The Applicant would participate in medicine management activities, diagnostics and smoking cessation etc. and provide clearly defined areas. The Applicant advised that she has been in regular contact with the local GPs but, did not dictate to them the wording of their unsolicited letters brought forward to this PPC meeting . The fact that the two letters received are of a similar style is purely coincidence and could be put down to the fact that the GPs work in close proximity. The GPs agreed with the Applicant that there was an unmet need in this area.

The Objectors Case

- XI) Mr James Patterson stated that the existing services already offered a full pharmacy service, especially on Victoria Road and the services provided were excellent. Mr Patterson felt the definition of the neighbourhood was not clear enough. He did not agree with the Applicant that the population had grown. With regard to providing methadone services, Florence Street Clinic was expanding and would deal with any methadone over-spill. Considering all the above, he felt there was no need for the granting of this contract.
- XII) Mr Charles Tait quoted Lord Nimmo 'that which may be described as neighbourhood in normal use of the word'. He felt the applicant had tried to redefine the neighbourhood. Mr Tait disagreed that the proposed location was within the G5 postcode area and he felt this was Hutchesontown (or Gorbals) which according to the 2001 census had a population of 6682. He suggested that the premises were in fact situated in Pollokshields East and has a population of 9000 plus residents. This area had high unemployment levels. Residents would describe this location as one neighbourhood which encompassed: Hutchesontown, Pollokshields and Govanhill. He also pointed out that there are very expensive residential flats now available for sale at Eglinton Toll. Govanhill was served by 6 pharmacies, which constituted a high density of pharmacies per population and these pharmacies offered excellent services as well as being easily located. He accepted that the area may be changing but, the proposed site did not appear to be one of high deprivation; this conclusion being based on the very expensive housing available which suggested the local residents would not be in a high dependant category. Therefore, this application could not be looked upon as a solution to the perceived drug problem. The general pharmaceutical services at present were adequate and there was no need to expand this service. Mr Tait felt that as the location of the proposed pharmacy was next door to a GP surgery, where patients attend from all over Glasgow, that this would be a motivating factor for the Applicant. Mr Tait informed the PPC that as the pharmaceutical services at present are secure and adequate, this application was neither necessary nor desirable according to the Regulations and should be rejected.

The Applicant Questions the Objectors

- XIII) Mr James Patterson felt that Florence Street had made a good start in addressing the under-provision of methadone services for drug abusers and specifically targeted residents of the Gorbals area. However, the local pharmacies were in a position to address any unmet need. The Applicant however, felt that Florence Street Clinic, when fully operational, would not sufficiently address the real problem concerning the numbers of drug abusers not yet in treatment, their health and welfare needs.
- XIV) The Applicant, on addressing Mr Charles Tait's previous comments on the neighbourhood, agreed with the previous PPC definition of the neighbourhood. She considered it difficult to define a neighbourhood and if a smaller area was defined, it

would show a change in circumstance. Although there were many new expensive properties for sale, there are still a great number of deprived residents. If this application were granted, the Applicant envisaged that the two categories of residents will contribute to the dynamics of the area and both will benefit from a full pharmaceutical service on their immediate doorstep.

The Committee Question the Objectors

- XV) David Thomson informed the Committee that the Trust had invested substantial amounts in the Florence Street Clinic over a five-year time frame. The numbers attending would be around 60 as it was felt that large numbers of patients attending would not be desirable and at the moment only 11 patients attended voluntarily. Glasgow City Council also recognised that to accommodate more than 60 patients at the Florence Street Clinic, further resources would be required.
- XVI) Mr Tait was invited to define the neighbourhood as he saw it. He informed the Committee that he had difficulty defining the neighbourhood, yet saw three distinct communities. He felt the local residents would disagree with the previous PPC definition of the neighbourhood. When pressed to define the borders Mr Tait replied: Hutchestontown, Govanhill and Pollokshields.
- XVII) Mr Patterson commented on the Florence Street Clinic and suggested that the methadone patients attending for treatment at Florence Street Clinic caused no problems. The Florence Street Clinic was supported by both the residents and local Councillors alike who perceived this Clinic to be an obvious solution to the drug problems. Mr Tait commented that multi-disciplinary working at Florence Street Clinic offered full and proper care e.g. counselling services as well as health and well being advice. However there was a place for the pharmacies to work in this area also.
- XVIII) On questioning from the Committee, Mr Tait clarified that when he referred to transporting patients, he was referring to patients travelling from one area to another for services. Mr Tait felt that the difficulty with the Regulations is how funding is obtained. Mr Tait refused to comment without first conducting further research on where he would place a pharmacy to provide services for the residents of Laureston. The Committee suggested that the population figures suggested by Mr Tait were somewhat adrift for Laurieston.

The Objectors Sum Up

- XIX) Mr Tait asked the PPC to consider the adequacy of the services within the neighbourhood at present and felt that great care should be taken by the PPC when defining the neighbourhood. It would not be reasonable to have a pharmacy situated next to every GP surgery and Mr Tait asked the PPC to use the common understanding of the words neighbourhood and adequacy. Mr Patterson stated that the area was well defined and the current services were perfectly adequate and acceptable.
- XX) Mr Patterson felt the neighbourhood had already been well defined and within this definition, the current services were perfectly acceptable and adequate.

The Applicant Sums Up

- XXI) The Applicant again stated that the definition of the neighbourhood could be discussed endlessly. The Applicant felt there was an unmet need for both the general pharmaceutical patients and patients requiring methadone services and furthermore, the granting of her application would not jeopardise the viability of the other local pharmacies. She reiterated that she had initially tried to obtain other premises in the area and would have chosen another site as first choice, however there were no other premises available.

Decision**Neighbourhood**

- XXII) Having considered the evidence presented to it, and the PPC's observations from the site visits, the PPC had to decide first the question of the neighbourhood in which the premises, to which the application related, were located.
- XXIII) The Panel considered that the neighbourhood should be defined as follows: on the Northern boundary by the M8 motorway, on the Southern boundary by Queens Park, on the Western boundary by St Andrews Drive and on the Eastern boundary by the River Clyde.
- XXIV) The reasons for the PPC's decision were that the premises were situated in an area where the neighbourhood had declined, and where there was an absence of significant residential properties. The one mile radius used for the consultation exercise held within it, four clearly defined neighbourhoods i.e. Gorbals, Kinning Park, Govanhill and Pollokshields. These neighbourhoods were each distinct from the other, and easily identifiable from a map.
- XXV) The PPC was of the view that the premises situated at Eglinton Street could be said to lie on the edge of all four neighbourhoods, although not properly part of any of them. The PPC heard that 681 places on the methadone scheme were already filled of the 695 available. The PPC concluded that although the waterfront changes would go ahead, the M74 and housing changes are several years off and it is uncertain as to whether they will take place.

Although the PPC were aware of potential residential developments in the area, they were satisfied that completion of most of these (including the M74 extension) were not imminent. The Committee were mindful that their determination must focus on the present situation, while being aware of known firm plans for development. They agreed that the new developments, while significant, would not have an impact in demand for services in the short term.

Adequacy of existing provision of pharmaceutical services and necessity or desirability

- XXVI) Having reached that conclusion, the PPC was then required to consider the adequacy of existing 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.
- XXVII) The PPC considered information received from Glasgow City Council and the Social Inclusion Partnership, which showed high deprivation in the Gorbals area. Other information available to the PPC showed the area to have lower than average levels of car ownership, and higher than average levels of unemployment, long term ill health and drug dependency. The PPC were aware of the current situation with regards to methadone supervision in the area, and the perception of some local residents that the level of methadone activity was affecting property sales. This concern had caused some residents to voice complaints, and the Trust was

currently working with other agencies to try and ensure that all patients in the Gorbals who were currently on a methadone programme, continued to have access to this service, while limiting any detrimental effects on the local residents. Immediate action in the form of limiting the number of patients receiving their supervised doses at the current pharmacies in the area had resulted in patients who wanted to come onto the programme not being accommodated. The methadone review undertaken by the NHS Board had advocated increased access to the service, and this was not borne out in Gorbals. As a means of alleviating the situation while providing more supervision places, the Trust in conjunction with other agencies had established a satellite supervision service at Florence Street Clinic, which should serve to ease the situation. The Director of Pharmacy wished to stress however, that the Florence Street facility, would not fully address the unmet need in the area.

- XXVIII) Within the neighbourhood as defined by the PPC, there was adequate provision of pharmaceutical services provided by the numerous pharmacies located in the neighbourhood. There was no evidence that the granting of an additional NHS contract would make the pharmaceutical services to the neighbourhood more adequate. The PPC were satisfied that the current pharmaceutical network provided an adequate service to meet the current demand for pharmaceutical care in the area, the PPC therefore did not consider the granting of the application to be necessary.
- XXIX) The PPC considered the Applicant's rationale for establishing a pharmacy at the Premise; that the new pharmacy would provide services for a newly developed neighbourhood established as a result of residential development in the area.
- XXX) Having considered the Applicant's justification for the granting of a new contract to provide of pharmaceutical services to these premises, the PPC did not agree that there was evidence of a sufficient need or desirability to justify the granting of the application.
- XXXI) Having regard to the overall services provided by the existing contractors within the vicinity of the Premises, the PPC agreed that the neighbourhood was already adequately served.
- XXXII) For the reasons set out above, the PPC considered that the existing pharmaceutical service in the neighbourhood was adequate. Accordingly, the PPC was not satisfied that the provision of pharmaceutical services at the premises of the Applicants was either 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.
- XXXIII)

In accordance with the statutory procedure, the chemist contractor member of the Committee, Mr Dykes, was excluded from the decision process.

DECIDED/-

In the circumstances, it was the unanimous decision of the PPC that the application be refused.

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

FHS Officer
(Pharmaceutical)

5. MATTERS CONSIDERED BY THE CHAIRMAN SINCE THE LAST MEETING

The Committee having previously been circulated with Paper 2003/11 noted the contents, which gave details of applications considered by the Chairman outwith the meeting since Thursday 17 April 2003.

1) Transfer of National Health Service Dispensing Contract Where a Change of Ownership Has Taken Place

Case No: PPC/COO/3/2003 - Burnside Pharmacy, 273 Stonelaw Road, Glasgow, G73 3RN.

The Committee considered the action taken by the Chairman on application for the transfer of the NHS Dispensing contract previously held by Mrs Alison Jamieson, at the above address.

The Committee noted that the Chairman had granted the application with effect from 1 July 2003, having been satisfied that the application fulfilled the requirements laid down in the Pharmaceutical Regulations. The new pharmacy contractor was Alasdair MacIntyre and the trading name would remain Burnside Pharmacy.

Case No: PPC/COO/4/2003 - Alston's Chemists, 1033 Shettleston Road, Glasgow, G32 7PB.

The Committee considered the action taken by the Chairman on application for the transfer of the NHS Dispensing contract previously held by Mr Paul Di Mambro, at the above address.

The Committee noted that the Chairman had granted the application with effect from 3 March 2003, having been satisfied that the application fulfilled the requirements laid down in the Pharmaceutical Regulations. The new pharmacy contractor was E Moss Ltd and the trading name would be Moss Pharmacy.

Case No: PPC/COO/5/2003 - Alston's Chemists, 92 Kirkintilloch Road, Lenzie, Glasgow, G66 4LQ.

The Committee considered the action taken by the Chairman on application for the transfer of the NHS Dispensing contract previously held by Mr Paul Di Mambro, at the above address.

The Committee noted that the Chairman had granted the application with effect from 3 March 2003, having been satisfied that the application fulfilled the requirements laid down in the Pharmaceutical Regulations. The new pharmacy contractor was E Moss Ltd and the trading name would be Moss Pharmacy.

Case No: PPC/COO/6/2003 - C & M Mackie Pharmacy, 1795 Paisley Road West, Glasgow, G52 3SS.

The Committee considered the action taken by the Chairman on application for the transfer of the NHS Dispensing contract previously held by Mrs Clare Mackie, at the above address.

The Committee noted that the Chairman had granted the application with effect from 1 August 2003, having been satisfied that the application fulfilled the requirements laid down in the Pharmaceutical Regulations. The new pharmacy contractor was John Paul Mackie and the trading name would be J P Mackie Pharmacy.

Case No: PPC/COO/7/2003 - C & M Mackie Pharmacy, 41 Sinclair Drive, Glasgow, G42 9PR.

The Committee considered the action taken by the Chairman on application for the transfer of the NHS Dispensing contract previously held by Mrs Clare Mackie, at the above address.

The Committee noted that the Chairman had granted the application with effect from 1 August 2003, having been satisfied that the application fulfilled the requirements laid down in the Pharmaceutical Regulations. The new pharmacy contractor was John Paul Mackie and the trading name would be J P Mackie Pharmacy.

Case No: PPC/COO/8/2003 - L B Dunn Chemists, 426 Victoria Road, Glasgow, G42 8YU.

The Committee considered the action taken by the Chairman on application for the transfer of the NHS Dispensing contract previously held by Mrs Carol Anderson, at the above address.

The Committee noted that the Chairman had granted the application with effect from 1 August 2003, having been satisfied that the application fulfilled the requirements laid down in the Pharmaceutical Regulations. The new pharmacy contractor was Joyce Morrison Ltd and the trading name would be Joyce Morrison Pharmacy.

Case No: PPC/COO/9/2003 - L B Dunn Chemists, 155 Crown Street, Glasgow, G5 9XT.

The Committee considered the action taken by the Chairman on application for the transfer of the NHS Dispensing contract previously held by Mrs Carol Anderson, at the above address.

The Committee noted that the Chairman had granted the application with effect from 1 August 2003, having been satisfied that the application fulfilled the requirements laid down in the Pharmaceutical Regulations. The new pharmacy contractor was Joyce Morrison Ltd and the trading name would be Joyce Morrison Pharmacy.

Case No: PPC/COO/10/2003 - G S Kitchin, 116 Nithsdale Road, Glasgow G41 5RB.

The Committee considered the action taken by the Chairman on application for the transfer of the NHS Dispensing contract previously held by Mr David and Karen Aitken, at the above address.

The Committee noted that the Chairman had granted the application with effect from 4 August 2003, having been satisfied that the application fulfilled the requirements laid down in the Pharmaceutical Regulations. The new pharmacy contractor was L Rowland & Co and the trading name would remain G S Kitchin Pharmacy.

II) Minor Relocation of Existing Pharmaceutical Services**Case No: PPC/MRELOC/04/2003 – Baxter Healthcare Ltd, 2A Burntbroom Court, Shotts Street, Queenslie Industrial Estate, Glasgow, G33 4JB.**

The Committee considered the action taken by the Chairperson on an application for the minor relocation of the NHS Dispensing contract held by Baxter Healthcare Ltd of Unicare, 44 Nurseries Road, Glasgow, G69 4JB.

The Committee noted that the Greater Glasgow Area Pharmaceutical General Practitioner Subcommittee and the Director of Pharmacy both considered that the application did not fulfil the criteria of a minor relocation. On this advice, the Chairperson agreed that the application should not be granted.

Case No: PPC/MRELOC/05/2003 – E Moss Ltd, 1041 Shettleston Road, Glasgow, G32 7PB.

The Committee considered the action taken by the Chairperson on an application for the minor relocation of the NHS Dispensing contract held by E Moss Ltd of Moss Pharmacy, 1033 Shettleston Road, Glasgow, G32 7PB.

The Committee noted that the Greater Glasgow Area Pharmaceutical General Practitioner Sub-committee and the Director of Pharmacy both considered that the application fulfilled the criteria of a minor relocation. On this advice, the Chairperson agreed that the application be granted.

DECIDED/-

That the Chairman's action under the National Health Service (General Pharmaceutical Services) (Scotland) Regulations 1995 as amended be homologated.

6. NATIONAL APPEALS PANEL

The Committee noted the decision of the National Appeal Panel's (NAP) determination of an appeal lodged against the Committee's decision in the following case:

Mr Jim Rae – 3 Kennishead Road, Thornliebank, Glasgow – National Appeals Panel rejected appeal after oral hearing.

7. MEMBERSHIP

The Committee were informed that as Mrs Carol Anderson had sold her two pharmacies with effect from 1 August 2003, she had subsequently tendered her resignation as Contractor Pharmacist Member to the Pharmacy Practice Committee. A nomination was being sought for the appointment of a replacement member.

8. NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of the Pharmacy Practices Committee was arranged for Thursday 20 November 2003 in Meeting Room 1, Trust HQ.

The Meeting ended at 4.20pm