

REF NO: CB 20 75

SUMMARY OF REPORT OF MEETING OF THE PHARMACY PRACTICES COMMITTEE

- 1. DATE OF MEETING** - 24 October 2006 and 7 December 2006, respectively.
- 2. MEMBERS**
 - **Appointed by Tayside NHS Board**
Mr A Baillie
Mr C McMurray
Mrs J Perry
Mr I Wightman
 - **Appointed by Area Pharmaceutical Committee**
Mr K Curran
Mr L McAllister
 - **Appointed by Pharmaceutical Society of Great Britain (Scottish Division)**
Mrs J Johnston
- 3. OFFICERS OF THE BOARD** - Miss J Haskett, Practitioner Services Manager
Mr J Hamley, Chief Pharmacist
Mrs L Scobie, Secretarial/Administration Support Officer
Mrs Ramsay, Secretarial/Administration Support Officer
- 4. APPLICANT** - Mr R O Jones and Mr G J Brown
- 5. PROPOSED PREMISES** - 86 High Street (t/a Auchterarder Community Pharmacy),
Auchterarder
PH3 1BJ

Mr I Wightman in the Chair

6. **PERSONS HAVING MADE REPRESENTATION** - Area Pharmaceutical Committee; GP Sub-Committee; and Lloyds Pharmacy, Auchterarder

7. **PURPOSE OF MEETING**

The meeting was called in terms of the National Health Service (Pharmaceutical Services) (Scotland) Regulations 1995, as amended, to consider Mr Jones and Mr Browns' application for inclusion in the Board's Pharmaceutical List at the above address. The application is in respect of the dispensing of medicines and supply of drugs and listed appliances as specified in the Drug Tariff.

8. **CONSIDERATION**

The Committee considered the neighbourhood to be served by the proposed pharmacy to be the town of Auchterarder in its entirety, bounded to the north and east by fields, to the south by the A9 dual carriageway and stretching slightly in a westerly direction to include the Muirton area, which has become adjoined to the town, through the passage of time. In making this decision, the members agreed that there was a clear distinction between what should be considered as the neighbourhood, i.e. a place where people who live in the close vicinity are served by a range of services such as shops, schools, churches etc, as apposed to a place where people from surrounding towns and villages outwith the neighbourhood may choose to access those services.

In considering the adequacy of existing services in the neighbourhood, the Committee noted both the requirements of the current regulations and the impact of the phased introduction of the New Community Pharmacy Contract on pharmaceutical services at the present time. The Committee acknowledged that although the Minor Ailment Service and Public Health Service schemes have already been implemented as additional services within the regulations, the Chronic Medication Service and Acute Medication Service have yet to be introduced. The Committee noted that, whilst great emphasis had been made in respect of the existing pharmacy's ability to meet the requirements of the New Community Pharmacy Contract, the arrangements for securing the provision of these services and all other types of pharmaceutical services would differ in future and that it will be for NHS Tayside, under the Pharmaceutical Care Services Plan, to determine unmet need and how and by whom these needs will be provided for.

The applicant made considerable note in their representation of the level of pharmaceutical provision outwith pharmacy hours and in particular, the lack of formal Sunday and Public Holiday rota arrangements. The Committee noted that the existing pharmacy had advised that they provide a 24 hour, seven days a week, on-call service that had only been utilised on 4 occasions. The members also noted that this arrangement is supplemented by the advice and services offered by NHS24. The Committee recognised that the requirement or otherwise for a local rota is a decision for the Board in consultation with the Area Pharmaceutical Committee and should a need be identified, the Board would approach existing contractors in the first instance.

In addressing the volume of prescriptions dispensed by the existing pharmacy, the members were satisfied that both the size of the pharmacy premises and the number of professional and support staff operating from these premises was adequate.

The Committee noted that great emphasis had also been placed on the housing developments in the area. However, the evidence presented stretched as far as the year 2015, and predominantly focused upon plans for the fairly medium to long-term future. The Committee agreed that the proposals for developments over the longer-term should not be considered to have bearing on this application and that in the short to medium term, the evidence presented did not demonstrate a marked increase in the population that could not be accommodated by the existing contract.

The Committee noted representations from the Auchterarder and District Community Council supporting a second pharmacy and reporting anecdotal issues around dispensing errors in relation to the existing contractor. Given that there had been no formal complaints either to the existing contractor or to NHS Tayside, the Committee were of the view that there was no evidence to support these allegations. In noting further representations from a member of the public, who drew a comparison between the respective number of pharmacies in Crieff and Auchterarder, the Committee were of the view that the issue was not around the actual number of pharmacies, but the adequacy of pharmaceutical service provision in relation to need.

The members noted that they should grant an application only if they were satisfied that 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 to be located by persons whose names were included in the Pharmaceutical List.

In conclusion, the Committee unanimously agreed that the existing pharmaceutical provision in this area was adequate to meet the needs of the local population and that whilst a choice in pharmacy may be considered attractive to patients, this was not grounds to support the application as being either necessary or desirable under the statutory test.

9. DECISION

The members of the Committee appointed by the Area Pharmaceutical Committee withdrew from the meeting. The remaining members, unanimously decided that the proposed pharmacy was neither necessary nor desirable in order to secure adequate provision of pharmaceutical services in the neighbourhood in which the premises were to be located.

The Committee refused the application.