

SUMMARY OF REPORT OF MEETING OF THE PHARMACY PRACTICES COMMITTEE

1. **DATE OF MEETING** - 4 March 2011
 2. **MEMBERS**
 - **Appointed by Tayside NHS Board**
Mr J Angus
Mr A Baillie
Mr A Jack
Mr I Wightman
 - **Appointed by Area Pharmaceutical Committee**
Mr E Jenkin
Mr L McAllister
 - **Appointed by Pharmaceutical Society of Great Britain (Scottish Division)**
Mr M Carson
- Mr J Angus in the Chair
3. **OFFICERS OF THE BOARD** - Miss J Haskett, Practitioner Services Manager
Ms S Macgregor, Head of Pharmacy, Dundee CHP
Mrs F Gordon, Administration Support Officer
 4. **APPLICANT** - Davidson's Chemists
 5. **PROPOSED PREMISES** - 54-56 High Street
Auchterarder
 6. **PERSONS HAVING MADE REPRESENTATION** - Mr D Henry, Lloyds Pharmacy
Mr M Cox, Lloyds Pharmacy

7. PURPOSE OF MEETING

The meeting was called in terms of the National Health Service (Pharmaceutical Services) (Scotland) Regulations 2009, as amended, to consider an application from Davidson's Chemists 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

Having considered the evidence presented and the observations from the site visit, the Committee agreed that the neighbourhood of the proposed pharmacy should be defined as the villages of Aberuthven, Auchterarder and Gleneagles, bound to the south east by the A9 dual carriage way, to the north by the countryside and to the west by the A823.

The Committee noted the dual carriageway to be particularly difficult to cross and felt that the 15 mile journey to Perth, left the area somewhat isolated. Although there was a sizeable gap between Aberuthven and Auchterarder, there was considered to be a natural route of travel between the three villages to access services.

In considering the adequacy of existing services in the defined neighbourhood, with the exception of one member who felt that the existing pharmacy's problems were mainly due to constraints on the premises, the Committee were greatly concerned by the existing pharmacy's performance and were particularly drawn to the letter which had been submitted from the local medical practice stressing the "need" for a further pharmacy. The evidence from both the Board's public consultation exercise and the surveys undertaken by the applicant highlighting issues such as: errors, non-availability of drugs; together with the non delivery of commissioned services, and lack of continuity of a pharmacist, all strongly suggested that this was a busy pharmacy which could not cope with the level of business.

In considering the surveys undertaken by the applicant, the Committee were mindful that it is difficult to quantify the significance of the responses received in relation to the types of questions asked. However, the members felt that the overwhelming result of the Board's public consultation exercise, i.e. only one negative response out of 414, could not be ignored.

The Committee noted that although the pace of housing developments had slowed in the area, there was still an indication that the population was increasing and would continue to do so as the area is very affluent and particularly attractive to elderly people through retirement. Based on the GP practice population, the number of people being serviced by the existing pharmacy was almost double in comparison to the number of people normally seen in an average pharmacy in Tayside.

Taking all matters into consideration, and following full and lengthy discussion, the Committee agreed that the current provision of pharmaceutical services in the defined neighbourhood was inadequate. The Committee expressed their disappointment at the lack of improvement in provision over the last year and were concerned by level of non delivery of other aspects of the service such as minor ailments scheme and the additional local enhanced service schemes, which in their opinion, only demonstrated further, the extent to which the existing pharmacy is being stretched.

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

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 necessary in order to secure adequate provision of pharmaceutical services in the neighbourhood in which the premises were to be located.

The Committee granted the application.

Practitioner Services Manager
17 March 2011