



## PRIMARY CARE CONTRACTOR ORGANISATION

### PHARMACY PRACTICES COMMITTEE

ISSUED 30 AUGUST 2018

Application by David Stevenson for inclusion in the pharmaceutical list in respect of the address 25 Main Street, Mid Calder, West Lothian, EH53 0AW.

#### Pharmacy Practices Committee

Derek Milligan	(Chair)
Julie Blythe	(Non-contractor Pharmacist)
Mike Embrey	(Contractor Pharmacist)
Margaret Tait	(Lay Member)
Ian Melville	(Lay member)

#### Administrator to the Pharmacy Practices Committee

Emma Smith (Contractor Support Officer)

#### **Reason for Meeting**

The Committee was reconvened on 15 May 2018 at the request of the NAP. The original PPC hearing was held on 17 October 2017 where the PPC granted the application. The Committee was asked by the NAP to consider their decision and to revisit the CAR and PCP and give more reasoning and evidence on how they reached their original decision.

The Committee stated that the PCP had not been included in the papers at the original PPC hearing, and so had not been taken into consideration then. The Chair of the Appeal Panel said the PPC are required to consider the PCP (2.4). It is also noted that the PCP was not included in the papers issued to the appellant and objectors at the original hearing so could not be discussed by them.

#### **Discussion**

The Committee reviewed the CAR paying attention to the survey and discussed the public engagement. The Chair noted that, at the original hearing, the Community Councillor had spoken on how well received the consultation had been by the local community with 297 responses received with 263 of these being from individual members of the public. The response rate was calculated at 1.5% based on the population of 19941. The Chair added that looking at this report it showed that the public were in favour of the application. Although the response rate seemed low, this was seen as being representative of the community. It was noted that 94.9% of the community agreed with the definition of the neighbourhood, 85.5% considered there were gaps/deficiencies in existing provision, 95.2% thought the application would have a positive impact on the neighbourhood, 89% had positive comments on the pharmaceutical services proposed, only 6.3% considered there were any services missing, 94.3% thought a community pharmacy would work with other NHS health services including local GPs, 92.9% believed the proposed pharmacy would have a

positive impact on existing NHS services, 96% had positive comments about the location and 86% positive thoughts on the proposed hours of the proposed pharmacy. This was all taken into account in the decision of the PPC.

The Committee then looked at the accessibility to the premises stating that there was a narrow pavement and that it was difficult for people with buggies and or mobility issues to access. However, the applicant stated that “the pharmacy will also have disabled access with an automatic door and parking outside the pharmacy.” (Meeting minutes 17/10/17 item 16). There was also an issue of transport and how people get to the pharmacies outwith Midcalder, where pedestrian access was mentioned by the Community Council as being difficult, along a narrow pavement and beside a busy main road, People with double-buggies or with mobility issues would be particularly disadvantaged. The Committee felt that the need for these proposed services was greater as there was a bigger need for consultation in pharmacy due to the distance of the nearest GP surgery.

The PCP indicated there was a shortage of pharmacies in West Lothian compared to the rest of the Lothians with 5485 people per community pharmacy in West Lothian. It was noted also that there was no community pharmacy in the neighbourhood and although there were care services outwith the neighbourhood, there was difficulty accessing them without the use of a car or other means of transport. The bus service was not frequent. It appeared that most people access pharmaceutical services in East Calder as this is nearest and also where the GP is located.

Other evidence according to Community Council that services were inadequate was the waiting time of patients due to the high volume of users. They had complained to the L&G pharmacy on this issue. Lindsay & Gilmour however felt that waiting times were realistic.

### **Decision**

It was the decision of the committee that the provision of pharmaceutical services to the neighbourhood was not adequate due to the reasons above, and to facilitate the adequacy of services, although it was not considered necessary, it was considered desirable to grant the application.