

Minutes of the meeting of the NHS Forth Valley Pharmacy Practices Committee (PPC) held on Wednesday 22nd January at 11.30am via Microsoft Teams.

Committee:	John Stuart	Chair
	Claire Colligan	Non-Contractor Pharmacist Member
	Arif Hanif	Contractor Pharmacist Member
	Sheila McGhee	Lay Member

Secretariat:	Julie Innes	NHS Forth Valley Administration
--------------	-------------	---------------------------------

Reconvening of PPC to provide sufficient reasons as to why they assess the provision of pharmaceutical services currently present in the area to be inadequate in line with the Decision of the Chair of the National Appeal Panel In application relating to Unit 6, Kinnaird Village, McIntyre Avenue, Larbert, FK5 4XT

1. Application by Web Pharmacy and Appeal

- 1.1 There was an application and supporting documents submitted from WEB Pharmacy, received by Forth Valley Health Board on 2nd December 2021, for inclusion in the pharmaceutical list of a new pharmacy at Unit 6, Kinnaird Village, McIntyre Avenue, Larbert, FK5 4XT.
- 1.2 The initial PPC was held at NHS Forth Valley HQ, Board Room, Carseview House, Castle Business Park, Stirling, FK9 4SW on 22nd September 2022. The PPC approved the application for the new pharmacy's inclusion on the pharmaceutical list.
- 1.3 Appeals were submitted to the National Appeals Panel (NAP) by two appellants on 31st October 2022 and 1st November 2022. One ground of appeal was upheld and as such the panel was reconvened on 9th July 2024 to consider adequacy of pharmaceutical services in the area.
- 1.4 Further appeals were submitted to the NAP following the reconvened panel of 9th July 2024, and the PPC were directed to provide sufficient reason as to why inadequacy of pharmaceutical services in the area had been established.
- 1.5 This minute is therefore a record of the reconvening of the PPC where the panel discusses the reasons behind their conclusions that pharmaceutical services in the area are inadequate.

2. Supporting Documentation

- 2.1 Consultation Analysis Report (CAR)
- 2.2 National Appeal Panel Decision
- 2.3 Pharmaceutical Services Plan
- 2.4 Services provided within the area

2.5 Minutes from previous PPC meetings

3. Welcome and Interests

- 3.1 The Chair welcomed all to the meeting and introductions were made. When asked by the Chair, members confirmed that all papers had been received and considered. When committee members were asked by the Chair in turn to declare any interests in the application, none were declared.
- 3.2 Having ascertained that there were no conflicts of interest or questions from Committee Members the Chair confirmed that the meeting would be conducted in accordance with the notes contained within the papers circulated.
- 3.3 The Chair advised that one PPC member could not attend despite attempts to reconvene the full panel. The Board obtained advice in relation to the issue of attendance, and the Chair advised that in doing so it has been concluded that the missing member has been asked for written contributions. The contributions will follow the meeting and if there is anything to further discuss based on this the Chair will contact the committee for further input.

4 Reasons for Inadequacy

- 4.1 The Chair clarified that this meeting was to further discuss areas which were considered to be inadequate. The four areas, which were previously discussed included: are distance to alternative pharmacies; difficulties with public transport links; responses within the CAR & public response to this; and population growth in the area since the initial application, it was noted that the population is continuing to grow. The Chair invited the panel to consider these areas and provide comment on any other issues they believe to be relevant.

Ms Colligan and Mr Hanif agreed that while the committee had reconvened to discuss the outcome of a second appeal, this was not a fresh application and the committee were being asked to provide evidence to substantiate the earlier decision based on the initial application.

The committee had made the decision based on the population at the time of the application and the committee agreed that any future decisions would be made based on this and not any subsequent, sustained growth of the area.

The following concerns were raised:

Distance to alternative pharmacies

- The nearest alternative pharmacy is one mile away.
- Consideration was given to road safety as there have been deaths on the main roads, and aggressive driving at established crossings was also a factor. This road

is recognised by the community as an unsafe road and would deter people using this route.

- It was reaffirmed that panel members had visited the site and had undertaken the journey to the nearest pharmacy by car. In addition, a wheelchair using member of the Panel had visited the site and found the route to the nearest pharmacy very difficult to manoeuvre. Topography was identified as an issue as the footpath stops and restarts along Bellsdyke Road. It is noted that this was not listed in the CAR.
- Existing pharmacy services are already stretched, with long waiting times. Patients regularly have to make a second visit to collect partially filled prescriptions as evidenced in the CAR.
- It was agreed that a delivery service from a pharmacy is not considered an adequate service, that it is important for patients to be able to physically go to the pharmacy if that is their wish.
- It was also noted that in the previous PPC meeting it was discussed that access can mean something different to everyone.

Difficulties with public transport links

- It was agreed that as there are little to no bus routes from Kinnaird to Larbert or Stenhousemuir, the nearest alternative pharmacy is not accessible by public transport. This is highlighted in the CAR.
- The nearest pharmacy is located beside a school leading to very high traffic levels at peak times.
- Lack of parking at other sites was also considered a factor.

Mr Harif and Ms Colligan left the room to allow the panel to deliberate.

5 Deliberations

- 5.1** The Chair directed the panel that they had to vote based on the binary issue of whether the services in the defined area are adequate or inadequate, and if on discussion do they maintain their position that services are inadequate.
- 5.2** The voting members of the panel have reaffirmed the PPC's original decision that services are considered to be inadequate for the reasons highlighted above. The remaining panel member will be contacted with the minutes to establish if there is anything further they wish to add and this will be noted as an addendum when available. If the remaining member of the panel does not agree with the outcome the Chair will account for their views and ask for a further vote of the voting members to take place based on the further contribution.

Signed:

John Stuart.

John Stuart

Chair Pharmacy Practices Committee.

Date: 4th February 2025