

**NOT YET ENDORSED AS A CORRECT RECORD**

**Pharmacy Practices Committee (01)**

Minutes of a Meeting held on

Monday 13<sup>th</sup> February 2006

Board Room , Gartnavel Royal Hospital, 1055 Great Western Road,  
Glasgow, G12

**PRESENT:**

Andrew Robertson	Chairman
Alan Fraser	Lay Member
Prof J McKie	Lay Member
Prof James Johnson	Non Contractor Pharmacist Member
Alasdair Macintyre	Contractor Pharmacist Member

**IN ATTENDANCE**

Janine Glen	Contractor Services Manager
David Thomson	Director of Pharmacy

Prior to the consideration of business, the Chairperson asked members if they had an interest in any of the applications to be discussed or if they were associated with any person who had a personal interest in the applications to be considered by the Committee.

**No declarations of interest were made on any of the applications to be considered.**

**1. APOLOGIES**

Apologies were received on behalf of Gordon Dykes and Mrs P Cox.

**2. MINUTES**

The Minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 19<sup>th</sup> October 2005 **PPC[M]2005/05** were approved as a correct record with the following amendment:

Page 14 – closing quote marks in Para 3 of Alyson Irving's submission should move from after the word "fail" to after the word "adequate".

**3. ANY OTHER BUSINESS NOT INCLUDED IN AGENDA**

There was no other business not already included in the Agenda.

**ACTION**

## Section 1 – Applications Under Regulation 5 (10)

### 4. APPLICATION FOR INCLUSION IN THE BOARD'S PHARMACEUTICAL LIST

#### i) Case No: PPC/INCL14/2005 C&A Fergusson, 194 Petershill Road, Glasgow G21.4

The Committee was asked to consider an application submitted by C&A Fergusson, to provide general pharmaceutical services from premises situated at 194 Petershill Road, Glasgow G21.4 under Regulation 5(2) of the National Health Service (General Pharmaceutical Services) (Scotland) Regulations 1995 as amended.

The Committee had to determine whether the granting of the application was necessary or desirable to secure the adequate provision of pharmaceutical services in the neighbourhood in which the Applicants' proposed premises were located.

The Chairman, Lay Members and Director of Pharmacy had previously received notice of the application, along with associated information including:

- i) The application form and supporting statement;
- ii) The map and information contained at **Appendix 4** of the papers;
- iii) Notification of decisions taken on previous applications received in respect of premises in the same post-code area; and
- iv) Other information the Board felt was relevant to allow them to consider whether the application should be considered by oral hearing.

Having considered the information, the Chairman, Lay Members and Director of Pharmacy had agreed that it was not necessary to consider the application by oral hearing.

The Committee, having previously been circulated with all the papers regarding the application from C&A Fergusson, agreed with the initial decision and reiterated that the application should be considered by the written representations.

Prior to the hearing, the Panel had individually made visits to the site at 194 Petershill Road, Glasgow G21.4.

The Committee noted that they had previously considered a similar application from the same applicants for the same premises in April 2005. This application had been considered by means of an oral hearing and subsequent to their deliberations, the Committee had concluded that the provision of pharmaceutical services at the premises at which the applicants had applied, was necessary and desirable. The application was therefore granted. Several of the interested parties in the initial application had appealed against the Committee's decision. The National

Appeals Panel had upheld the appeals, determining that pharmaceutical services were currently adequate in the area, and that therefore the application was not necessary.

Before considering the most recent application, the Committee questioned the propriety of applicants re-submitting applications which had already been tested and where there appeared to be no material difference in circumstances since the original determination of the application. The Committee were mindful that the National Appeals Panel had given their consideration to the applicants' initial application less than six months ago, and questioned whether it would be appropriate for the Pharmacy Practice Committee to determine the application again.

The Committee were keen to avoid a situation where applicant's deemed it appropriate to re-submit applications where the National Appeals Panel had found against them. The Committee were aware that there was already an established procedure for applicants or interested parties to test the decision of the National Appeals Panel where they considered this adverse. While it was known that few Judicial Reviews took place in Scotland, this was nevertheless the established procedure. The Committee wanted to avoid a situation arising where applicants circumvented this process by simply re-submitting an application and seeking a fresh decision from the Pharmacy Practices Committee.

The Committee agreed that consideration of this application be postponed until guidance could be sought from the Central Legal Office around the Committee's obligations in such situations.

***DECIDED/-***

That determination of C&A Fergusson's application be deferred until the April meeting or until such times as the Committee had received and had the opportunity to consider guidance from Central Legal Office in relation to this issue.

**Contractor  
Services  
Supervisor**

**ii) Case No: PPC/INCL015/2005  
Apple Healthcare, 331 Bilsland Drive, Glasgow G20.9**

The Committee was asked to consider an application submitted by Apple Healthcare Group, to provide general pharmaceutical services from premises which are situated at 331 Bilsland Drive, Glasgow G20.9 under Regulation 5(2) of the National Health Service (General Pharmaceutical Services) (Scotland) Regulations 1995 as amended.

The Committee had to determine whether the granting of the application was necessary or desirable to secure the adequate provision of pharmaceutical services in the neighbourhood in which the Applicant's proposed premises were located.

The Chairman, Lay Members and Director of Pharmacy had previously received notice of the application, along with associated information including:

- i) The application form and supporting statement;
- ii) The map and information contained at **Appendix 4** of the papers;
- iii) Notification of decisions taken on previous applications received in respect of premises in the same post-code area; and
- iv) Other information the Board felt was relevant to allow them to consider whether the application should be considered by oral hearing.

Having considered the information, the Chairman, Lay Members and Director of Pharmacy had unanimously agreed that it was unnecessary to consider the application by oral hearing.

The Committee, having previously been circulated with all the papers regarding the application from Apple Healthcare Group, agreed with the initial decision and reiterated that the application could be determined based on the written representations and that an oral hearing was not required.

The Committee members had individually made visits to the site at 331 Bilsland Drive, Glasgow G20.9.

The Committee considered views and representations received from

- a) Chemist contractors within the vicinity of the Applicant's premises namely:  
  
Maryhill Dispensary – 1129 Maryhill Road, Glasgow G20.9;  
Lloyds Pharmacy – 100 Napiershall Street, Glasgow G20.6 and 1421 Maryhill Road, G20.9;  
Alliance Pharmacy – 693 Great Western Road, Glasgow G12.8 and 80 Queen Margaret Drive, Glasgow G20.8;  
Westray Pharmacy – 9 Westray Circus, Glasgow G22.7; and  
Munro Pharmacy – 549 Maryhill Road, Glasgow G20.7
- b) the Greater Glasgow Area Pharmaceutical Committee (General Practitioner Sub-Committee);
- c) the Greater Glasgow Area Medical Committee (GP Sub-Committee).

The Committee also considered:-

- d) The location of the nearest existing pharmaceutical services;
- e) Demographic information regarding post code sectors G20.7, G20.9 and G22.6;

- f) Patterns of public transport; and
- g) Greater Glasgow NHS Board plans for future development of services;

## **CONCLUSION**

The Committee noted that the Applicant had applied for inclusion in the Board's Pharmaceutical List for the provision of pharmaceutical services from premises situated at 331 Bilsland Drive, Glasgow G20.9. The premises were already constructed, and the Applicant had satisfied the Board that they were in pursuit of the lease.

In considering this application, the Committee was required to take into account all relevant factors concerning the definition of the neighbourhood served and the adequacy of existing pharmaceutical services in the neighbourhood in the context of Regulation 5(10).

The Committee noted that they had previously considered an application for premises in this area in June 2005. At that time the Committee had considered the evidence presented to it, and from their own observations from site visits, had decided the neighbourhood should be defined as follows:

North: Canal, which was a natural boundary;  
West: Maryhill Road at Kelvindale Road to Garscube Road (including both sides);  
South: Panmure Street, Stronend Street to Balmore Road;  
East: Balmore Road to Bilsland Drive, along residential development to canal.

Having reached that conclusion the Committee were then required to consider the adequacy of existing pharmaceutical 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.

The Committee looked at the application to ascertain whether there had been any material changes since the last application was considered. When considering the initial application the Committee concluded that there was an adequate provision of pharmaceutical services provided by the existing pharmaceutical network. The Committee had found no evidence at that time that accessibility to the existing network was not adequate. They had found no evidence of a significant increase in population within the area, and in fact it was noted that the current population was in fact in decline. While it was recognised that some development would take place in the surrounding area, the Committee were satisfied that this was some time in the future and any subsequent reversal of the declining population should be reconsidered when the various redevelopments had been completed. Based on these considerations, the Committee had refused the application.

In considering this most recent application, the Committee did not consider that circumstances in the area had changed materially that they would reconsider their initial decision. The redevelopments illustrated by the applicant were on-going and would not have any significant effect on the area's residential population for some time. The Committee therefore reiterated their initial conclusion that the existing network provided adequate services to the neighbourhood, and that an additional contract in the area was not necessary or desirable.

**In accordance with the statutory procedure the Chemist Contractor member of the Committee Alasdair MacIntyre was excluded from the decision process:**

***DECIDED/-***

The Committee agreed by unanimous decision that the granting of the application was not necessary or desirable, in order to secure the adequate provision of pharmaceutical services in the neighbourhood of the proposed premises and accordingly that the application seeking inclusion in the Greater Glasgow NHS Board's Pharmaceutical List at 3331 Bilsland Drive, Glasgow G20.9 for the provision of general pharmaceutical services be refused.

**Contractor  
Services  
Supervisor**

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

**iii) Case No: PPC/INCL16/2005  
Mr M Rashid, 351 Bilsland Drive, Glasgow G20.9**

The Committee was asked to consider an application submitted by Mr M Rashid, to provide general pharmaceutical services from premises which were situated at 351 Bilsland Drive, Glasgow G20.9 under Regulation 5(2) of the National Health Service (General Pharmaceutical Services) (Scotland) Regulations 1995 as amended.

The Committee had to determine whether the granting of the application was necessary or desirable to secure the adequate provision of pharmaceutical services in the neighbourhood in which the Applicant's proposed premises were located.

The Chairman, Lay Members and Director of Pharmacy had previously received notice of the application, along with associated information including:

- i) The application form and supporting statement;
- ii) The map and information contained at **Appendix 4** of the papers;
- iii) Notification of decisions taken on previous applications received in respect of premises in the same post-code area; and
- iv) Other information the Board felt was relevant to allow them to consider whether the application should be considered by oral

hearing.

Having considered the information, the Chairman, Lay Members and Director of Pharmacy had unanimously agreed that it was unnecessary to consider the application by oral hearing.

The Committee, having previously been circulated with all the papers regarding the application from Mr Butt, agreed with the initial decision and reiterated that the application could be determined based on the written representations and that an oral hearing was not required.

The Committee members had individually made visits to the site at 351 Bilsland Drive, Glasgow G20.9.

The Committee considered views and representations received from

- a) Chemist contractors within the vicinity of the Applicant's premises namely:

Maryhill Dispensary – 1129 Maryhill Road, Glasgow G20.9;  
Lloyds Pharmacy – 100 Napiershall Street, Glasgow G20.6 and 1421 Maryhill Road, ,G20.9;  
Alliance Pharmacy – 693 Great Western Road, Glasgow G12.8 and 80 Queen Margaret Drive, Glasgow G20.8;  
Bannerman's Pharmacy – 171-173 Saracen Street, Glasgow G22.5;  
Westray Pharmacy – 9 Westray Circus, Glasgow G22.7; and  
Munro Pharmacy – 549 Maryhill Road, Glasgow G20.7

- b) the Greater Glasgow Area Pharmaceutical Committee (General Practitioner Sub-Committee).

The Committee also considered:-

- c) The location of the nearest existing pharmaceutical services;
- d) Demographic information regarding post code sectors G20.7, G20.9 and G22.6;
- e) Patterns of public transport; and
- f) Greater Glasgow NHS Board plans for future development of services.

## **CONCLUSION**

The Committee noted that the Applicant had applied for inclusion in the Board's Pharmaceutical List for the provision of pharmaceutical services from premises situated at 351 Bilsland Drive, Glasgow G20.9. The premises were already constructed, and the Applicant had satisfied the Board that they were in pursuit of the lease.

In considering this application, the Committee was required to take into account all relevant factors concerning the definition of the neighbourhood served and the adequacy of existing pharmaceutical services in the neighbourhood in the context of Regulation 5(10).

The Committee noted that they had previously considered an application for premises in this area in June 2005. At that time the Committee had considered the evidence presented to it, and from their own observations from site visits, had decided the neighbourhood should be defined as follows:

North: Canal, which was a natural boundary;

West: Maryhill Road at Kelvindale Road to Garscube Road (including both sides);

South: Panmure Street, Stronend Street to Balmore Road;

East: Balmore Road to Bilisland Drive, along residential development to canal.

Having reached that conclusion the Committee were then required to consider the adequacy of existing pharmaceutical 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.

The Committee looked at the application to ascertain whether there had been any material changes since the last application was considered. When considering the initial application the Committee concluded that there was an adequate provision of pharmaceutical services provided by the existing pharmaceutical network. The Committee found no evidence at that time that accessibility to the existing network was not adequate. They had found no evidence of a significant increase in population within the area, and in fact it was noted that the current population was in fact in decline. While it was recognised that some development would take place in the surrounding area, the Committee were satisfied that this was some time in the future and any subsequent reversal of the declining population should be reconsidered when the various redevelopments had been completed. Based on these considerations, the Committee had refused the application.

In considering this most recent application, the Committee did not consider that circumstances in the area had changed materially that they would reconsider their initial decision. The redevelopments illustrated by the applicant were on-going and would not have any significant effect on the area's residential population for some time. The Committee therefore reiterated their initial conclusion that the existing network provided adequate services to the neighbourhood, and that an additional contract in the area was not necessary or desirable.

**In accordance with the statutory procedure the Chemist Contractor member of the Committee Alasdair MacIntyre was excluded from**



**the decision process:**

***DECIDED/-***

The Committee agreed by unanimous decision that the granting of the application was not necessary or desirable, in order to secure the adequate provision of pharmaceutical services in the neighbourhood of the proposed premises and accordingly that the application seeking inclusion in the Greater Glasgow NHS Board's Pharmaceutical List at 351 Bilsland Drive, Glasgow G20.9 for the provision of general pharmaceutical services be refused.

**Contractor  
Services  
Supervisor**

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

**iv) Case No: PPC/INCL01/2006  
Apple Healthcare Group, 1056 Argyle Street, Glasgow G3.8**

The Committee was asked to consider an application submitted by Apple Healthcare Group, to provide general pharmaceutical services from premises which are situated at 1056 Argyle Street, Glasgow G3.8 under Regulation 5(2) of the National Health Service (General Pharmaceutical Services) (Scotland) Regulations 1995 as amended.

The Committee had to determine whether the granting of the application was necessary or desirable to secure the adequate provision of pharmaceutical services in the neighbourhood in which the applicant's proposed premises were located.

The Chairman, Lay Members and Director of Pharmacy had previously received notice of the application, along with associated information including:

- i) The application form and supporting statement;
- ii) The map and information contained at **Appendix 4** of the papers;
- iii) Notification of decisions taken on previous applications received in respect of premises in the same post-code area; and
- iv) Other information the Board felt was relevant to allow them to consider whether the application should be considered by oral hearing.

Having considered the information, the Chairman, Lay Members and Director of Pharmacy had unanimously agreed that it was unnecessary to consider the application by oral hearing.

The Committee, having previously been circulated with all the papers regarding the application from Apple Healthcare Group, agreed with the initial decision and reiterated that the application could be determined based on the written representations and that an oral hearing was not required.

The Committee members had individually made visits to the site at 1056 Argyle Street, Glasgow G3.8.

The Committee considered views and representations received from

- a) Chemist contractors within the vicinity of the applicant's premises namely:

Lewis Pharmacy – 5 Gardner Street, Glasgow G11.5  
Boots the Chemist – 494 Sauchiehall Street, Glasgow G2.3, 200 Sauchiehall Street, Glasgow G2.3 and 277 Byres Road, Glasgow G12.8 and  
Hughes Chemist – 16 Admiral Street, Glasgow G41.1.

- b) the Greater Glasgow Area Pharmaceutical Committee (General Practitioner Sub-Committee);  
c) the Greater Glasgow Area Medical Committee (GP Sub-Committee).

The Committee also considered:-

- d) The location of the nearest existing pharmaceutical services;  
e) Demographic information regarding post code sectors G2.3, and G3.8;  
f) Patterns of public transport; and  
g) Greater Glasgow NHS Board plans for future development of services.

## **CONCLUSION**

The Committee noted that the applicant had applied for inclusion in the Board's Pharmaceutical List for the provision of pharmaceutical services from premises to be situated at 1056 Argyle Street, Glasgow G3.8. The premises were already constructed, and the applicant had satisfied the Board that they were in pursuit of the lease.

In considering this application, the Committee was required to take into account all relevant factors concerning the definition of the neighbourhood served and the adequacy of existing pharmaceutical services in the neighbourhood in the context of Regulation 5(10).

The Committee noted that they had considered applications for premises in this area on 10 previous occasions. The last time an application was considered was in 1999.

For the purposes of considering the application, the Committee defined the neighbourhood as the area bound to the North by the south

perimeter of Kelvingrove Park to the M8 motorway to the West boundary, South to Stobcross Street, and what was commonly known as the Clydeside Expressway to Pointhouse Road, North through Kelvinhaugh Street, and the residential area to rejoin Argyle Street.

Having reached that conclusion the Committee were then required to consider the adequacy of existing pharmaceutical services in that neighbourhood, and where the granting of the application was necessary or desirable in order to secure adequate provision of pharmaceutical services in that neighbourhood.

- i) Within the neighbourhood, as defined by the Committee there were two pharmacies;
- ii) The current pharmaceutical network provided general pharmaceutical services, domiciliary oxygen, and supervised methadone;
- iii) The Committee considered that the level of existing services ensured that satisfactory access to pharmaceutical services existed, to the residential homes in the identified neighbourhood. The Committee therefore considered that the existing pharmaceutical services in the neighbourhood were adequate;
- iv) That there had been no significant increase to population within the neighbourhood since the Committee last considered an application for these premises in 1999;
- v) Having regard to the overall services provided by the existing contractors within the vicinity of the proposed pharmacy, and the number of prescriptions dispensed by those contractors in the preceding 12 months, the Committee agreed that the neighbourhood was already adequately served.

In view of the above, the Committee concluded that the granting of an NHS Contract for the premises situated at 1056 Argyle Street was not necessary or desirable in order to secure the adequate provisions of pharmaceutical services in the neighbourhood in which the premises were situated.

**In accordance with the statutory procedure the Chemist Contractor members of the Committee Alasdair MacIntyre was excluded from the decision process:**

***DECIDED/-***

The Committee agreed by unanimous decision that the granting of the application was not necessary or desirable, in order to secure the adequate provision of pharmaceutical services in the neighbourhood of the proposed premises and accordingly that the application seeking inclusion in the Greater Glasgow NHS Board's Pharmaceutical List at

**Contractor  
Services  
Supervisor**

1056 Argyle Street, Glasgow G3.8 for the provision of general pharmaceutical services be refused.

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

**5. MATTERS CONSIDERED BY THE CHAIRMAN SINCE THE LAST MEETING**

The Committee having previously been circulated with Paper 2006/05 noted the contents which gave details of an application considered by the Chairman outwith the meeting since Wednesday 19<sup>th</sup> October 2005.

**Transfer of NHS Contract – Change of Ownership**

**Case No: PPC/COO5/2005 – Safeway Stores Ltd – The Triangle Centre, G64.2**

**Case No: PPC/COO6/2005 – Safeway Stores Ltd – Ravenswood Road, G69.7**

**Case No: PPC/COO7/2005 – Safeway Stores Ltd – 900 Crow Road, G13.1**

**Case No: PPC/COO8/2005 – Safeway Stores Ltd – 117 Riverford Road, G43.1**

The Committee considered the action taken by the Chairman on an application for a change of ownership currently held by Safeway Stores Ltd, at the above addresses.

The Board received an application from Wm Morrison Supermarket T/A Morrison's Pharmacy for inclusion in the Board's Pharmaceutical List at pharmacies previously listed as Safeway Stores Ltd, at the four addresses given above with effect from 1<sup>st</sup> October 2005. The trading name of all four pharmacies is now Morrison's Pharmacy

The Committee was advised that the level of service was not reduced by the new contractor and that the new contractor was suitably registered with the Royal Pharmaceutical Society of Great Britain.

Given the above, the Chairman agreed that the criteria required by the Regulations were fulfilled, and accordingly approved the application.

**Case No: PPC/COO9/2005 – Apple Pharmacy – 1000 Cathcart Road, Glasgow G42.9**

The Board received an application from Apple Healthcare Scotland Ltd T/A Apple Pharmacy for inclusion in the Board's Pharmaceutical List at pharmacies previously listed as Apple Pharmacy, at the address given above with effect from 1<sup>st</sup> December 2005. The trading name of the pharmacy will remain as Apple Pharmacy

The Committee was advised that the level of service was not reduced by the new contractor and that the new contractor was suitably registered with the Royal Pharmaceutical Society of Great Britain.

Given the above, the Chairman agreed that the criteria required by the Regulations were fulfilled, and accordingly approved the application.

***DECIDED/-***

**That the Chairman's action in approving the above applications in accordance with Regulation 5(3) of the National Health Service (General Pharmaceutical Services) (Scotland) Regulations 1995 as amended be homologated.**

**6. AMENDMENT TO MODEL HOURS OF SERVICE**

**Case No: PPC/ALT01/2006 – D P Guidi Pharmacy, 139 Thurston Road, Glasgow G52.2.**

The Committee were asked to consider an application submitted by D P Guidi Pharmacy, seeking an alteration to the hours of service recorded in the Pharmaceutical List for the pharmacy situated at 139 Thurston Road, Glasgow G52.2.

In considering the application in accordance with Regulation 8(3) of the National Health Service (General Pharmaceutical Services) (Scotland) Regulations 1995 as amended, the Committee had to determine whether the alteration of hours would affect the adequacy of services in the neighbourhood in which the premises were located.

The Committee agreed that the hours of service proposed by the applicant fell short of the minimum required by the Model Hours of Service scheme. While the Committee recognised that the applicant had extended their closing times to accommodate local surgery times, they were nevertheless mindful that any service provision over and above the model hours of service scheme was carried out on a voluntary basis. The Committee were aware that all contractors who were currently deemed to be providing services outwith the current Model Hours Scheme had been contacted and asked to submit their plans to bring their hours of service in line with the Scheme. Of the ten that had been contacted, seven had immediately amended their hours in accordance with the Scheme. Taking this into consideration, the Committee concluded that they could not approve this application given the effort put in by other contractors to adhere to the scheme. The applicant should be requested to reduce the lunch time closing in line with the Model Hours of Service Scheme.

***DECIDED/-***

**That the application is refused and the Applicant urged to provide Contractor**

**hours in line with the current Model Hours of Service Scheme.**

**Services  
Supervisor**

**7. NATIONAL APPEALS PANEL DETERMINATIONS**

The Committee having previously been circulated with Paper 2006/07 noted the contents which gave details of the National Appeal Panel's determination of appeals lodged against the Committee's decision in the following cases.

**Invercoast Ltd – 1 Duntiglennan Road, Glasgow G81.6**

The Committee noted that the National Appeals Panel had refused the appeals submitted against the PPC's decision to grant Invercoast Ltd's application. As such Invercoast's name had been included in the Board's Provisional Pharmaceutical List, and general pharmaceutical services would commence later this year.

**Mr T Butt, Accutree Ltd – Unit 2, 151 western Road, Glasgow G72.8**

The Committee noted that the National Appeals Panel had rejected the appeal submitted against the PPC's decision to refuse Mr Butt's application.

**Boots the Chemist Ltd – 50 Crow Road, Glasgow G11.7**

The Committee noted that the National Appeals Panel had upheld the appeals submitted against the PPC's decision to grant Boots the Chemist Ltd's application. Boots would therefore not be included in the Board's Provisional Pharmaceutical List for the above premises.

***NOTED/-***

**8. IMPLICATIONS OF A&C INTEGRATION**

The Committee had previously been circulated with Paper 2006/08 which dealt with the issue of changes to the Committee subsequent to the dissolution of Argyll & Clyde Health Board.

The Committee noted that currently Argyll & Clyde Health Board operated a pool system from which attendees at PPCs were drawn. This reflected the spread in geography and the availability of members. Currently there was one lay member vacancy in the Glasgow PPC, and after comprehensive discussion the Committee agreed that this position should be filled by a member from the Argyll & Clyde pool. This would give the Committee continuity and allow the member to build up expertise in the Glasgow application process.

The Committee also agreed that the pool system should be retained and utilised where standing members submitted apologies or declared an interest in any of the applications to be considered.

***DECIDED/-***

The Committee agreed that Janine should respond to John Hamilton's letter of 19<sup>th</sup> December 2005 reflecting the above approach.

**Contractor  
Services  
Supervisor**

**9. PROGRAMME OF MEETINGS**

The Committee having previously been circulated with Paper 2006/09 noted the programme of meetings for the remainder of the year.

***NOTED/-***

**10. ANY OTHER COMPETENT BUSINESS**

There was no other competent business.

**11. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

Scheduled for Thursday 6<sup>th</sup> April 2006 at 1.30pm. Venue to be confirmed.

The Meeting ended at 10.50am