

Minutes of a Public Meeting held on Monday 10th October 1988 at 8pm in the Community Centre.

Present: Mrs. L.M. Lock (in chair), members of the Parish Council, Councillor M. Leeke, Mr. J. Moore, Administration Officer, Family Practitioner Committee; Mr. B. Salter, Administrator F.P.C. and 110 residents.

Apologies were received from R.J. Farrington and R.T. Summerfield

Min. 388/88

L.M.L. welcomed everyone to the meeting which had been called by the Parish Council to discuss the question "Does Milton need a dispensing chemist?"

L.M.L. explained the events that had led to this public meeting viz. the application by E. Moss Ltd to open a dispensing chemist's shop, the various leaflets and petitions to have circulated the village, the M.P.C. special meeting and the proposal to distribute a questionnaire throughout the village.

Dr. Draper was unable to attend because legally it was not possible for him or a representative to attend.

The Parish Council at a special meeting had agreed to put the following resolution to the public meeting:

"Having examined the position as far as is able M.P.C. recommends that a medical practice with dispensing facility should be maintained in this village."

Messrs. Salter and Moore of the F.P.C. were pleased to be able to attend to explain the procedures.

By law doctors prescribe chemists dispense but in rural areas the F.P.C. could arrange for doctors to provide a dispensing service. Regulations state that any change in service must not prejudice the existing doctor's practice or pharmaceutical services.

The F.P.C. sub committee had deemed Milton rural in character and informed the Rural Dispensing Committee (R.D.C.) in London.

An appeal could be made within 30 days from approximately September 26th. If there was no appeal or the appeal determined Milton rural the R.D.C. would decide whether a chemist should be allowed. (If Milton was not determined rural a pharmacy could not be refused.)

Once that decision was made any right of appeal would be determined by the Secretary of State.

The following topics were discussed in response to questions from the floor.

If a prescribing chemist were allowed all patients within a one mile radius of the pharmacy would be transferred from the doctor's list to the chemist's prescribing list.

Dispensing doctors were not expected to make a profit from dispensing although they were allowed to cover costs plus some remuneration to reflect the work of dispensing.

The R.D.C. would weigh up all financial aspects when making any decision. The doctor's practice would receive compensation if a chemist were allowed.

The maximum number of patients a doctor can have on a N.H.S. list is 3500.

The minimum hours a chemist must by law stay open are from 9 to 5.30.

A doctor may provide whatever is needed for immediate treatment during the night. Urgent prescriptions could be obtained through the police and a pharmacist.

Consent had already been given for the doctor to take on a partner. R.D.C. would weigh this up also and the affect that a possible loss of dispensing income would have. But as the population grew more income could be generated through capitation (allowance per patient on the doctor's list.)

The doctor's contract stipulated a 24 hour 365 days per year service. It was the doctor's responsibility to provide a locum service whenever he was not on duty.

It was possible for a doctor to dispense within a mile radius if he considered the case urgent enough.

Any patient who had difficulty may apply to the F.P.C. to continue to be a dispensing patient.

If R.D.C. determined Milton urban then there would be no appeal. The F.P.C. would then decide if a pharmacy was desirable or viable.

Views of the village would be welcomed by the F.P.C. (there was still some support from the floor for a questionnaire to be distributed throughout the village.)

75% of a pharmacy's income came from N.H.S. prescriptions. If a chemist's shop were not viable either another chemist may open a shop or the dispensing would revert to the doctor.

Once rurality was agreed it may not be considered again for five years unless there was a substantial change in the area.

Cllr. M. Leeke suggested that the issues rested on whether the profit from dispensing could be used for supporting the primary health care through the doctor or whether the profit could be used to increase the range of goods, drugs etc., sold by a chemist.

Mrs. J. Fisher proposed that the meeting support the Parish Council resolution, seconded Mrs. D. Kitching. R. Waters proposed and J.F.C. Fisher seconded the amendment:

"and we do not support a dispensing chemist in this village."

The motion was carried overwhelmingly with 5 votes against and 6 abstentions.

The chairman of Landbeach P.C. thanked M.P.C. for calling the meeting.

L.M.L. thanked everyone including Messrs. Moore and Salter for attending.

The meeting ended at 9.27pm.

Signed *Lesley M. Gowan*Chairman *24th April 1989* Date

N.B. Footnote: Legally a representative of Dr. Draper could have attended this meeting but it would have required three weeks notice to arrange.

Minutes of a Special Council Meeting held on Monday 10th October 1988 following a Public Meeting in the Community Centre.

Present: Mrs. L.M. Lock (in chair), R. Day, Mrs. J.E. Coston, Mrs. I.W. Chilton, E.M.C. Dunlop, J.F.C. Fisher, J. Harradine, Mrs. D.A. Roberts, R.T. Summerfield, D.B. Waterson and the clerk S.J. Daniels

Apologies were received from R.J. Farrington

- 1. 389/88 Dispensing. J.F.C.F. proposed that M.P.C. write to F.P.C. stating that Council's recommendation was overwhelmingly endorsed at the public meeting at which 110 residents were present.

E.M.C.D. seconded and all agreed.

It was agreed to write and thank Messrs. Moore and Salter for explaining the procedures and for pointing out that the meeting was a genuine consultation to find out people's views.

- 2. 390/88 Public Open Space. Mr. Evans had agreed to contact Mr. Sheppard's solicitor again having received no reply to earlier letters. Mr. Evans would pursue the Section 52 agreement with Mr. Taylor of S.C.D.C. although it appeared that a Section 52 agreement was not now necessary (as told to L.M.L. by Mr. Taylor.)

L.M.L. had contacted Mr. Sheppard's firm and on solicitor's advice would phone him again. If unsuccessful L.M.L. would then contact Mr. Thompson of Tesco. As a final resort Council would contact the national press.

There was a strong feeling that Council should not let this drag on much longer before taking action.

J.F.C.F. thanked L.M.L. for all her hard work during the previous week. He proposed and all agreed that L.M.L. continue as suggested by Mr. Evans until the next meeting or as soon as she felt a special meeting necessary.

L.M.L. was in full consultation with R.T.S. and R.D.

Signed *Lisley M. Gower Lock*Chairman *7th Nov. 1988* Date

Minutes of a Special Planning Meeting on Monday 10th October 1988

Present: As above

1. New Applications

- 391/88 (19/88) S/0223/87 C.J. Hanson - new dwelling, Ely Road amendment - extra 3rd bedroom and study on ground floor. Original objection repeated i.e. a dwelling on this narrow site would result in cramped form of development badly related to existing development and detrimental to the amenity at present enjoyed by the residents of adjoining dwellings.

Council had no objection to the removal of sycamore tree (within conservation area.)

- 392/88 S/1815/88 J.M. Barratt - use of 34 High Street as guest house - amendments. Original objection repeated -