

1 May 2026

REF: SHA/26861

8th Floor
10 South Colonnade
Canary Wharf
London
E14 4PU

Tel: 020 3928 2000
Email: nhsr.appeals@nhs.net

APPEAL AGAINST HAMPSHIRE AND ISLE OF WIGHT ICB DECISION TO REFUSE AN APPLICATION BY CHARLTON HILL SURGERY FOR A RELOCATION OF PREMISES AFTER OUTLINE CONSENT HAS TAKEN EFFECT FROM THE WHITE HOUSE SURGERY, NEWBURY ROAD, ENHAM ALAMEIN, ANDOVER, SP11 6HG TO CHARLTON HILL SURGERY, CHARLTON ROAD, ANDOVER, SP10 3JY UNDER REGULATION 55

1 Outcome

- 1.1 The Pharmacy Appeals Committee (“Committee”), appointed by NHS Resolution, confirms the decision of the Commissioner.
- 1.2 The Committee determined that the application should be refused.

A copy of this decision is being sent to:
Charlton Hill Surgery
PCSE, on behalf of Hampshire and Isle of Wight ICB

REF: SHA/26861

8th Floor
10 South Colonnade
Canary Wharf
London
E14 4PU

Tel: 020 3928 2000
Email: nhsr.appeals@nhs.net

APPEAL AGAINST HAMPSHIRE AND ISLE OF WIGHT ICB DECISION TO REFUSE AN APPLICATION BY CHARLTON HILL SURGERY FOR A RELOCATION OF PREMISES AFTER OUTLINE CONSENT HAS TAKEN EFFECT FROM THE WHITE HOUSE SURGERY, NEWBURY ROAD, ENHAM ALAMEIN, ANDOVER, SP11 6HG TO CHARLTON HILL SURGERY, CHARLTON ROAD, ANDOVER, SP10 3JY UNDER REGULATION 55

1 The Application

By application dated 13 August 2025, Charlton Hill Surgery (“the Applicant”) applied to Hampshire and Isle of Wight ICB (“the Commissioner”) for a relocation of premises after outline consent has taken effect from the White House Surgery, Newbury Road, Enham Alamein, Andover, SP11 6HG to Charlton Hill Surgery, Charlton Road, Andover, SP10 3JY under Regulation 55. The application stated:

- 1.1 Insert the address of the premises for which premises approval was previously given:
- 1.2 “The White House Surgery
Newbury Road
Enham Alamein
Andover
SP11 6HG
- 1.3 We rent this premises under a tenancy at will arrangement.
- 1.4 Our landlord has verbally given us notice of 30 September 2025.
- 1.5 We are presently trying to negotiate an extension to allow for a smooth transfer of service.”
- 1.6 Please insert below the address of the premises for which you are now seeking premises approval.
- 1.7 “Charlton Hill Surgery
Charlton Road
Andover
SP10 3JY
- 1.8 We own this building.”
- 1.9 Please confirm which patient groups are accustomed to accessing the dispensing service at your current premises.

- 1.10 “Dispensing services are accessed by patients from a rural community who largely access the premises by car. For those patients who are unable to access the dispensary a delivery service is provided. The number of dispensing patients is circa 600.
- 1.11 The dispensing patients can broadly be split into three groups. Those to whom we deliver; those who would have difficulty accessing services at a new site; those who access by car. We currently deliver to 25 patients and have about 20 patients who would have difficulty accessing a new site.
- 1.12 There are also three CQC registered care homes in the village of Enham Alamein to whom we dispense.
- 1.13 Outline consent has been granted (July 2016) for the villages of:
- 1.14 Enham Alamein
Appleshaw
Clanville
Faccombe
Hatherden
Hurstbourne Tarrant
Linkenholt
Little London
Penton Grafton
Penton Mewsey
Smannell
Tangley
Upton
Vernham Dean
Vernham Street
Weyhill
Wildhern
- 1.15 Practice map attached (ignore the title as this map was part of a series published by West Hampshire CCG in 2021). The blue line is Charlton Hill practice area. The villages covered by the outline consent sit to the north of Andover.”
- 1.16 Please use the box below to explain why you consider that the new premises are not significantly less accessible for the patient groups that are accustomed to accessing pharmaceutical services at the existing premises.
- 1.17 “The new premises are also accessible by car, with good parking, as well as bus.
- 1.18 For those patients to whom we currently deliver, and to any other dispensing patients who are unable to access the new premises a delivery service will be in place. This would increase the deliver [sic] service to 45 patients.
- 1.19 We intend to have a daily delivery system in place for the three CQC registered care homes.
- 1.20 We have not yet engaged in wider patient or public engagement regarding this relocation application, although our patient participation group (not all of

whom are dispensing patients), support the application as it provides continuation of service.

- 1.21 Because our landlord has indicated that they would like us to leave the premises by 30 September 2025, we would like the date of relocation to be as soon as possible, but understand that any application to relocate will take some time to process, so a date of 31 December 2025, would be more realistic, assuming that our landlord allows for an extension of our tenancy at will lease arrangement.”
- 1.22 Please use the box below to explain why you consider that granting the application will not result in a significant change to the arrangements that are in place for the provision of pharmaceutical services (including by a person on a dispensing doctor list) or of local pharmaceutical services in any part of the HWB’s area or in a controlled locality in the area of a neighbouring HWB area where that controlled locality is within 1.6km of your proposed new premises.
- 1.23 “The proposed new site is 2 miles from the existing site, with good car parking.
- 1.24 The reason for the application is that the current site has significant building defects and will need significant investment to repair. Our tenancy is currently at will and we have been given verbal notice that the landlord would like us to vacate the premises by 30 September 2025. We are trying to negotiate an extension to this. The landlord has indicated that the building will be demolished at some stage.
- 1.25 Therefore, the application is made to protect the provision of pharmaceutical services, to ensure continuity of service, to those patients on the dispensing doctors list. An unsuccessful application will result in the curtailment of dispensing services and will impact negatively on those persons on the dispensing doctors list, as the landlord has indicated that services cannot continue from the current premises, given the nature of repairs required to make the building suitable for continued use.”
- 1.26 Please use the box below to explain why you consider granting the application would not cause significant detriment to the proper planning in respect of the provision of pharmaceutical services in the HWB’s area.
- 1.27 “The patients to whom we can dispense will not change, and because the new site is within 1.6km of another pharmacy and in an urban area, there can be no addition to the dispensing patients from those not living in the outline consent areas.
- 1.28 Pharmaceutical services from existing local providers will be unchanged and not impacted by this relocation. We work closely with local pharmaceutical providers to ensure provision for the 15,000 patients we have who are not dispensing patients.
- 1.29 Hampshire and Isle of Wight ICB primary care team are aware of this application and have not raised any concerns.”
- 1.30 [Practice map provided to Committee]

2 The Decision

The Commissioner considered and decided to refuse the application. The decision letter dated 31 December 2025 states:

- 2.1 “Hampshire and the Isle of Wight ICB has considered the above application and I am writing to confirm that it has been refused. Please see the enclosed report for full reasoning.
- 2.2 You have a right of appeal to the Secretary of State against our decision. Should you choose to appeal then you should send a concise and reasoned statement of the grounds for your appeal within 30 days of the date of this letter to nhsr.appeals@nhs.net or:
- 2.3 Primary Care Appeals
NHS Resolution
8th Floor
10 South Colonnade
Canary Wharf
London
E14 4PU”

Decision report – Annex 34.1 to the minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 26 November 2025.

[Any reference to ‘Committee’ in this section is not to be confused with the Pharmacy Appeals Committee of NHS Resolution]

2.4 THE APPLICATION

- 2.5 An application from Charlton Hill Surgery for a relocation of practice premises which are not significant after outline consent has taken effect was received on 16th July 2025. The Applicant was proposing to relocate from The White House Surgery, Newbury Road, Enham Alamein, Andover SP11 6HG to Charlton Hill Surgery, Charlton Road, Andover SP10 3JY.
- 2.6 The Committee was now required to consider the application in accordance with Regulations 55 of the NHS (Pharmaceutical and Local Pharmaceutical Services) Regulations 2013, as amended.

2.7 CONSIDERATION

- 2.8 The Committee considered the following:
 - 2.8.1 The NHS (Pharmaceutical and Local Pharmaceutical Services) Regulations 2013, as amended.
 - 2.8.2 The application form provided by the Applicant
 - 2.8.3 Maps and images of the current premises.
 - 2.8.4 No representations were made by interested parties.
 - 2.8.5 All additional information, including location and distances of surrounding pharmacies GP Practices and their opening times.

- 2.8.6 Department of Health – Regulations under the Health and Social Care Act 2012: Market Entry by means of Pharmaceutical Needs Assessments – Chapter 15.
- 2.8.7 The Committee noted the proposed location is in a non-controlled locality.
- 2.8.8 The Committee decided it was not necessary to hold an oral hearing before determining the application.
- 2.9 **Regulation 55(2) – Premises approval: relocations of practice premises which are not significant after outline consent has taken effect.**
- 2.10 The Committee had regard to Regulation 55(2), which requires the following conditions to be met:
- 2.11 *Regulation 55(2) Subject to paragraph (3), the NHSCB must grant that application if it is of the type described in this paragraph, that is to say if the NHSCB is satisfied that –*
- (a) for the patient groups that are accustomed to accessing pharmaceutical services at the existing premises, the location of the new premises is not significantly less accessible;*
- (b) granting the application would not result in a significant change to the arrangements that are in place for the provision of pharmaceutical services (including by a person on a dispensing doctor list) or of local pharmaceutical services—*
- (i) in any part of the area of the relevant HWB, or*
- (ii) in a controlled locality in the area of a neighbouring HWB, where that controlled locality is within 1.6 kilometres of the premises to which the applicant is seeking to relocate; and*
- (c) the NHSCB is satisfied that granting the application would not cause significant detriment to proper planning in respect of the provision of pharmaceutical services in the area of the relevant HWB.*
- 2.12 *Regulation 55(3) The NHSCB must, unless it has good cause not to do so, refuse an application under paragraph (1) if an application under—*
- (a) that paragraph*
- (b) regulation 55(1) of the 2012 Regulations (premises approval: relocations of practice premises which are not significant after outline consent has taken effect); or*
- (c) regulation 65(4)(a) of the 2005 Regulations (premises approval: additional and new premises after outline consent has taken effect),*
- has been granted to D during the 12 months before the application was submitted under paragraph (1).*
- 2.13 **Regulation 55(2)(a)**

- 2.14 The applicant had defined the patient groups accustomed to accessing pharmaceutical services at the existing premises as those who they deliver to, those who have difficulty in accessing services at a new site and those who access services by car.
- 2.15 The Committee noted the proximity of the current premises and the proposed premises. The distance between the two premises is 2.3 miles/5 min drive or 2.3 mile/47 min walk.
- 2.16 The Committee noted that to be eligible as a dispensing patient you must live more than 1 mile from the nearest pharmacy. The current premises are located within the village of Enham Alamein and the proposed premises are located within the town of Andover. Patients currently accessing pharmaceutical services at the existing site would not reside in Andover town.
- 2.17 The Committee noted that for those patients who receive a delivery service, the Applicant had stated that a delivery service would remain in place.
- 2.18 The Committee noted the patient group the Applicant had identified as 'those who have difficulty in accessing services at a new site' and that the Applicant had stated they had identified about 20 patients in this category and for these patients they would also provide a delivery service.
- 2.19 The Committee considered the patient group identified as 'those who access services by car' and noted there is parking in the carpark outside of the proposed premises.
- 2.20 However, the Committee considered that these three groups did not cover all patients accustomed to accessing pharmaceutical services at the current premises and therefore found it difficult to assess whether the location of the proposed premises is significantly less accessible. The Committee noted that no information had been provided about those who currently access pharmaceutical services on foot or by public transport.
- 2.21 Taking into account that patients accessing pharmaceutical services would need to travel into Andover from Enham Alamein and the surrounding areas, the Committee was unable to be satisfied, given the difference in locality of each premises, that the location of the new premises is not significantly less accessible for some of the patient groups accustomed to accessing pharmaceutical services at the existing premises.
- 2.22 **Regulation 55(2)(b)**
- 2.23 The Committee had no evidence or information to suggest that granting the application would result in a significant change to arrangements for the provision of pharmaceutical services (including by a person on a dispensing doctor list) or of local pharmaceutical services.
- 2.24 The Committee was satisfied that the relocation would not result in a significant change to the arrangements for the provision of pharmaceutical services (including by a person on a dispensing doctor list) or of local pharmaceutical services.
- 2.25 **Regulation 55(2)(c)**

- 2.26 The Committee considered the locations of existing pharmacies as well as the proposed site and medical practices within the area and that there were no plans that would be affected. No information had been provided by interested parties suggesting there would be significant detriment to proper planning. The Committee was therefore satisfied that granting the application would not cause significant detriment to proper planning in respect of the provision of pharmaceutical services in the area.
- 2.27 The Committee was satisfied that the provisions of Regulation 55(3)(a)–(c) do not apply.
- 2.28 The Committee determined that conditions under Regulation 55(2)(a), (b), and (c) are satisfied.
- 2.29 **DECISION**
- 2.30 The Committee determines the application as follows –
- 2.30.1 the Committee was not satisfied that the location of the new premises is not significantly less accessible for the patient groups that are accustomed to accessing pharmaceutical services at the existing premises.
- 2.30.2 the Committee was satisfied that the relocation would not result in a significant change to pharmaceutical services or dispensing services.
- 2.30.3 the Committee was satisfied that granting the application would not cause significant detriment to proper planning
- 2.31 The Committee determined to **refuse** the application.
- 2.32 **THIRD PARTY RIGHTS OF APPEAL**
- 2.33 The application is refused so the applicant has the right to appeal.
- 2.34 There are no third party appeal rights as no third party has made a representation.”

3 The Appeal

In an email dated 19 January 2026 addressed to NHS Resolution, the Applicant appealed against the Commissioner’s decision. The grounds of appeal are:

- 3.1 “Appeal against decision to refuse relocation of dispensary services.
- 3.2 We note that the decision to refuse the application to relocate dispensary services is based upon item [2.30.1].
- 3.3 The Committee was not satisfied that the location of the new premises is not significantly less accessible for the patient groups that are accustomed to accessing pharmaceutical services at the existing premises.
- 3.4 We also note that the refusal decision refers to an application dated 16 July 2025, but our application was dated 13 August 2025. A copy of the application and original documents is attached for your reference, see email from PCSE Market Entry dated 17 August 2025.

3.5 Basis of Appeal

3.6 There are two strands to our appeal against this decision.

3.7 1. Of the patients who access pharmaceutical services at the existing premises we have identified the small number who do not attend by car (ie attend by foot) and have plans for a delivery service for these patients.

3.8 Our dispensing patients are spread over a wide area and almost all, except those already receiving a delivery service and those other identified to receive a delivery service arrive at the existing premises by car or are able to do so.

3.9 No patients attend by public transport as there is no public transport serving the current location. The closest bus stop is in Andover about 25 minutes' walk away. The proposed new premises is served by public transport.

3.10 The three CQC registered care homes to whom we dispense will also have a daily delivery service.

3.11 Excluding the CQC registered care homes, which represent 27% of monthly prescriptions, currently about 24% of all prescriptions are collected from the proposed new premises rather than the current premises. This leaves 49% who collect medication from the existing site.

3.12 We believe that when patients access a premises by car it does not matter which premises they access. Therefore, the proposed premises are not significantly less accessible for these patients.

3.13 The current dispensary is only open from 8:00 am to 1:00 pm, so patients can only access dispensary services during these hours. The proposed new premises will be open from 8:00 am to 6:30 pm, considerable [sic] extending the access during core hours.

3.14 Finally, we have started a conversation with the village post office, which is 150m from the existing premises to set up a village prescription collection service from them.

3.15 2. A significant point in our application to relocate pharmaceutical services centres around the current premises. These premises are not fit for purpose, and the landlord has given notice to vacate. We have been unable to find alternative premises in the village that is supported by Hampshire and Isle of Wight ICB. We have negotiated a short-term extension to our tenancy at will arrangement with the landlord.

3.16 Because of the current state of the existing premises, we do not offer medical services from them as the premises are not up to CQC required standards. All patients travel to the proposed premises to access medical services (doctor, nurse appointments, etc).

3.17 When we vacate the existing premises, without approval to relocate, all pharmaceutical services will be lost. This would make access to pharmaceutical services significantly less plausible for all dispensing patients. Particularly hit would be those patients to whom we deliver and intend to deliver, as other providers may not be able to provide a delivery service.

- 3.18 So, for avoidance of doubt, our branch surgery building has been vacated by every other occupant as deemed not fit for habitation by the landlord and is not suitable for ongoing use. Alternative accommodation offered by our landlord has been assessed by Hampshire and Isle of Wight ICB as needing significant investment to meet standards, and Hampshire and Isle of Wight ICB is not able to fund this. Consequently, they are supporting us in closing our branch site. If the decision to refuse relocation is upheld, then our current dispensary services will cease permanently.
- 3.19 We hope that you will consider the points we have raised and approve the application so that pharmaceutical services are not lost.”

4 **Summary of Representations**

This is a summary of representations received on the appeal.

4.1 The Commissioner

- 4.1.1 “Thank you for your letter of 3 February 2026 inviting us to provide representations to the appeal by Charlton Hill Surgery for a relocation of premises after outline consent has taken effect from the White House Surgery, Newbury Road, Enham Alamein, Andover, SP11 6HG to Charlton Hill Surgery, Charlton Road Andover, SP10 3JY.
- 4.1.2 Please note that the original application form was received in July and there was missing information, which was provided in August.”

5 **Observations**

The following observations were received by NHS Resolution in response to the representations received on appeal.

5.1 The Applicant

- 5.1.1 “Nothing to add except there is an error on the map.
- 5.1.2 Andover Health Centre Medical Practice has no letter assigned to it and its location is not marked. It’s on the hospital grounds, western edge.”

6 **Consideration**

- 6.1 The Pharmacy Appeals Committee (“Committee”) appointed by NHS Resolution, had before it the papers considered by the Commissioner, together with the responses to NHS Resolution’s own statutory consultations. On the basis of this information, the Committee considered it was not necessary to hold an oral hearing.
- 6.2 The Committee noted the application had been made in accordance with Regulation 55(1) (Premises approval: relocations of practice premises which are not significant after outline consent has taken effect) of the National Health Service (Pharmaceutical and Local Pharmaceutical Services) Regulations 2013 (“the Regulations”).
- 6.3 Regulation 55 reads:

55.—(1) A dispensing doctor (D) who—

(a) is providing pharmaceutical services at or from listed dispensing premises; and

(b) wishes to relocate and dispense from new medical practice premises in relation to the area for which D has outline consent,

may apply in writing to NHS England for premises approval for the new medical practice premises at or from which D wishes to dispense.

(2) Subject to paragraph (3), NHS England must grant that application if it is of the type described in this paragraph, that is to say if NHS England is satisfied that—

(a) for the patient groups that are accustomed to accessing pharmaceutical services at or from the existing premises, the location of the new premises is not significantly less accessible;

(b) granting the application would not result in a significant change to the arrangements that are in place for the provision of pharmaceutical services (including by a person on a dispensing doctor list) or of local pharmaceutical services—

(i) in any part of the area of the relevant HWB, or

(ii) in a controlled locality in the area of a neighbouring HWB, where that controlled locality is within 1.6 kilometres of the premises to which the applicant is seeking to relocate; and

(c) NHS England is satisfied that granting the application would not cause significant detriment to proper planning in respect of the provision of pharmaceutical services in the area of the relevant HWB.

(3) NHS England must, unless it has good cause not to do so, refuse an application under paragraph (1) if an application under—

(a) that paragraph;

(b) regulation 55(1) of the 2012 Regulations (premises approval: relocations of practice premises which are not significant after outline consent has taken effect); or

(c) regulation 65(4)(a) of the 2005 Regulations (premises approval: additional and new premises after outline consent has taken effect),

has been granted to D during the 12 months before the application was submitted under paragraph (1).

(4) NHS England must notify its decision in relation to the application under paragraph (1) to the persons to whom it notified the application who made representations in relation to it under regulation 52(4), and it must include with the notification of its decision an explanation of—

(a) the reasons for the decision; and

(b) if the person notified is a person with rights of appeal under regulation 63(1)(c) or (d), an explanation of how those rights may be exercised.

- 6.4 The Committee noted the Applicant currently has premises approval for The White House Surgery, Newbury Road, Enham Alamein, SP11 6HG and wishes to relocate this to Charlton Hill Surgery, Charlton Road, Andover SP10 3JY.
- 6.5 The Committee considered the requirements of Regulation 55(2).
- 6.6 In relation to condition (a), the Committee considered the map submitted by the Commissioner which shows the location of the existing premises as well as the proposed premises.
- 6.7 The Committee considered the information before it with regard to the patient groups who are accustomed to accessing pharmaceutical services at or from the existing premises. The Committee considers that it must seek to identify the patient groups who would potentially be affected by the relocation based upon the information provided by the parties.
- 6.8 In this case, the Applicant has identified the patient groups as:
- 6.8.1 those to whom the Applicant delivers;
- 6.8.2 those who would have difficulty accessing services at a new site;
- 6.8.3 those who access by car.
- 6.9 The Committee noted the Applicant's comment that *"We currently deliver to 25 patients and have about 20 patients who would have difficulty accessing a new site."*
- 6.10 The Committee also noted the Commissioner's comment in the decision report that *"...the Committee considered that these three groups did not cover all patients accustomed to accessing pharmaceutical services at the current premises and therefore found it difficult to assess whether the location of the proposed premises is significantly less accessible. The Committee noted that no information had been provided about those who currently access pharmaceutical services on foot or by public transport."*
- 6.11 In response the Applicant states *"Of the patients who access pharmaceutical services at the existing premises we have identified the small number who do not attend by car (ie attend by foot) and have plans for a delivery service for these patients."* The Committee noted that the Applicant had included those currently accessing pharmaceutical services on foot in the group who would have difficulty accessing services at a new site.
- 6.12 The Committee also noted the Applicant's comment that *"No patients attend by public transport as there is no public transport serving the current location. The closest bus stop is in Andover about 25 minutes' walk away."* The Committee was therefore not persuaded that those accessing pharmaceutical services by public transport constitutes a patient group, given that there is no bus stop nearby the current premises.

- 6.13 The Committee concludes that the patient groups who are accustomed to accessing pharmaceutical services at or from the existing premises are those set-out below.

Those to whom the Applicant delivers

- 6.14 The Committee noted the Applicant's statement that it currently delivers to 25 patients and its confirmation that it would continue to deliver to these patients. The Committee also noted the Applicant provides a delivery service to three care homes to whom it dispenses. The Committee was of the view that if patients were not accustomed to accessing pharmaceutical services at the premises, then they were not subject to the test under condition (a).

Those who would have difficulty accessing services at a new site

- 6.15 The Committee noted in the application the Applicant had identified 20 patients who would have difficulty accessing a new site and stated "*For ... any other dispensing patients who are unable to access the new premises a delivery service will be in place. This would increase the delivery service to 45 patients.*" On appeal, the Applicant states "*Of the patients who access pharmaceutical services at the existing premises we have identified the small number who do not attend by car (ie attend by foot) and have plans for a delivery service for these patients.*"
- 6.16 The Committee noted the Applicant seeks to mitigate the effects of the move by providing a delivery service to those who would have difficulty in accessing the proposed premises. The Committee was mindful that the Applicant itself had acknowledged that this patient group would have difficulty in accessing the proposed premises. The Committee noted as above that public transport would not be an alternative option for this patient group. Whilst the Committee accepted that the provision of a delivery service would assist, it considered that this did not alter the fact that the proposed premises are significantly less accessible for this patient group.

Those who access by car

- 6.17 The Committee noted the Applicant states in the application that "*The proposed new site is 2 miles from the existing site, with good car parking.*" In its decision the Commissioner states "*...there is parking in the carpark outside of the proposed premises.*"
- 6.18 The Committee also noted the Applicant's comment that "*We believe that when patients access a premises by car it does not matter which premises they access. Therefore, the proposed premises are not significantly less accessible for these patients.*" Whilst the Committee did not entirely agree with this comment, it was mindful that the distance involved is not excessive and there is no dispute that car parking is available.
- 6.19 On the information available, the Committee considered that for the patient group that travel by car in order to receive pharmaceutical services, the location of the new premises is not significantly less accessible.

Overall assessment

6.20 In the circumstances, the Committee was unable to be satisfied that, for patient groups who are accustomed to accessing the current premises, the proposed premises are not significantly less accessible.

6.21 The Committee was therefore of the view that condition (a) is not met.

Regulation 55(2)(b)

6.22 The Committee noted the decision of the Commissioner in respect of condition (c) that the granting of the relocation would not lead to significant detriment to proper planning in respect of the pharmaceutical services in the area. The Committee noted that this had not been disputed by any party either on appeal or in subsequent representations. On the information provided the Committee was of the opinion that the granting of the application would not cause a significant detriment to the proper planning in respect of the provision of pharmaceutical services in the area of HWB1 and therefore concluded that condition (c) is met.

Regulation 55(2)(c)

6.23 The Committee noted the decision of the Commissioner in respect of condition (c) that the granting of the relocation would not lead to significant detriment to proper planning in respect of the pharmaceutical services in the area. The Committee noted that this had not been disputed by any party either on appeal or in subsequent representations. On the information provided the Committee was of the opinion that the granting of the application would not cause a significant detriment to the proper planning in respect of the provision of pharmaceutical services in the area of HWB1 and therefore concluded that condition (c) is met.

Regulation 55(3)(a) to (c)

6.24 The Committee was satisfied that there is no requirement to refuse the application under these provisions.

6.25 The Committee may:

6.25.1 confirm the decision of the Commissioner;

6.25.2 quash the decision of the Commissioner and redetermine the application; or

6.25.3 quash the decision of the Commissioner and remit the matter to it for it to redetermine the application, subject to such directions as it considers appropriate.

7 Decision

7.1 For the reasons given above, the Committee confirms the decision of the Commissioner and refuses the application for a relocation of premises after outline consent has taken effect.

Case Manager
Primary Care Appeals