

Ms Melanie Paraskeva, Chair  
Uley Parish Council  
C/o Clerk, 6 Bailey Way  
Dursley  
Gloucestershire  
GL11 4FF  
Clerk@uleyparishcouncil.gov.uk

Ms Tricia McClelland  
Pharmacy Market Management Services  
Primary Care Support England  
PCSE Enquiries  
PO Box 350  
Darlington DL1 9QN  
13/08/2021

By Post & by email to [PCSE.marketentry@nhs.net](mailto:PCSE.marketentry@nhs.net)

**Your Ref: ME1122**

Dear Ms McClelland,

**Second letter from Uley Parish Council**  
**re. Application for a relocation of premises after outline consent has taken effect**  
**by Cam & Uley Family Practice from The Surgery, 42 The Street, Uley GL11**  
**5SY to The Surgery, Glebelands, Cam, Dursley, GL11 5NE**

This letter is supplementary to my letter of 16<sup>th</sup> July (attached), in which I wrote on behalf of Uley Parish Council to object most strongly to the closure of the existing Dispensary at the Surgery at Uley. This second letter is the product of much further thought, research and discussion and a public meeting for the village (attended by 230 patients) held at two days notice. It also follows a new notification from the Cam and Uley Family Practice (CUFP) of the intention to close Uley Surgery.

These applications have taken the whole community - and even some of the doctors and staff at the practice - completely by surprise. There was no consultation, no advance warning, no discussion with the Chairman of the CUFP Patient Participation Group, Mrs Caroline Penley, no warning to the Uley Parish Council and none to the Parish Councils of neighbouring villages which share Uley's qualifications of rurality and controlled location. Your letter emailed out on 30<sup>th</sup> June, which was received by the Clerk to Uley Parish Council (UPC), was the first indication to anyone of these very serious intentions to deprive our communities of such vital and highly valued resources. Since then there have been confusing and conflicting items on the CUFP website which we feel have been seriously misleading, in particular concerning the address and time frame for comment (further details about this can be made available).

We are confused by the heading of your letter of 30.6.21: Application for a relocation of premises after outline consent has taken effect...” Has outline consent already been granted? If so, please would you inform us what the consent was for and by whom it was granted?

We would contend that NHS Regulation 55 para 2 (below in red) implies that the relocation of the Uley dispensary to Cam should not be allowed as this would indeed constitute a “significant change” to the current dispensing arrangement from Uley surgery; the new premises at Cam are “significantly less accessible” for patients from Uley and the outlying villages which have rurality and controlled location status and are situated more than 1.6k from any other dispensary or pharmacy.

### **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.

The accessibility issue is addressed in our earlier letter but we have further comment from Cam Parish Council that considerable concern already exists about access to the Cam practice following housing redevelopment adjacent to the surgery car park and the further 5,000 new houses due to be built in and around Cam. Added to this, at the public meeting Dr McDowell responded to a question concerning the difficulty of parking at the Cam surgery by saying that patients could park in the Tesco car park close by; a suggestion which is denied by Tesco.

The closure of Uley’s dispensary and of the surgery would each have a profound negative effect on many of our residents’ lives, as described in our first letter (attached). Added to the points made, we are advised that the closure of the

dispensary will make Uley surgery an immediately less desirable practice, were there to be a new or neighbouring practice group willing to take it on.

The main reason given for closure of the dispensary, and now the surgery, is that the building in Uley is not fit for purpose. However, to date we can find no official report to substantiate this claim. The practice is rated “Good” in all areas by CQC whose latest review is dated 5<sup>th</sup> August 2021 and states: “we carried out a review of the data available to us and have not found evidence that we need to carry out an inspection or reassess our rating at this stage”. To date there is no indication or report that the practice consulted the estates department of Gloucestershire CCG to consider improvements, which, we understand, could be eligible for a high percentage of government funding. Surely evidence from either or both of these bodies should have been essential in reaching the devastating decision to close the dispensary and then the surgery.

The CUFPP doctors owe a duty of care to their patients who use the Uley dispensary. This has not been evidenced by the way the applications for closure of the dispensary and then the surgery have been approached. Little consideration appears to have been given to the nature of the patients who use the Uley surgery and their need for the accessible dispensary they currently enjoy. Nor does there appear to have been any consideration of sustainability objectives in Stroud District Council’s Local Plan. The current premises may have limitations concurrent with the village location and vernacular architecture but these have been overcome and accommodated for many decades and patients are vocal in their support of the service they receive from the doctors and staff who work there. As many patients walk to the dispensary, issues relating to parking, toilet facilities and waiting times are largely avoided and it is easy and convenient for medicines to be collected when they are ready.

There is no evidence of benefit to anyone in this application other than to the Cam practice that would thereby acquire a dispensary. As we have shown elsewhere, there is no need for a dispensary at the Cam surgery as there already exists very easy access to pharmacy services close by. Depriving Uley of its dispensary will cause considerable hardship both for patients in Uley and in the surrounding villages and outlying hamlets who rely upon it. A significant number of these patients already live with hardship and financial and social deprivation. This closure will add to their difficulties

Thank you for your consideration of this matter. Please let us know if there is any further information that would assist you in your deliberations.

Yours sincerely,

Ms Melanie Paraskeva,

Chair of Uley Parish Council.