

Dr. Manori Balachandra

# Manor Dental Surgery

## Inspection report

270 Hunts Pond Road  
Titchfield Common  
Fareham  
PO14 4PF  
Tel: 01489578917

Date of inspection visit: 24 May 2022  
Date of publication: 20/06/2022

### Overall summary

We undertook a follow-up focused inspection of The Manor Dental Surgery on 24 May 2022.

This inspection was carried out to review, in detail, the actions taken by the registered provider to improve the quality of care and to confirm that the practice was now meeting legal requirements.

The inspection was carried out by a Care Quality Commission, (CQC), inspector who was supported by a second inspector and a specialist dental advisor.

At our inspection on 20 December 2021 we found the registered provider was not providing well-led care and was in breach of Regulation 17 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014.

You can read our report of that inspection by selecting the 'all reports' link for The Manor Dental Surgery on our website [www.cqc.org.uk](http://www.cqc.org.uk).

#### **As part of this inspection we asked:**

- Is it well-led?

When one or more of the five questions are not met, we require the service to make improvements and send us an action plan. We then inspect again after a reasonable interval, focusing on the area where improvement was required.

#### **Are services well-led?**

We found this practice was providing well-led care in accordance with the relevant regulations.

The provider had made improvements in relation to the regulatory breach we found at our inspection on 20 December 2021

# Summary of findings

## Background

The Manor Dental Surgery is in Titchfield Common, Fareham and provides NHS and private dental care and treatment for adults and children.

There is step free access to the practice for wheelchair users and those with pushchairs. Car parking spaces, including dedicated parking for disabled people, are available outside the practice.

The dental team includes one dentist, two dental nurses and a dental hygienist.  
The practice has three treatment rooms.

During the inspection we spoke with the principal dentist and their legal representative.

We looked at practice policies and procedures and other records about how the service is managed.

## The practice is open:

- Monday to Friday from 9am to 5pm

The practice closes for lunch each day

## Our key findings were:

- The provider operated effective staff recruitment procedures which reflected current legislation.

## There were areas where the provider could make improvements. They should:

- Take action to improve the systems used to record patient's treatment to ensure information is recorded effectively and able to be located in a timely way.

# Summary of findings

## The five questions we ask about services and what we found

We asked the following question(s).

**Are services well-led?**

**No action**



# Are services well-led?

## Our findings

At our previous inspection on 20 December 2021 we judged the provider was not providing well-led care and was not complying with the relevant regulations.

We told the provider to take action as described in our requirement notice.

At our follow-up inspection on 24 May 2022 we found the practice had made the following improvements to comply with the regulations:

### **Governance and management**

Staff recruitment procedures reflected current legislation.

Staff recruitment files were maintained in an ordered way and all of the required information was available.

We reviewed the recruitment file for a member of staff who had been recruited since our visit in December 2021 and saw evidence which confirmed that all the required recruitment checks had been carried out.

During our visit also reviewed the standard of patient treatment record keeping.

We noted that two patient treatment recording systems were being used. The provider told us the practice was in the process of fully computerising patient record keeping systems.

We reviewed a sample of treatment records and found:

- Evidence of a medical history was not easily accessible for one patient.
- Electronic templates used were not specific to current treatment for two patients.
- Hand written treatment plans were hard to read for two patients.

We highlighted our findings with the provider and they assured us they would address this shortfall as soon as practicably possible.