

# London Road Surgery

## Quality Report

172 London Road  
Reading  
Berkshire  
RG1 3PA  
Tel: 0118 926 4992  
Website: [www.londonroadreading.nhs.uk](http://www.londonroadreading.nhs.uk)

Date of inspection visit: We have not revisited London Road Surgery as part of this review because they were able to demonstrate that they were meeting the standards without the need for a visit.  
Date of publication: 30/08/2016

This report describes our judgement of the quality of care at this service. It is based on a combination of what we found when we inspected, information from our ongoing monitoring of data about services and information given to us from the provider, patients, the public and other organisations.

## Ratings

Are services safe?

**Good**



Are services effective?

**Good**



# Summary of findings

## Contents

### Summary of this inspection

Overall summary	2
The five questions we ask and what we found	3

### Detailed findings from this inspection

Why we carried out this inspection	4
How we carried out this inspection	4
Detailed findings	5

## Overall summary

### Letter from the Chief Inspector of General Practice

During a comprehensive inspection of London Road Surgery in November 2015 we found concerns related to the knowledge of staff in relation to the Mental Capacity Act 2005 (MCA) and incomplete records of staff training. Because of these concerns, we found the practice in breach of regulations relating to effective delivery of services.

We also raised a concern with the practice over their lack of an effective review of emergency equipment. They did not have a defibrillator on the premises or access to one quickly in an emergency.

Following the inspection, the practice sent us an action plan detailing how they would improve the training for staff in MCA, update their staff training records and proposed the purchase of a defibrillator.

We carried out a desktop review of London Surgery on 14 July 2016 to ensure these changes had been

implemented and that the service was meeting regulations. The ratings for the practice have been updated to reflect our findings. We found the practice had made improvements in effective provision of services since our last inspection on 17 November 2015 and they were meeting the requirements of the regulation in breach.

Specifically the practice had;

- Offered appropriate training to all staff in regard to the MCA.
- Updated their training log for all staff training records.
- Purchased a defibrillator for use in an emergency.

We have updated the ratings for this practice to reflect these changes. The practice is now rated good for the provision of effective services.

**Professor Steve Field (CBE FRCP FFPH FRCGP)**  
Chief Inspector of General Practice

# Summary of findings

## The five questions we ask and what we found

We always ask the following five questions of services.

### Are services safe?

When we visited London Road Surgery in November 2015 we rated the practice as good for provision of safe services. However, the practice did not have, or have immediate access to, a defibrillator.

The practice provided evidence in July 2016 that confirmed a defibrillator had been purchased, was available on site and staff had been trained to use it. Our previous findings for delivery of safe services have not been updated.

Good



### Are services effective?

When we inspected in November 2015 we found there were gaps in staff training and development records, including elements of mandatory training. There was also limited or no understanding of the Mental Capacity act from some staff. There was also no automated defibrillator device (AED) on site.

When we reviewed the evidence provided to us by the practice in July 2016, we found;

- All clinical and non-clinical staff had received MCA training.
- The practice was able to demonstrate they had updated the training records which showed a programme of continuous learning and mandatory training on a rolling agenda.

Good



# London Road Surgery

## Detailed findings

### Why we carried out this inspection

We carried out a comprehensive inspection on 17 November 2015 and published a report setting out our judgements. We asked the provider to send a report of the changes they would make to comply with the regulation they were not meeting. We undertook a follow up inspection in July 2016 to make sure the necessary changes have been made and found the provider is now meeting the fundamental standards included within this report.

This report should be read in conjunction with the full inspection report. We have not revisited London Road Surgery as part of this review because the practice was able to demonstrate compliance without the need for an inspection.

### How we carried out this inspection

We reviewed information and evidence given to us by the practice.

## Are services safe?

### Our findings

When we visited London Road Surgery in November 2015 we rated the practice as good for provision of safe services. However, the practice did not have, or have immediate access to, a defibrillator.

The practice provided evidence in July 2016 that confirmed a defibrillator had been purchased, was available on site and staff had been trained to use it. Our previous findings for delivery of safe services have not been updated.

# Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

## Our findings

When we inspected in November 2015 we found there were gaps within staff training and development records. These included elements of mandatory training. Only one GP had been trained in the Mental Capacity Act (MCA) 2005 but was at that time on long term leave from the practice. There was limited or no understanding of the MCA from some staff.

When we reviewed the evidence provided by the practice in July 2016, we found all staff had received MCA training. The practice was able to demonstrate they had updated the training records which showed a programme of continuous learning and mandatory training on a rolling agenda. We were satisfied these improvements were sufficient to make the practice compliant with the regulations and the practice was no longer in breach. We have updated the rating for the practice in response to the improvements demonstrated.