Mr James McCubbin

The Coach House

Inspection report

24 Bakewell Street
Penkhull
Stoke On Trent
ST4 5HJ
Tel: 01782844907

Date of inspection visit: 1 November 2022
Date of publication: 29/11/2022

Overall summary

We undertook a follow up focused inspection of The Coach House on 1 November 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 led by a CQC inspector who was supported by a specialist dental adviser.

We had previously undertaken a focused inspection of The Coach House on 4 May 2022 under Section 60 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 as part of our regulatory functions. We found the registered provider was not providing safe, effective or well-led care and was in breach of regulations 12 and 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 Coach House dental practice on our website www.cqc.org.uk.

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 areas where improvement was required.

As part of this inspection we asked:

• Is it safe?

• Is it effective?

• Is it well-led?

Our findings were:

Are services safe?

We found this practice was providing safe care in accordance with the relevant regulations.

Summary of findings

The provider had made some improvements in relation to the regulatory breaches we found at our inspection on 4 May 2022 however there were areas in which the practice still needed to make improvements.

Are services effective?

We found this practice was providing effective care in accordance with the relevant regulations.

The provider had made improvements in relation to the regulatory breaches we found at our inspection on 4 May 2022.

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 breaches we found at our inspection on 4 May 2022.

Background

The provider has 1 practice and this report is about The Coach House.

The Coach House is in Stoke and provides private dental care and treatment for adults and children.

There is level access to the practice for people who use wheelchairs and those with pushchairs. Car parking spaces, including dedicated parking for people with disabilities are available near the practice.

The dental team includes 1 dentist and 1 dental nurse/receptionist. The practice has 1 treatment room.

During the inspection we spoke with 1 dentist and 1 dental nurse/receptionist. We looked at practice policies and procedures and other records about how the service is managed.

The practice is open:

Tuesday to Friday, 9am to 4pm, closing between 1pm and 2pm for lunch.

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

- Take action to ensure the availability of equipment in the practice to manage medical emergencies taking into account the guidelines issued by the Resuscitation Council (UK) and the General Dental Council.
- Take action to ensure the clinicians take into account the guidelines issued by the Department of Health publication 'Delivering better oral health: an evidence-based toolkit for prevention' when promoting the maintenance of good oral health and ensure this is recorded in all patient notes.

Summary of findings

The five questions we ask about services and what we found

We asked the following question(s).

Are services safe?	**No action** 
Are services effective?	**No action** 
Are services well-led?	**No action** 

Are services safe?

Our findings

We found that this practice was providing safe care and was complying with the relevant regulations.

During this inspection we found the practice had made the following improvements to comply with the regulations:

- The practice had implemented procedures to reduce the risk of legionella or other bacteria developing in water systems, in line with a risk assessment.
- The practice had implemented systems for referring patients with suspected oral cancer under the national two-week wait arrangements.
- The practice had implemented a system for receiving and acting on safety alerts.
-

While the practice had made improvements to comply with the regulations, there were still some areas of concern.

- We noted there was no children's ambu bag present. Sizes 2, 3, 4 and 5 masks were present but sizes 0 and 1 are missing. We also noted that all 5 of the oropharyngeal airways were out of date (all by over 10 years). Following our inspection, the provider submitted evidence that all missing or expired items had been ordered.
- We noted that clinical notes were still very brief and did not follow national guidance. No Basic Periodontal Examination (BPE) was recorded in any of the patient notes we reviewed.

Are services effective?

(for example, treatment is effective)

Our findings

We found that this practice was providing effective care and was complying with the relevant regulations.

During this inspection we found the practice had made the following improvements to comply with the regulation:

- Staff understood their responsibilities under the Mental Capacity Act 2005.
- We saw evidence the dentists justified, graded and reported on the radiographs they took. The practice carried out radiography audits six-monthly following current guidance and legislation.

Are services well-led?

Our findings

We found that this practice was providing well-led care and was complying with the relevant regulations.

During this inspection we found the practice had made the following improvements to comply with the regulations:

- The information and evidence presented during the inspection process was clear and well documented.
- Staff discussed their training needs during annual appraisals. The practice had arrangements to ensure staff training was up-to-date and reviewed at the required intervals.
- The practice had information governance arrangements and staff were aware of the importance of these in protecting patients' personal information.