

# CHHP London

## Inspection report

76 Harley Street  
London  
W1G 7HH  
Tel: 02076377677  
www.chhp.com

Date of inspection visit: 13 October 2022  
Date of publication: 15/11/2022

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

Overall rating for this location	Good	
Are services safe?	Good	
Are services effective?	Good	
Are services caring?	Good	
Are services responsive to people's needs?	Good	
Are services well-led?	Good	

# Overall summary

**This service is rated as Good overall.** This is the providers first rated inspection.

The key questions are rated as:

Are services safe? – Good

Are services effective? – Good

Are services caring? – Good

Are services responsive? – Good

Are services well-led? – Good

We carried out this inspection under Section 60 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 as part of our regulatory functions. This inspection was planned to check whether the service was meeting the legal requirements and regulations associated with the Health and Social Care Act 2008.

The provider Marylebone Health Group Ltd has one location registered as CHHP Ltd in London. The service combines medical services, sports and exercise medicine, health improvement, disease prevention and screening. There is a fully equipped cardio-pulmonary exercise testing and fitness training laboratory in-house, and three treatment rooms. The services are provided by a team of doctors and other therapists.

This service is registered with CQC under the Health and Social Care Act 2008 in respect of the provision of advice or treatment by, or under the supervision of, a medical practitioner, including the prescribing of medicines.

One of the owners is the registered manager. A registered manager is a person who is registered with the Care Quality Commission to manage the service. Like registered providers, they are 'registered persons'. Registered persons have legal responsibility for meeting the requirements in the Health and Social Care Act 2008 and associated Regulations about how the service is run.

We did not speak with any patient's during this inspection.

## **Our key findings were:**

- The service routinely reviewed the effectiveness and appropriateness of the care it provided. They ensured that care and treatment was delivered according to evidence- based guidelines.
- The provider had systems in place to protect people from avoidable harm and abuse.
- There was a clear vision to provide a safe, personalised, high quality service.
- All staff we spoke to felt valued by the leaders and said there was a high level of staff support and engagement.
- Patients could access care and treatment from the service within an appropriate timescale for their needs.

# Overall summary

- The service had a business development strategy that effectively monitored the service provided to assure safety and patient satisfaction.

The areas where the provider **should** make improvements are:

- Establish a program of quality improvement activity in relation to clinical outcomes for patients.

**Dr Sean O’Kelly BSc MB ChB MSc DCH FRCA**

Chief Inspector of Hospitals and Interim Chief Inspector of Primary Medical Services

## Our inspection team

The inspection team comprised of a CQC inspector and a GP specialist advisor.

## Background to CHHP London

The service offers a combination of medical services, sports and exercise medicine, health improvement, disease prevention and screening. They offer appointments with physicians, physiotherapists and physiologists with referral to specialist services as required. The provider is registered with CQC to carry out regulated activities of Treatment of disease, disorder and injury and Diagnostic and screening. The service is open on a Monday to Friday from 9am to 6.30pm.

The service treats adults and children over the age of thirteen. Patients can book appointments by telephone, email or in person. The practice estimates that it sees approximately 300 patients a month.

Patient facilities are provided in the basement of the building which can only be accessed via steps. The staff team include a managing director, practice manager, physiologist, one full time administrator and a receptionist. The physicians, physiotherapist and nutritionists are self-employed.

### **How we inspected this service**

We reviewed information sent to us by the provider remotely prior to attending the site to reduce the time spent on site in line with our Covid-19 inspecting guidance. We spoke with the registered manager, a physiologist, physiotherapist and administrative staff. We looked at records related to patient assessments and the provision of care and treatment. We also reviewed documentation related to the management of the service and we reviewed patient feedback.

To get to the heart of patients' experiences of care and treatment, we always ask the following five questions:

- Is it safe?
- Is it effective?
- Is it caring?
- Is it responsive to people's needs?
- Is it well-led?

These questions therefore formed the framework for the areas we looked at during the inspection.

# Are services safe?

## We rated safe as Good because:

- The provider conducted safety risk assessments. It had appropriate safety policies, which were regularly reviewed and communicated to staff including locums. They outlined clearly who to go to for further guidance. Staff received safety information from the service as part of their induction and refresher training. The service had systems to safeguard children and vulnerable adults from abuse.
- The service had systems in place to assure that an adult accompanying a child had parental authority.
- The service worked with other agencies to support patients and protect them from neglect and abuse. Staff took steps to protect patients from abuse, neglect, harassment, discrimination and breaches of their dignity and respect.
- The provider carried out staff checks at the time of recruitment and on an ongoing basis where appropriate. Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) checks were undertaken where required. (DBS checks identify whether a person has a criminal record or is on an official list of people barred from working in roles where they may have contact with children or adults who may be vulnerable).
- All staff received up-to-date safeguarding and safety training appropriate to their role. They knew how to identify and report concerns. Staff who acted as chaperones were trained for the role and had received a DBS check. All staff were trained to level 3 and the safeguarding lead was trained to level 4.
- The landlord for the building had an effective system to manage infection prevention and control, which had been updated to reflect the changes needed following the Covid pandemic. The landlords had carried out Legionella testing and were following the identified actions.
- The provider ensured that facilities and equipment were safe and that equipment was maintained according to manufacturers' instructions. There were systems for safely managing healthcare waste.

## Risks to patients

### There were systems to assess, monitor and manage risks to patient safety.

- There were arrangements for planning and monitoring the number and mix of staff needed.
- Staff understood their responsibilities to manage emergencies and to recognise those in need of urgent medical attention. They knew how to identify and manage patients with severe infections.
- When there were changes to services or staff the service assessed and monitored the impact on safety.
- There were appropriate indemnity arrangements in place
- There were suitable medicines and equipment to deal with medical emergencies which were stored appropriately and checked regularly. If items recommended in national guidance were not kept, there was an appropriate risk assessment to inform this decision.

## Information to deliver safe care and treatment

### Staff had the information they needed to deliver safe care and treatment to patients.

- Individual care records were written and managed in a way that kept patients safe. The care records we saw showed that information needed to deliver safe care and treatment was available to relevant staff in an accessible way.
- The service had systems for sharing information with staff and other agencies to enable them to deliver safe care and treatment.
- The service had a system in place to retain medical records in line with Department of Health and Social Care (DHSC) guidance in the event that they cease trading.
- Clinicians made appropriate and timely referrals in line with protocols and up to date evidence-based guidance.

# Are services safe?

## Safe and appropriate use of medicines

### The service had reliable systems for appropriate and safe handling of medicines.

- The systems and arrangements for managing medicines and emergency medicines and equipment minimised risks. The service kept prescription stationery securely and monitored its use.
- The service does not prescribe Schedule 2 and 3 controlled drugs (medicines that have the highest level of control due to their risk of misuse and dependence). They did (Neither did they) prescribe schedule 4 or 5 controlled drugs.
- Staff prescribed, administered or supplied medicines to patients and gave advice on medicines in line with legal requirements and current national guidance. Processes were in place for checking medicines and staff kept accurate records of medicines. Where there was a different approach taken from national guidance there was a clear rationale for this that protected patient safety.

## Track record on safety and incidents

### The service had a good safety record.

- There were comprehensive risk assessments in relation to safety issues.
- The service monitored and reviewed activity. This helped it to understand risks and gave a clear, accurate and current picture that led to safety improvements.

## Lessons learned and improvements made

### The service learned and made improvements when things went wrong.

- There was a system for recording and acting on significant events. Staff understood their duty to raise concerns and report incidents and near misses. Leaders and managers supported them when they did so.
- There were adequate systems for reviewing and investigating when things went wrong. The registered manager told us they did not have any incidents in the last twelve months, however their reporting system would allow them to identify themes and share lessons to improve safety in the service.
- The provider was aware of and complied with the requirements of the Duty of Candour. The provider encouraged a culture of openness and honesty. The service had systems in place for knowing about notifiable safety incidents

When there were unexpected or unintended safety incidents:

- The service gave affected people reasonable support, truthful information and a verbal and written apology
- They kept written records of verbal interactions as well as written correspondence.
- The service acted on and learned from external safety events as well as patient and medicine safety alerts. The service had an effective mechanism in place to disseminate alerts to all members of the team including sessional and agency staff.

# Are services effective?

**We rated effective as Good because:**

## **Effective needs assessment, care and treatment**

**The provider had systems to keep clinicians up to date with current evidence based practice. We saw evidence that clinicians assessed needs and delivered care and treatment in line with current legislation, standards and guidance (relevant to their service)**

- Patients' immediate and ongoing needs were fully assessed. Where appropriate this included their clinical needs and their mental and physical wellbeing. New patients had to complete a comprehensive health questionnaire before their first consultation.
- Clinicians had enough information to make or confirm a diagnosis
- The clinic had a free screening phone consultation for selecting patients appropriate for the service.
- We saw no evidence of discrimination when making care and treatment decisions.
- Staff assessed and managed patients' pain where appropriate.

## **Monitoring care and treatment**

**The service was involved in some quality improvement activity.**

- The service had systems in place to monitor the quality of care and treatment such as peer review of work and discussion of complex cases with other clinicians including consultants.
- The provider had carried out some administrative audits such as a clinical records and patient follow up audits. However, they had not yet established or completed any quality improvement activity in relation to the treatment they provided.

## **Effective staffing**

**Staff had the skills, knowledge and experience to carry out their roles.**

- All staff were appropriately qualified. The provider had an induction programme for all newly appointed staff.
- Relevant professionals (medical and nursing) were registered with the General Medical Council (GMC)/ Nursing and Midwifery Council and were up to date with revalidation
- The provider understood the learning needs of staff and provided protected time and training to meet them. Up to date records of skills, qualifications and training were maintained. Staff were encouraged and given opportunities to develop.

## **Coordinating patient care and information sharing**

**Staff worked together, and worked well with other organisations, to deliver effective care and treatment.**

- Patients received coordinated and person-centred care. Staff referred to, and communicated effectively with, other services when appropriate. For example, the technicians at the medically led laboratory where they sent the blood for testing.
- Before providing treatment, clinicians at the service ensured they had adequate knowledge of the patient's health, any relevant test results and their medicines history. We saw examples of patients being signposted to more suitable sources of treatment where this information was not available to ensure safe care and treatment.

# Are services effective?

- All patients were asked for consent to share details of their consultation and any medicines prescribed with their registered GP on each occasion they used the service.
- The provider had risk assessed the treatments they offered. They had identified medicines that were not suitable for prescribing if the patient did not give their consent to share information with their GP, or they were not registered with a GP. For example, medicines liable to abuse or misuse, and those for the treatment of long-term conditions such as asthma. Where patients agreed to share their information, we saw evidence of letters sent to their registered GP in line with GMC guidance.
- Patient information was shared appropriately (this included when patients moved to other professional services), and the information needed to plan and deliver care and treatment was available to relevant staff in a timely and accessible way. There were clear and effective arrangements for following up on people who had been referred to other services.
- The service monitored the process for seeking consent appropriately.

## Supporting patients to live healthier lives

### **Staff were consistent and proactive in empowering patients, and supporting them to manage their own health and maximise their independence.**

- Where appropriate, staff gave people advice so they could self-care.
- Risk factors were identified, highlighted to patients and where appropriate highlighted to their normal care provider for additional support. For example, we saw examples of clinical letters that were sent to GPs.
- Where patients needs could not be met by the service, staff redirected them to the appropriate service for their needs.

## Consent to care and treatment

### **The service obtained consent to care and treatment in line with legislation and guidance.**

- Staff understood the requirements of legislation and guidance when considering consent and decision making.
- Staff supported patients to make decisions. Where appropriate, they assessed and recorded a patient's mental capacity to make a decision.



# Are services caring?

**We rated caring as Good because:**

## **Kindness, respect and compassion**

### **Staff treated patients with kindness, respect and compassion.**

- The service sought feedback on the quality of clinical care patients received. Patients were sent feedback questionnaires after all consultations and they could also give feedback through a variety of social media platforms.
- Feedback from patients was positive about the way staff treat people
- Staff understood patients' personal, cultural, social and religious needs. They displayed an understanding and non-judgmental attitude to all patients.
- The service gave patients timely support and information.

## **Involvement in decisions about care and treatment**

### **Staff helped patients to be involved in decisions about care and treatment.**

- Interpretation services were available for patients who did not have English as a first language. Patients were also told about multi-lingual staff who might be able to support them. Information leaflets were available in easy read formats, to help patients be involved in decisions about their care.
- Patients feedback we viewed demonstrated that they felt listened to and supported by staff and had sufficient time during consultations to make an informed decision about the choice of treatment available to them.
- Staff communicated with people in a way that they could understand, for example, communication aids and easy read materials were available.

## **Privacy and Dignity**

### **The service respected patients' privacy and dignity.**

- Staff recognised the importance of people's dignity and respect.
- Staff knew that if patients wanted to discuss sensitive issues or appeared distressed, they could offer them a private room to discuss their needs.

# Are services responsive to people's needs?

**We rated responsive as Good because:**

## **Responding to and meeting people's needs**

**The service organised and delivered services to meet patients' needs. It took account of patient needs and preferences.**

- The provider understood the needs of their patients and improved services in response to those needs. For example, they were in the process of developing their general medical service.
- The facilities and premises were appropriate for the services delivered.

## **Timely access to the service**

**Patients were able to access care and treatment from the service within an appropriate timescale for their needs.**

- Patients had timely access to initial assessment, test results, diagnosis and treatment.
- Waiting times, delays and cancellations were minimal and managed appropriately.
- Patients reported that the appointment system was easy to use.
- Referrals and transfers to other services were undertaken in a timely way.

## **Listening and learning from concerns and complaints**

**The service took complaints and concerns seriously and responded to them appropriately to improve the quality of care.**

- Information about how to make a complaint or raise concerns was available. Although they had not received any complaints at the time of our inspection.
- The registered manager told us they would inform patients of any further action that may be available to them should they not be satisfied with the response to their complaint.
- The service had complaint policy and procedures in place.

# Are services well-led?

**We rated well-led as Good because:**

## **Leadership capacity and capability;**

**Leaders had the capacity and skills to deliver high-quality, sustainable care.**

- Leaders were knowledgeable about issues and priorities relating to the quality and future of services. They understood the challenges and were addressing them.
- Leaders at all levels were visible and approachable. They worked closely with staff and others to make sure they prioritised compassionate and inclusive leadership.
- The provider had effective processes to develop leadership capacity and skills, including planning for the future leadership of the service.

## **Vision and strategy**

**The service had a clear vision and credible strategy to deliver high quality care and promote good outcomes for patients.**

- There was a clear vision and set of values. The service had a realistic strategy and supporting business plans to achieve priorities.
- The service developed its vision, values and strategy jointly with staff and external partners.
- Staff were aware of and understood the vision, values and strategy and their role in achieving them
- The service monitored progress against delivery of the strategy.

## **Culture**

**The service had a culture of high-quality sustainable care.**

- Staff felt respected, supported and valued. They were proud to work for the service.
- The service focused on the needs of patients.
- Leaders and managers acted on behaviour and performance inconsistent with the vision and values.
- Openness, honesty and transparency were demonstrated when responding to incidents and complaints. The provider was aware of and had systems to ensure compliance with the requirements of the duty of candour.
- Staff told us they could raise concerns and were encouraged to do so. They had confidence that these would be addressed.
- There were processes for providing all staff with the development they need. This included appraisal and career development conversations. All staff received regular annual appraisals in the last year. Staff were supported to meet the requirements of professional revalidation where necessary. All staff were considered valued members of the team. They were given protected time for professional development and evaluation of their clinical work. There were opportunities for administration staff to train to be clinicians.
- There was a strong emphasis on the safety and well-being of all staff.
- The service actively promoted equality and diversity. It identified and addressed the causes of any workforce inequality. Staff had received equality and diversity training. Staff felt they were treated equally.
- There were positive relationships between staff and teams.

## **Governance arrangements**

# Are services well-led?

## **There were clear responsibilities, roles and systems of accountability to support good governance and management.**

- Structures, processes and systems to support good governance and management were clearly set out, understood and effective. The governance and management of partnerships, joint working arrangements and shared services promoted interactive and co-ordinated person-centred care.
- Staff were clear on their roles and accountabilities
- Leaders had established proper policies, procedures and activities to ensure safety and assured themselves that they were operating as intended.
- The service used performance information which was reported and monitored and management and staff were held to account
- The information used to monitor performance and the delivery of quality care was accurate and useful. There were plans to address any identified weaknesses.
- The service submitted data or notifications to external organisations as required.
- There were robust arrangements in line with data security standards for the availability, integrity and confidentiality of patient identifiable data, records and data management systems.

## **Managing risks, issues and performance**

### **There were clear and effective processes for managing risks, issues and performance.**

- There was an effective, process to identify, understand, monitor and address current and future risks including risks to patient safety.
- The service had processes to manage current and future performance. Performance of clinical staff could be demonstrated through audit of their consultations and referral decisions. Leaders had oversight of safety alerts, incidents, and complaints.
- There was clear evidence of action to change services to improve quality.
- The provider had plans in place and had trained staff for major incidents.

## **Appropriate and accurate information**

### **The service acted on appropriate and accurate information.**

- Quality and operational information was used to ensure and improve performance. Performance information was combined with the views of patients.
- Quality and sustainability were discussed in relevant meetings where all staff had sufficient access to information.

## **Engagement with patients, the public, staff and external partners**

### **The service involved patients, the public, staff and external partners to support high-quality sustainable services.**

- The service encouraged and heard views and concerns from the public, patients, staff and external partners and acted on them to shape services and culture. Patients were able to leave feedback on an online platform as well as direct to the clinic.

# Are services well-led?

- Staff could describe to us the systems in place to give feedback. For example, through staff meetings, appraisals and one to ones. We saw evidence of feedback opportunities for staff and how the findings were fed back to staff. We also saw staff engagement in responding to these findings.
- The service was transparent, collaborative and open with stakeholders about performance.

## **Continuous improvement and innovation**

### **There were evidence of systems and processes for learning, continuous improvement and innovation.**

- There was a focus on continuous learning and improvement. The provider was part of a peer group of similar services where learning was shared.
- The service made use of internal and external reviews of incidents and complaints. Learning was shared and used to make improvements.
- Leaders and managers encouraged staff to take time out to review individual and team objectives, processes and performance.