

Fort House Surgery

Quality Report

32 Hersham Road
Walton On Thames
Surrey
KT12 1UX

Tel: 01932253055

Website: www.forthouse-surgery.co.uk

Date of inspection visit: 8 November 2016

Date of publication: 22/12/2016

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

Overall rating for this service

Good



Are services safe?

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

Our inspection team	4
Why we carried out this inspection	4
Detailed findings	5

Overall summary

Letter from the Chief Inspector of General Practice

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection of Fort House surgery on 26 January 2016. Breaches of legal requirements were found during that inspection within the safe domain. The practice was rated as good overall, requires improvement in the safe domain and good in the effective, caring, responsive and well-led domains. After the comprehensive inspection, the practice sent to us an action plan detailing what they would do to meet the legal requirements. We undertook a focused inspection on 08 November 2016 to check that the provider had followed their action plan and to confirm that they now met legal requirements. The provider was now meeting all requirements and was rated as good overall and good under the safe domain. This report only covers our findings in relation to those requirements.

During the previous inspection on 26 January 2016 we found that the areas where the practice must make improvements were:

- To ensure all fire safety equipment is regularly serviced and that it is clarified to fire marshals what their responsibilities are. Ensure that all actions identified following fire risk assessments are implemented.
- To ensure that a Legionella risk assessment is carried out.

This report should be read in conjunction with the last report from 26 January 2016. The report from our last comprehensive inspection can be read by selecting the 'all reports' link on our website at www.cqc.org.uk.

During this inspection we found that:

- The practice had had all fire equipment checked by a specialist company. The fire marshals were clear about their roles. A further fire risk assessment had been carried out and the findings implemented.
- A Legionella risk assessment had been carried out and acted on.

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?

The practice is rated as good for providing safe services.

Good



At the last inspection on 26 January 2016 we found that:

- The practice had fire safety equipment available, but there was no record that the fire extinguishers had been serviced within the last year. Fire marshals were not entirely clear about their roles. The last fire risk assessment had advised locating a zonal plan next to the alarm, but this had not yet been done.
- Most risks to patients who used services were assessed with the exception that a risk assessment for Legionella had not been carried out, although the water had been tested to exclude its presence in the water supply. (Legionella is a term for a particular bacterium which can contaminate water systems in buildings).

On this occasion we found that:

- The fire equipment had been checked by a specialist company and had not required servicing. Two fire drills had been carried out and there was a third unplanned evacuation in response to the alarm going off without warning. A fire risk assessment had been carried out and actioned. The fire wardens were fully aware of what their role entailed. There was a zonal plan diagram by each fire point.
- A legionella risk assessment had been carried out and actioned.

Fort House Surgery

Detailed findings

Our inspection team

Our inspection team was led by:

The inspection was carried out by a CQC Inspector.

Why we carried out this inspection

We carried out a comprehensive inspection of this service under Section 60 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 on

26 January 2016 as part of our regulatory functions. This inspection was planned to check whether the provider was meeting the legal requirements and regulations associated with the Health and Social Care Act 2008, to look at the overall quality of the service, and to provide a rating for the service under the Care Act 2014.

Breaches of legal requirements were found. As a result, we undertook a focused inspection on 08 November 2016 to follow up on whether action had been taken to deal with the breaches.

Are services safe?

Our findings

Overview of safety systems and processes

At the inspection on 26 January 2016 we found that:

- The practice had a fire risk assessment dated May 2014. A rehearsal of evacuation procedures had been carried out within the previous year and fire alarm tests were carried out weekly and recorded. An external company had checked the alarms within the previous year. However, the fire extinguishers had not been serviced since March 2014 and the fire marshals were not entirely clear about their roles. A fire action plan from 2014 had noted that there was no zonal plan next to the alarm and that was still the case on the day of our inspection.
- Legionella had been tested for in the water system within the last year and the result was negative at the time of the test. However a risk assessment for it had not been carried out (Legionella is a term for a particular bacterium which can contaminate water systems in buildings).

At this inspection we found that:

- The practice had had a fire risk assessment carried out on 10 March 2016 by a specialist company and all the compulsory recommendations had been actioned including fitting smoke detectors below the stairs. The practice had carried out two further fire evacuation drills in January and July and also an evacuation of the premises in response to the alarm going off unexpectedly. We saw that all the fire equipment had now been checked by a specialist company and a zonal plan had been placed at each fire point. We saw fire evacuation sheets and that all names had been checked and the fire drill log was up to date. The fire marshals clearly understood their roles.
- A legionella risk assessment had been carried out by both a health and safety at work organisation and the practice. The practice were found to be low risk, but had carried out a further test for Legionella which was negative. The practice were carrying out monthly water temperature tests as recommended and all recordings had been within the accepted ranges.