

Cosmedics Clinics Putney

Inspection report

4 Disraeli Road
London
SW15 2DS
Tel: 0207 386 0464
www.cosmedics.co.uk

Date of inspection visit: 1 July 2019
Date of publication: 22/08/2019

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?

Good 

Are services well-led?

Good 

Overall summary

This service is rated as Good overall.

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 an announced comprehensive inspection at Cosmedics Clinics Putney on the 1 July 2019 as part of our inspection programme.

Cosmedics Clinics Putney provides private medical, cosmetic and beauty therapy services.

This service is registered with CQC under the Health and Social Care Act 2008 in respect of some, but not all, of the services it provides. There are some exemptions from regulation by CQC which relate to particular types of regulated activities and services and these are set out in Schedule 1 and Schedule 2 of The Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014. Cosmedics Clinics Harley Street provides a range of non-surgical cosmetic interventions, for example anti-ageing injections and dermal fillers which are not within CQC scope of registration. Therefore, we did not inspect or report on these services.

Dr Ross Perry 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.

Our key findings were:

- The service had systems and processes were in place to keep people safe. There was a fire policy, procedure and regular equipment checks and drills, and all staff had completed fire training. The service lead was the lead member of staff for safeguarding and had undertaken adult safeguarding to level two and child safeguarding training to level three.

- The service did not stock all the recommended emergency medicines at the premises and no formal risk assessment had been completed to support this decision. A formal risk assessment was sent to us shortly after the inspection.
- The service learned and made improvements when things went wrong. However, we found that there were examples of events that could usefully have been considered as significant events that had not been formally reviewed, and not all significant events had been fully documented.
- The service had a system in place to share safety alerts with to all members of staff. We heard examples of action taken as a result, but this was not recorded.
- There was quality improvement activity, although this was not consistent across the whole service.
- Patients were able to access care and treatment from the clinic within an appropriate timescale for their needs.
- There was a complaints procedure in place and information on how to complain was readily available.
- Governance arrangements were in place. There were clear responsibilities, roles and systems of accountability to support good governance and management.
- The service had systems and processes in place to ensure that patients were treated with compassion, dignity and respect and they were involved in decisions about their care and treatment.
- The service had good facilities and was well equipped to treat patients and meet their needs.
- The service had systems in place to collect and analyse feedback from patients.

The areas where the provider should make improvements are:

- Review the systems for the dissemination of safety alerts and the logging of any actions taken, and for ensuring that all significant events are identified and fully recorded.
- Review measures of effectiveness to develop comprehensive measures across all of the services offered.

Dr Rosie Benneyworth BM BS BMedSci MRCGP

Chief Inspector of Primary Medical Services and Integrated Care

Our inspection team

Our inspection was led by a CQC inspector with a GP specialist advisor and a second CQC inspector.

Background to Cosmedics Clinics Putney

Cosmedics Clinics Putney provides private medical, cosmetic and beauty therapy services under the trading name Cosmedics skin clinics located at 4 Disraeli Road, London, SW15 2DS. The service is registered with the CQC to provide the regulated activities of Treatment of disease disorder and injury and surgical procedures in respect of the varicose vein treatment service provided. Other services offered but not regulated by the CQC include beauty therapy services, injected skin fillers, mole, wart and skin tag removal, and laser treatments such as hair removal.

The service is located in a converted property with stairs and a ramp leading into a reception and separate waiting area. There are patient toilet facilities; however these are not suitable for wheelchair users. The service has beauty therapy rooms, consultation rooms and a treatment room with separate recovery area used for vein treatment activities. There are also staff areas, a basement storage area and an administration office.

Services are available to any fee paying patient on a pay per use basis. Services are available by appointment only from 10am Monday to Sunday and 9am on Saturdays. Appointments are available until 6pm on Monday and Friday, until 8pm Tuesday – Thursday, until 5pm on Saturday and 4pm on Sunday. Where requested, appointments are offered at the providers other location in central London.

Their website address is: <http://cosmedics.co.uk/>

The service is registered with CQC to undertake the following regulated activities:

- Treatment of Disease, Disorder or Injury
- Diagnostic and Screening Services.
- Surgical procedures

We carried out this comprehensive 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.

As part of the preparation for the inspection we also reviewed information provided to us by the provider.

During the inspection we asked people using the service to record their views on comment cards, interviewed staff, observed staff interaction with patients and reviewed documents relating to the service.

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 service had clear systems to keep people safe and safeguarded from abuse.
- There were systems to assess, monitor and manage risks to patient safety.
- Staff had the information they needed to deliver safe care and treatment to patients.
- The service had reliable systems for appropriate and safe handling of medicines.
- The service learned and made improvements when things went wrong. However, we found that there were examples of occasions that could usefully have been considered as significant events that had not been formally reviewed, and not all significant events had been fully documented.
- The service had an system in place to share safety alerts with to all members of staff. We heard examples of action taken as a result, but this was not recorded.

Safety systems and processes

The service had clear systems to keep people safe and safeguarded from abuse.

- 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.
- There was an effective system to manage infection prevention and control. The service had a variety of other risk assessments to monitor safety of the premises such as control of substances hazardous to health and infection control and legionella. Legionella is a term for a particular bacterium which can contaminate water systems in buildings.
- 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.
- The service had recently commissioned external assessments of premises' risks and risk of fire (June 2019). We saw evidence that some actions had already been acted upon, and some remained to be completed (within the timescales recommended in the reports).

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.
- There was an effective induction system for agency staff tailored to their role.
- 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, for example sepsis.
- When there were changes to services or staff the service assessed and monitored the impact on safety.
- There were appropriate indemnity arrangements in place to cover all potential liabilities.

Information to deliver safe care and treatment

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

Are services safe?

- 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.

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, including vaccines, controlled drugs, emergency medicines and equipment minimised risks. The service kept prescription stationery securely and monitored its use.
- The service carried out regular medicines audit to ensure prescribing was in line with best practice guidelines for safe prescribing.
- 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.
- The service used photo Identification to verify the identity of patients.

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.
- All staff had received annual basic life support training.

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 told us that they understood their duty to raise concerns and report incidents and near misses. Leaders and managers supported them when they did so. However, we found that there were examples of events that could usefully have been considered as significant events that had not been formally reviewed, and not all significant events had been fully documented.
- There were adequate systems for reviewing and investigating when things went wrong. The service learned and shared lessons identified themes and took action 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 system in place to disseminate alerts to all members of the team including sessional and agency staff, however this was done via email and no confirmation of compliance was sought from the clinicians they were sent to. There was no log kept of action taken on alerts.

Are services effective?

We rated effective as Good because:

- We saw evidence that clinicians assessed needs and delivered care and treatment in line with current legislation, standards and guidance (relevant to their service).
- There was quality improvement activity, although this was not consistent across the whole service.
- Staff had the skills, knowledge and experience to carry out their roles, and worked together, and worked well with other organisations, to deliver effective care and treatment.
- Staff supported patients to manage their own health, and obtained consent in line with legislation and guidance.

Effective needs assessment, care and treatment

- Staff told us that they assessed needs and delivered care in line with relevant and current evidence based guidance and standards such as the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) best practice guidelines, although this was not documented as an expectation by the provider.
- Patients' immediate and ongoing needs were fully assessed. Where appropriate this included their clinical needs and their mental and physical wellbeing.
- Clinicians had enough information to make or confirm a diagnosis.
- We saw no evidence of discrimination when making care and treatment decisions.
- Arrangements were in place to deal with repeat patients.
- Staff assessed and managed patients' pain where appropriate.

Monitoring care and treatment

There was quality improvement activity, although this was not consistent across the whole service.

- The service used information about care and treatment to make improvements.
- There was evidence of action to resolve concerns and improve quality. The service carried out a notes audit to ensure that abbreviations were avoided, only black ink was used in handwritten notes, and that all consent forms were signed. Individual clinicians completed audits of their work, but the audit programme was not comprehensive. For example, there were no audits of histology results or infection rates.

- The service also carried out annual patient satisfaction surveys to ensure that the services they were providing met their patient's needs.

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, but this was not fully documented.
- 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.
- Staff whose role included the removal of varicose veins had received specific training and could demonstrate how they stayed up to date.

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.
- Before providing treatment, doctors 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.
- All patients were asked for consent to share details of their consultation and any medicines prescribed with their registered GP.
- 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

Are services effective?

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.

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.
- Where patients needs could not be met by the service, staff redirected them to the appropriate service for their needs. For example, patients would be referred to an NHS GP or secondary services if a mole was found to be malignant.

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.
- The service monitored the process for seeking consent appropriately.

Are services caring?

- Staff treated patients with kindness, respect and compassion.
- Staff helped patients to be involved in decisions about care and treatment.
- The service respected patients' privacy and dignity.

Kindness, respect and compassion

Staff treated patients with kindness, respect and compassion.

- Feedback from patients was positive about the way staff treat people.
- The service carried out its own patient survey. In 2018, 40 patients responded. 98% said that they would recommend the service to friends and family. 94% rated the professionalism of doctors/clinical staff as excellent or good.
- 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.

- Formal interpreter services were not available for patients who did not have English as a first language; however, staff were aware of, and patients were told about, multi-lingual staff who might be able to support them.
- In the service's own survey for 2018 95% of patients rated how staff answered questions and gave information as excellent or good. 97% of patients surveyed were satisfied with the treatment they received.
- For patients with learning disabilities or complex social needs family, carers or social workers were appropriately involved.
- The service's website provided patients with information about the range of services and treatments available including costs.

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:

- The service organised and delivered services to meet patients' needs. It took account of patient needs and preferences.
- Patients were able to access care and treatment from the service within an appropriate timescale for their needs.
- The service took complaints and concerns seriously and responded to them appropriately to improve the quality of care.

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 by adjusting the opening times of the service.
- The facilities and premises were appropriate for the services delivered. The service had ramped access and was level throughout, however toilet facilities were not suitable for wheelchair users or other patients with additional access requirements. Staff told us that they would inform patients about other services available which may meet their needs.

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 with the most urgent needs had their care and treatment prioritised.
- 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. Staff treated patients who made complaints compassionately.
- The service informed 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. The service learned lessons from individual concerns, complaints and from analysis of trends. It acted as a result to improve the quality of care. For example, when a patient complained that their mole removal had involved unexpected additional cost, the service changed how it advertised that service to include the cost of histology.

Are services well-led?

We rated well-led as Good because:

- Leaders had the capacity and skills to deliver high-quality, sustainable care.
- The service had a clear vision and credible strategy to deliver high quality care and promote good outcomes for patients.
- The service had a culture of high-quality sustainable care.
- There were clear responsibilities, roles and systems of accountability to support good governance and management.
- There were clear and effective processes for managing risks, issues and performance.
- The service acted on appropriate and accurate information.
- The service involved patients, the public, staff and external partners to support high-quality sustainable services.
- There were evidence of systems and processes for learning, continuous improvement and innovation.

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, patients received a written response to complaints and learning was shared with all staff. 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. Clinical staff, including nurses, were considered valued members of the team. They were given protected time for professional time for professional development and evaluation of their clinical work.
- 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

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,

Are services well-led?

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.

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, however the service did not carry all the recommended emergency drugs and had not formally risk assessed their omission.
- The service had processes to manage current and future performance. Performance of clinical staff could be demonstrated through audit of their consultations, prescribing and referral decisions. Leaders had oversight of incidents, and complaints. Whilst clinicians could evidence knowledge of safety alerts there was not a formal way of confirming that all had been viewed and acted on.
- Audits had a positive impact on quality of care and outcomes for patients. 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.
- 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.

Engagement with patients, the public, staff and external partners

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

- The service encouraged and heard views and concerns from patients, staff and external partners and acted on them to shape services and culture. This was done through regular staff meetings and patient surveys.
- Staff could describe to us the systems in place to give feedback. 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 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.
- There were systems to support improvement and innovation work, for example the vascular surgeon had devised a new process for treating superficial varicose veins which made it less invasive and reduced bleeding and shortened the recovery time.