

# Angel Hill Surgery

## Quality Report

1 Angel Hill  
Bury St Edmunds  
Suffolk  
IP33 1LU

Tel: 01284 753008

Website: <http://www.angelhillsurgery.co.uk>

Date of inspection visit: 8 January 2018

Date of publication: 18/01/2018

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

	Page
Overall summary	2
Areas for improvement	4

### Detailed findings from this inspection

Our inspection team	5
Background to Angel Hill Surgery	5
Why we carried out this inspection	5
Detailed findings	6

## Overall summary

### Letter from the Chief Inspector of General Practice

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection at Angel Hill Surgery on 4 October 2016. The practice was rated as good for providing caring and responsive services, requires improvement for providing effective and well led services and inadequate for providing safe services. Overall the practice was rated as requires improvement. The full comprehensive reports on the 4 October 2016 inspection can be found by selecting the 'all reports' link for Angel Hill Surgery on our website at [www.cqc.org.uk](http://www.cqc.org.uk).

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection at Angel Hill Surgery on 26 June 2017. The practice was rated as good for providing effective, caring, responsive and well led services and requires improvement for providing safe services. Overall the practice was rated as good. The full comprehensive reports on the 26 June 2017 inspection can be found by selecting the 'all reports' link for Angel Hill Surgery on our website at [www.cqc.org.uk](http://www.cqc.org.uk).

We undertook a desk based inspection on 8 January 2018 to check they had followed their action plan and to confirm they now met legal requirements in relation to the breaches identified in our previous inspection on 26 June 2017. This report covers our findings in relation to those requirements and also additional improvements made since our last inspection.

Overall the practice is now rated as good, and good for providing safe services.

Our key findings from this inspection were as follows:

- The practice used a local taxi company to provide a medicine delivery service to housebound patients. The practice had undertaken a risk assessment and had appropriate policies and monitoring in place.
- Medical equipment had been calibrated and the practice had a system to alert them when this needed to be completed again.
- The arrangements for the security of the dispensary ensured that medicines were kept secure and only accessible to authorised staff. The practice was based in a listed building and architect plans had been submitted to the council planning office, and a response was being awaited by the practice, in order to further improve the security of the dispensary.
- The practice had continued to explore improvements to the arrangements for the security of the dispensary to ensure medicines were kept secure and accessible only to authorised staff.
- Infection control training had been completed by all staff, including dispensary staff.
- There was an effective and embedded process for reviewing, sharing and acting upon all National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) evidence based guidance within the practice. Lead clinicians were responsible for discussing evidence

# Summary of findings

based guidance at educational meetings and we saw evidence to demonstrate this. The practice regularly audited that NICE evidence based guidance was being implemented.

The areas where the provider should make improvement are:

- Continue to explore improvements to the arrangements for the security of the dispensary to ensure medicines are kept secure and accessible only to authorised staff.

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

# Summary of findings

## Areas for improvement

### Action the service **SHOULD** take to improve

- Continue to explore improvements to the arrangements for the security of the dispensary to ensure medicines are kept secure and accessible only to authorised staff.

# Angel Hill Surgery

## Detailed findings

### Our inspection team

#### Our inspection team was led by:

This desk based inspection was completed by a CQC lead inspector.

## Background to Angel Hill Surgery

The Angel Hill surgery is situated in the centre of Bury St Edmunds, Suffolk. The practice provides services for approximately 14,100 patients. It holds a Personal Medical Services contract with NHS West Suffolk.

According to Public Health England, the patient population has a lower number of patients aged below 45 and a higher number of patients aged 60 and over in comparison to the practice average across England. It has a considerably higher proportion of patients aged 65 to 69 and females aged over 85 compared to the practice average across England. Income deprivation affecting children and older people is lower than the practice average across England and slightly lower compared with the local area.

The practice has seven GP partners working 5.5 whole time equivalent (two male and five female) and three salaried GPs (one male, two female). There are five practice nurses and two health care assistant. The practice also employs a practice manager, a deputy practice manager, an accounts clerk, a cleaner, a dispensary manager and a team of reception, administration and dispensary staff, as well as three secretarial staff.

The practice is open from Monday to Friday 8am to 6.30pm and between 8.30am and midday on Saturday. Out-of-hours care is provided by Care UK via NHS 111.

The practice is a training practice and teaches GP registrars (qualified doctors who were training to become GPs). Two of the partners are trainers. There were two GP registrars at the practice at the time of our inspection.

## Why we carried out this inspection

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection at Angel Hill Surgery on 4 October 2016. The practice was rated as good for providing caring and responsive services, requires improvement for providing effective and well led services and inadequate for providing safe services. Overall the practice was rated as requires improvement. The full comprehensive reports on the 4 October 2016 inspection can be found by selecting the 'all reports' link for Angel Hill Surgery on our website at [www.cqc.org.uk](http://www.cqc.org.uk).

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection at Angel Hill Surgery on 26 June 2017. The practice was rated as good for providing effective, caring, responsive and well led services and requires improvement for providing safe services. Overall the practice was rated as good. The full comprehensive reports on the 26 June 2017 inspection can be found by selecting the 'all reports' link for Angel Hill Surgery on our website at [www.cqc.org.uk](http://www.cqc.org.uk).

We undertook a desk based inspection of Angel Hill Surgery on 8 January 2018. This inspection was carried out to review in detail the actions taken by the practice to improve the quality of care and to confirm that the practice was now meeting legal requirements.

# Are services safe?

## Our findings

At our previous inspection on 26 June 2017, we rated the practice as requires improvement for providing safe services. The following improvements were needed:

- Ensure care and treatment is provided in a safe way to patients.
- Ensure that a risk assessment of the arrangements for the delivery of medicines by a taxi company is undertaken, to ensure that it was safe.
- Ensure the calibration of medical equipment is completed. This was due in October 2016 and had not been undertaken.

These arrangements had improved when we undertook a desk based inspection on 8 January 2018. The practice is now rated as good for providing safe services.

### **Safety systems and process**

The lead for infection control and their deputy had undertaken infection control training for all staff, which included dispensary staff.

Clinical equipment, which included the patient weighing scales, had been calibrated to ensure they worked accurately. The practice had a spreadsheet of all the equipment safety checks needed. This included, for example, the frequency of checks, the date of the last and the next test, and the person responsible for arranging testing.

### **Appropriate and safe use of medicines**

At our inspection on 4 October 2016, we identified that improved arrangements were required to ensure the

security of medicines in the dispensary and to restrict access to medicines for unauthorised staff. At our inspection on 26 June 2017, the practice manager showed us three different plans which had been drawn up by an architect and had been submitted to the St Edmundsbury Borough Council Planning and Conservations department, in order to further improve the security of the dispensary. At the time of this inspection on 8 January 2018, the practice manager confirmed that a decision was still awaited by the St Edmundsbury Borough Council Planning and Conservations department, although the Conservation Officer had advised they would support one of the plans submitted. The practice manager confirmed that the medicines were never left unattended by an authorised member of staff and a member of dispensary staff was always present in the dispensary when the practice was open.

The practice offered a transport service for medicines to be delivered to housebound patients by a local taxi company and covered any costs incurred. The practice had confirmed with the taxi company that the taxi drivers had an enhanced disclosure and barring service check. The risks associated with the transportation of medicines, which included controlled drugs and refrigerated medicines had been assessed. Standard operating procedures were in place and we saw evidence that these were followed. For example, completed records were submitted which evidenced medicines were being collected by the taxi company and signed for by patients or their representatives.