

# Canterbury Oast Trust

# Farm House

## Inspection report

Highlands Farm  
Woodchurch  
Ashford  
Kent  
TN26 3RJ

Tel: 01233861514  
Website: [www.c-o-t.org.uk](http://www.c-o-t.org.uk)

Date of inspection visit:  
06 February 2017

Date of publication:  
20 March 2017

## Ratings

Overall rating for this service	Good ●
Is the service safe?	Good ●

# Summary of findings

## Overall summary

### Care service description

Farm House provides accommodation and personal care for up to five people with a learning disability. At the time of the inspection there were five people living at the service and no vacancies. The service is provided in a detached old farm house and is not suitable for people with poor mobility. It is set in a rural area on the outskirts of Woodchurch village on Highlands Farm, which is a tourist attraction and where the provider has other registered services located. Each person has a single room and there is a communal bathroom, separate shower room, toilet, kitchen/diner, laundry, snug and lounge. There is an enclosed garden and paved seating area.

### Rating at last inspection

At the last inspection, the service was rated Good and Requires Improvement in the 'Safe' domain.

### Why we inspected

We carried out an unannounced comprehensive inspection of this service on 19 November 2015. A breach of legal requirements was found in relation to medicine management. After the comprehensive inspection, the provider wrote to us to say what they would do to meet legal requirements in relation to the breach of Regulation 12 of the Health and Social Care Act Regulated Activities Regulations 2014, Safe care and treatment. We undertook this focused inspection to check that they had followed their plan and to confirm that they have now met legal the requirements. This report only covers our findings in relation to those requirements. You can read the report from our last comprehensive inspection, by selecting the 'all reports' link for Farm House on our website at [www.cqc.org.uk](http://www.cqc.org.uk)

At this inspection we found the service remained Good overall and is now rated Good in the Safe domain.

Why the service is rated Good.

People told us they felt safe living at Farm House and staff helped them when they needed support. A relative told us "This place is good".

People received their medicines safely and when they should. There were systems in place to ensure medicines were stored correctly and safely.

Risks were assessed and staff took steps to keep people safe whilst enabling their independence.

Staff knew how to recognise and respond to abuse. They had received training on how to keep people safe.

People lived in a homely environment, which was well-maintained. Regular checks were made on the premises and equipment to ensure it was safe.

Accidents and incidents were recorded and appropriate action taken to reduce the risk of further occurrences.

People were protected by safe recruitment procedures. People had their needs met by sufficient numbers of staff and staff rotas were based on people's needs and activities.

## The five questions we ask about services and what we found

We always ask the following five questions of services.

### Is the service safe?

Good ●

The service was safe.

People were supported to manage their medicines safely and others were managed safely by staff.

Risks associated with people's care and support had been assessed and steps were taken to keep people safe whilst enabling their independence.

People were protected by safe recruitment procedures and there were sufficient numbers of staff on duty to meet people's support needs.

# Farm House

## Detailed findings

### Background to this inspection

We carried out this inspection under Section 60 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 as part of our regulatory functions. This inspection checked whether the provider is 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.

We undertook an unannounced focused inspection of Farm House on 6 February 2017. This inspection was carried out to check that improvements to meet legal requirements planned by the provider after our 15 November 2015 inspection had been made. We inspected the service against one of the five questions we ask about services: is the service Safe? This is because the service was previously not meeting a legal requirement. This inspection was carried out by one inspector.

The provider did not complete a Provider Information Return (PIR), because we carried out this inspection before another PIR was required. This is a form that asks the provider to give some key information about the service, what the service does well and improvements they plan to make. Prior to the inspection we reviewed other information we held about the service, we looked at the previous inspection report and any notifications received by the Care Quality Commission. A notification is information about important events, which the provider is required to tell us about by law.

During the inspection we reviewed people's records and a variety of documents. These included three people's risk assessments, medicine records, two staff recruitment files, staff rotas and training records, accident and incident reports and servicing and maintenance records.

We spoke with two people who were using the service, a relative, the registered manager and four members of staff.

We last inspected this service on 15 November 2015 when one breach in the regulations was identified.

# Is the service safe?

## Our findings

People told us they felt safe living at Farm House. A relative told us this was a good service.

At the last inspection in November 2015 most medicines were stored safely. However there were controlled drugs held within the service, which were not stored in line with legislation (Misuse of Drugs (Safe Custody) Regulations).

The provider wrote to the Commission and told us that a controlled drugs cupboard had been purchased and installed the following week to ensure all medicines were stored correctly. During this inspection medicines were stored correctly and safely.

People received their medicines safely and when they should. There were very few medicines prescribed to people. Some people handled their own medicines and staff would check to ensure they had taken them; other people's medicines were managed by staff. Risk assessments were in place where people handled their own medicines. There was a clear medicines policy in place. Staff had received training in medicine administration. Medicines were checked by staff on arrival to ensure sufficient quantities. Where medicines were prescribed 'as required' or 'as directed' there was guidance in place to ensure staff handled these consistently and safely. There was a safe procedure in place for medicines to accompany people on visits to families and to return medicines safely to the pharmacist if they were no longer required.

People told us they felt safe and would speak with a staff member if they were unhappy. Staff were patient and there were good interactions between staff and people often with good humour, and people were relaxed in the company of staff. Staff had received training in safeguarding adults; they were able to describe different types of abuse and knew the procedures in place to report any suspicions of abuse or allegations. There was a clear safeguarding and whistle blowing policy in place, which staff knew how to locate.

Risks associated with people's care and support had been assessed and procedures were in place to keep people safe. These enabled people to be as independent as possible. For example, managing and handling finances, being left unsupervised within the service, self-administration of medicines and accessing the community with support or independently.

There were very few accidents and incidents involving people. The registered manager reviewed any accident and incident reports to ensure that appropriate action had been taken following the event to reduce the risk of further occurrences. Reports were then discussed at team meetings and sent to senior management who monitored for patterns and trends.

Staff knew how to safely evacuate people from the building in the event of an emergency and people had taken part in fire drills. An on call system, outside of office hours, was in operation covered by senior staff and management. Staff told us they felt confident to contact the person on call. The maintenance department were available to respond quickly in the event of an emergency.

People benefited from living in an environment and using equipment that was well maintained. There were records to show that equipment and the premises received regular checks and servicing, such as checks of fire alarms, fire equipment, the boiler and electrical wiring and electrical items. People told us they were happy with their rooms and everything was in working order. Repairs and maintenance were dealt with by the Estates department and people told us when there was a problem things were fixed fairly quickly.

People were protected by robust recruitment procedures. We looked at two staff recruitment files. Recruitment records included the required pre-employment checks to make sure staff were suitable and of good character.

People had their needs met by sufficient numbers of staff. People felt there were enough staff on duty. People told us that staff responded when they needed them and we saw this to be the case during the inspection. Staff were not rushed in their responses when responding to people's needs. There was a staffing rota, which was based around people's needs, activities and health appointments. There was a minimum of one member of staff on duty during the day although this may rise to two and one member of staff slept on the premises at night. The staff were supported by the registered manager who worked on shift as well as spending time in the office. At the time of the inspection there were no staff vacancies and the service used existing staff or the provider's bank staff to fill any gaps in the rota.