

Canterbury Oast Trust

The New Bungalow

Inspection report

Forge Hill
Aldington
Ashford
Kent
TN25 7DT

Date of inspection visit:
08 February 2017

Date of publication:
27 February 2017

Tel: 01233721222
Website: www.c-o-t.org.uk

Ratings

Overall rating for this service

Good ●

Is the service safe?

Good ●

Summary of findings

Overall summary

Care service description

The New Bungalow provides accommodation and personal care for up to six people with a learning disability and who may also have a physical disability. At the time of the inspection there were no vacancies. The service is provided in a detached bungalow. It is set well back from the road, up an incline and next to another service owned by the same provider. Car parking is available and it is in a rural location approximately 20 minutes' walk from Aldington village centre. Each person has a single bedroom and there is an assisted bathroom, shower room and two separate toilets, a kitchen/diner, lounge/diner and conservatory. There is a small decked garden with a seating area and views.

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 24 November 2015. Breaches of legal requirements was found. After the comprehensive inspection, the provider wrote to us to say what they would do to meet legal requirements in relation to the breaches 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 now met legal 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 The New Bungalow on our website at www.cqc.org.uk

Why the service is rated Good.

People told us they felt safe living here and staff helped them when they need supported.

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

Risks associated with people's care and support were assessed and staff took steps to keep people safe and healthy whilst enabling their independence as much as possible.

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

People benefited from living in an environment that was homely and had equipment to meet their needs, which was regularly serviced.

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, health appointments 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 benefited from living in an environment that was homely and well-maintained. Checks and servicing of the equipment were undertaken to keep people safe.

Risks associated with people's care and support had been assessed and steps were taken to minimise risks. People were given the medicines they needed at the right times and safely.

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

The New Bungalow

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 The New Bungalow on 8 February 2017. This inspection was carried out to check that improvements to meet legal requirements planned by the provider after our 24 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 legal requirements. 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 three people who were using the service, the registered manager and two members of staff and an agency worker.

We last inspected this service on 24 November 2015 when one breach in the regulations was identified.

Is the service safe?

Our findings

People told us they felt safe living here and staff responded when they needed support.

At the last inspection in November 2015 improvements were required to ensure people received safe care and treatment.

The provider wrote to the Commission and told us they had taken action to address the shortfalls identified during that inspection and we found during this inspection that to be the case.

People received their medicines safely and when they should. 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.

At the last inspection two risks associated with a person's care and support had not been assessed. Action had been taken to ensure all risks associated with people's care and support were assessed and steps were recorded of action staff should take in order to keep people safe and in good health.

The provider had a policy on fire safety in place. Previously not all tests had been undertaken by staff in line with this policy in order to keep people safe. Action had been taken and records showed that tests were now carried out in line with the policy mitigating risks to people. Staff knew how to safely evacuate people from the building in the event of an emergency and had taken part in fire drills.

People benefited from living in an environment and using equipment that was well maintained. People told us they were happy with their rooms and everything was in working order. People had access to equipment that met their needs. There were records to show that equipment and the premises received regular servicing, such as hoists, adjustable height beds, bathing equipment, fire equipment, the boiler and electrical wiring and electrical items. The maintenance department were available to respond quickly in the event of an emergency. Since the last inspection two bedroom floors had been upgraded and a new overhead hoist installed.

Accidents and incidents involving people were recorded. The registered manager reviewed each accident and incident report, to ensure that appropriate action had been taken following any accident or incident, to reduce the risk of further occurrences. Reports were then sent to senior management who monitored for patterns and trends.

People told us they felt safe and would speak with the registered manager or a staff member if they were unhappy. During the inspection the atmosphere was happy and relaxed. There were good interactions between staff and people. People were relaxed in the company of staff and staff were patient and people

were able to make their needs known, either verbally or by using facial expressions, noises or gestures. Staff had received training in safeguarding adults 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. The registered manager was familiar with the process to follow if any abuse was suspected in the service; and knew the local Kent and Medway safeguarding protocols and how to contact the Kent County Council's safeguarding team.

People had their needs met by sufficient numbers of staff. People told us they felt there were sufficient numbers of staff on duty. Staffing numbers were calculated based on people's chosen activities, health appointments and needs. During the inspection staff were responsive to people and were not rushed in their responses. There were usually four staff on duty 8am to 8pm and one member of staff worked a night duty and another slept on the premises. Rotas showed that staffing was planned with four staff during the day, but could drop to three dependant on visits to families and leave. There were 1.8 staff vacancies at the time of the inspection and gaps in the rota were covered by existing staff or the provider's bank staff and an outside agency. An on call system, outside of office hours, was in operation covered by senior staff and management.

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