

Little Sisters of the Poor

# St Anne's Home - London

## Inspection report

Little Sisters of the Poor, St Anne's Home  
77 Manor Road  
London  
N16 5BL

Tel: 02088262500

Date of inspection visit:  
14 February 2017

Date of publication:  
11 April 2017

## Ratings

Overall rating for this service

Good ●

Is the service safe?

Good ●

# Summary of findings

## Overall summary

We carried out an unannounced comprehensive inspection of this service on 25 July 2016 and made one recommendation relating to safe care and treatment. After the comprehensive inspection, the provider wrote to us to say what they would do to meet the requirement in relation safe care and treatment. We undertook this focused inspection on 27 February 2017 to check that they had followed up on our recommendation.

This report only covers our findings in relation to this recommendation. You can read the report from our last comprehensive inspection, by selecting the 'all reports' link for 'St Anne's Home London' on our website at [www.cqc.org.uk](http://www.cqc.org.uk).

St Anne's Home provides accommodation for 32 people who require nursing or personal care. The home is situated in the town of Stoke Newington and close to community facilities. At the time of our inspection there were 32 people living at the home.

Accommodation was provided over three floors and offered comfortable and spacious facilities. There were a number of independent flats attached to the home including separate living quarters for the Sisters. The aim of the provider is to offer the highest quality of care and security for older people, taking into account the particular conditions associated with the ageing process.

The service had a registered manager. A registered manager is a person who has 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.

People in the home told us they felt safe. Staff followed environmental risk management plans and further training had taken place. Improvements had been made to the environment to mitigate identified risks and people had been informed of these changes.

## 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 ●

We found that action had been taken to improve safety. Environmental risk assessments were now being followed by staff.

Safety precautions had been put in place to mitigate risks to people's safety. People and their relatives had been informed about these changes.

The provider had taken steps to address the recommendation made following the last inspection and therefore we have improved the rating for this question from requires improvement to good.

# St Anne's Home - London

## **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 was planned to check whether the provider is meeting the legal requirements and regulations associated with the Health and Social Care Act 2008.

We undertook a focused inspection of St Anne's Home on 14 February 2017. This inspection was completed to ensure steps to address a recommendation planned by the provider after our comprehensive inspection on 25 July 2016 had been made. We inspected the service against one of the five questions we ask about services: is the service safe? This was because a recommendation had been made in relation to people's safety at the last inspection. One inspector carried out the inspection.

Before the inspection, we looked at the information we held about the service. This included notifications of significant incidents reported to the Care Quality Commission (CQC) and the last inspection report of 25 July 2016.

During our inspection, we spoke with three people who used the service, one relative, a visitor, one care worker and the assistant manager. We reviewed the environmental risk assessment, the staff training records and observed people receiving care.

# Is the service safe?

## Our findings

At our last comprehensive inspection on 25 July 2016, we found that people may have been at risk of avoidable harm as staff did not always follow written guidance in risk assessments about how to manage potential risks in the environment. During this inspection, we found that the provider had acted on our recommendation to address this.

At our previous inspection, we found that the balcony door on the first floor of the building was left open at the beginning of the inspection and at the end of the inspection, which meant that staff were not following the provider's risk management plan in relation to access to the balcony to mitigate risks to people's safety. At this inspection, we found that measures had been put in place to ensure these risks were managed.

We checked the door to the first floor that led to the outside balcony and found that a keypad had been placed on the door and a sensor mat was in place to alert staff when the door was opened or closed. Only staff had access to the key code and the assistant manager told us people had to seek permission to use this area and would be supervised by staff during this time. Staff confirmed they were aware of these changes, had read the risk assessment and we saw records to show a new programme of training had been scheduled. The assistant manager explained that no one in the home was at risk of falls presently, but as a safety precaution they had ordered additional sensor mats in the event of any changes to people's needs. People also had access to the garden area and there were no restrictions in relation to accessing this area of the home.

People using the service and visitors to the service had been informed of these changes and we saw that a notice had been displayed within the entrance of the building that read, 'Following the CQC inspection and in response to this we have installed a door close and keypad so that access is better controlled'. Furthermore, health professionals had been updated about the safety measures put in place by the management team in relation to access to this area. A relative told us, "The care has been consistent since [my family member] came here, nothing is too much trouble, they get [my family member] up to exercise here. They are very well cared for, the staff are dedicated, genuine and quite special. The assisted living is very well thought out and it does seem to work. I just appreciate the work they do, people are very safe here."

During our inspection of the first floor of the home, we observed 10 people engaged in a choir session that was led by two volunteers who were playing musical instruments. The assistant manager told us people attended the sessions weekly and that the participants took delight in this. We asked people about their safety in the home and they said, "The care cannot be better. I only have to ring the bell and they come, I chose to come here and it has been the best place for me. Oh goodness yes I feel safe, I don't have to lock up anymore, no more keys to take care of or anything like that, I am going on a two week holiday soon to my favourite place" and "Totally safe that is why I came, they welcomed me with grace and kindness. I became unsteady on my feet. On the whole, I read a lot and they produced different programmes for me on my iPad. The nurse and staff treat me kindly and are always aware of my safety."

The provider showed us their new satisfaction surveys for visiting practitioners to complete, that took into account their observations of how people received their care, if their privacy and dignity was upheld, the cleanliness of the home and the accessibility of the services and providers information.

We have improved the rating for this key question from requires improvement to good because we found that concerns had been addressed by the provider. They had put the appropriate measures in place to address concerns and improvements had been sustained.