

Mr & Mrs N Kritikos

Clarendon House Residential Dementia Care Home

Inspection report

27 Clarendon Gardens
Wembley
Middlesex
HA9 7QW

Tel: 02087951141

Date of inspection visit:
04 February 2016

Date of publication:
04 March 2016

Ratings

Overall rating for this service

Good ●

Is the service effective?

Good ●

Summary of findings

Overall summary

We carried out an unannounced comprehensive inspection of this service on 15 October 2015. A breach of Regulation 13 HSCA 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014 Safeguarding services users from abuse and improper treatment was found. We found that that applications to deprive people from the liberty had not been made and care workers did not receive training on the Mental Capacity Act (MCA) 2005 and Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoLS). After the comprehensive inspection, the provider wrote to us on 15 December 2015 to say what they would do to meet legal requirements in relation to the breaches.

We undertook this focused inspection on 4 February 2016 to check the provider 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 Clarendon House Residential Dementia Care Home on our website at www.cqc.org.uk.

Clarendon House Residential Dementia Care Home is a care home that provides personal care and accommodation for up to six older people who have dementia care needs. On the day of the inspection there were six people residing at the home.

During our focused inspection on 4 February 2016 we found that the provider had taken the necessary steps to ensure that people were not deprived of their liberty and care worker received the appropriate training in MCA 2005 and DoLS.

The five questions we ask about services and what we found

We always ask the following five questions of services.

Is the service effective?

Good ●

The service was effective. We found that action had been taken to apply for deprivation of liberty safeguards for people with the supervisory body and training in DoLS and MCA was provided for care workers. Staff understood the principles of the MCA and told us they would always presume a person could make their own decisions about their care and treatment.

Clarendon House Residential Dementia Care Home

Detailed findings

Background to this inspection

We carried out this focused 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, 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 Clarendon House Residential Dementia Care Home on 4 February 2016. This inspection was done to check that improvements to meet legal requirements planned by the provider after our comprehensive inspection on 15 October 2015 had been made. We inspected the service against one of the five questions we ask about services: is the service effective?

The inspection was undertaken by one inspector. During our inspection we spoke with two care workers and the registered manager. We viewed training records for all care workers and care records in regards to DoLS for all people who used the service.

Is the service effective?

Our findings

During our comprehensive inspection on 15 October 2015 we found that the provider did not provide appropriate training for care workers in DoLS and MCA 2005 and did not arrange for capacity assessments and DoLS application for people who used the service. This meant that people who used the service were unlawfully deprived of their liberty. This was a breach of Regulation 13 HSCA 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014 Safeguarding service users from abuse and improper treatment.

The Mental Capacity Act 2005 (MCA) provides a legal framework for making particular decisions on behalf of people who may lack the mental capacity to do so for themselves. The Act requires that as far as possible people make their own decisions and are helped to do so when needed. When they lack mental capacity to take particular decisions, any made on their behalf must be in their best interests and as least restrictive as possible. People can only be deprived of their liberty to receive care and treatment when this is in their best interests and legally authorised under the MCA. The application procedures for this in care homes are called the Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoLS).

During our focused inspection on 4 February 2016 we found that the provider had sent appropriate DoLS applications to the local authority. So far one of the people who used the service had a standard DoLS in place and all other people were assessed by a psychiatrist and social worker to establish if their liberty was deprived. The provider was currently awaiting the outcome from these assessments.

Staff spoken with told us that they had received DoLS and MCA 2005 training in January 2016. We viewed training records for all staff employed including the registered manager, which confirmed this. Staff understood the principles of the MCA and told us they would always presume a person could make their own decisions about their care and treatment. They told us that if the person could not make certain decisions then they would have to think about what was in that person's "best interests" which would involve asking people close to the person as well as other professionals. Staff understood that people's capacity to make some decisions fluctuated depending on how they were feeling. We saw records that these "best interest" meetings had taken place when needed.

We observed staff asking people for permission before carrying out any required tasks for them. We noted staff waited for the person's consent before they went ahead. People told us that the staff did not do anything they didn't want them to do. This meant that the provider had taken appropriate actions to not deprive people of their liberty.