

Primrose House Care Home Limited

Primrose House Nursing Home

Inspection report

765-767 Kenton Lane
Harrow
Middlesex
HA3 6AH

Tel: 02089544442
Website: www.ruislipcarehomes.co.uk

Date of inspection visit:
26 January 2017

Date of publication:
22 February 2017

Ratings

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

Summary of findings

Overall summary

We undertook this unannounced inspection on 26 January 2017. Primrose House Nursing Home is a care home registered to provide accommodation and nursing care for a maximum of 25 older people some of whom may have dementia. The home may also admit people with a physical disability. At this inspection there were 25 people living in the home.

At our last comprehensive inspection on 28 April and 1 May 2015 we found one breach of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014. This was because the service did not have suitable arrangements in place for meeting the requirements of the Mental Capacity Act 2005 (MCA) and Deprivation of Liberty Safeguard (DoLS) regarding restrictions placed on people.

After the comprehensive inspection, the registered provider sent us an action plan telling us how they would meet legal requirements. We undertook this focused inspection on 26 January 2017 to check they had followed their plan and to confirm they now met legal requirements in relation to the MCA and DoLS.

This report only covers our findings in relation to the MCA and DoLS. You can read the report from our last comprehensive inspection, by selecting the 'all reports' link for 'Primrose House Nursing Home' on our website at www.cqc.org.uk.

At this focused inspection, we found that the provider had taken action to comply with The MCA and DoLS. This included ensuring that the home had the appropriate guidance, assessments and other care documentation. Options that were less restrictive were explored before bedrails were used. The necessary consultations with professionals had been undertaken before applications were made to restrict people's liberty.

Care workers and senior staff had been provided with appropriate training. Documented evidence of this was seen by us. When interviewed, they were knowledgeable regarding The MCA and DoLS.

People who used the service informed us that they were satisfied with the care provided. We observed that they appeared well cared for.

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.

Primrose House Nursing Home

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.

The inspection took place on 26 January 2017 and was unannounced. One inspector carried out this inspection. At the time of this inspection there were 25 people living in the home.

Before our inspection, we reviewed information we held about the service. This included any notifications and reports provided by the service or the local authority.

We spoke with three people who used the service. We also spoke with the registered manager, the nominated individual, an administration staff, a nurse and a care worker. We reviewed a range of records related to The MCA and DoLS. These included five care records of people who used the service, staff training record, The MCA and DoLS policies and procedures.



Our findings

At the previous inspection on 28 April and 1 May 2015 we found one breach of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014. This was because the service did not have suitable arrangements in place for meeting the requirements of the Mental Capacity Act 2005 (MCA) and Deprivation of Liberty Safeguard (DoLS) regarding restrictions placed on people. This was a breach of Regulation 11.

At this inspection we checked whether the service was working within the principles of The Mental Capacity Act 2005 (MCA). The 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. The registered manager informed us that most people were not able to make their wishes known and they had relatives or representatives who advocated for them. The registered manager and her staff were aware of the need for best interest decisions to be made and recorded when necessary. Nursing and care staff were knowledgeable about the importance of obtaining people's consent regarding their care, support and treatment.

We also looked at the Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoLS) which aims to make sure people are looked after in a way that does not inappropriately restrict their freedom. Applications had been made for people assessed by the registered manager as needing authorisation. We saw details of DoLS authorisations and reviews carried out for people. Nursing and care staff had received the relevant MCA and DoLS training and we confirmed this from records we saw. They were knowledgeable regarding The MCA and DoLS.

Care records of people contained appropriate MCA assessments. We examined three records of people who needed to use bedrails to ensure their safety in bed. Where people were unable to consent, there was evidence that the appropriate professionals and next of kin or representatives had been consulted and consent given. There was evidence that options that were less restrictive were explored before bedrails were used. The necessary consultations with professionals had been undertaken before applications were made to restrict people's liberty.

People who used the service informed us that they were satisfied with the care provided. We observed that they appeared well cared for.