

Mr & Mrs T F Chon

Elmhurst Residential Home

Inspection report

7 Queens Road
Enfield
Middlesex
EN1 1NE

Tel: 02083663346

Date of inspection visit:
07 November 2016

Date of publication:
09 December 2016

Ratings

Overall rating for this service

Requires Improvement ●

Is the service safe?

Requires Improvement ●

Summary of findings

Overall summary

We carried out an unannounced comprehensive inspection of this home on 28 June 2016 and found breaches of regulations relating to consent, staffing, person centred care, supervision, training and displaying CQC performance rating. In addition, the provider was not providing care in a safe way as they were not doing all that was reasonably practicable to ensure that people would be safe in the event of an emergency evacuation. Following the inspection we imposed urgent conditions on the provider requiring them to comply with the regulations for safe care and treatment to ensure people were protected in the event of an emergency evacuation.

We undertook this unannounced focused inspection on 7 November 2016 to check that the provider had complied with the conditions. At this inspection, we looked at aspects of the key question 'Is the service safe?' This report only covers our findings in relation to the focused inspection. You can read the report from our last comprehensive inspection, by selecting the 'all reports' link for 'Elmhurst Residential Home' on our website at www.cqc.org.uk.

Elmhurst Residential Home provides accommodation and support with personal care for up to 14 people. At the time of our visit, 10 people lived there who needed support with personal care.

The home did not have a registered manager. There was an acting manager in place. A registered manager is a person who has registered with the Care Quality Commission (CQC) 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. The provider told us that a manager had been recruited and will commence employment once pre-employment checks have been completed.

During our focused inspection we found the provider had made improvements with fire safety. Risk assessment and personal evacuation emergency plans (PEEPs) had been completed. Staff had been trained on fire safety and knew what to do in the event of an emergency evacuation. Fire safety audits and fire risk assessments were being completed to ensure the risk of fire was minimised and follow up action was recorded. Fire safety equipment had been installed and staff were aware on how to use the equipment. A risk assessment had been completed for a person that may exhibit behaviour that may be a fire risk.

The home had complied with the urgent conditions we had imposed. Although improvements had been made, we have not changed the service's rating from 'Requires Improvement' as there were other issues within this key question that we identified at the last comprehensive inspection that need to be addressed.

The five questions we ask about services and what we found

We always ask the following five questions of services.

Is the service safe?

The provider had made improvements to ensure people were safe in the event of an emergency evacuation.

Personal evacuation emergency plans had been completed in full.

Fire safety equipment had been installed and staff had received training in fire safety. Staff knew how to use the fire safety equipment and knew what to do in the event of an emergency evacuation.

We have not changed the services' rating from 'Requires Improvement' as there were other issues within this key question that we identified at the last comprehensive inspection that need to be addressed.

Requires Improvement ●

Elmhurst Residential 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 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.

This unannounced focused inspection was undertaken by a CQC inspector on 7 November 2016. This inspection was arranged to check that improvements to meet legal requirements planned by the provider after our comprehensive inspection on 28 June 2016 had been made with emergency evacuations.

We inspected the service against one of the five questions we ask about services: Is the service safe?

During our inspection we looked at records relating to the personal emergency evacuation plans for 10 people. We also looked at fire safety training records and fire safety risk assessments and audits. We spoke with the provider, acting manager, two senior carers and two carers.

Is the service safe?

Our findings

At our last inspection on 28 June 2016, we found that three people who used wheelchairs were living on the upper floor and Personal Emergency Evacuation Plans (PEEPs) had not been completed in full detailing what to do in the event of a fire. Evacuation equipment had not been installed to safely remove people and most staff had not been trained in fire safety. We found one person's admission form identified a fire risk due to this person smoking. The manager told us that this person had stopped smoking. The person's care plan did not reflect this and a risk assessment had not been completed to ensure that the risk of fire was mitigated should the person start to smoke. The manager and staff were not able to tell us how to evacuate people in the event of an emergency.

After the inspection we imposed urgent conditions against the provider to ensure training was delivered to staff in fire safety, risk assessments and PEEPs were completed in full and suitable fire safety equipment were installed. We also notified London Fire Brigade, who also carried out an inspection and issued the home with an enforcement notice following their findings. Afterwards, London Fire Brigade informed us they carried out a re-inspection and following improvements made the enforcement notice had been lifted.

During this inspection we found improvements have been made to ensure people were protected in the event of an emergency. PEEPs had been completed in full and listed what staff should do in the event of an emergency. We saw that PEEPs had been completed for four people living on the upper floors who used wheelchairs. The PEEPs listed how these people should be evacuated. When we spoke to staff they were able to tell us how to evacuate these people safely.

There were fire doors installed, which can withhold fire for up to 30 minutes when closed. If the doors were kept open it was held by a magnetic latch, we were informed that the door will close automatically if the fire alarm went off. Four fire evacuation slide mats had been installed on the upper floors, which was near the stairs. There were instructions on how to use the mats displayed next to them. Training had been provided on how to use the mats effectively. Staff were confident on how to use the mats and a staff demonstrated to us how to operate the mat. One staff member told us, "We used the sledge [fire mat], it was very easy." There were clear signs around the home on where the fire exit was. Fire extinguishers were placed around the home and had been refilled recently.

There was a fire safety policy that listed how to evacuate people in the event of an emergency. The policy had been reviewed recently. Staff had received training in fire safety and records confirmed this. Staff were able to tell us confidently how to evacuate people, extinguish small fires and minimise the risk of fires. Comments from staff about the fire safety training included, "It [training] was very good, very beneficial", "We put out real fire", "We learnt to put out fire", "[Trainer] showed us different things" and "It was very informative and useful."

A risk assessment had been completed for a person that may be a fire risk due to smoking. Staff told us the person had stopped smoking. The risk assessment detailed that the person's room should be checked regularly for cigarettes and the person was to be supervised. Records showed that this was being done

regularly.

There was a floor plan of the home for each floor, which included areas that may be high, medium and low risk of fire. Weekly fire tests and quarterly evacuation drills were carried out. Fire risk assessments and fire safety audits regarding the safety and security of the premises were completed with follow up actions to minimise the risk of fire.