

Total Care Homes Limited

# Phoenix House Care Home

## Inspection report

54 Andrews Lane  
Formby  
Liverpool  
Merseyside  
L37 2EW

Tel: 01704831866

Date of inspection visit:  
22 September 2016

Date of publication:  
19 October 2016

## Ratings

Overall rating for this service

Requires Improvement ●

Is the service safe?

**Requires Improvement** ●

Is the service well-led?

**Requires Improvement** ●

# Summary of findings

## Overall summary

Phoenix House provides residential care for up to 30 people. Accommodation is provided over three floors, with a dining room, lounge and bedrooms on the ground floor. A passenger lift and ramps allow access to all parts of the home and the large enclosed garden.

This was an unannounced inspection. The service was last inspected in February 2016 and at that time was found in breach of two regulations: Regulation 15 and 17 of the Health and Social care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014. These were in relation to the safe management of the premises and equipment at the home and the governance arrangements in the home [how the home was being managed]. We served a warning notice regarding premises and equipment.

This inspection was 'focussed' in that we only looked at the two breaches of regulations to see if the home had improved and the breaches were now met. This report only covers our findings in relation to these specific areas / breaches of regulations. They cover only two of the domains we normally inspect; whether the service is 'Safe' and 'Well led'. The domains 'Effective' 'Caring' and 'Responsive' were not assessed at this inspection.

You can read the report from our last comprehensive inspection, by selecting the 'all reports' link for 'Phoenix House' on our website at [www.cqc.org.uk](http://www.cqc.org.uk).

On this inspection we found improvements had been made and the home had taken action to address the issues identified with regards to the environment. Quality assurance systems in place to monitor and improve standards in the home had also been improved. Both breaches of regulation were now met.

There was a registered manager in post. 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.

We spent time looking around the home to check if the areas identified in our last report had been improved. We saw there were systems in place to monitor the environment and any repairs and maintenance was completed.

The provider was able to evidence a series of quality assurance processes and audits carried out internally by staff, the maintenance person, and the registered manager. We found these had been developed to meet the needs of the service.

While improvements had been made we have not revised the overall quality rating for the home. To improve the rating to 'Good' would require a longer term track record of consistent good practice. We will review the quality rating at the next comprehensive inspection.

## 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 service was safe.

The provider had taken action and addressed all of the maintenance and environmental issues identified in the last inspection. We checked this during this inspection.

While improvements had been made we have not revised the rating for this key question. To improve the rating to 'Good' would require a longer term track record of consistent good practice. We will review our rating for 'safe' at the next comprehensive inspection.

**Requires Improvement** ●

### Is the service well-led?

The service was well-led.

The systems for auditing and checking the environment had changed and were now more robust incorporating staff checks, checks by the maintenance person and the registered manager.

While improvements had been made we have not revised the rating for this key question. To improve the rating to 'Good' would require a longer term track record of consistent good practice. We will review our rating for 'safe' at the next comprehensive inspection.

**Requires Improvement** ●

# Phoenix House Care 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.

This was an unannounced inspection which took place on 22 September 2016. The inspection was undertaken by an adult social care inspector.

We spoke with the provider and a staff member at the home. We looked around the home, including the hallways, stairs lounge areas, bathrooms and some people's bedrooms. We checked the quality assurance and auditing systems.

## Is the service safe?

### Our findings

During our last inspection in February 2016, we identified a number of environmental issues, which compromised the health and well-being of the people living at the home. We found the provider was in breach of regulation relating to this and issued them a warning notice. We found during this inspection that the provider had taken action and addressed a number of health and safety issues in the home and had taken steps to ensure future maintenance issues were not overlooked. The provider was no longer in breach of regulations in relation to this and the requirements of the warning notice had been met.

During our last inspection, we saw that there was an open sluice room door on one floor, a rusty handrail in one room, and some fire extinguishers were not adequately fixed to the wall. We were also concerned as a fire door had been damaged. A light was broken in one person's bedroom making it difficult for them if they needed to use the toilet in the night. These jobs were reported to maintenance person by staff, however when we spoke to the maintenance man they only knew of one job. This raised the concern that there was no way for staff to document what repairs needed addressing.

The provider had made changes since our last inspection. For example, a new maintenance person had been employed who spent time every day checking the building for any repairs or damage. In addition, a staff communication 'snag' book had been implemented where staff wrote down any repairs or maintenance jobs they noticed, including where about in the home they were. We saw that the maintenance person signed when the jobs were completed and the registered manager was checking this process.

We checked these areas during this inspection and saw that new locks had been fitted on the sluice room doors and all of the fire-fighting equipment had been serviced. In addition, the handrail had been fixed, light bulbs replaced and the fire door had been repaired. Most areas had been re-painted in the home.

## Is the service well-led?

### Our findings

At our previous visit in February 2016 we had some concerns about the checking and auditing systems in the home as they had failed to effectively monitor key aspects of the running of the home such as identifying when repairs and maintenance were needed. We found the provider in breach of the associated regulation.

On this inspection we checked to make sure improvements had been carried out. We found improvements had been made and the general running of the home was more organised. Auditing systems had been developed to monitor safe standards, including when repairs and maintenance needed to be carried out.

The provider spent time showing us some of the changes to the quality assurance systems they had made and how they were more effective. We saw that the provider had employed a new maintenance person who had to sign to take accountability for the jobs they were completing. In addition, we also saw the implementation of a new audit tool which had extra columns entitled 'tour of the building' and 'cleaning check.'

We saw that a 'snag' book had been implemented for staff to communicate any damage or repairs they noticed throughout their shift, this was then signed when the job had been completed. We were able to see this was being used often for its intended purpose. The provider was no longer in breach of this regulation.