

G Gibbs

# The Paddocks

## Inspection report

Church Road  
Weybread  
Diss  
Norfolk  
IP21 5TR

Tel: 01379852415

Date of inspection visit:  
21 November 2018

Date of publication:  
07 February 2019

### Ratings

Overall rating for this service

Good ●

Is the service safe?

Good ●

Is the service effective?

Good ●

Is the service caring?

Good ●

Is the service responsive?

Good ●

Is the service well-led?

Requires Improvement ●

# Summary of findings

## Overall summary

The Paddocks is a care home. People in care homes receive accommodation and nursing or personal care as a single package under one contractual agreement. CQC regulates both the premises and the care provided, and both were looked at during this inspection. The Paddocks accommodates up to eight people. At the time of our inspection there were seven people living at the service. The Paddocks is a large detached two storey house in the rural village of Weybread, on the periphery of the town of Harleston in Suffolk. This unannounced comprehensive inspection took place on 21 November 2018.

At our last inspection we rated the service Good overall and in each of the five questions that we ask. At this inspection we found the evidence continued to support the overall rating of Good. There was no other evidence or information from our inspection and ongoing monitoring that demonstrated serious risks or concerns. However further improvements were needed within the key question of Effective. Staff did not all have the necessary up to date training to ensure people received effective care from staff who were suitably trained. Improvements were needed to ensure compliance with the Mental Capacity Act. For one person, continuous supervision and control, combined with lack of freedom to leave, indicated a deprivation of liberty, and the provider had not applied for this to be authorised under Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards.

At our last inspection we rated the service good. At this inspection we found the evidence continued to support the rating of good and there was no evidence or information from our inspection and ongoing monitoring that demonstrated serious risks or concerns. This inspection report is written in a shorter format because our overall rating of the service has not changed since our last inspection.

The care service had not originally been developed and designed in line with the values that underpin the Registering the Right Support and other best practice guidance. These values include choice, promotion of independence and inclusion. However, despite not being developed in line with these values, people's participation within the local community was encouraged and enabled.

The Paddocks is a service owned and operated by Mr Gibbs who is the provider of the service and also the registered manager. The people using the service are either the adopted siblings of the provider or they were looked after as children and have grown up with him at the home since they were children when the service was run by their parents. The registered manager is referred to as the provider throughout our report.

Improvements were needed to the providers oversight of the service. The fire risk assessment in place was insufficient had had not identified fire safety arrangements at the service were not safe. The providers systems had also failed to identify that some staff training was out of date.

The service is a large family home and the provider and his wife also live on site in a separate flat. In addition, a small group of staff are employed by the service. People and the provider referred to one another as 'family' and 'brothers and sisters' and as is common place with some families, were very familiar with one another and openly discussed one another's circumstances. People we spoke with told us they felt safe

living at the service. Medicines procedures were in place for staff to follow and medicines were ordered, stored and administered safely.

There were sufficient staff employed to meet people's needs; keep them safe and provide them with person centred support. Appropriate recruitment procedures were in place to ensure only suitable staff were employed. Staff were aware of their roles and responsibilities and told us they were well supported.

The service had a complaints procedure. People were happy living at the service and had made no complaints.

## The five questions we ask about services and what we found

We always ask the following five questions of services.

<p><b>Is the service safe?</b></p> <p>The service remains Good</p>	<p><b>Good</b> ●</p>
<p><b>Is the service effective?</b></p> <p>The service remains Good</p>	<p><b>Good</b> ●</p>
<p><b>Is the service caring?</b></p> <p>The service remains Good</p>	<p><b>Good</b> ●</p>
<p><b>Is the service responsive?</b></p> <p>The service remains Good</p>	<p><b>Good</b> ●</p>
<p><b>Is the service well-led?</b></p> <p>The was not always well-led</p> <p>The provider had failed to identify the concerns in relation to fire safety at the service.</p> <p>The providers oversight of the service had failed to identify that some staff did not have up to date training.</p> <p>People and staff told us they felt supported by the provider.</p>	<p><b>Requires Improvement</b> ●</p>

# The Paddocks

## 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 was 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 comprehensive inspection took place on 21 November 2018 and was unannounced. The inspection team consisted of one inspector. Before the inspection, we requested that the provider complete a Provider Information Return (PIR). This is a form that asks the provider to give some key information about the service, what the service does well and improvements they plan to make. This was received from the provider.

We also reviewed information that we held about the service. Providers are required to notify the Care Quality Commission about events and incidents that occur including unexpected deaths, injuries to people receiving care and safeguarding matters. Before the inspection we reviewed information that we held about the service such as notifications, which are events which happened in the service that the provider is required to tell us about, and information that had been sent to us by other agencies. We also contacted commissioners (who fund the care for some people) of the service and asked them for their views.

We looked at the care records of two people in detail to check they were receiving their care and support as planned. We also looked at records including staff recruitment files, training records, meeting minutes and management records.

We spoke with five people who lived at the service and also observed the family members and staff interacting with them. We spoke with the gardener, the cook as well as the providers wife and the provider. We left our contact details in order that any other staff could contact us and provide feedback and two further care staff got in touch to share their experiences.

# Is the service safe?

## Our findings

At our last inspection in May 2016 we rated this key question 'Good'. At this inspection we found the provider had sustained this rating.

People who could communicate verbally with us said they felt safe living at The Paddocks. One person said, "Yes I feel safe here, I can talk to [provider] or one of the staff if I am worried."

Some staff we spoke with demonstrated an understanding of the types of abuse and harm people could be at risk of and the action they would need to take to address this. We did also speak to some staff who were not clear on what safeguarding was and the process they would need to follow if concerned about a person. Not all staff had up to date safeguarding training with some staff not completing this training for several years. Following our visit, the provider informed us he had arranged for six staff to complete safeguarding training using the providers online training system.

Risk assessments and care plans continued to be in place and were reviewed as people's needs changed.

There were sufficient numbers of safely recruited staff to support people. The provider and his wife lived on site and told us they were always available if needed to support people. As well as people's family members some external non-family members were employed. A number of carers undertook some care hours and they were supported by a cook and a gardener, both of whom also directly supported people with undertaking some activities.

People's medicines were managed safely. The systems in place for the management of medicines were in line with safe practice. People at the home were not able to administer their own medicines and all medicines were looked after and administered by staff at the prescribed times. Staff completed medicine administration records (MARs) to record when people's medicine had been administered.

The service managed the control and prevention of infection well. One person took a key role in the cleaning of the home with assistance from staff in some areas. The house was clean and staff had access to personal protective equipment such as disposable gloves.

Health and safety checks of the environment and systems were in place. These covered electrical testing and water temperature checks. A recent visit and inspection from the fire service had identified a number of works required to bring the building up to the required legislation. The provider had commenced the work and had plans in place to complete the rest prior to the fire service re inspecting. We will follow up with the provider to check when these works are complete.

# Is the service effective?

## Our findings

At our last inspection in May 2016 we rated this key question 'Good'. At this inspection we have rated this key question 'Requires Improvement'. The provider had not ensured the staff had the training they needed to carry out their job role effectively and work was needed to ensure compliance with the Mental Capacity Act.

Staff received training via an online system, however not all staff had up to date training. This meant that people were supported by some staff that may not have had the knowledge needed to be able to fulfil their role. We found a number of staff had no up to date safeguarding training. There were also other staff who needed to undertake first aid training and medicines training. After our discussion the provider took action to address this following our visit and ensured all staff were undertaking the training.

Staff were a mixture of family members and external non- family members. The workforce was close knit and familiar with one another due to the lengths of service they had. Staff felt supported in their work roles and able to discuss any work related issues with the provider. One member of staff told us, "[Provider] is very supportive to the staff with regular staff meetings and training and I feel supported and valued in my role."

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 so that they can receive care and treatment when this is in their best interests and legally authorised under the MCA. The authorisation procedures for this in care homes and hospitals are called the Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoLS).

We checked whether the service was working within the principles of the MCA, and whether any conditions on authorisations to deprive a person of their liberty were being met.

There were no mental capacity assessments completed and the provider told us no DoLS applications had been submitted as he considered everyone living at The Paddocks had the capacity to make their own decisions. He told us he had previously made a DoLS application for a person who used to live at the service but had now moved on. We asked about another person currently living at the service, whom a social care professional had told us lacked capacity, in their opinion, to make day to day decisions. The provider told us when someone knew the person well they would be able to understand their body language and how they would make a decision. They also told us however, that they needed to be aware of where this person was at all times to ensure their safety. This meant that the person was under constant supervision. We discussed with the provider the need for a clear assessment of the persons capacity to make their own decisions and the need to consider applying for a DoLS for this person if it was deemed they lacked capacity.

As the service is a family home the provider told us that no new people would ever be admitted to the home as he did not view it as a care service. This also meant there were no pre-assessments of people's needs and they did not move into the service due to this being the family home they grew up in since very young. In

more recent times the provider had engaged with external professionals to meet people's changing needs. One person had moved from the service as their needs could no longer be met.

Peoples nutritional needs, including any preferences and special dietary needs were recorded and met. A cook was employed and at times people also helped with meal preparation. The service was situated on large grounds which included a fruit and vegetable farm. The provider and staff told us how everyone ordinarily ate food that they grew on the land. During our visit we joined people and staff whilst they were having lunch. Everyone ate together. We noted that apart from two people who had special dietary needs, everyone ate the same food, corn on the cob with three slices of bread and butter. People were not offered a choice; however, this was usual practice and part of the family life at The Paddocks. We saw one person supported to develop independent living skills whilst working alongside the cook and preparing a large quantity of vegetables which would be frozen for later consumption.

People were well supported with their physical health care needs. The care records we saw contained information about any visits and advice from healthcare professionals. We saw, for example one person had been seen by a speech and language therapist about their eating and drinking risks and ability to swallow safely. Guidance about modified and soft foods was being followed during our visit.

The Paddocks is a large detached two storey house sitting within extensive grounds. Believed to be the former Vicarage in the village it has been extended over the years and modernised to some extent. As people's needs had increased and changed the provider had made some changes to adapt. For example, a room downstairs had been created into an accessible 'wet room' for one person. The provider also told us there was scope to convert some of the rooms downstairs to bedrooms should any person find getting upstairs a challenge in the future. There was a choice of communal spaces available for people including a lounge area, a room with a dance floor, disco lights and karaoke machine as well as another room with a large snooker table.



# Is the service caring?

## Our findings

At our last inspection in May 2016 we rated this key question 'Good'. At this inspection we found the provider had sustained this rating.

People we spoke with told us they felt cared for at The Paddocks. Not all of the people who lived at the service were able to tell us about their experiences and views of the service. We observed how people were being supported to see if staff were caring towards them. As the service was a family home, it was clear everyone knew each other very well and had family bonds. Staff employed externally of the family were well known to people and observations showed positive relationships had been developed.

We were told about the past family history. The provider explained how he had grown up with people living at the service since childhood. The service had an array of family photographs depicting the past and the special occasions people had spent together.

The provider told us how people were encouraged to maintain relationships and friendships outside of The Paddocks and how he actively encouraged people to be a part of their local community away from the service.

People were asked for feedback on the service. Surveys in written and pictorial format were carried out with people to check if they were happy living at The Paddocks. We saw responses were positive and as part of the survey people had been asked if they wished to have an advocate and go to meetings to join other people who have a learning disability to talk with. We were told by the provider that everyone had declined having an advocate. An advocate is an independent person who helps someone express their views and wishes and helps them stand up for their rights.

The provider told us how people were encouraged to make decisions on what they wished to do as opposed to always being with the wider family group. The whole family was invited to a party however people were all given the choice about whether they wished to go and some people chose to go to other places where they had received an alternative invitation or where they had friends.

People openly discussed their personal information in front of others at the service and we discussed with the provider how they balanced ensuring people's privacy in the context of a family environment. The provider told us that before discussing something he would check with the person if they wished to talk about it with the wider family or wait until later when alone.

## Is the service responsive?

### Our findings

At our last inspection in May 2016 we rated this key question 'Good'. At this inspection we found the provider had sustained this rating.

Each person continued to have a care plan in place which was individual to them and their needs. Each person held a copy of their care plan in their bedroom and had been encouraged to check it and agree the content was accurate. One person told us, "I have my care plan somewhere in my room. It's all about me and living here." Care plans contained details of what people could do for themselves and what they liked and disliked as well as what was important to them.

Most people worked within the large grounds at The Paddocks which included a fruit and vegetable farm as well as outbuildings used as workshops for crushing cans and other manual tasks. The service provided support and opportunities for people to undertake 'real life' work activities in areas. In addition, people were supported to develop and maintain their everyday 'life skills' in areas such as housekeeping and food preparation. People working outside were involved in work tasks that included growing and selling fruit and vegetables as well as jams and chutneys to local businesses. Christmas trees were also sold to order. We also observed a person involved in crushing aluminium cans for selling on. It was very cold on the day of our visit and people were still working outside but the provider assured us that people did not spend all day outside in low temperatures and moved indoors at these times.

The provider told us people were supported, where required, to access the community to participate in activities such as shopping, lunch out in the community or visits to local café's, whilst some people were able to access the local community independently. One person told us how they spent time working in a shop and helped with the displays and pricing items. They also told us that as their preference was not to work outside in the farm area, they spent time cleaning the service and helping the extensive array of recycling which was taking place in house.

People's rooms were personalised and decorated to the individual's taste. Rooms contained items that were important to people and reflected their personalities. One person showed us their room and collection of items they had and said, "I like my bedroom. I chose my [colour] chair and I've a television."

People told us they would speak to the provider if they were unhappy. One person said, "If I am worried I can talk to one of the carers or [provider] or [his wife]." There had been no complaints at the time of our visit, however, there continued to be a policy for complaints which was available to people and staff easily accessible in the front hall area. Whilst there were no formal meetings for people using the service, the provider told us that mealtimes were often the perfect opportunity for people to discuss their day and any concerns that many have arisen.

Details of people's wishes in the event of their death were included as part of their care plans. These contained information for staff of any special preference around how people wanted to be cared for at the end of their lives, including information such as their funeral preferences.

# Is the service well-led?

## Our findings

At our last inspection in May 2016 we rated this key question 'Good'. At this inspection we found that improvements were needed to the provider's governance and oversight of the service. We have rated this key question 'Requires Improvement' at this inspection.

The registered manager was also the provider of the service and adopted brother of people living at The Paddocks. 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.

Whilst the provider had some systems in place to monitor the quality of the service provided they did not identify and highlight the issues that we found with out of date staff training and the concerns the fire officer found during their inspection of the premises. Improvements were identified as being needed to the fire risk assessment to ensure that it was sufficient and suitable for assessing the risks at the service. In addition, there were a number of improvements needed to the building to ensure it was safe and compliant with fire safety legislation. The lack of an appropriate and suitable fire risk assessment to identify any shortfalls in the fire safety system placed people at risk of potential harm. In response to these concerns the provider had sourced a company to help with his oversight and auditing.

People told us they liked living at The Paddocks and were happy being cared for by the provider and his wife along with the other staff. Staff we spoke with told us they felt supported and valued by the provider and confident their views would be listened to and actions taken where necessary.

The provider told us the service was a family home and that he tried to balance this with the regulated activity of running a care home. To support him in keeping abreast of legislation and changes within health and social care the provider had joined a county wide association of independent care providers. Since our last visit the provider had also sourced a health and safety and human resources company for support and in order that they could carry out audits of the records and practices in place. This enabled the provider to learn and improve from any actions identified.

The service had many links with the local community. Some people attended the local church and had close links with other parishioners there. People were also involved in growing produce which they supplied and sold to the local community. The provider told us how many people from within the community 'looked out' for people on a neighbourly basis when they were out and about.

Considering the family set up of the service we recommend that the provider ensures they continue to work to and within the principles of Registering the Right Support.

The provider continued to conduct regular quality assurance surveys to gain people's feedback about services being delivered. We saw completed surveys which were positive about the service being provided.

