

Severn Care Limited

Gatwick House

Inspection report

Upper Rodley Road
Bollow
Gloucestershire
GL14 1QU

Tel: 01452 760164

Website: www.severncare.co.uk

Date of inspection visit: 24 June 2015

Date of publication: 16/07/2015

Ratings

Overall rating for this service

Requires improvement



Is the service safe?

Requires improvement



Is the service effective?

Requires improvement



Overall summary

We carried out an unannounced comprehensive inspection of this service on 19 and 20 November 2014. Breaches of legal requirements were found. After the comprehensive inspection, the provider wrote to us to say what they would do to meet legal requirements in relation to a breach of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2010. These were the regulations in force at the time. We now inspect registered services under the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014.

We undertook this focused inspection to check that they 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 (location's name) on our website at www.cqc.org.uk

There had been improvements to the laundry enabling a clean environment to be maintained and improving staff access to hand washing facilities.

Peoples' rights were protected by the use of the Mental Capacity Act (2005) and the associated Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoLS).

Gatwick House had a registered manager. 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.

Summary of findings

The five questions we ask about services and what we found

We always ask the following five questions of services.

Is the service safe?

Action had been taken to improve safety.

People were protected from the risk of infection by improvements to the laundry.

We could not improve the rating for safe from requires improvement because to do so requires consistent good practice over time. We will check this during our next planned comprehensive inspection.

Requires improvement



Is the service effective?

Action had been taken to improve the effectiveness of the service.

People's rights were protected by the use of the MCA and DoLS.

We could not improve the rating for effective from requires improvement because to do so requires consistent good practice over time. We will check this during our next planned comprehensive inspection.

Requires improvement



Gatwick House

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.

We undertook an unannounced focused inspection of Gatwick House on 24 June 2015. This inspection was done to check that improvements to meet legal requirements

planned by the provider after our 15 and 16 November 2014 inspection had been made. We inspected the service against two of the five questions we ask about services: is the service safe? is the service effective? This is because the service was not meeting some legal requirements.

Our inspection team consisted of one inspector. We spoke with the registered manager, checked the conditions in one of the laundries and examined two files for people using the service and documents relating to the Mental Capacity Act (2005) and the associated Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoLS).

Is the service safe?

Our findings

At our inspection of 19 and 20 November 2014 we found people were at risk from infection because of conditions in the laundry. Improvements were needed in order for a clean and hygienic environment to be maintained with wall surfaces in need of remedial work. The hand wash basin was not easily accessible for staff. It would have been difficult for staff to wash their hands before leaving the laundry which may have put people using the service and staff at risk of infection.

At this inspection we found improvements had been made to protect people from the risk of infection. Work had been completed in the laundry room wall surfaces to provide a washable surface. The room had been tidied and the hand wash basin was easily accessible for staff. Although mops were still stored in the laundry room the registered manager told us this particular laundry room was not used to wash any items that may present a risk of cross infection. Another laundry facility on the site was available for this purpose.

Is the service effective?

Our findings

At our inspection of 19 and 20 November 2014 we found people's rights were not always protected by the correct use of the Mental Capacity Act (2005) (MCA) and Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoLS). The MCA provides a legal framework for acting and making decisions on behalf of adults who lack the capacity to make certain decisions for themselves. The DoLS protect people in care homes from inappropriate or unnecessary restrictions on their freedom. For example a person's care plan made reference to the fact that staff should put medication into their beaker of drink, and that the person must not see staff doing this or the person will refuse to drink it. There was no evidence of a decision taken under the MCA or in the person's best interest. Another person's care plan made reference to staff being allowed to restrict their movement outside the environment of the home. There was no information about a "best interests" meeting being carried out, or if a DoLS application had been made.

At this inspection we found improvements to how decisions taken in peoples' best interests under the MCA were made and recorded. In addition nine applications had been made to restrict people of their liberty under DoLS, three had been approved with the others still awaiting a decision.

Best interests decisions had been made and recorded for 'day to day' decisions for people using the service. These included giving medication and controlling people's finances. Consideration was being given to decisions about medical treatment for two people. The registered manager was working with people's family members and health care professionals to gather information and opinions before a decision would be taken if treatment should be offered. People's rights were protected by the appropriate use of the MCA and DoLS.