

Scarborough Hall Limited

Scarborough Hall and Lodge Care Home

Inspection report

Mount View Avenue, Scarborough, North Yorkshire,
YO12 4EQ

Tel: 01723 381594

Website: www.brighterkind.com/scarboroughhall

Date of inspection visit: 8 December 2015

Date of publication: 20/01/2016

Ratings

Is the service safe?

Requires improvement



Overall summary

We carried out an unannounced comprehensive inspection of this service on 13 February 2015. We found that the registered person had not protected people against the risk of cross infection. Areas of the home were not clean, cleaners did not work to schedules, and the laundry was not run in a way which minimised the risk of cross infection. This was in breach of regulation 12 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014. After the comprehensive inspection, the provider wrote to us to say what they would do to meet legal requirements in relation to the breach.

We undertook this focused inspection 8 December 2015 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 this requirement. You can read the report from our last comprehensive inspection, by selecting the 'all reports' link for Scarborough Hall and Lodge on our website at www.cqc.org.uk.

Scarborough Hall and Lodge care home is registered to provide residential care for up to 85 older people. There is a passenger lift to assist people to the upper floors and the home is set in pleasant grounds. The home had a registered manager in place. 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 found that the service was now clean and hygienic and that it was no longer in breach of regulation 12 of the Health and Social Care Act. This meant people were protected by the infection control practice of the home.

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?

The service was safe.

People were protected because the service had taken steps to protect people from the risk of cross infection.

We improved the rating for safe from Inadequate to Require Improvement. To improve the rating further would require consistent good practice over time. We will check safety again during our next planned comprehensive inspection.

Requires improvement



Scarborough Hall and Lodge 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 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.

We undertook an unannounced focused inspection of Scarborough Hall and Lodge on 8 December 2015. This inspection was done to check that improvements to meet legal requirements planned by the provider after our 13 February inspection had been made. The team inspected the service against one of the five questions we ask about services: is the service safe. This is because the service was not meeting one of the legal requirements.

We reviewed the information we held about the service, such as notifications we had received from the registered provider. A notification is information about important events which the service is required to send us by law. We planned the inspection using this information.

The Provider Information Return (PIR) 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. As this was not a comprehensive inspection we did not request a PIR, however, we gathered the information we needed during our inspection visit.

On the day of the inspection we did not speak with people who lived at the service. We spoke with five members of staff and the registered manager. We looked at some areas of the home, including some bedrooms (with people's permission where this was possible) and communal areas. We looked at the laundry, bathrooms, toilets, sluices and store cupboards. We examined cleaning schedules and training records for infection control.

Is the service safe?

Our findings

At our last comprehensive inspection which was carried out on 13 February 2015 we found that the registered person had not protected people against the risk of cross infection. Some areas of the home were not clean and some furniture had sustained surface damage which posed an infection control risk. The laundry was not run in a way which minimised the risk of cross infection. Cleaners did not work to schedules so there was no clear plan to ensure the whole service received thorough regular cleaning. This was a breach of regulation 12 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014.

During this inspection 8 December 2015 we found that the home was clean and fresh throughout. This included people's rooms, the laundry, hairdressing room, communal areas, store areas and corridors. Areas around sluices were free from unpleasant odour. Carpets and furnishings were clean, with some older damaged furniture replaced with new which was easy to keep clean. We spoke with a member of staff who had responsibility for laundry and they showed us how there was a clear separation between dirty and clean laundry in the laundry room and that laundry followed a flow which ensured that clean laundry did not come into contact with dirty. The flooring of the laundry was clean.

We saw cleaning schedules and cleaning staff told us that they worked to these. One member of cleaning staff was allocated to each floor. An extra member of staff was on duty to allow them the time to deep clean each person's room at least fortnightly. A member of cleaning staff told us that they had the responsibility for carrying out cleaning audits where they regularly sampled a number of rooms. Records of these audits showed that action points were recorded and marked off when these had been completed. To complement in house auditing, the registered manager

told us that the area manager carried out regular audits of infection control practice and records confirmed this. The service had an updated policy and procedure on infection control.

The registered manager told us that they had bought a new hard surface cleaner which cleaning staff told us had improved the level of cleanliness of hard surface flooring. We saw the latest environmental health report which had awarded the service a rating of five, where five is described as "very good" and is the highest score achievable.

Bathrooms had cartridge soap dispensers and paper towels, which were all in holders to reduce the risk of cross infection. Staff told us that they carried hand sanitising gel with them, and that there was also sanitising gel available in the home. However, they told us that this did not take the place of regular and thorough hand washing between giving personal care to people and recognised that this was an effective method to reduce the risk of cross infection. Staff told us that they had received up to date infection control training, and records confirmed this. They were able to tell us about the importance of using the correct aprons and gloves to reduce the risk of cross infection. Staff told us that the home had a colour coding system for laundry, cleaning cloths and materials, aprons and gloves to further protect people from the risk of cross infection.

This meant that people were protected by the infection control procedures within the home and that the service was no longer in breach of regulation 12 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014.

We have not improved the rating beyond Requires Improvement. To improve the rating further would require consistent good practice over time. We will check safety again during our next planned comprehensive inspection.