

Metropolitan Housing Trust Limited

Rosswood Gardens

Inspection report

4,6,8 & 10 Rosswood Gardens

Wallington

Surrey

SM6 8QZ

Tel: 020 8647 8193

Website: www.mst-online.org.uk

Date of inspection visit: 7 May 2015

Date of publication: 08/06/2015

Ratings

Overall rating for this service

Requires improvement



Is the service safe?

Requires improvement



Is the service well-led?

Requires improvement



Overall summary

We carried out an unannounced comprehensive inspection of this service on 14 October 2015 and 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 the safety and suitability of the premises, and assessing and monitoring the quality of the service provided by the care home.

We undertook this focused inspection to check that the provider 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 Rosswood Gardens on our website at www.cqc.org.uk

We undertook this unannounced focused inspection of Rosswood Gardens on 7 May 2015.

Rosswood Gardens is a care home and short stay respite unit that provides accommodation and personal care for up to 23 people. There were 13 people living in the home and two people staying in the respite unit when we visited. The service specialises in the care and support of younger adults with learning disabilities. The accommodation is split across four adjoining houses that are self-contained each with their own separate entrance, communal lounge, kitchen, toilet and bathroom facilities and laundry room. The respite unit can accommodate a maximum of six people at any one time and is not accessible from the main care home.

The service had a registered manager in post. A registered manager is a person who has registered with the Care Quality Commission (CQC) to manage the service. Like

Summary of findings

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 saw the environment was adequately maintained and people could move around the care home freely. Our discussions with people using the service, staff and the care homes management supported this.

We found there were more effective systems in place to help the care home and the provider monitor the safety and quality of the service people received at Rosswood Gardens.

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?

We found that action had been taken to improve safety.

The premises were safe and maintenance took place when needed.

However, we could not improve the rating for 'Is the service 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 well-led?

We found that action had been taken to improve how the care home was run.

The provider regularly monitored the care, facilities and support people using the service received. On-going audits and feedback from people was used to drive improvement.

However, we could not improve the rating for 'Is the service well-led' 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



Rosswood Gardens

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 unannounced focused inspection was undertaken by a single inspector on 7 May 2015. It was done to check that improvements to meet legal requirements planned by the provider after our comprehensive inspection on 14 October 2014 had been made. This is because the service was not meeting some legal requirements at the time of that inspection. The team inspected the service against two of the five questions we ask about services: is the service safe and is the service well-led.

During our inspection we spoke with four people who lived at the care home, the registered manager, the deputy manager, the shift leader for the respite unit and three care staff. We also toured the premises and looked at all the communal areas, which included four lounges, four dining areas/kitchens, three laundry rooms, the rear garden and various bathroom, shower and toilet facilities located throughout the main house and respite unit.

Before the inspection we reviewed the information we held about the service. This included notifications the provider is required to submit to the CQC. We also read the written report we required the provider to send to us regarding the action they told us they were going to take to meet the regulations they breached at their last inspection.

We also looked at records that related to the overall management of the service, including; various quality assurance audits, financial receipts and the minutes from meetings held with people using the service and staff.

Is the service safe?

Our findings

On 14 October 2014 we inspected the service and identified a breach of the regulation with regards to the premises. We found damaged and missing cupboard doors in three of the care homes laundry rooms, ripped blinds, curtains and sofas in all the communal lounges, a broken toilet and an overgrown rear garden. These failures to properly maintain the premises meant people using the service were not protected against the risks associated with living or receiving respite care in an environment that was not suitable for the purpose for which it was intended.

Following that comprehensive inspection the provider sent us an action plan telling us they would complete all the care homes outstanding environmental maintenance, repair and refurbishment work by the end of April 2015.

On 7 May 2015 we inspected the service to check whether or not the provider had taken all the action they said they would take in their improvement plan. We found that the premises was being properly maintained and was fit for its intended purpose.

During our tour of the premises we saw four new kitchen units had been fitted throughout the care home and work to improve the rear garden had commenced. It was clear from maintenance records and financial receipts we looked at that finances and dates to replace the entire missing and damaged laundry cupboard doors, the broken toilet and wet room, ripped blinds/curtains and furniture in communal areas had all been agreed by the provider. Records showed us dates had been arranged and materials purchased by the provider to replace the offensive smelling flooring in one toilet with more suitable floor covering and to convert a bathroom in the main house into a wet room.

Staff told us a gardener was now employed by the service to tend to the garden once a week. The registered manager and deputy manager also told us they were confident this outstanding maintenance work would be completed by the end of May 2015.

Progress made by the provider to achieve the on-going maintenance and repair issues highlighted above will be assessed at the care home's next comprehensive inspection.

Is the service well-led?

Our findings

On 14 October 2014 we inspected the service and identified a breach of the regulation with regards to good governance. Although systems were in place to identify, assess and improve the quality and safety of the service people received; we found the provider had not always operated them effectively. For example, we saw the provider had failed to identify a large number of outstanding maintenance and repair issues and consequently no action had been taken to address them. This meant people using the service may have been at risk of receiving inappropriate or unsafe care because effective good governance systems were not in place that enabled the provider to continually assess and monitor the quality and safety of the service provided at the care home/respite unit. Do you need to say: Following the inspection the provider sent us an action and told us they would (summarise action they said they would do) by

On 7 May 2015 we inspected the service to check whether or not the provider had taken all the action they said they would take in their improvement plan. We found that the provider had established better governance systems to effectively assess monitor and improve the quality and safety of the services provided at Rosswood Gardens.

People we spoke with told us that they felt involved in helping staff make Rosswood Gardens a better place to live. One person said they had “lots of meetings with their key-worker and the manager about changes they wanted to happen at the care home”, while another person told us, “My key-worker asked me the other day what colour blinds we should have in the lounge and if I would like to help buy them”. Two other people we spoke with gave us an example about the manager buying a small snooker table for the kitchen after people had expressed an interest in having one during a ‘house’ meeting.

Records we looked at indicated the care home’s area manager had visited Rosswood Gardens in 2015 to undertake an internal quality monitoring inspection on behalf of the provider. This was confirmed by the registered manager. The registered manager also told us the provider

had established a new quality assurance policy which stated area managers were expected to visit services they were responsible for at least once a quarter and carry out a thorough audit. Progress made by the provider to achieve this stated aim will be assessed at the care home’s next inspection.

It was clear from records we looked at that senior shift leaders and the home managers were responsible for undertaking regular quality monitoring checks with regards staff working practices. The registered manager and the deputy manager both told us these audits included, routinely checking care plans, risk assessments, medicines management, infection control, fire safety, food hygiene, health and safety, finances, staff training and supervision and record keeping. We saw that where any issues had been found an action plan was put in place which stated what the service needed to do to improve and progress against these actions. The registered manager told us they had recently attended one of the providers new briefing sessions, which were being held every six to eight weeks, to help registered managers share learning from CQC inspections.

There was evidence that learning from accidents and incidents, complaints and safeguarding concerns took place and appropriate changes were implemented. Records of accidents and incidents we looked at included an analysis of what had happened and improvements that could be made to prevent similar events reoccurring. Minutes of the care homes last staff meeting in March 2015 revealed accidents and incidents involving people using the service were always discussed at these group forums to ensure everyone who worked at the home was aware what had happened and the improvements that were needed. Staff confirmed there were regular team meetings where they were able discuss their opinions openly and receive feedback about any issues or incidents that had adversely affected the care home and/or the people who lived or stayed there. Staff also told us they would speak with the home’s management about any concerns they might have and were confident that they would be listened to. One member staff said, “I think the managers who work at Rosswood are very approachable.”