

Diva Care Limited Hyperion House

Inspection report

London Street
Fairford
Gloucestershire
GL7 4AH

Date of inspection visit: 31 May 2017

Good

Date of publication: 03 July 2017

Tel: 01285712349 Website: www.divacare.co.uk

Ratings

Overall rating for this service

Is the service safe?	Good	
Is the service well-led?	Good	

Summary of findings

Overall summary

We carried out an unannounced comprehensive inspection of this service on 19 and 20 December 2016 at which two breaches of legal requirements were found. This was because people were not always protected from the spread of infection through safe infection control measures and the property had not always been maintained to a safe standard. We also found the registered manager and provider had not always fully assessed risks and taken preventative action to minimise these risks.

After the comprehensive inspection, the provider wrote to us to say what they would do to meet legal requirements in relation to the breaches. We undertook a focused inspection on 31 May 2017 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 these topics. You can read the report from our last comprehensive inspection by selecting the 'all reports' link for 'Hyperion House' on our website at www.cqc.org.uk.

Hyperion House is a care home providing accommodation for up to 45 people who require nursing or personal care. There were 36 people living at Hyperion House at the time of the inspection.

There was no registered manager at the service. 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. The provider had recruited a manager who was already in place at the time of the inspection. The manager told us they had applied to CQC for their registration and we had received their registration application at the time of the inspection.

At our focused inspection on 31 May 2017 we found the provider had followed their action plan and legal requirements had been met. The provider had implemented systems to ensure the risk of the spread of infection had been minimised through safe infection control practices. Following the last comprehensive inspection, the provider had initiated a refurbishment programme throughout the home. The provider and manager had ensured systems were in place to identify, assess and address risks posed to the people living at Hyperion House.

Following our inspection, we have revised the overall rating of the service to 'Good'.

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 improvements had been made to improve the safety of the service.

The provider and manager had implemented a new laundry collection system to ensure the risk of soiled and non-soiled clothing mixing was minimised. The staff we spoke with had good knowledge of the new process and told us they no longer had to handle soiled clothing due to the new laundry bags they were using.

The provider had implemented a refurbishment programme throughout the home. We saw that the carpets in the hallways that were previously ripped had all been replaced.

Is the service well-led?

The service was well-led.

The manager had implemented regular checks of the home to ensure issues of maintenance were identified and appropriate action had been taken to minimise the risk posed to the people living at Hyperion House.

People, relatives and staff spoke positively about the new manager.

Good

Good



Hyperion 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, to look at the overall quality of the service, and to provide a rating for the service under the Care Act 2014.

We undertook a focused inspection of Hyperion House on 31 May 2017. The inspection was undertaken by one adult social care inspector and was unannounced. This inspection was completed to check that improvements to meet legal requirements planned by the provider after our comprehensive inspection on 19 and 20 December 2017 had been made. We inspected the service against two of the five questions we ask about services: is the service safe and is the service well-led. This is because the service was not meeting legal requirements in relation to those questions.

Before our inspection we reviewed the information we held about the home. This included the provider's action plan, which set out the action they would take to meet legal requirements, and notifications submitted by the provider. Providers tell us about important events relating to the service they provide using a notification.

During the visit we spoke with four members of staff, five people living at Hyperion House and three relatives who were visiting on the day of the inspection. Following the inspection, we contact three relatives for their views on Hyperion House .

Our findings

At our comprehensive inspection of Hyperion House on 19 and 20 December 2016 we could not be satisfied that there were sufficient infection control practices within the service to protect people from the spread of infection. For example, we observed staff using disposable laundry bags to collect soiled clothing and bed linen. These bags were designed to be fully inserted into the washing machine without removing any of the clothing to prevent the spread of infection. However, when we visited the laundry, the bags were split and some of the soiled linen and clothing had come out. This meant the laundry staff had to handle the soiled items and there was also a risk of them mixing with other non-soiled items. This was a breach of Regulation 15 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014. Premises and equipment.

At our focused inspection on 31 May 2017 we found the provider had followed their action plan and improvements had been made to minimise the risk of infection. The provider had sourced new disposable laundry bags which were stronger and less prone to splitting before being inserted in the washing machine. We observed a number of these bags being used and found all of the bags were intact. The staff we spoke with told us how they would insert the whole bag into the machine without removing any of the clothing. Staff told us how all soiled clothing would be washed separately. The staff told us the new bags were of much better quality and minimised the risk of the spread of infection.

At our comprehensive inspection of Hyperion House on 19 and 20 December 2016 we found that maintenance issues which had been identified in April 2016 had not been addressed. For example, we found the provider had identified ripped carpets in the hallways which posed trip hazards to people. This had been identified in February 2016 but when we arrived for our comprehensive inspection in December 2016, this was yet to be repaired or replaced. During our comprehensive inspection in December 2016, we also observed damaged flooring in the dining room but did not see any evidence of plans to repair or replace this flooring. This was a breach of Regulation 15 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014. Premises and equipment.

At our focused inspection on 31 May 2017 we found the provider had followed their action plan and improvements had been made. All of the damaged carpets had been replaced throughout the home. The provider had also replaced the flooring in the dining room to ensure it was safe and minimised trip hazards to people living at the Home. The manager also told us how the providers had implemented a refurbishment plan to replace all of the carpets throughout the home and also re-decorate all of the rooms in the home. We saw that work on individual rooms had already commenced at the time of the inspection.

Our findings

At our comprehensive inspection of Hyperion House on 19 and 20 December 2016 we found the registered manager and provider had not always fully assessed risks and taken preventative action to minimise these risks. For example, they had identified ripped carpets in the hallways in February 2016 but had taken no action to address the issues. This was a breach of Regulation 17 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014. Good Governance.

At our focused inspection on 31 May 2017 we found the provider had followed their action plan and improvements had been made. Systems had been implemented to check on the standards within the service. For example, the manager carried out regular audits of the service. We found where issues had been identified; action had been taken to make improvements. For example, one audit had identified faults in the hot water system and a new hot water tank had been sourced. Another audit had identified that people's wheelchairs were not always cleaned properly and increased the risk of infection spread. As a result, a new cleaning system was implemented to ensure the wheelchairs were cleaned properly.

There was a new manager in post at Hyperion House. They had been working at home since January 2017. People and relatives spoke positively about the leadership and management style of the manager. Comments included, "The manager is great" and, "I can speak to them whenever I need to. They are very approachable." Staff also spoke positively about the leadership and management of the service. Staff emphasised the positive changes made since the new management team began working at the service. For example, staff told us how the new manager used team meetings as learning opportunities and would regularly use reflective learning to support staff to improve their practice around topics such as manual handling and person centred care. The staff also told us the registered manager had worked hard with the providers to initiate the refurbishment programme in the home.

The staff described the manager and deputy manager as 'being a part of the team' and 'very hands on'. One member of staff said, "The manager is excellent and always happy to help us." All of the staff we spoke with told us morale amongst the staff group had improved significantly over the past few months and this was down to the strong leadership offered by the new manager.