

Barchester Healthcare Homes Limited Marriott House & Lodge

Inspection report

Tollhouse Close Chichester West Sussex PO19 1SG Date of inspection visit: 17 March 2022 24 March 2022 06 April 2022

Tel: 01243536652 Website: www.barchester.com Date of publication: 21 April 2022

Good

Ratings

Overall rating for this service

Summary of findings

Overall summary

About the service

Marriott House and Lodge is a care home registered to provide nursing and residential care and accommodation for 119 people with various health conditions, including dementia and sensory impairment. There were 65 people living at the service on the day of our inspection. Marriott House and Lodge is a large converted care home located in Chichester, West Sussex.

People's experience of using this service and what we found

People were happy with the care they received, felt relaxed with staff and told us they were treated with kindness. They said they felt safe, were well supported and there were enough staff to care for them. One person told us, "They are all very kind to me and they make sure I'm happy. They are good people. "Our own observations supported this, and we saw friendly relationships had developed between people and staff. A relative told us, "I'm very happy with the care. [My relative] is happy here. They do a lot of work around the food he likes and I'm confident he is being well cared for."

People were supported to have maximum choice and control of their lives and staff supported them in the least restrictive way possible and in their best interests; the policies and systems in the service supported this practice.

The provider had systems of quality assurance to measure and monitor the standard of the service and drive improvement. These systems also supported people to stay safe by assessing and mitigating risks, ensuring people were cared for in a person-centred way and that the provider learned from any mistakes. Our own observations and the feedback we received supported this.

People received good care that met their needs and improved their wellbeing. The staff team were dedicated and enthusiastic.

For more details, please see the full report which is on the CQC website at www.cqc.org.uk

Rating at last inspection

The last rating for this service was Good (published 14 December 2019).

Why we inspected

This inspection was prompted by a review of the information we held about this service. As a result, we undertook a focused inspection to review the key questions of safe and well-led only. Please see the safe and well-led sections of this full report.

We reviewed the information we held about the service. No areas of concern were identified in the key questions of effective, caring and responsive. We therefore did not inspect these. Ratings from previous comprehensive inspections for those key questions were used in calculating the overall rating at this

inspection.

We looked at infection prevention and control measures under the Safe key question. We look at this in all care home inspections even if no concerns or risks have been identified. This is to provide assurance that the service can respond to COVID-19 and other infection outbreaks effectively.

The overall rating for the service has remained as Good.

Follow up

We will continue to monitor information we receive about the service until we return to visit as per our reinspection programme. If we receive any concerning information we may inspect sooner.

The five questions we ask about services and what we found

We always ask the following five questions of services.

Is the service safe?	Good •
The service was safe.	
Details are in our Safe findings below.	
Is the service well-led?	Good •
Is the service well-led? The service was well-led.	Good •



Marriott House & Lodge Detailed findings

Background to this inspection

The 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.

As part of this inspection we looked at the infection control and prevention measures in place. This was conducted so we can understand the preparedness of the service in preventing or managing an infection outbreak, and to identify good practice we can share with other services.

Inspection team The inspection team consisted of one inspector.

Service and service type

Marriott House and Lodge 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.

This service is required to have a registered manager. A registered manager is a person who has registered with the Care Quality Commission to manage the service. This means that they and the provider are legally responsible for how the service is run and for the quality and safety of the care provided. At the time of our inspection there was not a registered manager in post. However, the general manager of the service was in the process of registering with the CQC.

Notice of inspection This inspection was unannounced.

What we did before the inspection

We used the information the provider sent us in the provider information return (PIR). This is information providers are required to send us annually with key information about their service, what they do well, and

improvements they plan to make.

During the inspection

We visited the service on 17 March 2022 and observed the support that people received. We spoke with relatives and staff and gathered information relating to the management of the service. We reviewed a range of records. This included six care plans. We spoke with a visiting relative. We also spoke with eight members of staff, including the managing director, a regional director, the general manager, a registered nurse and care staff. We spoke with four relatives over the telephone on 24 March 2022. We re-visited the service on 6 April 2022 to gather further evidence and feedback from people. We spoke with nine people living at the service and one volunteer.

We used the Short Observational Framework for Inspection (SOFI). SOFI is a way of observing care to help us understand the experience of people who could not talk with us.

After the inspection

We requested further records from the provider relating to the management of the service and a variety of policies and procedures and quality assurance processes developed and implemented by the provider.

Is the service safe?

Our findings

Safe - this means people were protected from abuse and avoidable harm

At our last inspection we rated this key question Good. The rating for this key question has remained Good. This meant people were safe and protected from avoidable harm. Legal requirements were met.

Systems and processes to safeguard people from the risk of abuse; Learning lessons when things go wrong • People said they felt safe and they had no concerns around safety. A relative told us, "[My relative] is perfectly safe, I have no concerns, he is treated very well."

• Staff had a good awareness of safeguarding, could identify the different types of abuse and knew what to do if they had any concerns about people's safety. Information relating to safeguarding and what steps should be followed if anyone witnessed or suspected abuse was displayed around the service.

• Staff took appropriate action following accidents and incidents to ensure people's safety and this was recorded.

• We saw specific details and any follow up measures to prevent a re-occurrence were recorded. Any subsequent action was shared and analysed to look for any trends or patterns.

Staffing and recruitment

• The deployment of staff met people's needs and kept them safe. Staffing levels were assessed daily, or when the needs of people changed, to ensure people's safety. We were told existing staff would be contacted to cover shifts in circumstances such as sickness and annual leave, and agency staff were used when required.

• People and staff told us the service had enough staff to keep people safe. A relative told us, "I visit regularly and have never had an issue with staffing levels. There has been sickness with Covid-19, but they have managed." A member of staff said, "We are sometimes a bit short if people need to isolate, but on the whole, we have enough staff."

• Records demonstrated staff were recruited in line with safe practice and equal opportunities protocols. For example, employment histories had been checked, suitable references obtained, and appropriate checks undertaken to ensure that potential staff were safe to work within the care sector.

Using medicines safely

• Registered nurses and care staff were trained in the administration of medicines. A member of staff described how they completed the medicine administration records (MAR). We saw these were accurate. They also showed us how they ensured that stock levels of medicines were accurate.

• People told us they had no concerns about their medicines. One person said, "Every day without fail they bring me my tablets."

• Regular auditing of medicine procedures had taken place, including checks on accurately recording administered medicines as well as temperature checks of medicines storage areas. This ensured the system for medicine administration worked effectively and any issues could be identified and addressed.

• Medicines were stored appropriately and securely, in line with legal requirements. We checked that medicines were ordered appropriately and medicines which were out of date or no longer needed were

disposed of safely.

Assessing risk, safety monitoring and management

• Risk assessments were reviewed regularly to ensure they provided current guidance for staff. Each person's care plan had a number of risk assessments completed which were specific to their needs. For example, some people were at risk of falls or choking. Their care plans contained comprehensive and specific details for staff on how to manage these risks.

• Risks associated with the safety of the environment and equipment were identified and managed appropriately. Regular checks to ensure fire safety had been undertaken and people had personal emergency evacuation plans, which informed staff of how to support people to evacuate the building in the event of an emergency.

• Equipment was regularly checked and maintained. This ensured that people were supported to use equipment that was safe.

Preventing and controlling infection

• We were assured that the provider was preventing visitors from catching and spreading infections.

- We were assured that the provider was meeting shielding and social distancing rules.
- We were assured that the provider was admitting people safely to the service.
- We were assured that the provider was using PPE effectively and safely.
- We were assured that the provider was accessing testing for people using the service and staff.
- We were assured that the provider was promoting safety through the layout and hygiene practices of the premises.

• We were assured that the provider was making sure infection outbreaks can be effectively prevented or managed.

• We were assured that the provider's infection prevention and control policy was up to date.

Visiting in care homes

The provider was facilitating visits for people living in the service in accordance with the current guidance.

The Government has announced its intention to change the legal requirement for vaccination in care homes, but the service was meeting the current requirement to ensure non-exempt staff and visiting professionals were vaccinated against COVID-19.

Is the service well-led?

Our findings

Well-Led – this means that service leadership, management and governance assured high-quality, personcentred care; supported learning and innovation; and promoted an open, fair culture.

At our last inspection we rated this key question Good. The rating for this key question has remained Good. This meant the service was consistently managed and well-led. Leaders and the culture they created promoted high quality, person-centred care.

Managers and staff are clear about their roles, and understand quality performance, risks and regulatory requirements

• The provider undertook a range of quality assurance audits to ensure a good level of quality was maintained. We saw audit activity which included medicines, infection control and health and safety. The results were analysed to determine trends and introduce preventative measures.

• Staff knew about whistleblowing and said they would have no hesitation in reporting any concerns they had. Policy and procedure documentation was up to date and relevant to guide staff on how to carry out their roles.

• The provider had informed the CQC of significant events in a timely way, such as when people had passed away, where there had been suspected abuse and any significant injury. This meant we could check appropriate action had been taken.

Promoting a positive culture that is person-centred, open, inclusive and empowering, which achieves good outcomes for people

• We received positive feedback in relation to how the service was run, and our own observations supported this. One person told us, "I'm perfectly happy here, they do a good job." A relative added, "I think it's a very well-run home. [Manager] has been very helpful and has an excellent understanding of my [relative's] needs and what is best for him."

People, relatives and staff spoke highly of the service and felt it was well-led. Staff commented they felt supported and had a good understanding of their roles and responsibilities. The general manager and staff told us the care of people living at the service was the most important aspect of their work and they strived to ensure that people received high quality care. Our own observations supported this. A member of staff told us, "I enjoy working here, we provide good care for the residents. I'd be happy for a relative to live here."
Staff had a good understanding of equality, diversity and human rights and explained how they would make sure nobody at the service suffered from any kind of discrimination. This was reinforced through training.

Engaging and involving people using the service, the public and staff, fully considering their equality characteristics

• People and staff were actively involved in developing the service. We saw examples of how feedback from people had influenced activities and food choices. A relative told us, "They always contact me if there are any changes with [my relative] and they ask for my opinion on what is best."

• There were systems and processes followed to consult with people, relatives, staff and healthcare

professionals. We saw that people living at the service became ambassadors and engaged with the provider on important issues and topics that meant a lot to them. One person said, "I enjoy my ambassador role, it means I can talk to the managers and be involved." Meetings and satisfaction surveys were carried out, providing management with a mechanism for monitoring satisfaction with the service provided.

Continuous learning and improving care

• The service had a strong emphasis on teamwork and communication. Handover between shifts was thorough and staff had time to discuss matters relating to the previous shift.

• Staff commented that they all worked together and approached concerns as a team. A member of staff told us, "It's hard work, but we are all well supported. We're a good team."

• Up to date information was made available for staff including details of specific topics, such as COVID-19, medicines and the Mental Capacity Act, to ensure they understood and had knowledge of how to assist people.

Working in partnership with others; How the provider understands and acts on the duty of candour, which is their legal responsibility to be open and honest with people when something goes wrong

• The service liaised with organisations within the local community. For example, the Local Authority and Clinical Commissioning Group, to share information and learning around local issues and best practice in care delivery, as well as to assist each other in investigating any concerns.

• The general manager was aware of their responsibilities under the Duty of Candour. The Duty of Candour is a regulation that all providers must adhere to. Under the Duty of Candour, providers must be open and transparent, and it sets out specific guideline's providers must follow if things go wrong with care and treatment.