

Leonard Cheshire Disability

Park House Hotel - Care Home with Nursing Physical Disabilities

Inspection report

Sandringham

Kings Lynn

Norfolk

PE36 6EH

Tel: 01485 543000

Website: www.parkhousehotel.org.uk

Date of inspection visit: 09 and 13 October 2014

Date of publication: 27/04/2015

Ratings

Overall rating for this service

Good 

Is the service safe?

Good 

Is the service effective?

Good 

Is the service caring?

Good 

Is the service responsive?

Good 

Is the service well-led?

Good 

Overall summary

This inspection took place on Thursday 9 October and Monday 13 October 2014. The visit on the 09 October 2014 was unannounced and we arranged to go back to speak to more people using the service on 13 October 2014.

Park House Hotel is a large building that has easy access for people with a physical disability and is situated in the grounds of the Sandringham estate. The service provides support for people who want to take a holiday break. The level of care and assistance is negotiated prior to any visit

Summary of findings

and some people return to the service on a regular basis. The person receiving care or support is also able to have a family member or friend with them as the service also provides a certain amount of independent rooms as well as shared rooms to suit the requirements of the individual.

There is currently a manager who oversees the service but the registered manager has recently left. 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 and associated Regulations about how the service is run. There is currently a review of how the service operates and how senior staff work together to decide who will be best to take this position of registered manager.

Please note that as the staff refer to people as 'guests' due to the nature of the service provided, we have used this term throughout the full report and also in the summary of this service.

Guests who used the service told us that they felt safe and well cared for. They told us that staff had telephoned them before their arrival and made certain that their

needs could be met. Menus were varied and guests had a choice of food, or they could request any special items they particularly enjoyed. Specific dietary needs were also met when necessary.

Staff had been trained to provide support to the people who required care and support. Any specific needs, for example regarding a guest's emotional or physical needs, were fully researched and procedures developed prior to the person admission. Any equipment that was needed was also sourced before the guest was booked in, making certain that all needs were safely met.

People had access to healthcare professionals should this be necessary and every care plan had relevant details to ensure appropriate care was provided. Staff got to know regular guests and their preferences enabling continuity of care and support.

The staff told us that they enjoyed working at the service. They confirmed that the staff team worked together at Park House, discussions were open and honest. Any concerns or comments from guests were dealt with immediately and action was taken to quickly address the issue. Everyone worked together to make certain that the guest had an enjoyable stay.

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.

Staff were trained to recognise and deal with any abuse they may suspect and they understood how to reduce the risk of people experiencing abuse.

There were enough staff to keep people safe and risks to people's safety had been assessed. People felt safe and secure whilst they were staying at the service.

People's medicines were managed safely. The provider made sure that the staff working with people were of good character and suitable to work there.

Good



Is the service effective?

The service was effective.

The staff were trained and had the skills and knowledge they needed to support and care for people who stayed at the service.

Staff demonstrated an understanding of the Mental Capacity Act (2005) as well as the Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards.

Good communication systems were in place to ensure relevant information was passed to the right people. This ensured the delivery of the service was correct.

People were served with a choice of meals that met their dietary needs.

Good



Is the service caring?

The service was caring.

Staff were kind, considerate and thoughtful when providing care or support. People told us that their privacy and dignity were respected. People were fully involved in making decisions about their care and their independence was supported and encouraged at all times.

Relatives were very complimentary about the caring support that provided.

Staff were considerate and demonstrated a caring attitude when informing other staff members about any incidents or passing information at the end of a shift.

Good



Is the service responsive?

The service was responsive.

People's individual needs and preferences had been assessed before they arrived at the service and these were met. This included having access to activities both within the local area as well as at the service.

The service developed a programme of events that suited people needs. This was also changed at short notice if necessary for such things as poor weather conditions. Alternative events were then offered.

Good



Summary of findings

Guests and their relatives told us that they were always asked about their opinion of the service at the end of each visit.

Is the service well-led?

The service was well led.

Staff were happy working at the service and staff were able to comment and make suggestions about the development of the service. The staff team were supported well with regular supervisions and annual appraisals. The manager and the whole staff team worked openly and closely together at all times to share and discuss ideas.

The quality of the service was regularly monitored and matters that needed attention were assessed, allocated to the appropriate person and a timescale was in place for completion.

Good



Park House Hotel - Care Home with Nursing Physical Disabilities

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 inspection took place on 9 and 13 October 2014 and was unannounced. The inspection was completed by one inspector.

Before the inspection, the provider completed a Provider Information Return (PIR). This 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. We also reviewed any statutory notifications that the provider had sent us. A notification is information about important events which the service is required to send us by law.

On the day we visited the service, we spoke with eight people who were staying at Park House Hotel, five visiting relatives, seven members of care staff, three kitchen staff, the service manager and the Head of Operations who was also present. We observed how care and support were provided to people and how staff interacted with people who were staying at the service. There is currently no registered care manager as the previous manager had left. However, there is an overall manager who is running the service currently while a recruitment drive is being undertaken to fill the registered post.

The records we looked at included; four people's care plans, four staff recruitment, and supervision files, staff training records and records relating to the maintenance of the premises and equipment. We also looked at how the quality of the service was monitored. We saw that all volunteers were also recruited through the same selection processes and also completed an induction into their role.

Is the service safe?

Our findings

Guests who were staying at the service told us they felt safe at Park House Hotel. Two people who return regularly told us about individual circumstances where staff had ensured the person's safety and considered their wellbeing. For example, risk assessments were in place on care plans to make certain that people remained safe when they walked within the grounds of the service. Any concerns were discussed with the person and the staff team so any activity was as safe as possible for the individual. We saw that people could come into the office and discuss any concerns they had about their support.

Any area of risk were assessed to try to eliminate or reduce risks to people. All outings planned were fully risk assessed. We attended a meeting of the heads of department at which staff discussed the previous week and any lessons that had been learnt as well as the week ahead and any areas that needed an assessment. This allowed staff to be aware of any difficulties that may be encountered and safety measures were then put into place.

Routines at the service supported the safety of the guests who stayed at the service and also their relatives, because the provider had systems in place that helped to protect them. Members of staff explained clearly what they would do if they had any concerns or worries. Staff told us that they worked together across all areas to make certain that each person was safe, happy and enjoyed their time at the service. Staff told us that they had completed and continued to refresh their training about safeguarding people. Volunteers also undertook this training and the training records confirmed this. There is a national safeguarding advisor for the organisation who is available for support at any time.

Staff discussed what type of support and care that each person needed. Although people returned regularly, each admission record had up to date forms with current information such as medication and any physical conditions. Three visiting relatives, and one relative who was also staying at the service, told us that staff had telephoned on numerous occasions to gather as much information about people as possible. This was to make certain that the needs of each guest could be safely met by staff.

The service manager told us that staff were always willing to cover any absences and therefore the service did not use agency staff. We looked at copies of the staff rota that confirmed this as well as speaking with member of staff who also said agency staff were not used.

Staff told us that on occasions they needed to support a guest who became distressed and upset. To enable them to do this, staff engaged in regular discussions with this person and the people close to them. This was so that they could understand what actions they needed to take to keep the individual and others safe. There was a policy and procedure for staff regarding dealing with any such behaviour. All members of staff said that they would have no problem with speaking out about any poor practices they may observe.

While there were no medications stored at the service at the time of this inspection, staff showed us their storage room and explained their procedures regarding the handling of medications. These were in line with current guidance and staff expressed a thorough knowledge of good practice for the management of medicines.

Any equipment that was needed to support people and their safety was obtained prior to admission. Guests staying at the service confirmed that this was the case. One person explained what equipment had previously been needed and how efficient staff had been with making certain it was exactly right for the individual concerned. The premises were maintained, had wheelchair access with automatic door openings and lighting was placed in particularly dark external areas that may have been difficult for some people to negotiate. This supported the independence and safety of people using the service.

Recruitment records of staff and volunteers showed that correct procedures and checks had been completed before a member of staff was able to work at the service. The staffing levels were allocated for any outings that had been booked following an assessment of each person's needs.

When we asked people staying at the service if they had assistance when they needed it, they told us that staff were always available. One guest told us that staff always said to take as much time as they needed. People did not feel rushed or disregarded, they felt that staff knew what support or care they needed and there were enough staff

Is the service safe?

when needed. If they waited for attention it was only for a short space of time that they felt was acceptable. We were told that staff retention was good and therefore staff got to know people and their routines.

Is the service effective?

Our findings

We asked guests how they felt their needs were being met. They told us that they felt staff were fully aware of their individual needs and requirements. They told us they felt that staff who supported them were well informed and trained. One guest said, “Staff are always helpful and respectful, they know when I need help.” For example, we observed at the change of shift that staff explained about one person who did not always ask for drinks. Therefore staff said they would watch and regularly offer them fluids. Staff said this person preferred a certain drink and arrangements were made to offer this drink regularly.

Members of staff told us they had received enough training to meet the needs of the guests who stayed at the service. We checked the training records and saw that staff had received training in a variety of different subjects including; infection control, manual handling, safeguarding, health and safety, food safety and hygiene plus any specific illnesses that any guests may be experiencing. Staff also told us that they had regular supervision meetings with their manager where they were encouraged to raise any issues that they wanted to discuss including their performance at work.

All of the members of staff we spoke with were very knowledgeable about the people they supported as well as the people who were about to arrive. We spoke with one guest who had recently arrived and they and their relative said staff understood their needs. They told us, “Before we arrived we had lots of phone calls and were asked lots of questions about what support and care was needed. It took a long time but they certainly seem to be helpful and know what they are doing.” People also confirmed that they signed their agreement to their support plan on arrival, we found this was the case when we looked at individual support plans.

The relatives we spoke with all had compliments and praise for the staff. One person told us, “They know exactly what is needed and always check daily to see everything is appropriate before they help.”

The service was meeting the requirements of the Mental Capacity Act (2005) and understood when best interest decisions were needed. Our discussions with members of staff also showed that staff were aware of their responsibilities regarding these areas of support.

The information staff gave us about individual needs and certain medical conditions matched what was documented within people’s care plans. Each person who lived at the service had full details about their health, medication and needs recorded in their care plans. The person’s doctor was also recorded in case of any emergency. One person said, “The staff asked for my doctor’s details as they explained my medication had changed and in case of any reaction they would call my doctor. I think they are very good about my medication.” Records confirmed that people had access to external healthcare professionals whenever contact or advice was needed.

People were provided with a choice of nutritious food and the current menus showed that people could choose between a variety of meals. People who were staying at the service told us they could ask for what they wanted at each meal time. Menus were on display for people to read at their leisure. One person told us that they were given what staff knew they liked when they did not feel like a full meal. “Staff know me and what I enjoy, always just right.” People told us that they liked the food that was offered and one person said they could not remember asking for an alternative as the meals were “always wonderful.” Staff had discussed what to provide for one person who was not feeling like eating. They also made a note to check on what this person had at supper time, in case they again did not feel like eating much.

Catering staff told us they always discussed the amount of food and fluid that people had to ensure this was sufficient. If staff were concerned about a person, they worked together to get a clear picture of what was happening to make certain the individual was comfortable and well. Our observations and discussions at this inspection confirmed this was the case.

Is the service caring?

Our findings

People told us that the staff were caring and that their dignity and privacy were respected at all times. One person said, “Yes, they help me when needed and always ask first.” Another person said, “Yes, very caring, helpful and always happy.” Another person told us, “Yes, that is why I return here when I can. Could not get better.” Everyone staying at the service had very positive comments about staff and how well they did their job. One person told us, “Staff are always good and remember me and what I like that’s important.” Another person said, “Staff are always very kind and check if anything has changed to make certain they know what I want.”

On our arrival at Park House Hotel we saw people laughing with staff and looking happy. They were relaxed with the staff who were supporting them and were talking openly about the activities they had booked for the week ahead. Staff were polite and respectful when they talked to people.

Staff knocked on people’s doors before entering into their room and people staying at the service confirmed that this was always the case.

The support plans we looked at had been written in a way that meant the person decided what support or care they received. They decided how and when these would be provided. Each one contained detailed information in relation to the individual person’s life history, needs, likes, dislikes and preferences. All of the staff were able to demonstrate a good knowledge of people’s individual needs. Staff clearly used previous knowledge for visits to make certain that the person’s expectations were met or

exceeded. On one occasion a certain meal had been enjoyed and this person’s notes clearly stated that this particular meal be made available again when the person booked a visit.

Outings, routines and events were planned to meet personal choices and preferences. People were also encouraged to maintain their independence and to complete whatever tasks they were able to manage. Our discussions with people staying at the service also confirmed this. One person told us, “Staff always ask before they help. On days when I am able to do things I like to at least try. Staff always respect this, do not rush me and often make suggestions that mean I can do what I want to myself. If my day is bad, they will help and they are so very good.”

We also spoke with people who had just arrived at Park House and who were on their first visit to the service. They told us that they had been welcomed, had tea and cake and were discussing their stay with staff. Equipment had been organised on arrival and both people felt that staff were very caring, helpful and could not be faulted. One person told us that their relative needed, ‘A lot of support and care.’ They told us that staff had made certain that care and support had been fully understood before their arrival to ensure that all needs could be met by the staff team.

When we read through records we saw that these fully supported the wellbeing and individual needs of people. For example, during one meeting staff discussed the comments of people who had left and any issues that may need to be followed through. The needs of the new guests due to arrive at the service were then discussed and their exact requirements. Staff worked together and discussed every aspect of care and support to make certain that each individual was cared for in the way they wished.

Is the service responsive?

Our findings

People had access to a number of activities they were interested in. Staff knew people, their likes and also their specific expectations for their stay. For example, one person had not been able to attend an outing that they were looking forward to. Staff made a note for the person's next visit to make certain that the same outing was on the agenda for this person to take part in. One person staying at the service told us, "We planned to look around locally but that has had to be changed to a garden centre as it is raining so hard." Another person said, "Staff always have such wonderful outings planned, this is my holiday so I enjoy it all. Staff make it special." One relative told us, "There is always something to enjoy and staff plan things so well." This demonstrated that people were supported to access activities that were important to them.

The service worked closely with the local community and external organisations to provide outings and specific events that were undertaken locally. The service itself is a member of various local organisations. People were also invited to access certain areas of Sandringham that were not readily available to the general public. One person said, "I look forward to the outings and always find something interesting to occupy my time. Not every outing is to my taste but there are plenty that are."

All of the staff told us they were mindful that some people may not get any other chance to have a rest and enjoy a holiday. This meant that staff worked together to make certain the experience was enjoyed by everyone. On the second day of our inspection discussions with people who had just arrived showed that staff took great care to ensure that they gathered information from the person concerned about what was important to them regarding their stay. Any trips that could be arranged for people during their stay were either arranged or noted for the person's next visit. People told us that they looked forward to their stay and one person said, "This is the one thing that keeps me going. I look forward to this holiday so much."

The support plans demonstrated the service had conducted a full assessment of people's individual needs to determine whether or not they could provide them with the support that they required. Plans of care were in place to give staff guidance on how to support people with their identified needs such as personal care, activities and with their night time routine.

Our discussions with staff and people staying confirmed that on admission the person's needs were discussed right down to if and when a person wanted to be checked during the night time. This helped to ensure that each person was enabled to have an individual and personalised experience during their stay. We saw that previous records were kept to provide historical information for each person. This helped staff to remember certain conversations or wishes that a person had voiced and then staff tried to fulfil these at the next stay for each individual. One person said that they had previously stayed over their birthday. The meal had been what the person had preferred and a cake was made to celebrate. The person said, "Staff made it a special day for me. I am usually alone a lot so it meant a great deal."

People were given details of how to complain or raise any concerns if they needed during their stay. This was included in the information that the provider sent to everyone who booked a stay.

A relative told us they had no complaints about the service but that if they did, they would speak to the staff and were confident that it would be resolved. Two people who had recently arrived explained that a few things needed to be sorted on arrival and staff had listened then acted efficiently to make certain things were put into place as needed. The service had not received any formal written complaints in the last 12 months. All of the staff we spoke with knew how to respond to complaints if they arose.

Is the service well-led?

Our findings

The service currently has an overall manager who is handling the management of the service, along with a team of senior staff, but there is no registered manager in place.

There is currently a review of how the service operates and how senior staff work together. The service wants to find the most suitable person for the role of registered manager and is therefore in the process of deciding who will be best to take over this position.

The culture of the service is to fully include the comments of all guests and their relatives into the development of any new areas. For example, specific requests about outings and tours have now been incorporated into the schedule for guests. The organisation worked to enable people with any degree of disability to be as independent as possible during their stay, with easy access to all areas of the hotel.

At the beginning of this inspection we attended a staff meeting. This clearly showed us that staff worked together to discuss the best plan of action for each intake of new guests. The forthcoming week of activities, outings and needs of the new guests were fully reviewed. Staffing levels were discussed plus safety and risk assessments. We were shown a computer programme that is shared between all departments. This enabled all information to be accessed by staff and also clearly showed if any tasks still required attention. For example, it showed how many volunteers were available, what recent events they supported and who has specific skills in certain areas. This allowed the appropriate person to be allocated to an event in the hope this would enhance the experience for the guests who took part. This produced an open and transparent working environment that included the wishes and requirements of people who used the service.

The comments from the guests who stayed during the previous week were looked at and discussed. If comments were made or any improvements suggested then staff addressed these at the meeting. Staff passed any individual comments they had to the head of department to take to these meetings. This meant that all members of staff had the opportunity to put their ideas or thoughts forward to be considered. We were told about one idea for the service that was put into place but had not been very successful.

Staff were discussing this outcome to try and find an alternative solution together.

Guests were given a form to complete on their departure to provide people with the opportunity to say what they felt about their experience. We saw that these were then followed up and any required changes were put into place as soon as possible. These were discussed at the next head of department meeting. The people we spoke with at this inspection who were staying at the service confirmed this was always the routine on leaving and that changes were made if needed. Three people told us they had never had cause to complain about anything. One person told us, "I always put compliments as that is the only way to say how I feel after my stay." Two people told us why they no longer completed feedback forms. One person said, "We do not fill the forms in any more as we always say how good things have been."

Staff told us they felt listened to and encouraged to make comments about the service. They said they knew about whistleblowing and would not hesitate to speak out if they had any concerns. Staff also felt that they worked together to deal with anything that may be brought up. Every member of staff told us that they liked their job and enjoyed being at work. Many staff had been working at the service for some time. The management structure was on display in the main entrance hall for people to understand how the various teams worked.

Records and procedures were in place to support the wellbeing and safety of people staying at the service. Regular checks on such things as equipment, fire safety, vehicles in use and also of the grounds were completed. Records were clearly labelled to help staff find the information they needed. Therefore staff had access to these records at any time so that they could provide people with the correct level of support that they required at all times.

The quality of the service was monitored by the service manager. We reviewed records that showed regular audits and monitoring of all areas was completed and discussed to ensure the environment and care was appropriate and of a good standard. Redecoration of internal areas was on going and as rooms became empty these were redecorated and had a deep clean. There were clear policies and procedures in place that had been regularly updated to reflect current legislation and good practice.

We saw that there was an appropriate system in place to monitor and learn from any concerns that may be raised. There had been no recent complaints as guests and staff

Is the service well-led?

discussed individual needs on a daily basis. However, we saw records that showed us that any matters needing attention were recorded, action taken and measures put in place to review and learn from these.

The needs of people were closely reviewed and monitored before and during a stay. This helped staff to fully meet the care and support needs of those staying at Park House Hotel.