Hanningfield Retirement Homes Limited

Hanningfield Retirement Home Limited

Inspection report

99 London Road
Sittingbourne
Kent
ME10 1NR
Tel: 01795 479587
Website:

Date of inspection visit: 27 October 2015
Date of publication: 27/11/2015

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

We carried out this inspection on the 27 October 2015, it was unannounced.

Hanningfield Retirement Home is a privately owned care home providing accommodation and personal care for up to 39 older people, some of whom are living with dementia. The premises are a large detached property providing accommodation over two floors with a passenger lift and two chair lifts for access to upper floors. At the time of the inspection, 39 people lived at the service.

The service had a registered manager. A registered manager is a person who has registered with the Care Quality Commission 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.

There were sufficient numbers of staff to meet people's needs. Staff were recruited using procedures designed to protect people from unsuitable staff. Staff had the knowledge and skills to meet people's needs, and attended regular training courses. Staff met with the management team and discussed their work performance at one to one meetings and during annual appraisal, so they were supported to carry out their roles. Staff were supported by the registered manager and felt able to raise any concerns they had or to make suggestions to improve the service to people.

People said they were happy at the service. Staff were available throughout the day, and responded quickly to people's requests for help. Staff communicated well with people, and supported them when they needed it.

People were protected against the risk of abuse. People told us they felt safe. Staff recognised the signs of abuse or neglect and what to look out for. Both the registered providers, registered manager and staff understood their role and responsibilities to report any concerns and were confident in doing so.

The Care Quality Commission (CQC) monitors the operation of the Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoLS) which applies to care homes. The registered manager understood when an application should be made. They were aware of the Supreme Court Judgement which widened and clarified the definition of a deprivation of liberty. The service was meeting the requirements of the Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards.

There were risk assessments in place for the environment, and for each person who received care. Assessments identified people's specific needs, and showed how risks could be minimised. There were systems in place to review accidents and incidents and make any relevant improvements as a result.

People and their relatives were involved in planning their own care, and staff supported them in making arrangements to meet their health needs. Staff contacted other health and social care professionals for support and advice.

Medicines were administered, stored, and disposed of safely. People received their medicines as prescribed.

People were provided with a diet that met their needs and wishes. Menus offered variety and choice. People said they liked the food. Staff respected people and we saw several instances of a kindly touch or a joke and conversation as drinks or the lunch was served.

Staff encouraged people to undertake activities and supported them to become more independent. Staff spent time engaging people in conversations, and spoke to them politely and respectfully.

The registered providers and the registered manager investigated and responded to people's complaints. People knew how to raise any concerns and relatives were confident that the registered manager dealt with them appropriately and resolved them where possible.

There were systems in place to obtain people's views about the service. These included formal and informal meetings; events; questionnaires; and daily contact with the registered manager and staff.

The registered providers and registered manager regularly assessed and monitored the quality of care to ensure standards were met and maintained. The registered providers and registered manager understood the requirements of their registration with the Care Quality Commission.

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 received their medicines as required and prescribed.

People told us that they felt safe living in the service, and that staff cared for them well.

Staff were recruited safely.

Staff had received training on how to recognise the signs of abuse and were aware of their roles and responsibilities in regards to this.

Good

Is the service effective?
The service was effective.

People said that staff understood their individual needs and staff were trained to meet those needs.

The menus offered variety and choice and provided people with enough to eat and drink to maintain their health and wellbeing.

Staff were guided by the principles of the Mental Capacity Act 2005 to ensure any decisions were made in the person's best interests.

Staff ensured that people's health needs were met. Referrals were made to health and social care professionals when needed.

Good

Is the service caring?
The service was caring.

People were treated with dignity and respect.

Staff were supportive, patient and caring. The atmosphere in the service was welcoming.

Wherever possible, people were involved in making decisions about their care and staff took account of their individual needs and preferences.

Good

Is the service responsive?
The service was responsive.

People were given information on how to make a complaint in a format that met their communication needs.

People and their relatives were involved in their care planning. Changes in care and treatment were discussed with people.

People were supported to maintain their own interests and hobbies. Visitors were always made welcome.

Good

Is the service well-led?
The service was well-led.

Good

Summary of findings

The home had an open and approachable management team. Staff were supported to work in a transparent and supportive culture.

Staff told us they found their registered manager to be very supportive and felt able to have open and transparent discussions with them through one-to-one meetings and staff meetings.

There were effective systems in place to monitor and improve the quality of the service provided.

Hanningfield Retirement Home Limited

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 the 27 October 2015, it was unannounced. The inspection team consisted of an inspector and an expert by experience. Our expert had experience of working with older people and people living with dementia.

We spoke with 20 people, and five relatives. We looked at personal care records and support plans for four people. We looked at the medicine records; activity records; and four staff recruitment records. We spoke with the registered manager, the registered provider, four members of staff and the cook. We observed the care interaction and staff carrying out their duties, such as giving people support at lunchtime.

Before the inspection, we asked the provider to complete a Provider Information Return (PIR). This is a form that asks for some key information about the service, what the service does well and improvements they plan to make. We also contacted other health and social care professionals who provided health and social care services to people. These included community nurses, doctors, local authority care managers and commissioners of services.

Before the inspection we examined previous inspection reports and notifications sent to us by the registered manager about incidents and events that had occurred at the service. A notification is information about important events which the provider is required to tell us about by law. We used all this information to decide which areas to focus on during our inspection.

At the previous inspection on 25 November 2013, the service had met the standards of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2010.

Good

Is the service safe?

Our findings

People told us that they felt safe living in the service. People who were able to commented, “Oh yes, it is safe”, “We are safe here, and anyone who said they weren’t would be wrong”, and “I came here voluntarily, so I do feel safe”.

Relatives felt that their loved ones were safe. Relatives said, “I feel that she is safe”, “I think he is safe. The environment seems perfect for him”, and “There is peace of mind now that she is here”.

There were suitable numbers of staff to care for people safely and meet their needs. Most people needed to be supervised due to their needs. Staff were on hand and it was easy to find someone when people needed assistance. The registered manager showed us the staff duty rotas and explained how care staff were allocated to each shift. The rotas showed there were sufficient staff on shift at all times. The registered manager said if a person telephones in sick, the person in charge would ring around the other members of staff to find cover. This showed that arrangements were in place to ensure enough staff were made available at short notice. The registered manager told us staffing levels were regularly assessed depending on people’s needs and occupancy levels, and adjusted accordingly.

The provider operated safe recruitment procedures. There was a recruitment policy which set out the appropriate procedure for employing new staff. Staff recruitment records were clear and complete. This enabled the registered manager to easily see whether any further checks or documents were needed for each employee. Staff told us they did not start work until the required checks had been carried out. These included proof of identity check; satisfactory written references; a Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) criminal record check; and proof of qualifications obtained. These processes help employers make safer recruitment decisions and helps prevent unsuitable people from working with people who use care and support services. Successful applicants were required to complete an induction programme during their probation period, so that they understood their role and were trained to care for people.

Staff followed the provider’s policy about safeguarding people and this was up to date with current practice. Staff were trained and had access to information so they understood how abuse could occur. Staff understood how they reported concerns in line with the providers safeguarding policy if they suspected or saw abuse taking place. Staff spoke confidently about their understanding of keeping people safe. Staff gave us examples of the tell-tale signs they would look out for that would cause them concern. For example bruising. Staff understood that they could blow-the-whistle to care managers or others about their concerns if they needed to. Staff were aware that people living with dementia may not always be able to recognise risk or communicate their needs. Staff told us that they had received safeguarding training at induction and records showed that staff had completed safeguarding training. Any concerns raised were recorded and the registered manager understood how to protect people by reporting concerns they had to the local authority and protecting people from harm. People could be confident that staff had the knowledge and skills to recognise and report any abuse appropriately.

Risks were minimised and safe working practices were followed by staff. Risk assessments were completed for each person to make sure staff knew how to protect them from harm. The risk assessments contained detailed instructions for staff on how to recognise risks and take action to try to prevent accidents or harm occurring. For example, moving and handling, skin integrity risk and falls risk assessments were in place for staff to refer to and act on. In relation to maintaining people’s safety, the slips, trips and falls assessments instructed staff to make sure that the person used their walking aid, and to ensure that there were no hazards in their way. For one person whose records showed they had had two falls, they had been referred to a health care professional for a falls assessment to be carried out. We saw that the risk assessment had been updated. We observed that staff used appropriate moving and handling transfers to ensure people were supported safely.

Incidents and accidents were checked and investigated by the registered manager to make sure that responses were effective and to see if any changes could be made to prevent incidents happening again. We saw there were risk assessments and guidelines for the use of bedrails which were reviewed on a regular basis.

People were protected from the risks associated with the management of medicines. Medicines were kept safe and secure and were disposed of in a timely and safe manner. A policy was in place to guide staff from the point of ordering,

Good

Is the service safe?

administering, storing and disposal, and we observed this was followed by the staff. A number of checks were conducted by both the registered manager to ensure medicines were ordered and no excess stock was kept by the home. Daily checks were made of the medicine room to ensure the temperature did not exceed normal room temperatures. The medicines fridge was also checked daily and records maintained to ensure the medicines remained within normal range. The registered manager conducted a monthly audit of the medicine used. This indicated that the registered manager had an effective governance system in place to ensure medicines were managed and handled safely.

People were given their medicines by staff trained to administer medicines. Staff ensured they were administered on time and as prescribed. One person said, "If my tablets are changed, they tell me. I like to know". Another person said, "My tablets are on time and I know what they are all for". Appropriate assessments had been undertaken for people around their ability to take their medicines and whether they had the capacity. Records we reviewed contained when needed, a detailed plan for the administration of medicines that were for 'as required' or homely medicines. This gave staff details of why certain medicines such as paracetamol were given.

Emergency procedures in the event of a fire were in place and understood by staff. Internal checks of fire safety systems were made regularly and recorded. Fire detection and alarm systems were regularly maintained. Staff knew how to protect people in the event of fire as they had undertaken fire training and took part in practice fire drills. Evacuation information was available in each person's care plan. These included details of the support they would need if they had to be evacuated. These were kept in an accessible place and readily available in the event of an emergency. The staff knew how to respond in the event of an emergency, who to contact and how to protect people.

Good

Is the service effective?

Our findings

People told us that staff looked after them well. People said, "The staff make a very relaxed atmosphere here", "I get all the help I need", and "I have never been so well in my life. I have seen the doctor a couple of times and now I am fine".

Relatives said, "They (staff) really know what they are doing and they all seem naturally to love older people", and "They are efficient. They cannot do enough for her". Relatives were pleased with the way in which their loved ones' healthcare needs were met. One relative said, "Her health has improved here. They make sure she gets to all of the appointments that she needs and they changed her doctor, this one is much better". Another relative said, "The whole family are happy with his healthcare".

People confirmed that staff sought their consent before they provided care and support. Staff interacted well with people, and asked them where they wanted to go and what they wanted to do. They obtained people's verbal consent to assist them with personal care such as helping them with their meals, or taking them to the toilet. Staff were aware of how to treat people with respect and that they allowed people to express their consent to different tasks. There were consent forms in place in each person's care plan. Consent forms had been appropriately completed by people's representatives where this was applicable. The forms showed the representative's relationship to the person concerned, and their authorisation to speak or sign forms on the person's behalf or in their best interests.

The registered manager and staff we spoke with told us that people had capacity to make decisions but recognised that in the future this may not be the case, so they and the staff had attended training in the Mental Capacity Act (MCA) 2005. MCA is legislation to protect and empower people who may not be able to make their own decisions, particularly about their health care, welfare or finances. Staff that we spoke with understood the principles of the MCA, deprivation of liberty and 'best interest' decisions.

Staff had received training in the Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoLS). There were procedures in place and guidance in relation to the Mental Capacity Act 2005 (MCA) which included steps that staff should take to comply with legal requirements. People when appropriate, were assessed in line with the Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoLS) as set out in the Mental Capacity Act 2005 (MCA). A DoLS ensures a person is only deprived of their liberty in a safe and correct way, and is only done when it is in the best interests of the person and there is no other way to look after them. Staff supported people without any form of restrictions of their liberty. There were people who lived in home for whom a DoLS application had been applied for, and granted. For example, one person was restricted from leaving the premises, in order to maintain their safety.

Staff told us that they had received induction training, which provided them with essential information about their duties and job roles. They said that any new staff would complete an induction programme and shadow experienced staff, and not work on their own until assessed as competent to do so. They were signed off by the registered managed when assessed as competent.

All care staff had or were completing vocational qualifications in health and social care. These are work based awards that are achieved through assessment and training. To achieve vocational qualification candidates must prove that they have the competence to carry out their job to the required standard. This helped staff to deliver care effectively to people at the expected standard. Staff received refresher training in a variety of topics such as infection control and health and safety. Training records showed that staff were trained to meet people's specialist needs such as dementia care awareness. This training helped staff to know how to empathise with people who had old age confusion as well as anyone with dementia.

Staff were supported through individual one to one meetings and appraisals. One to one meetings and appraisals provided opportunities for staff to discuss their performance, development and training needs, which the registered provider monitored effectively. The staff said that they had handovers between shifts, and this provided the opportunity for daily updates with people's care needs. Staff were aware that the registered manager had an open door policy and was available for staff to talk to at any time. Staff were positive about this and felt able to discuss areas of concerns within this system. Staff received an annual appraisal and felt these were beneficial to identify what they wished to do within the service and their career. All of the staff we talked to said that the staff "worked well as a team" and this was evident in the way the staff related to each other and to people they were caring for. A relative we spoke with said, "The staff are a good team".

Good

Is the service effective?

People were supported to have a balanced diet. People's dietary needs were discussed before admission and the cook was informed. The cook was familiar with different diets, such as diabetic diets and vegetarian. Care plans included eating and drinking assessments and gave clear instructions to staff on how to assist people with eating. There was a menu in place that gave people a variety of food they could choose from. People's likes and dislikes were recorded and the cook was aware of what people liked and did not like. People were offered choices of what they wanted to eat and records showed what they had chosen. Comments from people included, "We have good food here", "If there is something you don't like they change it", "The cook is very good and you get enough", and "'It is excellent food here, and I am a fussy eater. Everything is lovely. If you want some more, you have only to ask, and they give you more". Relatives told us, "The food looks lovely. It is all freshly prepared. She is eating, so we are all pleased", "He is happy with the food", and "The food and drink all look good here". This meant that people's nutritional needs were met people at risk of dehydration or malnutrition were appropriately assessed, and fortified food was provided to increase their calorie intake if they had low weights. People were weighed regularly and their weight was recorded in their care plan. Staff informed the registered manager of any significant weight gains or losses, so that they could refer them to the doctor for any treatment required.

The registered manager had procedures in place to monitor people's health. Referrals were made to health professionals including doctors and dentists as needed. People told us that the doctor regularly visited and if they wanted to see the doctor the staff would make an appointment. One person said, "The doctor always comes here when needed". Where necessary the registered manager referred people to other professionals such as the tissue viability nurse, speech and language therapist (SALT) and dieticians. All appointments with professionals such as doctors, opticians, dentists and chiropodists had been recorded. Future appointments had been scheduled and there was evidence of regular health checks. People's health and well-being had been discussed with them regularly and professionally assessed and action taken to maintain or improve people's welfare.

The premises were adapted for people who use wheelchairs or have difficulty moving around. Some adaptations to the environment had been made to meet people's physical needs. For example, a range of equipment for transferring people, from their bed to a chair. Toilets had raised toilet seats, and grab bars which provided support for people to enable them to retain their independence.

Good

Is the service caring?

Our findings

People told us, “It is not a miserable place. The carers are 100% good and no one is ill-treated. Some of the carers are extremely nice”, “People are lovely here. It is a very nice place. There are men as well as women and I like that. They are all nice girls (staff), they work very hard”, and “I find the carers wonderful”.

Relatives commented, “They (staff) are absolutely friendly and welcoming. They all know us here”, “It is 100% good care. A fantastic home for her”, “They are caring people, we all love it, they are wonderful people”, “I have been happy with his care here, as have all of the family. He looks well cared for, all clean and well shaven”, and “We are all over the moon with the care here. Her health has improved and she is happier here”.

People and their relatives had been involved in planning how they wanted their care to be delivered. People told us that they were involved in discussions about their care needs. One relative told us, they made her room perfect for her. Relatives felt involved and had been consulted about their family member’s likes and dislikes, and personal history.

People said that staff knew them well and that they made choices throughout the day regarding the time they got up went to bed, whether they stayed in their rooms, where they ate and what they ate. People felt they could ask any staff for help if they needed it. People were supported as required but allowed to be as independent as possible. One person said, “The carers are really caring. I get on well with them all. We talk normally”.

Staff were responsive to people’s needs. People's needs were recognised and addressed by the staff and the level of support was adjusted to suit individual requirements. The care plans contained specific information about the person’s ability to retain information or make decisions. Staff encouraged people to make their own decisions and respected their choices. For example, people were encouraged to choose what to wear and, supported to make decisions about what they wanted to wear. Changes in care and treatment were discussed with people or their representative before they were put in place. People were included in the regular assessments and reviews of their individual needs. The staff spoken with showed that they knew people well.

Staff chatted to people when they were walking with them, and when giving assistance during the mealtime. Staff knew people’s names, nicknames and preferred names, and people’s preferred name was recorded in the care plans. Staff recognised and understood people's non-verbal ways of communicating with them, for example people's body language and gestures. Staff were able to understand people's wishes and offer choices. There was a relaxed atmosphere in the service and we heard good humoured exchanges with positive reinforcement and encouragement. We saw gentle and supportive interactions between staff and people. Staff supported people in a patient manner and treated people with respect. We observed the staff knocking on the doors before entering rooms.

People said they were always treated with respect and dignity. Staff gave people time to answer questions and respected their decisions. They spoke to people clearly and politely, and made sure people had what they needed. Staff spoke with people according to their different personalities and preferences, joking with some appropriately, and listening to people.

People were able to choose where they spent their time, for example, in their bedroom or the communal areas. We saw people had personalised their bedrooms according to their individual choice. For example family photos, small pieces of their own furniture and their own choice of bed linen. People were relaxed in the company of staff, and often smiled when they talked with them. Support was individual for each person.

We observed that the call bells (a button people could press when they required assistance) were answered in a timely manner, and staff were always around to give people the support they needed. People told us, “They come quickly usually”, “I press the buzzer and don’t wait long”, and “I press it at night and they come quickly. I cannot fault it at all”.

Staff respected confidentiality. When talking about people, they made sure no one could over hear the conversations. All confidential information about people was kept securely in the office and the access was restricted to senior staff. When staff completed paperwork they kept this confidential.

Good

Is the service responsive?

Our findings

People told us they received care or treatment when they needed it. None of the people we spoke with had made a complaint about their care, but told us if they had a problem they would speak with the manager. People said, "I know they contact the family okay", "I can do whatever I want. A bath, a shower. Nothing is a problem here for them", "I couldn't have better treatment if I was in a hotel", and "Everything is looked after for me".

Relatives felt that staff maintained contact with them. Relatives said, "They keep in touch with us", "We talk all the time", "Sometimes they might not call us if there's a problem, but it is because she has said to them, don't phone them, it'll worry them. We understand their problem and we are talking to her about it".

The management team carried out pre-admission assessments to make sure that they could meet the person's needs before they moved in. People and their relatives or representatives had been involved in these assessments. This was an important part of encouraging people to maintain their independence. People's needs were assessed and care and treatment was planned and recorded in people's individual care plan. These care plans contained clear instructions for the staff to follow to meet individual care needs. The staff knew each person well enough to respond appropriately to their needs in a way they preferred and was consistent with their plan of care.

People's needs were recognised and addressed by staff and the levels of support was adjusted to suit individual requirements. The care plans contained specific information about the person's ability to retain information or make decisions. Staff encouraged people to make their own decisions and respected their choices. One person told us "I'm happy with my 9 o'clock bedtime, and I have a lovely shower". Changes in care and treatment were discussed with people before they were put in place. People were included in the regular assessments and reviews of their individual needs.

The staff recorded the care and support given to each person. Each person was involved in regular reviews of their care plan, which included updating their assessments as needed. The records of their care and support showed that the care people received was consistent with the plans that they had been involved in reviewing. Staff were able to describe the differing levels of support and care provided and also when they should be encouraging and enabling people to do things for themselves. Support was individual for each person. We saw that people could ask any staff for help if they needed it. Staff knew the needs and personalities of the people they cared for.

Staff encouraged people to follow their individual interests and hobbies. Several people spoke fondly of the recent Salvation Army visit, and of the weekly 'man with the guitar'. In the afternoon of the inspection visit, a video was shown. A relative mentioned, 'Colouring, crosswords and bingo'. A person said, "There are quizzes and games if you want to join in". Another person spoke highly of Xmas at the home, and of an open day, saying "Lots of people came". There were links with local services for example, local churches and local entertainers.

People's family and friends were able to visit at any time. People said, "They are absolutely friendly and welcoming", "They make all my visitors welcome", and "They give your visitors tea and coffee". No one mentioned any visiting restrictions at all and one relative stressed how welcome the staff made them feel.

Information about making a complaint was available on the information board at the entrance of the service. People were given information on how to make a complaint in a format that met their communication needs, such as large print. People were given the opportunity at regular reviews to raise any concerns they may have. All people spoken with said they would be confident about raising any concerns. Relatives and people who lived at the service knew the registered provider and registered manager and felt that they could talk to the manager with any problems they had. The providers and the registered manager investigated and responded to people's complaints.

The registered manager told us that there had been two complaints made, and action had been taken to resolve any issues raised. The registered manager confirmed that complaints were investigated appropriately and reported on. The registered provider said that any concerns or complaints were regarded as an opportunity to learn and improve the service, and would always be taken seriously and followed up. People told us they knew how to raise any concerns and were confident that the registered manager dealt with them appropriately within a set timescale.

Good

Is the service well-led?

Our findings

People and staff told us that they thought the service was well-led. People said, “There is a man and a woman in charge”, and “The owners are very sociable, they all get involved”. One person said they had an affectionate nickname for the registered manager and said, “The manager is fine, they are all great”. Another person said, “This is a well-run establishment”.

The provider had a clear set of vision and values. These were described in the Statement of Purpose. The aims and objectives was to provide an environment that all people can regard as their home. A place where comfort and dignity take priority. A place where choices are respected where privacy is an individual right. The management team demonstrated their commitment to implementing these by putting people at the centre when planning, delivering, maintaining and improving the service they provided. From our observations and what people told us, it was clear that these values had been successfully cascaded to the staff. It was clear that they were committed to caring for people and responded to their individual needs.

The aims and objectives of the service were set out, and management and staff were able to follow these. For example, they had a clear understanding of what the service could provide to people in the way of care and meeting their physical and mental health needs.

The management team at Hanningfield Retirement Home included the registered providers, and the registered manager. The registered providers provided support to the registered manager, and the registered manager supported the care staff and ancillary staff. Staff understood the management structure of the home, who they were accountable to and their roles and responsibilities in providing care for people.

People were asked for their views about the service in a variety of ways. These included formal and informal meetings; events where family and friends were invited; questionnaires and daily contact with the registered manager and staff.

People and relatives spoke highly of the registered manager and staff. We heard positive comments about how the service was run. They said the registered manager had an open door policy. People said that staff and management worked well together as a team. They promoted an open culture by making themselves accessible to people, visitors, and staff, and listening to their views.

There were systems in place to review the quality of all aspects of the service. Monthly and weekly audits were carried out to monitor areas such as infection control, health and safety, care planning and accident and incidents. Appropriate and timely action had been taken to protect people and ensure that they received any necessary support or treatment. There were auditing systems in place to identify any shortfalls or areas for development, and action was taken to make improvements whenever possible.

Communication within the service was facilitated through regular team meetings. Minutes of staff meetings showed that staff were able to voice opinions. We asked staff on duty if they felt comfortable in doing so and they replied that they could contribute to meeting agendas and 'be heard', acknowledged and supported. Staff told us there was good communication between staff and the management team. The registered manager had consistently taken account of people's and staff’s input in order to take actions to improve the care people were receiving.

The registered manager was aware of when notifications had to be sent to the Commission. These notifications would tell us about any important events that had happened in the home. Notifications had been sent in to tell us about incidents that required a notification. We used this information to monitor the service and to check how any events had been handled. This demonstrated the registered manager understood their legal obligations.

There were effective systems in place to manage risks to people’s safety and welfare in the environment. The provider contracted with specialists companies to check the safety of equipment and installations such as gas, electrical systems, hoists and the adapted baths to make sure people were protected from harm.