

John & Mrs Valerie Bailey







Phoenix House

Inspection report

6 Lynn Road
Snettisham
Kings Lynn
Norfolk
PE31 7LP
Tel: 001485 544415
Website: www.val.bailey@btopenworld.com

Date of inspection visit: 5 & 9 December 2014
Date of publication: 18/03/2015

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 5 December 2014 and was unannounced. We arranged a return visit to the service on 9 December 2014 to speak with people living at Phoenix House.

Phoenix House is a residential care home that provides accommodation, care and support for up to six people who have learning disabilities. The home enables people to live as independently as possible with support. At the time of the inspection there were six people living at Phoenix House. There was a registered manager in place.

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.

People liked living at the home and felt safe. They received help when they needed it and were able to discuss things when they had any problems. People's

Summary of findings

needs were met by staff who were friendly, caring and who spoke appropriately to people. We saw that staff treated people with respect and clearly knew the routines and preferences of each person.

Staff knew how to make sure that people were safe and protected from abuse. They had been trained and had the skills and knowledge they needed to provide support to the people they cared for. Staff knew about the Mental Capacity Act (2005) and understood when best interest decisions were needed.

People and their relatives were consulted and involved in reviewing their plans of care to ensure their needs were met. They had access to healthcare professionals when they became unwell or required specialist help with a medical condition. People's independence was encouraged and developed wherever possible.

The staff group had worked for many years to maintain a domestic environment that encourages people to feel

part of a family. Some people have lived at the service for over 20 years. Relationships have been developed with family members as well as with professionals who provided support for people.

Surveys had been completed by people who lived at the service and also by relatives. These gained their view of the care and support provided to them. People's concerns and worries were quickly dealt with following discussions.

Regular checks were completed and the premises were maintained as a safe environment that met people's needs. For one person experiencing some mobility difficulties plans were in place to adjust the environment to make access easier. Medicines were stored correctly and records showed that people had received them as prescribed.

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.

The service had assessed the risks to people's safety and staff were always available to help them.

Staff knew how to reduce the risk of people experiencing abuse.

Medicines were available when people needed them. Regular checks were carried out to make sure people were safely assisted to take the correct medication.

Good



Is the service effective?

The service was effective.

Staff knew about the needs of the people that they supported and people had access to specialist healthcare advice when it was needed.

People were cared for by staff who were trained and had the knowledge and skills they needed to provide support for people.

Staff demonstrated an understanding of the Mental Capacity Act (2005) when supporting people to make decisions for themselves about their care.

Good



Is the service caring?

The service was caring.

People were involved in making decisions about their care and staff responded when people asked for help.

Staff were kind and attentive and supported people's wellbeing at all times. People's privacy and dignity were respected.

Staff listened to people who lived at the service and offered choices. People were supported to be as independent as possible.

Good



Is the service responsive?

The service was responsive.

People's individual needs had been assessed, planned and reviewed with them to make sure these were met. Staff knew how people wished to be supported.

Activities were provided and people would always ask and discuss any new activities or outings. People had access to, and were informed about, activities within the community.

People were able to talk with staff about any concerns they had. Concerns and complaints were dealt with quickly and opportunities were developed to encourage people to speak openly.

Good communication systems were in place and the manager was readily available to all.

Good



Is the service well-led?

The service was well-led.

Good



Summary of findings

People knew who the management team were. Staff were listened to and could question the way care and support was being provided.

The quality of the service was regularly monitored and audits were completed on all aspects of the service provided.

Phoenix 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.

This inspection took place on 5 and 9 December 2014 and was unannounced on the first visit. We made an appointment to return and speak with people who lived at the service. It was carried out by one inspector.

Prior to our inspection we reviewed information we held about the service. This included information we had received and any statutory notifications that had been sent

to us. A notification is information about important events which the service is required to send us by law. We looked at previous inspection records and all other information that we hold about the service.

On the day we visited the service, we spoke with four people who lived at Phoenix House. We spoke with the registered manager who oversaw the overall management of the service and is also one of the registered providers, the second registered provider and one member of staff. We also observed how care and support was provided to people.

We looked at four people's care plans and other records that showed us what routines people maintained and how they liked to be supported. We looked at medication records, daily diaries for each person's activities and routines as well as an appointments diary.

Is the service safe?

Our findings

One person said to us, “I am living here and I am very happy.” Another person told us, “They always look after me and I have my own room with my things.” We were shown a letter from a family member who expressed their pleasure that their relative had moved into Phoenix House. This clearly stated that the staff were like family and that they knew their relative would be well supported and safe.

Staff had completed safeguarding training and knew what they would do if they had any concerns. Staff told us that people living at the service were encouraged to share any concerns they may have. People living at the service said that they felt safe and were supported appropriately. They also said that staff always listened to them and were ready to assist people when needed.

Risk assessments had been completed and were up to date. Care plans held individual risk assessments for specific daily activities that assisted staff to support the safety of people. Potential risks to people had been assessed and reviewed by staff to ensure that they were receiving appropriate care. Staff knew the care and support needs of each person living at the home. They described the action they took to minimise the risk to a person’s safety that supported people’s wellbeing and changing needs.

People maintained their independence in a safe and well maintained environment that was geared to meet their needs. The provider told us, that for one person who may soon need support with their mobility, they were planning to make adjustments to the current use of ground floor rooms. They said that this action would enable staff to support this person and assist them in protecting the person from the risks associated with falls or other incidents.

We noted throughout the day that staff attended to people’s needs and provided continued support and attention. People were encouraged to maintain an independent lifestyle in a safe and unrestricted way. Any new travel arrangements or routines were risk assessed and the person was supported by staff until they were confident in undertaking the activity independently. Staffing levels were assessed daily according to the routines of each person. If any appointments were booked then staff were available to accompany the individual concerned.

Phoenix House operates in a domestic way and people are encouraged and supported to make their own choices and undertake the activities they enjoy. The providers and one member of staff have worked together for some years to provide this support and maintain the dignity and independence of people living at the service.

Medicines were safely managed. The manager explained how any difficulties with a person taking their medicines would be addressed. We noted that there was regular monitoring by the doctor to ensure the prescribed medicine continued to be appropriate. This meant that people were not left taking medicines when it was not necessary. Staff worked closely with the local GP to make certain that people managed their medicines when they were able, with support where needed. Any person self-medicating was also monitored to ensure the appropriate amounts were being taken. This action supported the independence of the person while ensuring their wellbeing. We saw that the practices being undertaken were appropriate and in accordance with current legislation.

Is the service effective?

Our findings

One person living at the service said, “Yes, staff help, I like it here.” Three people showed us their rooms and explained how they had wanted certain items of furnishings. They then explained how this provider had supported them to save and obtain exactly what they had wanted, meaning that staff had communicated appropriately. Staff understood what the person chose to do and provided support to the individual to achieve their goal.

Care plans contained information about what people liked and how they enjoyed their meals served. The provider explained about the support they provided to one person in relation to their diabetes. The effects of poor diet had been fully explained to the individual and they were then supported to manage their condition to be as independent as possible. We heard staff discussing certain aspects of people’s meal times and this showed us that staff were fully aware of what and how people should be supported with meals.

Staff told us that the GP was called as soon as there were any concerns about a person’s health. They said that professional advice was sought for people with any specific health difficulties and specialist consultants were involved whenever necessary. People living at the service and daily diaries we reviewed confirmed this. We noted during our discussions with people living at the service, that when people needed any medical support, the provider took action to involve a relevant health professional. These included healthcare professionals such as dietician or speech and language specialist to assist them in reduce any risk to people.

There were enough staff on duty at all times to provide assistance for people when they needed it. Staff told us that the likes and dislikes of individuals were known and choices were always available. We saw that alternative choices were accepted and fully supported regarding meals. People living at the service said that they liked their meals and had lots of meals out or at the pub if they chose to do so.

The provider and one person living at the service explained about the local allotment that was maintained and the vegetables that were planted. Fresh vegetables were

available on most days and we noted that there were at least six options on the daily menus. Meals chosen and eaten by each person were recorded in their individual daily diaries.

The fluid and nutritional in-take of people was monitored. Staff were aware of any individual needs or changes in the support needs of people and immediate action was taken needed. The provider told us how they regularly supported one person who needed regular snacks. This was undertaken with due consideration for the person’s independence, with regular health checks to ensure the individual’s wellbeing.

We observed staff asking people for their verbal consent before any actions, including support, were completed. Staff actively encouraged people to express their opinions and thoughts about the days ahead. People living at the service told us that they made decisions each day about what they would like to do.

We were assured that people and staff would be listened to and appropriate action would be taken when any issues arose such as complaints or concerns. People living at the service agreed that they would talk to the providers when they had any worries. One person explained how they had been helped following a difficult time. They made positive comments about this particular experience.

Staff development has been supported and a member of staff is currently completing an NVQ qualification. Following completion of this certificate, it is planned that the staff member will take on additional responsibilities within the service. We were told that refresher training had been booked to update current qualifications and knowledge. The local authority safeguarding team were also due to provide training within the next month.

People’s capacity to make decisions about their own care and support was assessed. For example, in relation to the medical needs of one person, the provider assessed the individual’s understanding of what was needed to manage a certain condition. Risk assessments were then completed and the person has been fully supported to independently manage this situation. There were regular assessments of this situation and the person continued to be fully in control of their daily lives regarding this condition. The

Is the service effective?

manager and staff discussed such assessments and showed that they had an understanding and knowledge of the Mental Capacity Act (MCA) and Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoLS).

Is the service caring?

Our findings

People living at Phoenix House were complementary about the staff team who provided their support and care. They told us that the staff were always available to speak to them about any matters and that they enjoyed living at the service. They told us they were able to invite their friends to visit them at the service at any time and that staff knew who their friends were. We saw staff laughing with people living at the service and that everyone was relaxed. People said they could join in with discussions, if they chose to do so. One person told us, "Staff are like my family and I am very happy here. I like it, they are good."

We heard people being offered choices and saw how people were encouraged to express their decisions. People were allowed time to think and then reply in their own time. When needed staff made certain that the individual had enough information and detail to make an informed decision.

Staff were respectful when they spoke about the people they were caring for. Staff recognised that the independence of people needed to be maintained and how this was best to undertake regarding each individual.

Staff told us about the care and support needs of each person living at the home. They told us that they used a flexible and relaxed approach that encouraged and supported people to choose their own daily routine and to

make a choice in all things that affected them. They explained that they made sure that people's privacy and dignity were respected. For example, by knocking on their bedroom door before entering and by checking with the person that they agreed with the care or support they were about to provide. Our observations of staff confirmed they carried out these actions and did consider people's dignity, particularly when prompting individuals. Staff showed a caring and considered attitude when providing any support. People living at the service were acting confidently and comfortably when speaking to staff, confirming that people were relaxed and felt able to discuss issues with staff.

Staff were relaxed and welcoming with discussions clearly showing that staff knew the current needs of people living at the service. People living at the service told us that they chose their own daily routines and said, "I choose things and staff help me." One person confirmed, "If I do not want to do something I can tell staff, that's alright, yes."

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 the individual person's life history, needs, likes, dislikes and preferences. Staff were able to demonstrate a good knowledge of people's individual needs. When we read through records we saw that these fully supported the wellbeing and individual needs of people.

Is the service responsive?

Our findings

People living at the service explained about past events and how these had been celebrated. They outlined the events to be enjoyed over the Christmas period. One person told us about gifts they had purchased and which friends they were keeping in touch with. People made positive comments about Phoenix House. Three people said they liked it and one person said, "They help me here and always sort things out. I like talking to the others."

We found detailed information in people's individual care plans and these also contained risk assessments. Daily records were maintained for each person that detailed how the person felt each day, the activities they had enjoyed as well as any healthcare appointments they had attended.

Staff were aware of people's individual requirements, routines and how the person preferred to be supported. We were told by staff how certain people would feel about any new person being at the service and we saw how comfortable people were when talking with staff and each other. Staff described the individual needs of people. They knew the daily routines and when support was needed.

Individual support plans were regularly reviewed to ensure that any change in care and support was recorded for staff information. A record was held of people's preferences, interests and diverse needs. We saw that staff members consulted and encouraged people living at the service to make their own decisions at all times.

The manager explained that a friend who visited one person regularly had moved into the service permanently. This had been discussed with everyone living at Phoenix House. We were shown a letter from this person's parents who spoke very highly of the service. The family were very happy that their relative was settled into a family environment that met his needs. This supported their wellbeing of everyone as there was no anxiety or concern about a stranger moving into the service. One person living at Phoenix House said that they liked having this person living there and commented, "Everyone is a friend, we like it here."

We saw that staff members explained things to people and allowed people time to fully understand the conversation. We saw that staff checked with the person that they were happy with the arrangements for the day ahead, making sure that the person gave their consent before any action was taken. People who required more information were reminded of why things were being slightly altered. For instance to allow people to attend a Christmas event, the meal time had been altered, staff listened and fully supported the individual needs of people.

We found appropriate routines were in place for such things as dealing with any complaints. People were regularly encouraged and supported to talk about their feelings. During our discussions with people living at the service, everyone told us that they would always talk with staff and that they would be listened to. One person explained about a certain item that no longer worked but meant a great deal to them. This item had been replaced but staff had adjusted things in the room to make certain there was adequate space for the item that no longer worked. The person said, "I like it and do not want to throw it away, so they [staff] helped me keep it." This supported individual needs and clearly showed people were listened to.

Outings, routines and events were planned to meet personal choices and preferences. For example, one person living at the service told us that they had some Christmas events that they were attending and that staff had made appropriate arrangements to ensure this was not missed. On the day of our inspection the meal had been moved to an alternative time as people were due to be at a show during the evening. People asked about these arrangements and staff explained the full details to people, sometimes repeating this information and checking that the person fully understood what was happening. Staff were respectful and considerate, allowing the person to take this information in.

Is the service well-led?

Our findings

Phoenix House is set out as a family home and the environment is therefore relaxed and has a friendly atmosphere. One person living at the service said, “This is my home and it’s comfortable here. I am happy.” Staff explained that if they had ideas about any type of change, they would discuss this. Most discussions were openly held over meal times when people were together and relaxed. This was the best time as people could easily become concerned if things appeared to be too formal. The wishes of people were then recorded in their daily diaries for reference.

The providers discussed some future plans for development and training that had been booked for everyone working at the home. This showed an open management style that allowed everyone to voice their opinion and be listened to. Staff also told us that they were able to discuss any matters with the providers and that meetings and on going plans for the service were also regularly addressed.

We were told that informal meetings with staff were held regularly and that staff were always available for everyone staying at the service. When we discussed this with people who were living at the service, they all confirmed that the staff ensured things were running smoothly and people were on time for their activities or appointments. This helped people to feel confident about the support they received.

People living at the service, and where possible, their relatives were asked for their opinions about the quality of the service provided. Most people had been living at Phoenix House for many years and were very much part of the local community.

Questionnaires were issued regularly to family members and discussions with people living at eh home about the service were recorded. The providers told us that questionnaires were also to be sending to external professionals and healthcare professionals such as GPs. This had not been formalised in the past but we were told that staff checked with all healthcare professionals to make certain that the support that was provided was appropriate. The providers said that they enjoyed a good working relationship with various professionals who provided support for people.

We were told that records were regularly checked for accuracy and to ensure that full details were provided. These records were for such area as diet and fluid intake, activities, medicines and ongoing healthcare appointments. We saw that records were complete and up to date.

Staff told us that they had access to historical information about each person. They said that this helped them to remember certain conversations or wishes that a person had voiced. They told us that the service tried to fulfil anything they were able to for each individual. People living at the service confirmed this. This supported the aims of people living at the service and also the values of the service, to enable and support people to achieve their full potential, were being maintained.

People were listened to and action was taken on any suggestions for improvements or adjustments to the service. These matters were then fully discussed and all outcomes were recorded. Staff explained what their actions would be if they needed to contact the local authority about such things as safeguarding.

This section is primarily information for the provider

Action we have told the provider to take

The table below shows where regulations were not being met and we have asked the provider to send us a report that says what action they are going to take. We did not take formal enforcement action at this stage. We will check that this action is taken by the provider.

This section is primarily information for the provider

Enforcement actions

The table below shows where regulations were not being met and we have taken enforcement action.