

Aldanat Care Limited

Peterhouse

Inspection report

Sneating Hall Lane
Kirby le Soken
Frinton On Sea
Essex
CO13 0EW

Tel: 01255861241
Website: www.aldanatcare.co.uk

Date of inspection visit:
09 August 2016

Date of publication:
23 September 2016

Ratings

Overall rating for this service	Inadequate ●
Is the service safe?	Inspected but not rated

Summary of findings

Overall summary

This was an unannounced and focused inspection carried out on 9 August 2016.

Peterhouse is a residential care home that provides care and support for up to eleven people who have a learning disability or autistic spectrum disorder. At the time of our inspection there were nine people using the service.

The service had a registered manager in post but they did not manage the service on a day to day basis. The registered manager was also a director of the company that provided the service. A registered manager is a person who has registered with the Care Quality Commission to manage the service. Like registered providers, they are 'registered persons'. Registered persons have legal responsibility for meeting the requirements in the Health and Social Care Act 2008 and associated Regulations about how the service is run.

We carried out an unannounced comprehensive inspection of Peterhouse on 5 April 2016 and we found a number of breaches of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014 and the service was given an overall judgement rating of 'inadequate' and is therefore in Special Measures.

Services in Special Measures will be kept under review and, if we have not taken immediate action to propose to cancel the provider's registration of the service, will be inspected again within six months. The expectation is that providers found to have been providing inadequate care should have made significant improvements within this timeframe.

If not enough improvement is made within this timeframe so that there is still a rating of inadequate for any key question or overall, we will take action in line with our enforcement procedures to begin the process of preventing the provider from operating this service. This will lead to cancelling their registration or to varying the terms of their registration within six months if they do not improve. This service will continue to be kept under review and, if needed, could be escalated to urgent enforcement action. Where necessary, another inspection will be conducted within a further six months, and if there is not enough improvement so there is still a rating of inadequate for any key question or overall, we will take action to prevent the provider from operating this service. This will lead to cancelling their registration or to varying the terms of their registration.

For adult social care services the maximum time for being in Special Measures will usually be no more than 12 months. If the service has demonstrated improvements when we inspect it and it is no longer rated as inadequate for any of the five key questions it will no longer be in Special Measures.

Following the comprehensive inspection on 5 April 2016 we served a warning notice on the provider in relation to the physical environment of the service which posed risks to people's health and safety. The warning notice included a timescale by when compliance with the legal requirements must be achieved.

We undertook this focused inspection to check that the provider had made improvements to meet the legal requirements in the warning notice, within the given timescale. This report only covers our findings in relation to the warning notice and those requirements. You can read the report from our last comprehensive inspection, by selecting the 'all reports' link for Peterhouse on our website at www.cqc.org.uk.

Measures had been put in place to reduce the risk of fire in the laundry and the risk of the spread of fire from the laundry. The laundry facilities had been refurbished which included fire safety precautions.

Actions had been taken to ensure the means of escape from the premises in the event of an emergency could be safely and effectively used. These included a secure ramp for people who use a wheelchair, new emergency lighting and the removal of rust and moss from the fire escape steps to minimise a slip and fall hazard.

The laundry facilities were fully refurbished and equipped to enable effective cleaning and minimise the risk of cross infection to protect people using the service, and staff, from harm.

Wardrobes and radiators were securely fixed to the wall to protect people from risk of injury and where required protective covering had been placed over radiators to protect people from risk of burns.

Further improvement was required to ensure the issues with the stair carpet coming away and fraying do not reoccur and pose a trip hazard.

Health, safety and fire risk assessments had been carried out. We will monitor to check the provider regularly reviews the assessments to identify risks to people using the service and necessary precautions to be taken within the service, and ensure compliance is sustained.

Other issues identified in the April inspection under the domain Safe were not followed up at this inspection. We will review our rating for Safe at the next comprehensive inspection. To improve the rating to 'Good' would require a longer term track record of sustainability.

The five questions we ask about services and what we found

We always ask the following five questions of services.

Is the service safe?

Inspected but not rated

Improvements had been made to the physical environment to ensure it was safe, adequately maintained and clean to protect people from risk.

Peterhouse

Detailed findings

Background to this inspection

We carried out this inspection under Section 60 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 as part of our regulatory functions. This inspection was planned to check whether the provider is meeting the legal requirements and regulations associated with the Health and Social Care Act 2008, to look at the overall quality of the service, and to provide a rating for the service under the Care Act 2014.

We undertook this unannounced focused inspection of Peterhouse on 9 August 2016. This inspection was carried out to check that improvements to meet legal requirements had been made by the provider following our comprehensive inspection on 5 April 2016. The inspection was carried out by one inspector.

Following the comprehensive inspection on 5 April 2016, we asked the provider to take action within a given timescale to make improvements to the physical environment of the service which posed risks to people's health and safety. This action has been completed.

During this inspection we did not speak with people using the service. We spoke with the registered manager, senior care worker and two care staff. We also spoke with members of the local authority safeguarding and quality improvement teams. We looked at the premises and reviewed risk assessment and management documentation.

Is the service safe?

Our findings

At the last inspection on 5 April 2016 we found shortfalls with facilities, equipment and practice within the service which did not protect people from risks relating to health and safety, fire, poor hygiene and infection control systems. This included concerns with the laundry, unsecure wardrobes and radiators, worn carpets, exposed wiring and outstanding actions to prevent the risks of Legionella in the water supply. We took enforcement action to ensure the provider made improvements to meet legal requirements and protect people from these risks. This inspection took place to ensure improvements had been made within the given timescale.

The laundry facilities were not designed or maintained to minimise the risk of fire and the risk of recontamination. Therefore people were not protected from the risk of the spread of fire or the risk of cross infection.

At this inspection we saw the laundry room had been refurbished and measures had been taken to reduce the risk of fire. Ventilation was provided to reduce condensation which also reduced this risk. Action had also been taken to minimise the risk of cross infection. The walls were non-permeable for effective cleaning; there were separate sluicing and hand washing facilities and appropriate areas for the segregation of dirty and clean linen. Floor mops were colour coded to identify purpose and were appropriately stored. Washing machines were in full working order to decontaminate laundry effectively. The provider had put in place a new linen handling and laundry policy for staff to follow to limit the risks of cross infection. Staff told us that they were very pleased with the results of the refurbishment of the laundry room and the facilities were suitable to protect people using the service, and themselves, from risks to their health and safety. They were able to demonstrate that the new policies were being adhered to which improved the overall quality and safety of care they provided.

All wardrobes were securely fixed to the wall, with the exception of two wardrobes in one person's bedroom. This was because the bedroom had just been redecorated; assurance was given by the Director of the company that the wardrobes were scheduled to be fixed to the wall on the day of our inspection. Additional storage facilities had been provided for people so that items were not stored on the top of wardrobes.

Radiators were repaired or replaced and where required had protective covering which minimised the risk of injury and burns. The stair carpet had not been replaced but repaired. This will only provide a temporary measure to reduce the trip hazard. Staff said that the carpet was continuing to wear in other places. The broken electric socket in the dining room had not been replaced. The Director of the company told us that there was no longer a risk because the socket was disconnected from the electricity circuit. They acknowledged a blank plate was required to hide the exposed wiring, and assured us that this would be addressed.

Outstanding maintenance work had been completed to protect people from the risk of Legionella and we saw that there were systems in place to ensure this was monitored and reviewed.

Measures had been taken to minimise risk to emergency exit routes. A new ramp was in place at the fire exit to provide people who use wheelchairs easy access in the event of an emergency. New emergency lighting had been installed to exits from the building and rust, moss and algae had been removed from the fire escape steps to reduce a slip hazard, however the steps still required painting to prevent reoccurrence of moss collection and rust.

Health, safety and fire risk assessments had been carried out. The provider told us that these would be regularly reviewed to identify risks to people using the service and necessary precautions to be taken within the service to sustain compliance.

People were happy with the refurbishment programme and were involved in planning and choosing new decoration colours and themes for their bedrooms. A property development plan for 2016 which identified areas in the service that required redecoration, replacement or repair was in working progress. The plan prioritised urgency and included dates for completion and any reasons if not completed by due date. The plan showed the work was on track and work planned for the months May, June and July had been completed. This included redecoration of six people's bedrooms, the repair or replacement of windows, new safety fencing around the pond and entrance, as well as the work mentioned above.