

Cumberland Complex Ltd

Cumberland Complex

Inspection report

95-99 Braddons Hill Road East
Torquay
Devon
TQ1 1HF

Tel: 01803292379

Date of inspection visit:
31 March 2023

Date of publication:
12 June 2023

Ratings

Overall rating for this service

Good ●

Is the service safe?

Good ●

Is the service well-led?

Good ●

Summary of findings

Overall summary

About the service

Cumberland complex is a supported living service that can support up to 38 people. At the time of our inspection it was only providing a regulated activity to one person. The building had been adapted for supported living services and was registered with the local authority as a house of multiple occupancy (HMO). The building was in the seaside town of Torquay close to local shops and the sea. People had their own rooms and there were shared dining and communal lounge facilities. There was an office on site with staff available for support if needed.

Not everyone who used the service received personal care. CQC only inspects where people receive personal care. This is help with tasks related to personal hygiene and eating. Where they do we also consider any wider social care provided.

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

One person was supported to have maximum choice and control of their life and staff supported them in the least restrictive way possible and in their best interests; the policies and systems in the service supported this practice.

Since our last inspection improvements had been made in relation to medicines management, governance and how risks to people were assessed, monitored and managed.

The provider, registered manager and staff were clear about their roles and responsibilities. Quality assurance checks were in place to monitor the quality of the service provided. Medicines were managed safely, and people received their medicines as prescribed.

Staff were skilled and knowledgeable and knew how to identify and report any concerns. The provider had safe recruitment and selection processes in place. Staff were deployed effectively to meet the persons needs.

Rating at last inspection and update

The last rating for this service was requires improvement (published 30 April 2020) and there were breaches of regulation. The provider completed an action plan after the last inspection to show what they would do and by when to improve. At this inspection we found improvements had been made and the provider was no longer in breach of regulations.

Why we inspected

We carried out an announced comprehensive inspection of this service on 12 March 2020. Breaches of legal requirements were found. The provider completed an action plan after the last inspection to show what they would do and by when to improve medicines management, risk management and governance.

We undertook this focused inspection to check they had followed their action plan and to confirm they now

met legal requirements. This report only covers our findings in relation to the Key Questions Safe and Well-led which contain those requirements.

For those key questions not inspected, we used the ratings awarded at the last inspection to calculate the overall rating. The overall rating for the service has changed from Requires Improvement to Good. This is based on the findings at this inspection.

You can read the report from our last comprehensive inspection, by selecting the 'all reports' link for Cumberland Complex on our website at www.cqc.org.uk.

Follow up

We will continue to monitor information we receive about the service, which will help inform when we next inspect.

The five questions we ask about services and what we found

We always ask the following five questions of services.

Is the service safe?

Good ●

The service was safe.

Details are in our safe findings below.

Is the service well-led?

Good ●

The service was well-led.

Details are in our well-led findings below.

Cumberland Complex

Detailed findings

Background to this inspection

The inspection

We carried out this inspection under Section 60 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (the Act) as part of our regulatory functions. We checked whether the provider was meeting the legal requirements and regulations associated with the Act. We looked at the overall quality of the service and provided a rating for the service under the Health and Social Care Act 2008.

Inspection team

The inspection was carried out by 1 inspector

Service and service type

This service provides care and support to people living in 1 'supported living' setting, so that they can live as independently as possible. People's care and housing are provided under separate contractual agreements. CQC does not regulate premises used for supported living; this inspection looked at people's personal care and support.

Registered Manager

This provider is required to have a registered manager to oversee the delivery of regulated activities at this location. A registered manager is a person who has registered with the Care Quality Commission to manage the service. Registered managers and providers are legally responsible for how the service is run, for the quality and safety of the care provided and compliance with regulations.

At the time of our inspection there was a registered manager in post.

Notice of inspection

This inspection was unannounced.

What we did before the inspection

We reviewed information we had received about the service since the last inspection. We sought feedback from the local authority and professionals who work with the service. We used the information the provider sent us in the provider information return (PIR). This is information providers are required to send us

annually with key information about their service, what they do well, and improvements they plan to make. We used all this information to plan our inspection.

During the inspection

We spoke with 1 person who used the service. We spoke with 3 members of staff, the registered manager, the deputy manager and the provider, We reviewed a range of records. This included one person's care records and medicine administration records. We looked at four staff files in relation to recruitment. A variety of records relating to the management of the service, including audits were reviewed.

Is the service safe?

Our findings

Safe – this means we looked for evidence that people were protected from abuse and avoidable harm.

At our last inspection we rated this key question requires improvement. At this inspection the rating has changed to good. This meant people were safe and protected from avoidable harm.

At our last inspection in March 2020, the provider failed to ensure safe risk assessment processes and medicine systems were operating effectively. This was a breach of Regulation 12 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014. At this inspection the provider had made enough improvement and was no longer in breach of regulation 12.

Assessing risk, safety monitoring and management: Using medicines safely

- Staff fully understood the providers risk management procedure and how to manage risk in a consistent way which was based on nationally recognised good practice.
- The registered manager regularly assessed and reviewed risks and took appropriate action to ensure these risks were managed safely.
- The provider had a medicine policy in place which guided staff on how to administer and manage medicines safely. Staff had been trained in administering medicines and their competence regularly checked.
- Medicines were managed safely. Records confirmed and we observed one person received their medicines as prescribed.

Systems and processes to safeguard people from the risk of abuse

- The service had a safeguarding policy and procedure.
- One person told us they felt safe.
- Staff had completed mandatory safeguarding adults training. One staff member said, "we are receiving regular training. I would go to my manager if I had any concerns. We also have numbers for the local safeguarding team and we are encouraged to use this if we need to".

The Mental Capacity Act 2005 (MCA) provides a legal framework for making particular decisions on behalf of people who may lack the mental capacity to do so for themselves. The MCA requires that, as far as possible, people make their own decisions and are helped to do so when needed. When they lack mental capacity to take particular decisions, any made on their behalf must be in their best interests and as least restrictive as possible.

People can only be deprived of their liberty to receive care and treatment when this is in their best interests and legally authorised under the Mental Capacity Act (MCA). In care homes, and some hospitals, this is usually through MCA application procedures called the Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoLS)

- We found the service was working within the principles of the MCA. Staff were knowledgeable and understood their duty's under the act. One staff member told us "Capacity fluctuates and just because

someone lacks capacity in one thing it doesn't mean they lack capacity in everything".

Staffing and recruitment

- There was sufficient numbers of staff and staff were not rushed in their duties.
- Staff were recruited using a robust system that included several stages such as application, interview, DBS (police background) checks, shadowing and a probation review. This meant the service had made a concerted effort to recruit staff who were suitable to work with people who might be vulnerable.

Learning lessons when things go wrong

- There was a strong emphasis within the service on learning when things went wrong. The registered manager and provider had reflected on the findings from our last inspection and taken robust action to reduce the risk of reoccurrence.
- Accidents and incidents were recorded and reviewed by the registered manager and provider to identify any learning which may help to prevent a reoccurrence.
- Learning from accidents and incidents was shared with all staff on an individual basis and as a team.

Is the service well-led?

Our findings

Safe – this means we looked for evidence that people were protected from abuse and avoidable harm.

At our last inspection we rated this key question requires improvement. At this inspection the rating has changed to good. This meant people were safe and protected from avoidable harm.

At our last inspection in April 2020, the provider failed to ensure safe risk assessment processes and medicine systems were operating effectively. This was a breach of Regulation 12 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014. At this inspection the provider had made enough improvement and was no longer in breach of regulation 12.

Assessing risk, safety monitoring and management: Using medicines safely

- Staff fully understood the providers risk management procedure and how to manage risk in a consistent way which was based on nationally recognised good practice.
- The registered manager regularly assessed and reviewed risks and took appropriate action to ensure these risks were managed safely.
- The provider had a medicine policy in place which guided staff on how to administer and manage medicines safely. Staff had been trained in administering medicines and their competence regularly checked.
- Medicines were managed safely. Records confirmed and we observed one person received their medicines as prescribed.

Systems and processes to safeguard people from the risk of abuse

- The service had a safeguarding policy and procedure.
- One person told us they felt safe.
- Staff had completed mandatory safeguarding adults training. One staff member said, "We are receiving regular training. I would go to my manager if I had any concerns. We also have numbers for the local safeguarding team and we are encouraged to use this if we need to".

The Mental Capacity Act 2005 (MCA) provides a legal framework for making particular decisions on behalf of people who may lack the mental capacity to do so for themselves. The MCA requires that, as far as possible, people make their own decisions and are helped to do so when needed. When they lack mental capacity to take particular decisions, any made on their behalf must be in their best interests and as least restrictive as possible.

People can only be deprived of their liberty to receive care and treatment when this is in their best interests and legally authorised under the Mental Capacity Act (MCA). In care homes, and some hospitals, this is usually through MCA application procedures called the Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoLS)

- We found the service was working within the principles of the MCA. Staff were knowledgeable and understood their duties under the act. One staff member told us, "Capacity fluctuates and just because

someone lacks capacity in one thing it doesn't mean they lack capacity in everything".

Staffing and recruitment

- There was sufficient numbers of staff and staff were not rushed in their duties.
- Staff were recruited using a robust system that included several stages such as application, interview, DBS (police background) checks, shadowing and a probation review. This meant the service had made a concerted effort to recruit staff who were suitable to work with people who might be vulnerable.

Learning lessons when things go wrong

- There was a strong emphasis within the service on learning when things went wrong. The registered manager and provider had reflected on the findings from our last inspection and taken robust action to reduce the risk of reoccurrence.
- Accidents and incidents were recorded and reviewed by the registered manager and provider to identify any learning which may help to prevent a reoccurrence.
- Learning from accidents and incidents was shared with all staff on an individual basis and as a team.