

Canterbury Oast Trust Harrington Cottage

Inspection report

Forge Hill Aldington Ashford Kent TN25 7DT Date of inspection visit: 30 April 2017

Date of publication: 19 May 2017

Tel: 01233720814 Website: www.c-o-t.org.uk

Ratings

Overall rating for this service

Is the service safe?

Good

Good

Summary of findings

Overall summary

Care service description

Harrington Cottage is registered to provide accommodation and personal care for up to six people. Harrington Cottage is a detached house situated near Aldington village and has views over countryside. People living at the service had a range of learning disabilities. There were four people living at the service at the time of the inspection. Everyone had their own bedroom and shared a lounge, kitchen, dining room, bathrooms and toilets.

Rating at last inspection

At the last inspection, the service was rated Good overall and rated Requires Improvement in the 'safe' domain.

Why we inspected

We carried out an unannounced comprehensive inspection of this service on 21 October 2015. One breach of a regulation was found. After the comprehensive inspection, the provider wrote to us to say what they would do to meet legal requirements in relation to the breach of Regulation 12 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 Regulated Activities Regulations 2014, medicines management. We undertook this focused inspection to check that they had followed their plan and to confirm that they now met legal requirements. This report only covers our findings in relation to those requirements. You can read the report from our last comprehensive inspection, by selecting the 'all reports' link for Harrington Cottage on our website at www.cqc.org.uk

At this inspection we found the service remained 'Good' overall and is now rated Good in the 'safe' domain.

Why the service is rated Good

The service had improved since the last inspection and the breach of Regulation 12 had been met.

There were now records of the stocks of medicines purchased 'over the counter' as well as medicines given only when needed including pain relief. Medicines were stored safely and there were now clear guidelines for each person who took medicines on an 'as and when needed' basis. Medicines records were up to date and accurate.

Staffing was organised around people's activities and appointments so staff were available when people needed them. Staff continued to be recruited safely although no new permanent staff had been employed recently.

Risks continued to be well managed so that no one was restricted and everyone took part in a range of activities and experiences. People indicated that they felt safe. Staff knew about different types of abuse and who to report any concerns to.

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.	
Improvements had been made to manage medicines more safely.	
Staff continued to be recruited safely and there were enough staff to meet people's needs.	
People were protected from harm and abuse. Risks were managed so that people were safe but not restricted.	



Harrington Cottage

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 question, is the service safe, under the Care Act 2014.

This unannounced inspection was carried out on 30 April 2017 by one inspector because this is a small service. The inspection was carried out to check that the service was compliant with a breach of regulations found at the last inspection of 21 October 2015. We inspected the service against one of the five questions we ask about services: is the service safe? We inspected on a Sunday as we wanted to catch people at home so we could talk with them.

We had not requested a Provider Information Return (PIR) because this was a focused inspection. 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. Before the inspection we reviewed all the information we held about the service, we looked at previous inspection reports and any notifications received by the Care Quality Commission. A notification is information about important events, which the provider is required to tell us about by law.

We spoke with two people who lived at the service, a senior member of staff and another member of staff. We spent time with people chatting and observing the morning routine and we looked at some records.

Our findings

People appeared happy and relaxed in each other's company and with staff. People knew each other well and had known each other for a long time. Some people had been at school together. People were relaxing and made themselves drinks and snacks in the kitchen. People told us about a future party and holiday that they were looking forward to.

Since the last inspection improvements had been made to the way medicines were managed. There were now clear records of the stocks of medicines purchased 'over the counter' as well as medicines used occasionally or 'as and when needed.' Staff carried out regular checks to make sure the stocks of medicines and medicines records were correct.

Each person, who needed to take medicines only occasionally like pain relief, had clear guidelines including large print and photographs, so that staff were aware of how often they could take the medicines as well as the maximum amount they could take.

Staff had regular training about medicines and were knowledgeable about the medicines people were prescribed. Medicines were stored securely and medicines records were accurate and up to date. The temperature of the room where medicines were stored was taken daily to make sure it was within safe limits.

Risks continued to be assessed and managed well so that people were not restricted. One person preferred to catch a bus to their day activities. The risks of this had been assessed and mitigated so that the person was able to catch the bus safely on their own. Another person had poor eyesight so staff reminded them to wear their glasses so they were at less risks of falling or tripping. Staff reviewed risk assessments regularly to make sure they were still relevant and up to date.

Occasionally, some people could get angry or anxious. When this happened staff reassured people and kept a record of what had happened and whether there was a trigger or if anything different had happened that day. This information was shared with the community learning disability team who analysed the records and suggested different ways of supporting people so they were less anxious.

People were supported with their money and there were daily checks to make sure that all money and receipts were accounted for. Staff knew about different types of abuse and knew who to report any concerns to. Staff knew about the whistle blowing policy and said they were confident that the registered manager would take action if they raised any concerns. People had family members to speak on their behalf and to raise any concerns.

Staffing was organised around people's activities and appointments. There were two staff on duty supporting four people when we inspected. People indicated that staff were there when they needed them. Additional staff were on duty when needed and managers shared an on call system to give advice and support. Staff continued to be recruited safely, although no permanent staff had been recruited for some

time.

The house and gardens were well maintained and staff carried out regular health and safety checks and reported any issues. A maintenance team responded promptly to any requests for repairs. Everyone took part in practice fire drills so everyone knew how to evacuate the building in an emergency.