

Wakefield MDC

Hazel Garth

Inspection report

49 Hazel Road
Knottingley
West Yorkshire
WF11 0LG

Tel: 01977722405
Website: www.wakefield.gov.uk

Date of inspection visit:
28 December 2018

Date of publication:
19 February 2019

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 ●

Summary of findings

Overall summary

Hazel Garth is a 'care home'. People in care homes receive accommodation and nursing or personal care as single package under one contractual agreement. CQC regulates both the premises and the care provided, and both were looked at during this inspection. Accommodation is provided for up to 24 people. There were 19 people living at Hazel Garth when we inspected.

At our last inspection in February 2016 we rated the service good. At this inspection we found the evidence continued to support the rating of good and there was no evidence or information from our inspection and ongoing monitoring that demonstrated serious risks or concerns. This inspection report is written in a shorter format because our overall rating of the service has not changed since our last inspection.

At this inspection we found the service remained Good.

There were systems and processes to ensure people were safe and risks were appropriately assessed. People were supported with their medicines and staff understood safe practice around managing medicines. Staff understood how to safeguard people from harm, and there was a system for recording accidents and incidents. Premises and equipment were regularly checked for safety.

Staff completed regular training and engaged in supervision meetings. People were supported to have maximum choice and control of their lives and staff supported them in the least restrictive way possible; the policies and systems in the service supported this practice. People were encouraged to lead healthy lives and there were effective links with other professionals. People enjoyed the meals and the social occasion from mealtimes.

Staff were respectful of people's privacy and dignity and people's independence was promoted. There was a friendly, welcoming atmosphere and people said they felt at home.

Care was person centred and people's individual needs were promoted and respected. Care records showed individual preferences and people's visitors were welcomed at any time.

Staff were motivated and there was open communication in the home and effective teamwork. Audits were in place and regular feedback was sought from people about the quality of the service. Documentation was securely filed and care records were being updated

Further information is in the detailed findings below

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 remains Good.

Is the service effective?

Good ●

The service remains Good.

Is the service caring?

Good ●

The service remains Good.

Is the service responsive?

Good ●

The service remains Good.

Is the service well-led?

Good ●

The service remains Good.

Hazel Garth

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 was a comprehensive inspection. The inspection took place on 28 December 2018 and was unannounced. There was one adult social care inspector and an assistant inspector. There were 19 people living in the home when we inspected.

We gathered and reviewed information before the inspection such as the provider information return (PIR), notifications about the service and liaison with other agencies, such as the local safeguarding team.

We spoke with six people who used the service and two relatives. We spoke with three care staff and the registered manager. We looked at the premises and some people's rooms with their permission. We looked at three care plans, two staff files, training and supervision records and documentation to show how the service was run, such as maintenance records, policies, procedures and audits.

Is the service safe?

Our findings

People said they felt safe. One person said, "Oh aye, I'm safe here". One relative we spoke with told us they felt reassured their family member was living at Hazel Garth.

Staff knew each person's abilities and the individual risks to each person's safety. Staff we spoke with said they made daily assessments as well as being aware of written risk assessments which were 'not set in stone'. Staff understood their responsibilities to ensure safeguarding procedures were followed in the event of a concern. Safeguarding notifications were appropriately made and referred to CQC, although there was a discrepancy in the monthly evaluation of these for one referral. The registered manager assured us they would investigate this.

Accidents and incidents were closely monitored to ensure people's safety was maintained and lessons were learned.

Staff supported people patiently and safely when helping them move from place to place, either with equipment or with staff walking beside them. When using the hoist staff gave reassuring commentary and conversation for people to feel secure.

Safe recruitment procedures were followed. We saw staffing levels were based upon people's individual needs and the registered manager told us they had flexibility to control admissions to ensure people received safe care with sufficient staff.

People's support with medicines was discussed with them on an individual basis. Medicines were stored securely and only authorised staff had access to the keys. Records of medicines were maintained well and staff told us they were confident in the medicines management process.

The home was visibly clean with regular cleaning taking place, although there were some lingering odours. The registered manager told us there were plans to refurbish the home, which would eliminate the odours. We saw evidence of regular premises and equipment maintenance.

Is the service effective?

Our findings

People told us they thought staff were able to care for them well. Staff said they had opportunities to complete regular training and they had frequent supportive supervision meetings and competency checks of their practice. Records we looked at confirmed this. Staff told us induction was thorough and included shadowing experienced staff until they felt confident.

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 Act 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. Staff told us they always asked for people's consent when providing care and may involve people's relatives or advocates where appropriate. Staff we spoke with had an appropriate understanding of people's rights and the legislation around people's mental capacity. There was information in people's care files of mental capacity considered in relation to specific decisions and best interest meetings, although there was not always the detail of best interest meetings recorded. The registered manager assured us they were addressing this as part of their ongoing care record improvement, which we saw was in progress.

Mealtimes were sociable and people chose to either sit to the tables to eat together, or sit privately in their own rooms. Staff understood people's dietary needs and were very attentive to ensure people were supported well. One relative we spoke with told us their family member had lost weight before coming into Hazel Garth, where they had regained it. People had continuous access to drinks throughout the day.

People's healthcare needs were supported and there was evidence in care plans and through what they told us about visits from relevant health professionals, such as their GP, district nurse, community dentist and the reablement team.

Is the service caring?

Our findings

People told us they were very well cared for and felt happy living at Hazel Garth. One person told us, "Staff are lovely, the girls are great". One relative said, "It's five star here".

We saw people's rooms were personalised with their own belongings, such as family photographs. There was a homely feel to communal areas and people spent time enjoying the company of others or staff.

Staff had a friendly rapport with people and they engaged in happy banter, clearly understanding each person well and their individual preferences. One person said, "I do like a laugh". Staff were aware when people needed reassurance and offered this promptly where they noticed a person was feeling confused or lonely.

Staff demonstrated respect for people's privacy and dignity and they were discreet when asking if people needed support for personal care. The registered manager told us staff did not wear uniform because this helped to break down barriers.

Relatives told us they could visit at any time. They said they liked to use the smaller lounges if they wished to bring other family members, such as children, and staff always made them welcome, such as by bringing them drinks.

Is the service responsive?

Our findings

People said they had enough to keep them occupied. One person's relative said their family member had been involved in events such as a seaside trip, a Christmas meal out and dressing up for Halloween. We saw people were engaged in activities during the inspection; a 'pets as therapy' visitor brought a dog for people to stroke and there was a film people watched together.

The registered manager told us there were good links with the local community and schools, and said the home was friends of the neighbouring Warwick estate. They told us of further plans to improve, such as creating more outdoor opportunities and upgrading the garden.

Care plans were in place although we saw these were in a standardised format for all people's files we looked at. We spoke with the registered manager who told us if people had any identified needs additional to the content of the standardised care plans, their care records would reflect this. We saw individual care planning in place where people needed specialised equipment. Staff said they were aware of people's care plans but also to ensure assessment was ongoing each day according to each person's needs.

The complaints procedure was available within the home. People and the relatives we spoke with said they would be confident to raise any concerns with any of the staff and the registered manager.

Is the service well-led?

Our findings

There was a registered manager in post, who also had responsibility for managing one of the provider's other homes. They told us they were soon to be only based at Hazel Garth.

People, relatives and staff were complimentary about how the home was managed. The registered manager was very actively involved in people's care through working alongside the staff team to support and model the quality of care in line with the regulations. Staff were motivated and clear of their roles and responsibilities. Staff reported a positive, open and transparent culture in the home.

Staff told us they felt communication was continuous and did not always feel the need to attend staff meetings, although they made sure to read the minutes. We saw positive results of relatives' surveys and quality feedback from professional visitors.

We saw regular, detailed quality audits although some of these needed to ensure actions were recorded with timescales where matters were identified for completion, such as refurbishment work. The registered provider maintained a good oversight of the service through regular quality visits and shared learning from their other services to drive improvement.

Documentation was clearly filed and securely stored and there was good regard for confidentiality of information.