

Mrs Annette Louise Cartlidge

Ullswater House

Inspection report

20 Burlington Road
Blackpool
Lancashire
FY4 1JR

Tel: 01253345664

Date of inspection visit:
14 January 2016

Date of publication:
17 February 2016

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

This inspection visit took place on 14 January 2016 and was announced. The registered provider was given 48 hours notice because the location was a small care home for younger adults who are often out during the day; we needed to be sure someone would be in.

This is the services first inspection since it's registration with the Care Quality Commission (CQC) on 4 November 2015.

The registered provider was an individual who also managed the home on a day to day basis. Registered providers 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.

Ullswater House is a care home registered to accommodate up to two adults. The home is a large mid terraced property. It is run as an ordinary domestic household. People lived with the owners and their family and shared the communal facilities. The house is close to all local amenities. At the time of our inspection visit there were two people who lived at the home.

The carers in the home were the registered provider and her family. The registered provider was the main carer. The service did not employ any staff. Both people who lived in the home were independent and could attend to their own care needs with minimum supervision.

Suitable arrangements were in place to protect people from abuse and unsafe care. Both people told us they felt safe and their rights and dignity were respected. One person said, "I love it here because I am happy. Everyone is good to me and I feel really safe."

We looked at the care records for both people. There was information in place about the support needs for each person and how these were being met.

We found both people were having their healthcare needs met. They told us they had access to their doctor's when they needed to see them.

We found medication procedures in place at the home were safe. Medicines were safely kept and appropriate arrangements for storing were in place. People told us they received their medicines at the times they needed them.

The home was well maintained and clean and hygienic when we visited. The people we spoke with said they were happy with the standard of accommodation provided.

People were happy with the variety and choice of meals available to them. Regular snacks and drinks were available to them between meals to ensure they received adequate nutrition and hydration. One person

said, "The kettle is never cold, we have lot's of drinks."

The registered provider understood the requirements of the Mental Capacity Act (2005) (MCA and the Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoLS). This meant they were working within the law to support people who may lack capacity to make their own decisions.

People had freedom of movement around the building. They were involved in decision making about their personal care needs and the running of the home. We saw no restrictions on people's liberty during our visit.

There was no formal internal quality assurance in place but informal checks were made routinely. Everyone talked together frequently to discuss any plans or changes. Decisions were made as a family group.

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.

Procedures were in place to protect people from abuse and unsafe care.

Staffing arrangements in place were sufficient to meet the needs of people who lived in the home.

Assessments were undertaken to identify risks to people who lived in the home. Written plans were in place to manage these risks.

People were protected against the risks associated with unsafe use and management of medicines. This was because medicines were managed safely.

Is the service effective?

Good ●

The service was effective.

Suitable support arrangements were in place to ensure people had a good quality of life.

People received a choice of suitable and nutritious meals and drinks in sufficient quantities to meet their needs.

The registered provider was aware of the Mental Capacity Act 2005 (MCA) and Deprivation of Liberty Safeguard (DoLS) and had knowledge of the process to follow.

People's healthcare needs were monitored and continuity of care was maintained.

Is the service caring?

Good ●

The service was caring.

People were able to make decisions for themselves and be involved in planning their own care.

People were satisfied with the support and care they received.

They said they were treated with dignity and their privacy was respected.

People were supported to express their views and wishes about all aspects of life in the home.

Is the service responsive?

Good ●

The service was responsive.

People participated in a range of activities which kept them entertained and occupied.

People's care plans had been developed with them to identify what support they required and how they would like this to be provided.

People told us they knew their comments and complaints would be listened to and acted on effectively.

Is the service well-led?

Good ●

The service was well led.

There was informal quality assurance systems in place to monitor the quality of the service. The provider routinely worked in the home and dealt with any issues of quality quickly and appropriately.

The registered provider had clear lines of responsibility and accountability. The registered provider was committed to providing a good standard of support for people who lived in the home.

Ullswater 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 checked 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 14 January 2016 and was announced. The registered provider was given 48 hours notice because the location was a small care home for younger adults who are often out during the day; we needed to be sure someone would be in.

The inspection was undertaken by an adult social care inspector.

Before our inspection visit on 14 January 2016 we reviewed the information we held on the service. This included notifications we had received from the registered provider, about incidents that affect the health, safety and welfare of people who lived at the home and previous inspection reports. We also checked to see if any information concerning the care and welfare of people who lived at the home had been received.

We spoke with a range of people about the service. They included the registered provider, a family member and two people who lived at the home. We also spoke with the commissioning department at the local authority. This helped us to gain a balanced overview of what people experienced accessing the service.

We looked at the care records of two people, arrangements in place for meal preparation, records relating to the management of the home and the medication records of both people.

Is the service safe?

Our findings

We spoke with both people who lived at the home. They told us they felt safe and their rights and dignity were respected. They told us they were receiving safe and appropriate care which was meeting their needs. They said they liked the registered provider and her family and wouldn't wish to live anywhere else. Comments received included, "I love everything about living here. I feel so safe." And, "I am so happy here."

There had been no safeguarding alerts made to the local authority or referred to the Care Quality Commission (CQC) about poor care or abusive practices when we undertook this inspection. Both people said they were safe and well and had no concerns about their care. Discussion with the registered provider confirmed she was aware of the local authorities safeguarding procedures and these would be followed if required.

When we arrived for our inspection visit both people who lived at the home were sat at the kitchen table enjoying a cup of coffee. They told us they were going out together later in the morning and were happy to talk with us about their experiences before they went out. They told us they were safe and received the level of support they required when they needed it. They said they enjoyed being part of the registered provider's family and didn't feel as though they lived in a home. Both people lived as part of the registered provider's family who was their main carer. We saw both people enjoyed the time spent with the registered provider and there was lots of discussion and laughter. One person said, "I am so happy with my family I love it here."

We looked around the building and found it was clean, tidy and well-maintained. We found equipment in use had been serviced and maintained as required. Records were available confirming the electrical installation certificate complied with statutory requirements. Fire extinguishers had recently been serviced and weekly checks were being undertaken to ensure the smoke detectors in place were working. We saw PAT testing of electrical appliances was due to commence the following week and work to service gas facilities were scheduled to commence. We spoke with both people who lived at the home. They told us they were comfortable and felt safe. One person we spoke with said, "I love my room I have everything I need including my television and CD player."

The service had procedures in place to record accidents and incidents. When we undertook this inspection visit one person had experienced two falls in 2015. Records showed no serious injury had been sustained on either occasion and appropriate medical attention had been sought.

The service did not use any moving and handling equipment such as hoists. This was because both people were mobile and could be supported independently.

The carers in the home were the registered provider and her family. The registered provider was the main carer. The service did not employ any staff. Both people who lived at the home were independent and could attend to their own care needs with minimum supervision.

Although the service did not employ separately paid staff we did complete checks to ensure the main carer

was safe to support the people in her care. We found a Disclosure and Barring Service check (DBS) had recently been completed. These checks were required to identify if people have a criminal record and were safe to work with vulnerable people.

We looked at how medicines were prepared and administered. Medicines had been ordered appropriately, checked on receipt into the home, given as prescribed and stored and disposed of correctly. We looked at medication administration records for both people following the morning medication round. Records showed all morning medication had been signed for. We checked this against individual medication packs which confirmed all administered medication could be accounted for. This meant people had received their medication as prescribed.

Medicines were safely kept. Storing medicines safely helps prevent mishandling and misuse. Both people told us they were happy their medicines were managed for them. They confirmed they received when they needed them.

Is the service effective?

Our findings

The two people who lived at Ullswater House had lived at the home for a number years. They received effective care because they were supported by people who had an excellent understanding of their needs. We were able to establish through our observations and discussions that they received effective, safe and appropriate care which was meeting their needs and protected their rights. One person said, "I have lived here since I was a young man. I am very happy with everything. I am lucky to have two families."

We spoke with the registered provider to establish her understanding of the needs of people in her care and the support they required. We found she was able to describe the individual needs and support that each person required. Observations throughout the inspection visit confirmed both people were happy with the care and support they received.

We spoke with the registered provider about training she had undertaken so she could provide effective support to the people in her care. She told us she had achieved a Health and Social Care qualification at level 3. She told us this qualification had covered the Mental Capacity Act (MCA) 2005 and the associated Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoLS) and safeguarding vulnerable adults. When we undertook this inspection visit the registered provider was working towards a Health and Social Care qualification at level 5. This confirmed both people were supported by a well trained and competent person.

Our observations confirmed the atmosphere was relaxed and both people had freedom of movement around the building. One person said, "We spend time together as a family but can go to our rooms whenever we want. I like a bit of time on my own to listen to my music and watch television. I also enjoy my colouring books."

Both people told us they enjoyed the food provided by the service. They said they received varied, nutritious meals and always had plenty to eat. The service did not work to a set menu and people were asked daily about meals and choices available to them for the day. On the day of our inspection visit both people were going out with the registered providers mother for lunch. However we were able to observe them being involved in the decision making process to decide what they would have for their tea. One person said, "We have our main meal at tea time and we all sit together as a family. We are always asked what we would like. I enjoy meal times." Another person said, "I love all my meals. We have lot's of roast dinners and pasta. They are really tasty."

We spoke with the registered provider about meal preparation and people's nutritional needs. She confirmed both people in her care had special dietary needs and these were being met. We observed both people had unrestricted access to the kitchen/ dining room where drinks were prepared for them. One person said, "The kettle is never cold."

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.

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 MCA. The application procedures for this in care homes and hospitals are called the Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoLS).

We checked whether the service was working within the principles of the MCA, and whether any conditions on authorisations to deprive a person of their liberty were being met. We did not see any restrictive practices during our inspection visit and observed both people had freedom of movement around the home.

Both people's healthcare needs were carefully monitored and discussed with them as part of the care planning process. Care records seen confirmed visits to and from General Practitioners and other healthcare professionals had been recorded. The records were informative and had documented the reason for the visit and what the outcome had been. This confirmed good communication protocols were in place for people to receive continuity with their healthcare needs.

We saw one person who lived with diabetes regularly attended the diabetic clinic at their General Practitioners practice to have their diabetes monitored. This confirmed the person's health was being reviewed and appropriate healthcare was provided.

Is the service caring?

Our findings

During our inspection visit we spent time observing interactions between the registered provider and the people in her care. This helped us assess and understand whether people using the service received care that was meeting their individual needs. We saw the registered provider was responsive and attentive. She was polite, respectful and kind and showed compassion. We spoke with both people about their care. They told us they were happy and couldn't receive better care anywhere. One person said, "I am looked after really well. I am happy here and don't want to go anywhere else."

Throughout the inspection visit we saw both people had freedom of movement around the building and were able to make decisions for themselves. We observed the routines within the home were relaxed and arranged around both people's individual and collective needs. We saw they were provided with the choice of spending time on their own or in the lounge area. The home had a relaxed atmosphere.

We spoke with both people and they told us they were supported to express their views and wishes about all aspects of life in the home. We observed the registered provider enquiring about both people's comfort and welfare throughout the inspection visit and she responded promptly if they required any assistance.

We looked at care records of both people. We saw evidence they had been involved with and were at the centre of developing their care plans. Both people told us they were encouraged to express their views about how their care and support was delivered. The plans contained information about people's current needs as well as their wishes and preferences. Daily records completed were up to date and well maintained. These described the daily support both people had received and the activities they had undertaken. The records were informative and enabled us to identify how both people had been supported with their daily routines.

Both people told us their privacy was respected when they wanted to spend time in their rooms. One person said, "I like to spend time on my own in my room sometimes. I am left to listen to my music if that is what I want to do. They will call me if they need me for anything. No one enters my room unless invited to do so."

We spoke with the registered provider about access to advocacy services should people require their guidance and support. The registered provider told us she had information details that could be provided to people and their families if this was required. This ensured people's interests would be represented and they could access appropriate services outside of the service to act on their behalf if needed.

Before our inspection visit we received information from external agencies about the home. They included the commissioning department at the local authority. Links with these external agencies were good and we received some positive feedback from them about the care being provided. They told us they were pleased with the care people received and had no concerns.

Is the service responsive?

Our findings

We spoke with both people and they told us they received a personalised care service which was responsive to their care needs. They told us the care they received was focussed on them and they were encouraged to make their views known about the care and support they received. They told us they were encouraged to pursue personal interests and had no restrictions placed upon them with their daily routines. On the day of our inspection visit both people attended their local church service and then went for lunch at the church's café. They both told us this was an activity they looked forward to and enjoyed.

Both people participated in a wide range of activities which kept them entertained. The activities were undertaken both individually and as a group. These included attending arts and crafts, helping out on a charity stall at the church and going to the pub for lunch. We were also informed outings in the car to the zoo, local park and shopping expeditions were organised. One person said, "We have a full and active social life which keeps us occupied. We are always doing something." Another person said, "We have just had a brilliant Christmas. We went to a pantomime and a Chinese restaurant for a meal. It was lovely." We noted both people were laughing whilst telling us about their day out.

Both people told us they were enabled to maintain relationships with their friends and family members and take part in activities which were of particular interest to them. Comments received included, "I like to spend time in my room painting and drawing." And, "I go to visit my family in Wales and they come to see me here. I enjoy seeing them."

We looked at the care records of both people to see if their needs had been assessed and consistently met. We found each person had a care plan which detailed the support they required. The care plan was person centred and had been developed with the person identifying what support they required and how they would like this to be provided. We spoke with the two people concerned. They both told us they had been involved in planning their records and they were happy they were receiving the support they needed when they needed it. One person said, "We talk about my care all the time and if I am happy which I am."

We observed how both people were treated with respect throughout our inspection visit and assisted them to make basic decisions. For example one person said being able to choose what clothing they wanted to wear each day was so important to them. The person said, "I was always told what I had to wear before I came to live here."

The service had a complaints procedure which was made available to people they supported in an easy read format. The procedure was clear in explaining how a complaint could be made and reassured people these would be responded to appropriately. Both people said they were happy and never had anything they wanted to complain about.

Is the service well-led?

Our findings

We found the service had clear lines of responsibility and accountability. The registered provider lived on the premises with her family and supported both people as their main carer on a daily basis. The two people lived at Ullswater House as part of the family, with everyone sharing the same communal facilities. Both people were involved in decision making about the running of the home and their own lifestyles. It was evident that people were treated as part of the family and involved in family activities.

The registered provider was knowledgeable about the support people in her care required. She was clear about her role and was committed to providing a high standard of care and support to people who lived at the service. Both people spoken with said the registered provider was available and approachable if they needed to speak with her. Throughout the visit we saw both people were comfortable and relaxed in the company of the registered provider and we observed lots of laughter.

There was no formal internal quality assurance systems in place but informal checks were made routinely. Everyone talked together frequently to discuss any plans or changes. Decisions were made as a family group about holidays, outings, meals and any changes made to the environment. This meant both people who lived at the home were given as much choice and control as possible into how the service was run for them.

Both people told us they were encouraged to express their views about any improvements or changes they would like to see made to the service they receive. They told us they were happy and didn't feel improvements needed to be made. One person said, "We have family meetings to discuss everything. I am happy and don't want changes made to anything." Another person said, "I am so happy here. I love my room and my family."