

## The Oaklea Trust

# Garth Brow (Adult Care Home)

### Inspection report

The Oaklea Trust, 1a Garth Brow,  
Kendal, Cumbria, LA9 5NN  
Tel: 01539 734111  
Website: [www.oakleatrust.co.uk](http://www.oakleatrust.co.uk)

Date of inspection visit: 2 and 12 October 2015  
Date of publication: 26/11/2015

### 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 

### Overall summary

We carried out this announced inspection on 2 and 12 October 2015. We last inspected this service on 28 May 2014. At that inspection we found that the registered provider was meeting all of the regulations that we assessed.

Garth Brow (Adult Care Home), (Garth Brow), provides accommodation and personal care for up to six people who have a learning disability. There are four bedrooms in the main part of the home and suitable facilities including toilets, bathrooms, sitting and dining areas and

a kitchen which people living in the home share. There are also two flats which are part of the home and which are used by two people who are able to live more independently.

There was a registered manager employed in the home. A registered manager is a person who has registered with the Care Quality Commission to manage the service. Like

# Summary of findings

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.

People were safe living at Garth Brow and were happy living at the home. They were treated with kindness and respect and their rights were protected.

The service focused on providing high quality care and people were given opportunities to gain independence and to develop their skills.

People were active members of the local community, some people were engaged in paid employment and other people were gaining skills to support them into employment.

People knew and liked the staff who worked at the home. There were enough staff to provide the support people needed. The staff were well trained and had the skills and knowledge to support people.

People received the support they required to maintain their health. Medicines were handled safely and people were protected against the misuse of medicines.

The home was well run. People knew the registered manager and trusted her to provide advice and guidance as they needed. The registered manager was aware of her legal responsibilities and carried out checks to ensure the high quality of the service was maintained.

# Summary of findings

## The five questions we ask about services and what we found

We always ask the following five questions of services.

### Is the service safe?

The service was safe.

People were protected from the risk of abuse because the staff in the home were knowledgeable about how to identify abuse and were confident to report any concerns.

There were enough staff to support people and to meet their needs.

Medicines were handled safely and people were supported to take their medicines as they needed.

Good



### Is the service effective?

The service was effective.

The staff in the home were trained and had the skills and knowledge to provide the care people needed.

People's rights were protected. The registered manager was knowledgeable about the Mental Capacity Act 2005 and Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards.

People were included in planning and preparing the meals in the home and enjoyed the meals provided.

Good



### Is the service caring?

The service was caring.

The staff were kind and friendly to people and gave people the support they needed.

People made choices about their care and were given the information they needed to understand their support and to make choices about their lives.

The focus of the service was on promoting people's rights and independence.

Good



### Is the service responsive?

The service was responsive.

People made choices about their daily lives and were included in decisions about their support.

A range of appropriate activities were provided that took account of people's interests and preferences.

The registered provider had a procedure for receiving and managing complaints about the service. People knew how they could raise any concerns about their support and were confident that action would be taken if they made a complaint.

Good



### Is the service well-led?

The service was well-led.

People who lived in the home were asked for their views about the service and placed at the centre of decisions about their lives in the home.

Good



# Summary of findings

The registered provider monitored the quality of the service to ensure people received safe care that met their needs.

# Garth Brow (Adult Care Home)

## 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 inspection took place on 2 and 12 October 2015. We gave the provider 24 hours' notice of our visit on the 2 October because the location was a care home for younger adults who are often out during the day and we needed to be sure that someone would be in. The registered manager was not available in the home when we visited on 2 October and we arranged to return to the service on 12 October to speak with them and to examine some records.

The inspection was carried out by one adult social care inspector.

There were six people living at Garth Brow when we carried out our inspection. During the inspection we spoke with all of the six people who lived in the home, three support staff and the registered manager of the service. We observed care and support in communal areas of the home and looked at the care records for four people. We also looked at records that related to how the home was managed.

Before the inspection we reviewed the information we held about the service and contacted the local authority social work teams to obtain their views of the home.

# Is the service safe?

## Our findings

We asked people who lived at Garth Bow if they felt safe in the home. Everyone we spoke with told us that they did feel safe living at Garth Brow. One person told us, “Yes, I’m safe here” and another person said, “We’re all safe”.

People told us that they would speak to the registered manager or to one of the support staff if they felt unsafe in the home or while following activities in the community. Throughout our inspection we saw that people were comfortable and relaxed in the home and with the staff who were working there.

All the staff we spoke with told us that people were safe living in the home. They told us that they had received training in how to identify and report abuse. All of the staff said they would report any concerns about a person’s safety or welfare to the registered manager. They said they would be confident to speak to the registered manager if they had any concerns about the actions of another member of staff and could also report this to a senior person within The Oaklea Trust. All of the staff showed that understood their responsibility to protect people in the home from harm.

People’s care records showed that risks to their safety had been identified and measures put in place to reduce and manage any hazards identified. We saw that the risk assessments focused on protecting people from harm while also supporting them to have opportunities to follow activities that they enjoyed and to increase their independence.

We saw that there were sufficient staff to provide the support people needed and to allow people to follow a

range of activities in and away from the home. People who lived at Garth Brow told us that they liked the staff who worked at the home and said there were enough staff to provide the support they needed.

We looked at how medicines were managed in the home. We saw that medicines were stored securely to protect people against their misuse. The staff we spoke with told us that they had received training in how to handle medicines safely. They told us that no staff were allowed to support people with their medicines until they had completed training. During our inspection we saw that one person approached the staff on duty to request their medicines. This was given safely and recorded properly. Procedures were in place to ensure people had the medicines they needed at the time that they needed them. The records of medicines that had been given to people were fully completed to show when people had received their medicines. This protected people as it helped to prevent mistakes in how medicines were administered.

The registered provider used robust systems to check that new staff were suitable to work in the home. All staff had to provide references to show they were of good character and were checked to make sure they were not barred from working in social care services. This helped to protect people who lived at Garth Brow.

We saw that checks were carried out on the premises to ensure the safety of people who lived at the home. There was equipment to detect and to fight fires and a procedure for staff to follow to protect people in the event of a fire. People who lived at the home had been given guidance about the actions they needed to take if there was a fire. People we spoke with showed that they knew how to protect themselves if there was a fire at the home.

# Is the service effective?

## Our findings

We asked people who lived at Garth Brow if they thought the staff who worked there were trained and able to carry out their duties. They told us that they thought the staff were well trained and one person said, “The staff do training, they are all good”. Another person told us, “The staff know how to support me”.

All the staff we spoke with told us that they were provided with a range of training to ensure they had the skills to meet people’s needs, this was confirmed by the records we looked at. We saw there were good systems in place to identify when staff had completed required training and when this needed to be repeated to ensure support staff had up to date knowledge and skills.

The staff told us that they felt well supported by the registered manager of the home. They said that they had regular meetings with the manager where they discussed their own practice and were able to raise any concerns. They told us that the organisation had an on call system so that support staff were always able to contact a senior person if they had concerns about a person who lived at the home. All the staff we spoke with said they received the support they needed to carry out their roles and to provide the care people in the home required.

People told us that they enjoyed the meals provided in the home. They said that they were included in planning and helping to prepare the meals provided. During our

inspection we saw one person assisting staff with preparing the evening meal. They told us that they enjoyed doing this. Everyone told us they had enjoyed the meal provided during the evening of our inspection.

The Care Quality Commission (CQC) is required by law to monitor the operation of Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards. We discussed the requirements of the Mental Capacity Act 2005 (MCA) and the associated Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoLS), with the registered manager of Garth Brow. They had a good understanding of the MCA and DoLS and how they applied to respecting the rights of people who lived at Garth Brow. The registered manager was very knowledgeable about their responsibility to protect the rights of people who lived in the home.

We saw that the staff in the home treated people in a friendly and respectful manner and asked for people’s consent and agreement before providing support to them. People were given guidance and support to make their own decisions and the staff respected the choices people made.

People told us that they were supported to attend health care appointments as they needed. The care records we looked at showed that people received support from local health care services such as GPs and dentists. People had also been supported to attend hospital appointments as they needed. We saw that people who lived in the home received support to maintain their health and to access health care services as appropriate to their needs.

# Is the service caring?

## Our findings

People told us that the staff at Garth Brow were “kind” and said they liked the staff who worked at the home. We saw that the staff shared jokes with people and that this supported individuals’ wellbeing. One person told us, [Named staff member] is always joking with me”. People told us that all the staff in the home were caring and looked after them well. One person said, “I like [the staff member supporting them], she’s kind and helps me”.

People told us that they knew all the staff who worked in the home. They told us that the staff were caring and helped them as they needed. Throughout our inspection we saw that the staff were friendly towards people and gave them their time and attention. We saw that this helped to create a relaxed and homely environment for people to live in.

All the people who lived at Garth Brow were able to express their needs and to make choices about their care. We saw that the staff in the home knew how to support people to make and communicate their choices about their lives.

One person told us that they were considering plans for their future. They said they would speak to the support staff and to the registered manager to discuss their plans and to take advice. We saw that the person trusted the staff in the home to support them and were confident they would receive the support and guidance they needed.

The focus of the service was on promoting people’s rights, skills and independence. People told us about activities they had followed independently or with a low level of support from staff. We saw that individuals had gained greater independence and confidence due to the positive support provided in the home.

People were supported to gain daily living skills. Each person took it in turn to assist the support staff with tasks in the home such as preparing meals and cleaning their rooms.

When we visited the service on 2 October one person was not present as they were visiting their family. We spoke with them when we returned to the home on 12 October. They told us that they had enjoyed their visit to their relatives and said they were supported to see their family as they wished. Everyone we spoke with told us that they were supported to see their friends and families as they wanted. People were supported to maintain relationships that were important to them.

People told us that they had their own bedrooms and had been included in choosing the furniture and furnishings they wanted in their rooms. We saw that the staff respected people’s privacy and only went in to their rooms with their agreement. The staff also understood the need to respect people’s confidential information. Throughout our visits we noted that the staff did not speak about people who lived in the home in front of other individuals.



# Is the service responsive?

## Our findings

Everyone we spoke with told us that that Garth Brow was “a nice place to live”. People told us that they made choices about their lives and said that the staff supported them to make their own decisions about their care and lives. During our inspection we observed that the staff gave people choices about their support and respected the decisions people made.

We saw that people followed a range of activities that they enjoyed. Two people told us about a recent holiday they had enjoyed. One person told us that they had chosen not to go on holiday but preferred to have “days out” instead. They said this was their choice and that they had chosen the places they wanted to visit and who they wanted to go with them. During our first visit to the home people getting ready to visit a local pub. They told us that this was a regular activity on Friday evenings and said how much they enjoyed this.

People were active members of the local community, some people were engaged in paid employment and other people were gaining skills to support them into employment.

Each person who lived in the home had a detailed support plan that held information about the assistance they required and how they wanted this to be provided. The support plans had detailed information to guide the staff on how to care for people. We saw that the support plans were reviewed regularly to ensure that the staff had up to date information about how to support each person.

The support plans that we looked at included individuals’ goals and the support they required to achieve these. We saw that people’s chosen goals were broken down into steps to help them plan and achieve them. People told us about activities they had chosen to follow and how staff had supported them to plan and attend them. All the staff we spoke with showed that they were knowledgeable about the individuals they supported and the things that were important to them in their lives.

Everyone we spoke with told us that the staff in the home listened to them. Throughout our inspection we saw that people were treated with respect and given choices in a way that they understood. We saw people were given the time and support they needed to make decisions about their lives and their care.

We asked people if they would tell the staff in the home if they were not happy about their care or about how they were treated at Garth Brow. Everyone we asked told us that they would speak to a member of the support staff or to the registered manager if they were not happy about any aspect of their care. People showed that they were confident that action would be taken if they raised any complaints about their support. One person told us, “I’d tell if I wasn’t happy” and another person said I’d speak to [the registered manager], she’s nice and would help me”.

The registered provider had a procedure for receiving and managing complaints about the service. We saw that information about how to raise concerns was available in pictorial format, to make it accessible to people who lived in the home.

# Is the service well-led?

## Our findings

We asked people who lived at Garth Brow if they thought the home was well run. Everyone we spoke with told us that it was. We saw that people who lived in the home knew the registered manager and were comfortable around her. People told us, “[the registered manager] is nice” and said, [The registered manager] is good at her job”.

Throughout our inspection we saw that the support staff asked people if they were happy with their care. The provider had systems to gather people’s views about the support they received. We saw that people had been asked to complete a survey to share their views with the registered provider and the registered manager. People also told us that they had regular meetings with the support staff and other people who lived at the home where they were asked for their views. We saw notes of recent meetings that had taken place. These showed that people had been included in decisions about how the service was provided and had been asked for their views.

During our inspection we found the atmosphere in the home was relaxed and friendly. We saw many positive interactions between the staff on duty and people who lived in the home. The staff we spoke with told us they enjoyed working at the home and said they were proud of the service and the care provided. They told us that they felt well supported by the registered manager. We saw that the focus of the service was on providing high quality support that promoted people’s rights.

All the staff we spoke with said they were confident that people were well cared for in this home. They said that they would challenge their colleagues if they observed any poor practice and would also report their concerns to the registered manager or a senior person in The Oaklea Trust.

The registered provider had systems in place to ensure management support was always available to staff working in the homes it operated. When the registered manager of a service was not on duty a senior staff member was responsible for overseeing each home. The senior staff were supported by the registered provider’s “on call” system which ensured a senior manager was available to support staff.

We saw that the registered manager had systems in place to check the quality of the service to ensure people received safe care that met their needs. Checks were carried out on medication records, the safety of the environment and care records. This helped the registered manager to monitor the quality of the service.

Providers of health and social care services are required by law to inform the Care Quality Commission, (the CQC), of important events that happen in their services. The registered manager of Garth Brow was knowledgeable their responsibility to notify CQC about significant events in the home and had done so in a timely way. This meant we could check that appropriate action had been taken.