

Enhanceable

# EnhanceAble Space

## Inspection report

221a Malden Road  
New Malden  
Surrey  
KT3 6AG

Tel: 02082880225  
Website: [www.enhanceable.org](http://www.enhanceable.org)

Date of inspection visit:  
22 February 2017

Date of publication:  
30 March 2017

### 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

EnhanceAble Space is a respite care service that offers support and activities during the day and accommodation overnight. It provides accommodation, personal care and support services for up to five people a day with learning and physical disabilities. There were five people receiving day-care services and of those people, two were receiving overnight accommodation at the home on the day we visited.

At the last Care Quality Commission (CQC) inspection in July 2015, the overall rating for this service was Good. At this inspection we found the service remained Good. The service demonstrated they continued to meet the regulations and fundamental standards.'

People remained safe at the home. Staff could explain to us how to keep people safe from abuse and neglect. People had suitable risk assessments in place. The provider managed risks associated with the premises and equipment well. There were enough staff at the home to meet people's needs. Recruitment practices remained safe. Medicines continued to be administered safely. The checks we made confirmed that people were receiving their medicines as prescribed by staff qualified to administer medicines.

People continued to be supported by staff who received appropriate training and support. Staff had the skills, experience and a good understanding of how to meet people's needs. We saw that staff encouraged people to make their own decisions and gave them the encouragement, time and support to do so. Staff were providing support in line with the Mental Capacity Act 2005. People were supported to eat and drink sufficient amounts to meet their needs. People had access to a range of healthcare professionals.

The staff were caring. The atmosphere in the home was calm and friendly. Staff took their time and gave people encouragement whilst supporting them. Throughout the inspection we saw that people had the privacy they needed and were treated with dignity and respect by staff.

People's needs were assessed before they stayed at the respite home and support was planned and delivered in response to their needs. People could choose the activities they liked to do. The provider had arrangements in place to respond appropriately to people's concerns and complaints.

Relatives we spoke with described the management as very positive. We observed during our visit that management were approachable and responsive to staff needs. Systems were in place to monitor and improve the quality of the service. Audits of the premises helped ensure the premises and people were kept safe.

## 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

# EnhanceAble Space

## **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 was a comprehensive inspection. The inspection took place on 22 February 2017 and was announced. The provider was given 24 hours' notice because the location was a small respite home for younger adults who are often out during the day; we needed to be sure that someone would be in. The inspection was carried out by a single inspector.

Before our inspection we reviewed information we held about the service. This included statutory notifications received from the provider since the last inspection and the Provider Information Return (PIR). The PIR is a form we asked the provider to complete prior to our visit which gives us some key information about the service, including what the service does well, what the service could do better and improvements they plan to make.

Before the inspection we emailed a questionnaire to the local authority who commission places at the home. We asked them for their opinion of their clients care and they replied to us.

During the inspection we spoke with three people who used the service. Not everyone was able to verbally answer our questions, but with the help of staff, sign language and a person's reaction to our questions we were able to understand their answers. We also spoke with the manager and three care staff. We looked at a range of records including four staff files, three people's care plans and other records relating to the management of the home.

After the inspection we contacted and received feedback from seven relatives.

# Is the service safe?

## Our findings

People continued to be safe at the home. One person commented in the annual survey saying "EnhanceAble Space is very safe." Two relatives commented, "They [family member] are relaxed and secure at EnhanceAble Space. I would know if something was not right" and "They [family member] have settled into respite so easily, they are always excited to go. It's wonderful, so nice for both of us."

Safeguarding and whistleblowing policies were in place which staff were aware of and helped them understand how to keep people safe. Staff could explain to us how to keep people safe from abuse and neglect and had received training in this.

People had suitable risk assessments in place. These detailed how staff should support people by minimising risks such as those relating to their mobility, accessing the community for travelling and traffic awareness. People had a current personal emergency evacuation plan [PEEP] in place, which explained the help individuals would need to safely leave the building. The provider had implemented a scheme which they called the 'Red Bag', where contact details, PEEP's and items for use in an emergency such as thermal blankets were kept together and easily accessible should the home need to be evacuated. Arrangements had been made with a local care home to accommodate people if an evacuation was necessary.

Relatives described the home as "A comfy environment," "Great environment, very homely" and "My family member is always proud to show me his room." The provider and staff managed risks associated with the premises and equipment well. A range of checks were in place including those relating to fire and gas safety and electrical installations. We found the kitchen and food storage areas to be clean, with food stored correctly. Repairs were carried out promptly when necessary to ensure the premises were maintained and remained safe.

We observed that there were sufficient numbers of qualified staff to support people to meet their needs. Before 3pm there were two people using the service who had stayed overnight and there were three members of staff on duty. After 3pm an additional three people came to EnhanceAble Space from college and additional staff were there to support them. The majority of people were receiving one to one support and we observed that people were happy with this arrangement. Three relatives commented, "My relative receives one to one care and that gives me a sense of security when I leave them," "Staff have taken the time to get to know my relative" and "This is a caring, positive place and staff are open and very responsive to my family member."

Recruitment practices remained safe. We looked at three staff's personal files and saw the necessary recruitment steps had been carried out before staff were employed. This included completed application forms, references and criminal record checks. These checks helped to ensure that people were cared for by staff suitable for the role.

Medicines continued to be administered safely. People could use the services of EnhanceAble Space for day time and weekend breaks, overnight or longer stays and brought with them their own medicines, generally

but not always in blister packs. People were supported by staff to take their medicines when they needed them and records were kept of medicines taken. The MAR's we looked at were up to date and accurate. Medicines including controlled drugs were stored securely. Staff received training in medicines administration. A monthly audit of the MAR's was conducted. The checks we made confirmed that people were receiving their medicines as prescribed by staff qualified to administer medicines

## Is the service effective?

### Our findings

People were cared for by staff who received appropriate training and support. When speaking about the staff relatives commented, "Lovely staff, just amazing" and "Staff here are always good, they genuinely want to work here" and "Staff and activities are very age related. I am very impressed by the standards at Space."

Staff continued to have the skills, experience and a good understanding of how to meet people's needs. The provider had identified a range of training courses that all new staff needed to complete as part of their induction and a range of training courses that were refreshed annually or biannually. Before working with a person with specific medical needs staff would undergo training in that specialism, so they could confidently support the person's medical needs. For example specialist training on how to support someone requiring percutaneous endoscopic gastrostomy [PEG] feeding or someone with epilepsy. A PEG is a way of introducing food, fluids and medicines directly into the stomach by passing a thin tube through the skin and into the stomach

Records we looked at confirmed staff received one to one supervision and an annual appraisal. Team meetings were also held monthly.

We saw that staff encouraged people to make their own decisions and gave them the encouragement, time and support to do so. People who were mobile could move freely around the home and garden. People who were not independently mobile were asked where they would like to be in the home and staff helped them when necessary. One relative told us "EnhanceAble Space offers great opportunities and independent skills for my family member. He can attend to his personal care and recently surprised me by making a cup of tea."

People who lack mental capacity to consent to arrangements for necessary care or treatment can only be deprived of their liberty when this is in their best interests and legally authorised under the MCA. The procedures for this in care homes and hospitals are called the Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoLS). The manager understood these and applied for authorisations to deprive people of their liberty as part of keeping people safe.

Because this was a flexible support and respite service people could choose when they were going to attend and meals were not planned in advance. We saw meals were prepared according to people's wishes on the day the person visited. Each person had a food profile detailing the type of food they required, i.e. pureed, cut into small pieces, or PEG feeding. Additional information on equipment people needed such as shaped plates and cutlery and the position they needed to be in to ensure a person could enjoy their meal safely and effectively. People could also choose to eat out at a restaurant or pub and staff would accompany them. We saw that people could join in with cooking meals if they wanted to and could make their own drinks with help from staff when needed.

Staff continued to take appropriate action to ensure people received the care and support they needed from healthcare professionals. Detailed records of the care and support people received were kept. Details

included information about people's general health and wellbeing and any medical needs they had.

The home continued to provide a suitable environment to meet people's needs. EnhanceAble Space was based in a large house with rooms on two floors. En-suite bedrooms were on both floors, with a kitchen/dining room, a large sitting room and a sensory room that could also be used as a quiet chill out space on the ground floor. The house had a large garden with a sunken trampoline. Unoccupied bedrooms could be used by a person during the day for personal care, to have a shower or bath or to rest. This flexibility in the use of the rooms meant that people could choose where they wanted to be and how they wanted to spend their time.



## Is the service caring?

### Our findings

The service continued to be caring. Relatives commented about staff, "Staff are genuinely good people, really lovely," "Staff are great they have a good knowledge of our family member." Relatives described the service saying "I was very anxious at first but EnhanceAble Space is a real lifeline for me" and "It has revolutionised my life," "Previously my family member has refused to go respite making it difficult for me his carer but at Space they are always keen to go and often reminds me to pack his bag. Above all for the first time I don't feel guilty because when he goes to Space he does it willingly" and "EnhanceAble offers great opportunities and independent skills for my son."

They also commented about how their relative felt about the service, "They love it," "She [family member] chose it for herself and she loves it" and "He [family member] is very happy there." People commented in the annual survey saying 'Staff are friendly and chatty' and 'Great home, lovely, lovely staff.' Our observations during our visit confirmed what relatives told us.

Staff knew people well and in many cases had worked with people before through the EnhanceAble Living domiciliary care service. People's support plans were sufficiently detailed for staff to know and understand a person's support needs. The atmosphere in the home was calm and friendly. Staff took their time and gave people encouragement whilst supporting them.

Staff continued to find ways to communicate with people especially those people who had limited communication skills. Staff said they would show a person the actual choice of food or drinks or pictures of an activity. Then when they were delivering a service or a new activity they watched people very carefully for signs that they were happy. People also used an iPad or Makaton signing to help them communicate. [Makaton uses signs and symbols to help people communicate]. This helped to ensure people received the support they wanted.

People could choose which days and times they came to the house. Some people booked themselves in on a regular day each week, sometimes when they knew their friends would also be there. Staff said this made for a very sociable time for people and some people would stay overnight and go to school or college from the service.

Staff continued to respect people dignity and privacy. We saw and heard staff speaking quietly with people when discussing their personal needs. Staff encouraged people to think about their own personal care and how they could manage this themselves. We observed when staff provided personal care this was done in the privacy of the bedrooms or bathrooms.

## Is the service responsive?

### Our findings

The service continued to be responsive to people's needs. The assessment process had been changed since our last visit to help ensure staff at EnhanceAble Space fully understood a person's support needs including the person's health, their ability to consent to support, the level of their personal care needs and their social needs. Staff would speak to the person, their family, their school or college and to the local authority commissioners to get as much information as was needed to ensure EnhanceAble Space could meet the person's individual needs.

Before a person started to use the respite service they could visit the house as many times as they wanted to so that they, their families and staff could assess if this was the right environment for the individual person. During this time they could join in an activity or have a meal. Staff told us that several people went to the same school or college and this gave them an opportunity to meet up in a non-educational setting to have fun and play games.

The home had emergency call bells and pull cords in all the rooms but in response to one person's individual support needs they had provided the person with a pendent alarm bell which they kept on their person at all times. This gave the person the confidence to know they could summon help at any time from staff.

Support plans included information and guidance to staff about how people's support needs should be met. The information was comprehensive including a person's likes and dislikes, how they communicated, their skills and daily activities. Plans outlined a person's disability and how this affected the support they needed and the personal goals they wanted to achieve. The manager told us the more they got to know a person the more responsive they could be to their support needs and the written support plan could be better written and more effective for that person. Regular reviews, every three to six months of people's support continued to be conducted and changes made when necessary to their support plan.

Staff spoke to people individually about what activities they would like to do and how they would like to spend their time at the service and staff supported people to do these activities. On the day of our visit one person who had stayed overnight was having a lie in and staff respected their wish to do this. Once they were up they went out with staff to the cinema and later to local stables to see and pat the horses. Staff showed us photos of this visit and the joy the person felt was evident in the pictures. Another person returning from college spent time with staff in the sensory room, watching the lights and listening to music. Two more people were having a snack in the kitchen with staff. One person with encouragement from staff showed us their skill at playing a drum with their bare hands. Everyone we saw appeared content and happy with the activity they were engaged in.

The provider had arrangements in place to respond appropriately to people's concerns and complaints. People and relatives told us they knew who to make a complaint to and said they felt happy to speak up when necessary. Relatives told us they had not needed to complain as they spoke to staff and management regularly, so any small concern was dealt with promptly.

## Is the service well-led?

### Our findings

Relatives we spoke with described the manager as "Very positive" and "A great manager." Staff said "The manager and deputy were approachable and very informative." Relatives also told us communication with the service was good and improving all the time.

There was a new manager at the home who was in the process of registering with the CQC. A registered manager is a person who has registered with the Care Quality Commission to manage the service. Like 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. The manager was supported by a deputy manager and the chief executive officer of EnhanceAble.

From our discussions with the manager it was clear they had an understanding of their management role and responsibilities and the provider's legal obligations with regard to CQC including the requirements for submission of notifications of relevant events and changes.

Staff photos and names were on display in the main hallway to help people recognise where they were and who was going to support them. There were also pictures of activities and outings that people had been on displayed as a reminder of what people had been doing during their time at EnhanceAble Space.

The provider continued to assess and monitor the quality of the service. They conducted weekly and monthly health and safety checks of the home including the environment, people's rooms and equipment. Audits were also conducted of people's risk assessments, support plans and MAR's. Both types of audits generated action plans detailing what actions needed to be taken and were signed off once completed.

Following on from the annual service users and family's survey the provider organised a one day conference that everyone was invited to. The manager told us the response rate to their latest survey was not as good as previous years but that they and staff were available to chat to relatives and people at any time. They could hear first-hand people's comments good or not so good and act on them quickly. This helped to make the service consistently relevant to the people they supported. The provider was in the process of conducting a staff survey and the results of this would be discussed at a one day conference.

Staff said they were a small staff team and they worked well together. They told us the manager and the deputy manager worked with them each day and they had the opportunity to discuss people's progress or changing needs at any time. Staff said and we observed during our visit that management were approachable and responsive to staff needs.