

# High Quality Lifestyles Limited

## 55 Sandwich Road

### Inspection report

55 Sandwich Road  
Whitfield  
Kent  
CT16 3LT

Tel: 01304820803  
Website: [www.hqls.org.uk](http://www.hqls.org.uk)

Date of inspection visit:  
14 February 2017

Date of publication:  
06 March 2017

### Ratings

Overall rating for this service

Good ●

Is the service safe?

Good ●

# Summary of findings

## Overall summary

### Care service description

55 Sandwich Road is a detached bungalow that provides accommodation and personal care for two people with learning disabilities. Each person had their own bedroom, there was a communal lounge and kitchen and a well maintained garden. Each person had access to their own car and were able to access facilities in the local area.

### Rating at last inspection

At the last inspection, the service was rated good overall and requires improvement in the 'safe' domain.

### Why we inspected

We carried out an unannounced comprehensive inspection of this service on 15 October 2015. A breach of legal requirements 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 Regulated Activities Regulations 2014, safe care and treatment. We undertook this focused inspection to check that they had followed their plan and to confirm that they now met legal requirements. You can read the report from our last comprehensive inspection, by selecting the 'all reports' link for 55 Sandwich Road on our website at [www.cqc.org.uk](http://www.cqc.org.uk)

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

### Why the service is rated Good

The service had improved since the last inspection. People's money was now being managed safely, people had access to their monies when they wanted.

Potential risks to people were identified and there was detailed guidance for staff to manage risks to keep people as safe as possible.

Regular health and safety checks were undertaken to ensure the environment was safe and equipment worked as required. People and staff had completed fire drills.

Staff knew how to recognise and respond to abuse. There had been no safeguarding incidents since our last inspection. Accidents and incidents were recorded and analysed to recognise any trends and stop them from reoccurring.

There were enough staff on duty to keep people safe and give them the care and support that they needed. Staff were recruited safely, checks were made to ensure they were of good character and had the necessary skills and experience to support people effectively.

People received their medicines safely and when they needed them.

## 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** ●

We found that action had been taken to improve safety.

Potential risks to people had been identified and recorded and there was clear guidance in place to help manage risks.

Regular checks were carried out on the environment and equipment to ensure it was safe and fit for use.

Staff had received training and knew how to recognise and respond to different types of abuse.

There was enough staff to keep people safe. Staff were recruited safely.

Medicines were managed safely.

# 55 Sandwich Road

## 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.

We undertook an announced focused inspection of 55 Sandwich Road on 14 February 2017, the inspection was announced so that there would be someone at the service. This inspection was carried out to check that improvements to meet legal requirements planned by the provider after our 15 October 2015 inspection had been made. The team inspected the service against one of the five questions we ask about services: Is the service safe? This was because the service was previously not meeting some legal requirements. This inspection was carried out by one inspector.

The provider had not completed a Provider Information Return (PIR), because we had not requested one before this 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 to the registered manager and a member of staff. We observed people with staff in the communal lounge. We looked at people's care plans and the associated risk assessments and guidance. We looked at a range of other records including medicines records and audits, maintenance records, recruitment files and staff rotas.

We last inspected this service on 15 October 2015. A breach in the regulations was identified at this inspection.

## Is the service safe?

### Our findings

People indicated that they felt safe at the service. They were smiling and appeared happy in the company of staff. Staff reassured people quickly when they became anxious.

At the last inspection in October 2015, people had not been fully protected from financial abuse. People's monies had been spent inappropriately; when people ate out their money had been used to pay for a staff meal as well. At this inspection improvements had been made.

Staff followed the provider's financial policies and procedures to protect people from financial abuse; these were now adhered to consistently. People's money was kept safely and was accessed by senior staff only. Monies spent was monitored and accounted for. People were able to access their money when they needed it. Each person had a support plan in place which included guidelines about how they preferred to spend their money. Receipts showed that when people had eaten out and they had only paid for their food and drink. The registered manager had completed a weekly audit to ensure that the policy was being followed.

People were protected from abuse. Staff knew people well and were able to recognise signs through body language and behaviour, if people were upset or unhappy. Staff explained how they would recognise signs of abuse and how they would report it. They had received training on how to keep people safe and were aware of the whistle blowing policy and how to take concerns to outside agencies, if they felt concerns were not being dealt with properly. Staff told us that they were confident that the registered manager would take any concerns seriously and deal with these concerns appropriately.

Staff had identified the risks associated with people's care such as mobility, eating and drinking and behaviour. People's support plans provided guidelines about how to manage risks and ensure that they received the care they needed to minimise the risks from occurring. One person had a positive behaviour support plan to manage their behaviour; this had enabled staff to support the person while out in the community. People were able to access the community on a regular basis; they received individual support from staff that had training in how to support people whose behaviour might be challenging.

Accidents and incidents were recorded. The registered manager analysed these to identify if there were any trends or patterns and took action to reduce the risk to people. Incidents were discussed with staff as a learning process so that further occurrences could be prevented.

Regular health and safety checks of the environment and equipment were completed. These included making sure gas and electrical appliances were safe. Water temperatures were checked to make sure people were not at risk from scalding. Regular checks were carried out on the fire alarms and other fire equipment to make sure it was fit for purpose. People had a personal emergency evacuation plan (PEEP) and staff were involved in fire drills. A PEEP sets out specific physical and communication requirements for each person to ensure that they can safely be evacuated from the service in the event of a fire or emergency.

There were enough staff on duty to meet people's needs and keep them safe. People required one to one

support at times and required two staff when they went out on activities. The registered manager made sure there were enough staff so that people were able to enjoy activities when they wanted. There were arrangements in place to make sure there were extra staff available in an emergency and to cover unexpected shortfalls such as staff sickness. During the inspection there were enough staff available to meet people's needs and people went out for lunch.

No new staff had been recruited since the last inspection. Recruitment procedures were thorough to make sure that staff were suitable to work with people. Written references were obtained and checks had been carried out to make sure staff were of good character. Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) criminal records checks had been completed. The DBS helps employers make safer recruitment decisions and helps prevent unsuitable people from working with people who use care and support services.

People received their medicines safely and on time. Staff had completed training on how to give people their medicines safely and their competencies were checked regularly to make sure their practise was safe. Medicines were stored safely. Room temperatures were checked daily to ensure medicines were stored at the correct temperature to remain effective. Records showed that people had received their medicines as prescribed by their doctor. Some people were prescribed medicines on a 'when required' basis such as pain relief. There were detailed written instructions for staff on how to administer 'when required' medicines to each person and these had been followed by staff.