

Elmfield Residential Home Limited

# Elmfield House

## Inspection report

Church Lane  
Bisley  
Woking  
Surrey  
GU24 9ED

Date of inspection visit:  
03 May 2017

Date of publication:  
01 June 2017

Tel: 01483489522

Website: [www.elmfieldhouse.com](http://www.elmfieldhouse.com)

## Ratings

Overall rating for this service

Good ●

Is the service well-led?

Good ●

# Summary of findings

## Overall summary

This inspection was carried out on 3 May 2017.

Elmfield House is registered to provide accommodation with personal care for up to 18 people. At the time of our inspection there were 18 people living at the service, some of whom were living with dementia.

At the last inspection in July 2016, the service was rated Good, however, we found the service was in breach of Regulation 5 of the Registration Regulations 2009 (Schedule 1) Registered manager condition. The service did not have a registered manager for the provision of the regulated activity at the location. During this inspection we found the provider has met this Regulation.

The registered manager had registered with the Care Quality Commission (CQC) for the regulated activity undertaken at the location.

Staff and the provider undertook quality assurance audits to ensure the care provided was of a standard people should expect. Any areas identified as needing improvement were attended to by staff.

People, relatives and associated professionals had been asked for their views about the care provided and how the home was run. Regular resident and relatives and staff meetings took place.

Records of accidents and incidents were maintained at the service and the registered manager undertook monthly audits to identify any trends and took action as required to maintain the safety of people.

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 well-led?**

The service was well led.

There was a registered manager in post and a staff structure where everyone was aware of their roles.

Quality assurance checks were completed to help ensure the care provided was of good quality.

There was a system in place to ascertain the views of people about the care and support they received from the service.

Staff felt supported by the registered manager who had an open door policy.

**Good** 

# Elmfield 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 was a focused inspection to ensure that the provider was meeting breaches identified at the previous inspection in July 2016.

This was an unannounced inspection which took place on 3 May 2017. The inspection team consisted of one inspector.

Prior to the inspection we reviewed the information we had about the service. This included information sent to us by the provider, about the staff and the people who used the service. As this was a focused inspection to look at previous breach we did not ask the provider to complete a Provider Information Return (PIR). 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.

During our inspection we spoke with the registered manager, three members of staff, three people and two relatives. We looked at the quality assurance monitoring tools used at the home, minutes of staff meetings, resident and relatives meetings and the servicing certificates of the appliances used.

The last inspection of this home was 8 July 2016 where we found one breach of their condition of registration to have a manager who was registered with the Care Quality Commission (CQC) to carry on the regulated activity. This was a focused inspection to follow up on this breach.

# Is the service well-led?

## Our findings

At our inspection of July 2016 we found the service was in breach of Regulation 5 Registration Regulations 2009 (Schedule 1) Registered manager condition. The service did not have a registered manager for the provision of the regulated activity at the location. During this inspection we found the provider had made the required improvements to address this breach of regulation.

The manager had successfully registered with the CQC on the 28 September 2016 for the provision of the regulated activity for Accommodation for persons who require nursing or personal care.

People told us that staff at the home were very caring and looked after them well. One person told us, "Staff here are wonderful. They are so caring. You only have to ask the registered manager for things once and you get it by the next day." Another person told us, "The registered manager here is very good, this home runs well." Relatives felt that the home was well run. One relative told us, "The registered manager is very good and approachable; I can talk to her at any time." Another relative told us, "The management here are very efficient; everyone knows what they are doing."

The service had a positive culture that was person-centred, open, inclusive and empowering. People and relatives told us that the registered manager was always at the service and could be approached at any time. They told us that the registered manager was always walking about the service and talked to them every day. One person told us, "It is a very warm, friendly and homely place here." One relative told us, "I always get a warm welcome when I visit and I am offered a hot drink." Relatives told us they could visit the home at any time and were always made to feel welcomed.

Staff were complimentary about the registered manager. One member of staff told us, "The registered manager is very supportive and gives her time to support with on both a professional and personal level." Another member of staff told us, "I can talk to the registered manager at any time; she is very supportive and has an open door policy." Staff told us they enjoyed working at the home as it had a friendly and homely atmosphere.

Quality assurance systems were in place to monitor the quality and running of service being delivered. We saw regular audits had been undertaken by the registered manager. Audits were undertaken on a daily, weekly, monthly and six monthly. These audits included moving and handling, health and safety, medication, care plans, infection control, emergency plans, first aid equipment and the kitchen. The registered manager had produced an action plan of any issues identified. For example, create a new medicines policy; update the staff photographs on the notice board for people to see who is who and what their roles are. These had been complete. The provider held monthly board meetings where the service was discussed. The registered manager provided written monthly reports about the home that included information about the audits undertaken, people, staff, vacancies and any concerns. These were discussed at the board meetings with the registered manager.

Staff knew how to report to management when accidents or incidents had occurred. These were then discussed at team meetings to see if anymore could be done to prevent these reoccurring. Records of

accidents and incidents were maintained at the service and the registered manager undertook monthly audits to identify any trends and took action as required. For example, when people had up to four falls the registered manager made GP appointments so referrals to the falls clinic could be made for people. If people suffered a serious injury from a fall the paramedics were called immediately.

As part of the continuous improvement of the service an extension was built to accommodate an extra three people and to provide more space for people. For example, the lounge had been made bigger and the large garden had astro turf and a gazebo with comfortable seating and table. The final part of the re-development of the home had been completed with a large purpose built porch with a ramp. Staff told us that people liked to use the porch to look out of the large windows that overlooked communal land opposite the home where lots of activities took place.

People and relatives told us they were provided with opportunities to have their say about how the home was run. They told us they had regular resident and relatives meetings where they could put ideas forward. One relative told us they had made a suggestion about the visitor's book being put in order so it was easily accessible. They told us this was implemented the following day. One person told us they had discussed the menu during the meetings and they could make suggestions for meals. Minutes of these meetings were maintained. Topics discussed included the staff at the home, menus, and suggestions for future activities. For example, the home had signed up with an external travel company so people could continue to attend external activities such as dancing and afternoon tea in a local town.

People, their relatives and other associated professionals had been asked for their views about the service. Annual surveys had been distributed in January 2016. Comments in these surveys were all positive about the care provided. The registered manager had sent this year's survey out in March, and some had already been completed. We noted that there were no negative comments about the service in the returned surveys. The registered manager told us that a summary of the findings would be written and an action plan would be implemented for any identified concerns.

The provider had a set of values and philosophy of care. Staff were knowledgeable about these and were able to state how they put them into practice. For example, "To provide a safe, caring environment, to promote the privacy and dignity of people and to attend to people's personal care needs in private." Staff did provide care in this way and they cared for people in a quiet and respectful manner, asking them for their views and attending to the requests made by people.

External contacts were encouraged. For example, external entertainers visited the home. The registered manager had contact with a local organisation that provided chicken eggs and an incubator. This enabled people to monitor and care for chickens as they hatched and grew to be ten days old before returning them. People were talkative about this and they told us they enjoyed listening to the 'chirps' they made.