

***We are the regulator:** Our job is to check whether hospitals, care homes and care services are meeting essential standards.*

## The Yachtsman Rest Home

41-42 Laidleys Walk, Fleetwood, FY7 7JL

Tel: 01253873472

Date of Inspection: 29 November 2012

Date of Publication:  
December 2012

We inspected the following standards as part of a routine inspection. This is what we found:

<b>Respecting and involving people who use services</b>	✓ Met this standard
<b>Care and welfare of people who use services</b>	✓ Met this standard
<b>Safeguarding people who use services from abuse</b>	✓ Met this standard
<b>Staffing</b>	✓ Met this standard
<b>Complaints</b>	✓ Met this standard

## Details about this location

Registered Provider	Graham Philip Saunders & Robert Mark Saunders
Registered Manager	Ms. Marie Deer
Overview of the service	<p>The Yachtsman Rest Home is registered to provide personal care for up to 32 people. They support mainly older people or people with dementia. Accommodation is on three floors with a passenger lift for access between the floors. There are two lounges and dining rooms and a smaller quiet lounge plus a large garden for people to enjoy. The home is situated close to shops, buses, the beach and the local facilities of Fleetwood.</p>
Type of service	Care home service without nursing
Regulated activity	Accommodation for persons who require nursing or personal care

## Contents

*When you read this report, you may find it useful to read the sections towards the back called 'About CQC inspections' and 'How we define our judgements'.*

	Page
<b>Summary of this inspection:</b>	
Why we carried out this inspection	4
How we carried out this inspection	4
What people told us and what we found	4
More information about the provider	5
<b>Our judgements for each standard inspected:</b>	
Respecting and involving people who use services	6
Care and welfare of people who use services	7
Safeguarding people who use services from abuse	9
Staffing	10
Complaints	11
<b>About CQC Inspections</b>	12
<b>How we define our judgements</b>	13
<b>Glossary of terms we use in this report</b>	15
<b>Contact us</b>	17

## Summary of this inspection

---

### Why we carried out this inspection

---

This was a routine inspection to check that essential standards of quality and safety referred to on the front page were being met. We sometimes describe this as a scheduled inspection.

This was an unannounced inspection.

---

### How we carried out this inspection

---

We looked at the personal care or treatment records of people who use the service, reviewed information sent to us by other organisations, carried out a visit on 29 November 2012 and observed how people were being cared for. We checked how people were cared for at each stage of their treatment and care, talked with people who use the service and talked with staff.

We used the Short Observational Framework for Inspection (SOFI). SOFI is a specific way of observing care to help us understand the experience of people who could not talk with us.

---

### What people told us and what we found

---

We observed how staff supported people living in The Yachtsman Rest Home. They were treated in a respectful and dignified manner. People told us that the staff were caring and supported them well. One person said, "Staff help me just as I want them to". Another person said they did not need much support but only had to ask if they needed help.

Staff encouraged people to join in activities indoors and in the local community. One person told us about a theatre trip planned for the day after the inspection. Another person showed us the Christmas newsletter which detailed the activities and trips out over the festive period.

People living in the home said they felt that they were safe at The Yachtsman. They said staff were approachable and kind and they could talk to them.

Care plans were in place and were informative and person centred. People living in the home and their relatives had been involved in collecting this information. This gave all involved clear and detailed information on how to support people effectively.

The staffing levels and staff skills made sure people were well supported. People told us that staff assisted them quickly when they needed support. One person said, "I never have to wait long if I need any help."

You can see our judgements on the front page of this report.

---

## **More information about the provider**

---

Please see our website [www.cqc.org.uk](http://www.cqc.org.uk) for more information, including our most recent judgements against the essential standards. You can contact us using the telephone number on the back of the report if you have additional questions.

There is a glossary at the back of this report which has definitions for words and phrases we use in the report.

## Our judgements for each standard inspected

**Respecting and involving people who use services** ✓ Met this standard

**People should be treated with respect, involved in discussions about their care and treatment and able to influence how the service is run**

---

### Our judgement

---

The provider was meeting this standard.

People's views and experiences were taken into account in the way the service was provided and delivered in relation to their care.

---

### Reasons for our judgement

---

We observed how staff supported people living in The Yachtsman Rest Home. We did this using a method called Short Observational Framework for Inspection (SOFI). This involved observing staff interactions with the people in their care. Staff were supportive and reassuring throughout the observation process. This meant they were aware of people's needs and had the skills to deliver care.

People were treated in a respectful and dignified manner. Staff supported people in a relaxed unhurried way, encouraging them to become involved in activities. We saw staff discreetly assisting people to their rooms for personal care while quietly explaining the reason for this. We also saw staff sensitively re-orientating one person who had become confused.

We saw that routines in the home were flexible. People were supported to rise and retire at times of their choosing. They were encouraged to make choices about their care and support. We observed people being given choices about the activities they wanted to do.

Staff involved people in decision making. Where people lacked mental capacity, staff told us best interests meetings had been carried out over important decisions. The person, the family and appropriate professionals had been involved in the decisions.

We looked at some care records. Records showed that people living in the home and where appropriate their relatives, were involved in managing their care. As well as making choices about care they needed they were also planning for the future.

**People should get safe and appropriate care that meets their needs and supports their rights**

---

**Our judgement**

---

The provider was meeting this standard.

People experienced care, treatment and support that met their needs and protected their rights.

---

**Reasons for our judgement**

---

We looked at the care records for three people living in the home. Senior staff assessed the care needs of each person before they moved in. This meant that staff knew the basic needs of each person before admission.

Care plans were in place and were informative and person centred. They clearly showed how the person wanted their care delivered. People living in the home and their relatives had been involved in collecting this information. This gave all involved clear and detailed information on how to support people effectively.

Risk assessments were in place and had been regularly updated to reflect the changes in support needed. We saw evidence that changes in health were noted, records updated and the advice of other professionals sought. This assisted staff in providing appropriate care and support.

We talked to four people living in the home during our visit. Some people were able to tell us their views about The Yachtsman and the support they received. They told us that the staff were caring and supported them well. One person said, "Staff help me just as I want them to. Another person said they did not need much support but only had to ask if they needed help.

Other people had limited verbal communication and understanding and were unable to hold a detailed conversation with us. To help us understand their experiences of living in the home we observed the care people received and the interaction by staff. Interaction was frequent and friendly. We saw people involved in activities or chatting with staff.

We observed people being supported over lunch time. The meal was relaxed and unhurried. We saw staff chatting about the lunchtime choices with people. They reminded people which meal they had chosen before they set the meal down.

Senior staff told us that some people would refuse meals occasionally or they only ate a small amount at mealtimes. Staff were encouraged to provide food at any time to ensure that people were able to eat whenever they were hungry. This was recorded in care records. Boxes and plates of biscuits were available in the lounges for people to take as they wanted them. This meant that they could snack when they wanted. People were

also provided with drinks frequently to encourage fluid intake.

Staff encouraged people to join in activities indoors and in the local community. People told us about activities available. These included local choirs and entertainers visiting the home, exercise sessions, bingo, arts and crafts and film afternoons. There were also frequent outings to tea dances, theatres and trips out. One person told us about a theatre trip planned for the day after the inspection. Another person showed us the Christmas newsletter which detailed the activities and trips out over the festive period.

Staff assisted people sensitively and without rushing anyone and encouraged people to choose the clothing they wanted to wear. People were smartly dressed, well groomed and wearing clean clothing.

Religious and cultural needs were taken into account and people were supported to attend a place of worship if they wished. Local ministers also regularly visited the home. The majority of people living in the home were Christian or had no religious affiliation. However senior staff felt they could support people from other religious or cultural backgrounds. They would make sure that everyone had the necessary knowledge to support people effectively.

**People should be protected from abuse and staff should respect their human rights**

---

### **Our judgement**

---

The provider was meeting this standard.

People who use the service were protected from the risk of abuse because the provider had taken reasonable steps to identify the possibility of abuse and prevent abuse from happening.

---

### **Reasons for our judgement**

---

People living in the home said they felt that they were safe at The Yachtsman. They said staff were approachable and kind and they could talk to them. People told us that they would tell the staff or their relatives if they were worried or something was wrong and it would be dealt with. Some people told us that in the past one person living in the home had become very confused and had been very agitated. They said that although distressing, staff had made sure everyone was kept safe whilst also looking after the person.

We spoke with staff about safeguarding. They were able to explain what to do in the event of any allegations or suspicion of abuse. They said they would talk to senior staff if they had any concerns about care in the home. If this was not possible they knew to contact the Local Authority.

The manager had reported any safeguarding issues to the funding authority, who carried out their safeguarding procedures. Any safeguarding issues were dealt with appropriately and CQC informed as required.

## Staffing

✓ Met this standard

There should be enough members of staff to keep people safe and meet their health and welfare needs

---

### Our judgement

---

The provider was meeting this standard.

There were enough qualified, skilled and experienced staff to meet people's needs.

---

### Reasons for our judgement

---

We looked at the staffing levels on the inspection and looked at recent rotas. In addition to the manager, there was a senior member of staff plus three care staff supporting people during the week and a senior member of staff plus four care staff at weekend. There was a senior member of staff plus two or three care staff at night. There was also an activity coordinator who worked in the home for part of the day organising and leading activities. A cook and housekeeping and laundry staff prepared meals and kept the home clean.

Staff spoken with told us that they felt that there were enough staff to provide good care safely and without rushing people. Most staff were part way through or had completed national qualifications in care to assist them in carrying out their work to a good standard. These staffing levels and staff skills made sure people were well supported

We talked with people living in the home, observed care and talked with staff. People said they were supported well and staff were caring and kind. One person said, "The staff are absolutely marvellous." Another person said, "The staff are all good and some are excellent." People said they felt staff came to assist them quickly when they asked for assistance. One person said, "I never have to wait long if I need any help."

Staff told us they were well supported by the owners and the manager who were all approachable and helpful. One member of staff said, "They are brilliant, nothing is too much trouble."

We observed care during the inspection. Staff responded quickly and sensitively to any requests for assistance and interacted well with people. There were satisfactory numbers of staff throughout the inspection to support people in the way they needed.

## Complaints

✓ Met this standard

People should have their complaints listened to and acted on properly

---

### Our judgement

---

The provider was meeting this standard.

There was an effective complaints system available. Comments and complaints people made were responded to appropriately.

---

### Reasons for our judgement

---

There was an effective complaints system in place. Where people made any comments and concerns these were investigated and responded to appropriately. A complaints policy outlined the procedure people should follow if they were unhappy about something at The Yachtsman. A system was in place, so that any complaints could be recorded and monitored, showing action taken in order to address the issues raised.

People we spoke with told us they would speak to the owners, manager or a member of staff if they were unhappy. They felt their comments or complaints would be listened to and acted on.

## About CQC inspections

We are the regulator of health and social care in England.

All providers of regulated health and social care services have a legal responsibility to make sure they are meeting essential standards of quality and safety. These are the standards everyone should be able to expect when they receive care.

The essential standards are described in the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2010 and the Care Quality Commission (Registration) Regulations 2009. We regulate against these standards, which we sometimes describe as "government standards".

We carry out unannounced inspections of all care homes, acute hospitals and domiciliary care services in England at least once a year to judge whether or not the essential standards are being met. We carry out inspections of dentists and other services at least once every two years. All of our inspections are unannounced unless there is a good reason to let the provider know we are coming.

There are 16 essential standards that relate most directly to the quality and safety of care and these are grouped into five key areas. When we inspect we could check all or part of any of the 16 standards at any time depending on the individual circumstances of the service. Because of this we often check different standards at different times but we always inspect at least one standard from each of the five key areas every year. We may check fewer key areas in the case of dentists and some other services.

When we inspect, we always visit and we do things like observe how people are cared for, and we talk to people who use the service, to their carers and to staff. We also review information we have gathered about the provider, check the service's records and check whether the right systems and processes are in place.

We focus on whether or not the provider is meeting the standards and we are guided by whether people are experiencing the outcomes they should be able to expect when the standards are being met. By outcomes we mean the impact care has on the health, safety and welfare of people who use the service, and the experience they have whilst receiving it.

Our inspectors judge if any action is required by the provider of the service to improve the standard of care being provided. Where providers are non-compliant with the regulations, we take enforcement action against them. If we require a service to take action, or if we take enforcement action, we re-inspect it before its next routine inspection was due. This could mean we re-inspect a service several times in one year. We also might decide to re-inspect a service if new concerns emerge about it before the next routine inspection.

In between inspections we continually monitor information we have about providers. The information comes from the public, the provider, other organisations, and from care workers.

You can tell us about your experience of this provider on our website.

## How we define our judgements

The following pages show our findings and regulatory judgement for each essential standard or part of the standard that we inspected. Our judgements are based on the ongoing review and analysis of the information gathered by CQC about this provider and the evidence collected during this inspection.

We reach one of the following judgements for each essential standard inspected.

**✓ Met this standard** This means that the standard was being met in that the provider was compliant with the regulation. If we find that standards were met, we take no regulatory action but we may make comments that may be useful to the provider and to the public about minor improvements that could be made.

**✗ Action needed** This means that the standard was not being met in that the provider was non-compliant with the regulation. We may have set a compliance action requiring the provider to produce a report setting out how and by when changes will be made to make sure they comply with the standard. We monitor the implementation of action plans in these reports and, if necessary, take further action. We may have identified a breach of a regulation which is more serious, and we will make sure action is taken. We will report on this when it is complete.

**✗ Enforcement action taken** If the breach of the regulation was more serious, or there have been several or continual breaches, we have a range of actions we take using the criminal and/or civil procedures in the Health and Social Care Act 2008 and relevant regulations. These enforcement powers include issuing a warning notice; restricting or suspending the services a provider can offer, or the number of people it can care for; issuing fines and formal cautions; in extreme cases, cancelling a provider or managers registration or prosecuting a manager or provider. These enforcement powers are set out in law and mean that we can take swift, targeted action where services are failing people.

## How we define our judgements (continued)

Where we find non-compliance with a regulation (or part of a regulation), we state which part of the regulation has been breached. We make a judgement about the level of impact on people who use the service (and others, if appropriate to the regulation) from the breach. This could be a minor, moderate or major impact.

---

**Minor impact** – people who use the service experienced poor care that had an impact on their health, safety or welfare or there was a risk of this happening. The impact was not significant and the matter could be managed or resolved quickly.

---

**Moderate impact** – people who use the service experienced poor care that had a significant effect on their health, safety or welfare or there was a risk of this happening. The matter may need to be resolved quickly.

---

**Major impact** – people who use the service experienced poor care that had a serious current or long term impact on their health, safety and welfare, or there was a risk of this happening. The matter needs to be resolved quickly

---

We decide the most appropriate action to take to ensure that the necessary changes are made. We always follow up to check whether action has been taken to meet the standards.

## Glossary of terms we use in this report

### Essential standard

The essential standards of quality and safety are described in our *Guidance about compliance: Essential standards of quality and safety*. They consist of a significant number of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2010 and the Care Quality Commission (Registration) Regulations 2009. These regulations describe the essential standards of quality and safety that people who use health and adult social care services have a right to expect. A full list of the standards can be found within the *Guidance about compliance*. The 16 essential standards are:

Respecting and involving people who use services - Outcome 1 (Regulation 17)

Consent to care and treatment - Outcome 2 (Regulation 18)

Care and welfare of people who use services - Outcome 4 (Regulation 9)

Meeting Nutritional Needs - Outcome 5 (Regulation 14)

Cooperating with other providers - Outcome 6 (Regulation 24)

Safeguarding people who use services from abuse - Outcome 7 (Regulation 11)

Cleanliness and infection control - Outcome 8 (Regulation 12)

Management of medicines - Outcome 9 (Regulation 13)

Safety and suitability of premises - Outcome 10 (Regulation 15)

Safety, availability and suitability of equipment - Outcome 11 (Regulation 16)

Requirements relating to workers - Outcome 12 (Regulation 21)

Staffing - Outcome 13 (Regulation 22)

Supporting Staff - Outcome 14 (Regulation 23)

Assessing and monitoring the quality of service provision - Outcome 16 (Regulation 10)

Complaints - Outcome 17 (Regulation 19)

Records - Outcome 21 (Regulation 20)

### Regulated activity

These are prescribed activities related to care and treatment that require registration with CQC. These are set out in legislation, and reflect the services provided.

## Glossary of terms we use in this report (continued)

---

### **(Registered) Provider**

---

There are several legal terms relating to the providers of services. These include registered person, service provider and registered manager. The term 'provider' means anyone with a legal responsibility for ensuring that the requirements of the law are carried out. On our website we often refer to providers as a 'service'.

---

### **Regulations**

---

We regulate against the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2010 and the Care Quality Commission (Registration) Regulations 2009.

---

### **Responsive inspection**

---

This is carried out at any time in relation to identified concerns.

---

### **Routine inspection**

---

This is planned and could occur at any time. We sometimes describe this as a scheduled inspection.

---

### **Themed inspection**

---

This is targeted to look at specific standards, sectors or types of care.

## Contact us

---

Phone: 03000 616161

---

---

Email: [enquiries@ccq.org.uk](mailto:enquiries@ccq.org.uk)

---

---

Write to us  
at: Care Quality Commission  
Citygate  
Gallowgate  
Newcastle upon Tyne  
NE1 4PA

---

---

Website: [www.cqc.org.uk](http://www.cqc.org.uk)

---

---

Copyright Copyright © (2011) Care Quality Commission (CQC). This publication may be reproduced in whole or in part, free of charge, in any format or medium provided that it is not used for commercial gain. This consent is subject to the material being reproduced accurately and on proviso that it is not used in a derogatory manner or misleading context. The material should be acknowledged as CQC copyright, with the title and date of publication of the document specified.

---