

Riverside Care Centre Sawley, Clitheroe

**Enter and View Report Tuesday 29th August 2017
V:3**



DISCLAIMER

This report relates only to the service viewed at the time of the visit, and is only representative of the views of the staff, visitors and residents who met members of the Enter and View team on that date.

Contact Details:**Riverside Care Centre****Sawley****Clitheroe****BB7 4LF****Staff met during our visit:****Area Manager: Sian Hughes****Date and time of our visit:****Tuesday 29th August 2017 1.30pm-3.30pm****Healthwatch Lancashire Authorised****Representatives:****Linda Brown Senior Project Officer(Lead)****Carolyn Stuart Volunteer****Liz Butterworth Volunteer****Gill Green Volunteer****Introduction**

This was an announced Enter and View visit undertaken by authorised representatives from Healthwatch Lancashire who have the authority to enter health and social care premises, announced or unannounced, to observe and assess the nature and quality of services and obtain the view of those people using the services. The representatives observe and speak to residents in communal areas only.

This visit was arranged as part of Healthwatch Lancashire's Enter and View schedule. The aim is to observe services, consider how services may be improved and disseminate good practice. The team of trained Enter and View authorised representatives record their observations along with feedback from residents, staff and, where possible, resident's families or friends.

The team compile a report reflecting these observations and feedback, making comment where appropriate. The report is sent to the manager of the facility for validation of the facts. Any response from the manager is included with the final version of the report which is published on the Healthwatch Lancashire website at www.healthwatchlancashire.co.uk

Acknowledgements

Healthwatch Lancashire would like to thank Sian Hughes the Area Manager, together with staff, residents and visitors, for making us feel welcome and taking part in the visit.

General Information

Riverside Care Centre is privately owned by Canterbury Care Ltd with places for 40 residents. There were eight vacancies at the time of our visit. 10 residents who have lower dependency occupied Riverside House and 22 residents who have higher needs occupied Riverside Court.

Ali Gupoul has been the Acting Manager for the past few months but was currently on holiday along with the deputy manager at the time of our visit. Information obtained from carehome.co.uk states that the home provides care for people over the age of 60 years who are affected by dementia.

Methodology

The Enter and View representatives made an announced visit on Tuesday 29th August 2017.

We spoke to six residents and an additional Person Centred Care observation was undertaken for those unable to provide verbal feedback. We also spoke to five staff and one relative, where possible within the constraints of the home routine, people's willingness and ability to engage and access to people in public areas. Discussion was structured around four themes (Environment, Care, Nutrition and Activities) designed to gather information concerning residents overall experience of living at the home.

The team also recorded their own observations on the environment, facilities and care provided.

Our role at Healthwatch Lancashire is to gather the views of service users, especially those that are hard to reach and seldom heard, to give them the opportunity to express how they feel about a service regardless of their perceived ability to be able to do so. It is not our role to censor feedback from respondents.

Observations were rated on Red, Amber, Green scale as follows;

Green = We would choose this home for a loved one.

Amber = We may choose this home if some improvements were made

Red = We would not choose this home for a loved one unless significant improvements were made.

Summary:

On the day of our visit the area manager contacted Healthwatch Lancashire to rearrange the planned visit as she was concerned that the testing/servicing of fire alarms that day would be disruptive. However, we were unable to rearrange and the visit took place. Fire alarms appeared to have been tested/serviced prior to the visit taking place.

On arrival representatives noted that some areas of the home needed minor maintenance and cleaning but generally the buildings and particularly the gardens were homely and attractive.

A discernible odour was noted throughout the facility however representatives considered this was more obvious on the dedicated dementia unit Riverside Court. Interaction between staff and residents on this unit was minimal and on occasion residents were not responded to in a timely manner. Representatives also observed the dignity of one resident being compromised.

Staff told us that there had been a high turnover of leadership personnel leading to a lack of support and consistency from management.

At the time of our visit both the manager and deputy manager were on annual leave as was the activity coordinator. The laundry operative was also “off sick” and this had led to a significant accumulation of malodorous unwashed items.

There was a mixed response from residents in relation to their experiences of the home with the majority of respondents saying that they enjoyed the food and liked the staff but there was a lack of meaningful activities and “did not go out”.

When asked some staff said they would be reluctant to consider the home for the care of a close relative.

However, a relative spoke very positively about their experience of the home.

Based on the criteria, the Enter and View Representatives gave the home an overall score of:

Amber/Red

Enter and View observations

Pre-visit and location

The home details can be found on carehome.co.uk and a brochure was available at the home.

Riverside Care Centre is set in a county side location but is not accessible by public transport and there are no local amenities close by. The home was clearly signposted.

Riverside Care Centre consists of two adjoining houses connected by an internal corridor. Riverside House is an older type property retaining many of its features such as wood panelling and large staircase to the upper floor bedrooms accessed by a stair lift. Riverside House has a lower occupancy of residents who require less support. Riverside Court is a more modern single storey facility with an enclosed inner courtyard for use by residents who require more support and supervision. Most residents occupy this facility.

There is a car park at the home but parking space is limited for the size of the home. There did not appear to be a dedicated disabled parking space but disabled access was evident at the main entrances.

A steep hill into the car park could make going for a walk or pushing a wheel chair difficult. Representatives observed a staff member struggling to push a resident in a wheel chair up this incline.

Amber

The external environment

On arrival, it was noted that the gutters to the home needed clearing but the external gardens were well maintained with mature trees, shrubs and plants. Pots and planters of flowers made pleasant focal points. Appropriate seating could be seen in the pleasant grounds for use by residents and visitors.

It was clear where visitors should report to and the front door to Riverside Court was secure but staff struggled to open it with a key on arrival. In addition to this the internal door handle in Riverside House had reportedly snapped off that morning so could not be opened from the inside. However, there was an internal connecting door to both units. The area manager informed us that the door handle was to be repaired that day.

Amber

The internal environment/reception -first impressions

The senior carer and area manager made us feel very welcome on arrival. Both the deputy manager and acting manager were on holiday at the time of our visit. A visitor's book was available and in use. A small notice board with a few

photographs of residents enjoying an activity along with a limited activity schedule was noted in the lounge dining area.

The main office was situated next to the entrance area with up to date notices. The Healthwatch Enter & View poster was clearly displayed. It was not apparent if there was a notice board identifying key members of staff. However, staff observed appeared to have different coloured uniforms and it was confusing to identify them.

The senior carer was new to Riverside Care Centre and was not yet fully conversant with all residents' names and requests for information. She was very supportive of our visit and showed representatives around the main part of Riverside Court. There was another senior carer on Riverside House that had been at the home for a few years and knew residents well.

A discernible odour was noted on arrival and throughout the home particularly in Riverside Court. Some areas of the Court needed a high area clean with cobwebs noticeable on some ceilings and windows. No hand gel was available to the entrance of Riverside House.

Representatives considered that the general environment on Riverside Court was rather bland in terms of atmosphere and homely features. Whereas Riverside House appeared to be homelier with more interaction between the residents and staff, despite some residents being compromised with dementia.

Amber

The observation of corridors public toilets and bathrooms

Corridors and public areas were uncluttered and generally clean except for some ceiling cobwebs. The main corridor on Riverside Court was decorated to give the impression of a row of shops with brick wall paper and wall displays that represented shop windows such as, the bakers, fruit and veg and the butchers. A wall clock complimented the 'street' scene. Residents doors were individually coloured and where residents and relatives chose, had a photograph and name of the resident on their door. Some doors also displayed memory boxes which although containing old photograph did not really say anything individual about the person. Other parts of the corridors had old style pictures, contrasting handrails and sufficient space for wheel chairs and walking frames.

A feature on the same corridor was a plaque containing locks and bolts to attract residents' attention. (Fiddle board) In addition, coat hooks were on walls but did not have any coats hats or bags for residents to use.

Public areas appeared adequately lit and floor coverings were unworn and appropriate.



Public bathrooms observed were accessible to communal areas and clean except for high level cobwebs. There was an adequate supply of soap, hand towels and toilet rolls. However, they were not dementia friendly in terms of adaptations such as taps and colour contrasting seats. Dementia friendly signage was inconsistent with some bathrooms displaying large picture signage and others did not. The disabled toilet needed decoration and had a discernible odour.

Amber

The lounges, dining and other public areas

Communal areas appeared to be generally comfortable and homely but may have benefitted from more personalisation in terms of ornaments and visual items of interest. However, Riverside Court benefitted from pleasant views overlooking the colourful central courtyard which was well used by residents. There was appropriate outdoor seating and a raised potting area for outdoor garden activity.

Likewise, the colour scheme in the quiet lounge of soft green was pleasant and homely

It was noted that most lounges had the TV on but many residents were not watching it or sleeping. Other residents sat around the sides of the lounge could not see the TV.

There did not appear to be any background music or radio in any communal areas but this may have been by choice of the residents.

Due to natural features of the building and less occupancy Riverside House, felt more intimate and homely with residents sat around dining tables conversing and ready to take afternoon drinks and homemade cake, creating a pleasant social experience. A few residents in the lounge were watching the TV.

An empty room was said to be in the process of being converted into a dementia café. It was noted in the CQC report January 2017 that this room was to be converted into a tea room. We were also shown a dedicated cinema room complete with large screen and surround sound to simulate the cinema experience. This was said to be very popular with residents.



The area manager told us that residents are shown the two food choices on offer at lunch and evening meal times so that they can choose what they would prefer to eat and the manager later told us that a daily menu was displayed on both units. It was noted that in both units there was enough seating for residents to enjoy sitting together at meal times, if required.

Green/Amber

Social activities

Representatives were informed that is an activity coordinator 8am to 3pm four days a week however, she was on holiday during our visit. Staff told us that Riverside Care Centre were talking about buying a minibus to take residents out for drives and trips, as currently residents did not get to go out except with family. An entertainer is said to visit the home once a month but that there is little variation. Themed seasonal events are said to take place such a Summer Fete, Christmas, Easter and Halloween.

There was no evidence of activities taking place at the time of our visit or recently in either unit except for a couple of photographs on a notice board.

The homes brochure states that *“care home activities often involve the local community and we encourage strong social links with local groups.”* There was no evidence of this on the notice boards, and no one could tell us about social activities taking place. The brochure also states that a regular visit from the hairdresser takes place where the home has *“salon facilities available”* and a *“state of the art sensory room”* neither of which we saw. The dementia friendly notice displayed on Riverside Court was for a Friday and not the day of the visit so it was unclear what activities were planned for the day.



Red

Observations of Person Centred care and the physical environment.

Number of residents observed 9, staff observed 6. Plus, five residents and two staff in Riverside House.

Staff to resident interaction (is the interaction positive, are the staff reassuring, do the staff know residents?)

Riverside Court

Four residents in the small quiet lounge were asleep. There was no interaction noted or stimulation for residents. Nine residents were sat in the larger lounge area with one member of staff sat with a resident having a conversation. All other residents sat in front of the TV. Very little interaction between staff and residents was noted with residents left to wander aimlessly. Not all staff knew residents by name and interaction was functional. One resident in the quiet lounge was noted to be asleep in what appeared to be an uncomfortable position. Over two hours later this resident had not moved position. This was brought to the attention of the area manager as representatives were concerned about the prolonged position the resident had been in.

Riverside House

Interaction between residents and the two carers in the House was more evident with residents sat communally at dining tables and in the lounge area.

Dignity and care (in toileting, eating, support in activities)

Riverside Court

Three staff were observed hoisting a resident to toilet them. No reassurance was given despite the resident screaming and being obviously distressed. Physical dignity was maintained whilst in the hoist but no verbal explanation or consolation was given.

There did not appear to be adequate responses to toileting needs. One female resident was observed repeatedly shouting for help but was ignored by staff. A representative spoke to the resident and discovered that they needed the toilet and notified a staff member.

Eventually a member of staff came to take them but left the door to the toilet ajar. A male resident opened the door wide to look inside whilst the female resident was occupying it, which was felt to compromise her dignity.

On another occasion whilst two staff were in a toilet with the same resident they required an incontinence aid. A third member of staff was asked to go and get some. This left the remaining highly dependent residents without any care or supervision.

It was observed that some residents were walking around in stocking feet, which was a potential slip hazard on the laminate flooring.

Response times (to call bells, to residents in need)

Other residents were observed calling out but were ignored. When seen wandering residents were told to sit down by staff without any enquiry as to the possible needs of the resident. One resident did indicate they needed the toilet.

Call bells were not heard during the visit however, it was noted that call bells were not accessible to immobile residents especially in the lounge areas.

Atmosphere (is it calm/relaxing/positive?)

The atmosphere in Riverside Court did not feel homely or relaxing to the representatives. Residents did not react to representatives going into the lounges and most residents were either asleep or disengaged. No laughter or banter was noted.

The physical environment generally lacked reading material, games and ornaments. There did not appear to be anything for residents to occupy themselves except for three activity tubes placed on a table in one of the Court lounges. Some residents frequented the inner enclosed courtyard area which was very pleasant with ample potted plants, flowers and outdoor seating.

Riverside House appeared more relaxed as residents were interacting with staff and each other.

The homes resident cat was observed around the home.

Red/Amber

Feedback from six residents

Environment

“It’s a good place, comfortable and homely.”

“There is nothing good about living here.”

“There are lots of good parts but it’s not perfect.”

“I like to be able to look at the hills.”

“I have everything that I need.”

“It’s a lonely location, you can’t go out because there is nowhere to go.”

“There is nothing to make it; ‘isn’t it lovely’, no features, it’s a bit bare.”

“It disappoints me greatly that I can’t get access to the surrounding countryside.”

“I like living here everyone is friendly.”

Activities

“There isn’t much activity it’s mainly the TV.”

“There are no trips out and there isn’t much to do. I would like to go out for a drive.”

“Activities? You can go outside or take a bath. There is never anything going on.”

“There are definitely no games.”

Care

“I like the staff in both units.”

“Some staff are not always very nice.”

“Good care if you are well, the staff are good.”

“I don’t need a great deal of care.”

“I like to smile and chat.”

“The staff are very nice with us.”

“The care is good but there are no buzzers you just have to look for someone.”

Food

“The food is good.”

“You get a choice of food; the fish was nice for lunch.”

“Some meals are nice and some are not.”

“I like the food.”

Relatives and Friends Views

One relative gave feedback about Riverside House which is a lower dependency part of the home.

How do you feel generally about the service?

“My relative has settled into the home better than I thought they would. They haven’t been here long but they seem to be quite happy, it has been fabulous for them.”

Do you think that you are kept informed about your relative e.g. Health and future care plans?

“Yes, I have been kept informed.”

Do you know how to make a complaint if you need to?

“Yes, I would speak to the manager.”

Are you aware of the social activities at the service and do you feel welcomed to join in?

“The activity coordinator tailor’s activities to everyone. She walks with the fitter residents.”

Would you recommend this service to others?

“I would recommend this service. The staff (in the House) are very attentive and are always talking to the residents. My relative gets a lot of personal attention compared to other homes we looked at. The staff seem to know each individual person.”

Staff views

We had an opportunity to speak to five members of care staff about their experience of working at the home.

Do you have enough staff when on duty?

“Two staff at night in Riverside House and two at night in Riverside Court high dependency.”

“No, we don’t really have enough staff. We need more help in a morning especially if a resident needs hoisting.”

“There are not always enough staff.”

“There are not enough staff in the morning when we must help residents get up. After lunch, it is ok.”

“More staff would be helpful, particularly with activities. If an activity coordinator was here all the time we could concentrate on the care.”

“I feel that we are short staffed.”

“The staff are very caring. It would be helpful if residents had activities to do. I have only seen the activity coordinator once in six months. We try and do activities with residents but there are not always enough staff. There is not much for residents to do.”

“There is a laundry assistant for 3 days a week, there used to be two. The laundry assistant is currently off sick and laundry is piled up. Staff have to do it when they get time but the care comes first. I don’t know how the home got a Good CQC rating.”

“In the past two years, we have had four different managers.”

Do you feel supported to carry out person centred care?

“There are some good staff here.”

“I have been in care work for many years and it is not possible to give person centred care here.”

“There is more time in the House to offer person centred care because there are less residents who are a bit more independent.”

Do you feel you have enough training to carry out your duties well?

“We have training on site but it doesn’t seem to change things. People come out of the training and still carry on the same.”

Are you happy working here?

“I get disheartened even though I love working here, but I can’t get to do everything.”

“It’s not a bad place to work and the rest of the staff are friendly and make you feel a part of the team.”

“I am not happy working here. I hoped it would change under the new manager but she has also left. I don’t feel supported.”

“I am not happy working here because it doesn’t pay very well and there is not enough support from management. Managers are very office based. They need to come out more to understand the work that needs to be done. All three managers are currently on holiday which is very poor. One of the seniors has only just been here for a couple of months.”

Would you be happy to recommend this care home to a close relative?

“I would choose the home if some tweaks were made.”

“I would not choose this home because staff don’t have enough time to help people.”

“I don’t know how they got a Good CQC report”.

“I wouldn’t recommend The Court because it is too noisy.”

“Not at all! I would not recommend this home to my loved one because not all staff are as patient as me.”

Other comments

A new manager has now been appointed according to the area manager.

We were told that there were issues with the laundry due to a laundry assistant on sick leave. A representative observed the laundry room had a significant amount of unwashed laundry.

Staff said they were expected to do the laundry, activities and care at present.

Response from provider

The provider responded by email on 17/10/2017 as below

Summary:

“Staff told us that there had been a high turnover of leadership personnel leading to a lack of support and consistency from management.”

Response from provider

When the first Home Manager left, a Peripatetic Manager was at the home to ensure the smooth running on a daily basis until a permanent manager was sourced and employed. A Home Manager was recruited and was in post for over 2 years. The latest left due to performance issues. Another Peripatetic Manager worked at the home full time from Monday-Friday to ensure leadership and management at Riverside.

Pre-visit and location

“Riverside Care Centre is set in a county side location but is not accessible by public transport and there are no local amenities close by”.

Response from provider

Clitheroe is 20 minutes away and Chatburn is 5 minutes away.

“There is a car park at the home but parking space is limited for the size of the home. There did not appear to be a dedicated disabled parking space but disabled access was evident at the main entrances”.

Response from provider

There is ample off-road car parking which is sufficient to accommodate the parking needs of the home. Current Manager will contact P Services to discuss wheelchair access.

“A steep hill into the car park could make going for a walk or pushing a wheel chair difficult. Representatives observed a staff member struggling to push a resident in a wheel chair up this incline”.

Response from provider

Steps off garden area as well for more able bodied.

The external environment

“On arrival, it was noted that the gutters to the home needed clearing but the external gardens were well maintained with mature trees, shrubs and plants”.

Response from provider

Guttering was planned after tree leaves fallen.

The internal environment/reception -first impressions

“Representatives considered that the general environment on Riverside Court was rather bland in terms of atmosphere and homely features. Whereas Riverside House appeared to be homelier with more interaction between the residents and staff, despite some residents being compromised with dementia”.

Response from provider

Additions of pictures, ornaments, soft furniture’s.

The lounges, dining and other public areas

“Communal areas appeared to be generally comfortable and homely but may have benefitted from more personalisation in terms of ornaments and visual items of interest”.

Response from provider

This was planned and now is completed.

Social activities

“The brochure also states that a regular visit from the hairdresser takes place where the home has “salon facilities available” and a “state of the art sensory room” neither of which we saw.”

Response from provider

The Sensory room will be removed from the brochure.

Dignity and care (in toileting, eating, support in activities)

Riverside Court

“There did not appear to be adequate responses to toileting needs. One female resident was observed repeatedly shouting for help but was ignored by staff. A

representative spoke to the resident and discovered that they needed the toilet and notified a staff member.”

Response from provider

This is clearly documented in the Care Plan.

“Eventually a member of staff came to take them but left the door to the toilet ajar. A male resident opened the door wide to look inside whilst the female resident was occupying it, which was felt to compromise her dignity”.

Response from provider

Dignity and Respect Person Centre Care training provided.

Response times (to call bells, to residents in need)

“Call bells were not heard during the visit however, it was noted that call bells were not accessible to immobile residents especially in the lounge areas”.

Response from provider

Risk assessment in place for those who cannot use a call bell.

Atmosphere (is it calm/relaxing/positive?)

“The atmosphere in Riverside Court did not feel homely or relaxing to the representatives. Residents did not react to representatives going into the lounges and most residents were either asleep or disengaged. No laughter or banter was noted.

The physical environment generally lacked reading material, games and ornaments. There did not appear to be anything for residents to occupy themselves except for three activity tubes placed on a table in one of the Court lounges. Some residents frequented the inner enclosed courtyard area which was very pleasant with ample potted plants, flowers and outdoor seating.

Riverside House appeared more relaxed as residents were interacting with staff and each other.”

Response from provider

The Court needs are higher and behaviour can increase throughout the day. We continue to work with residents and families through Care Plan reviews to put strategies in place to reduce increased anxiety levels.

www.healthwatchlancashire.co.uk

info@healthwatchlancashire.co.uk

Twitter: [@HW_Lancashire](https://twitter.com/HW_Lancashire)

Facebook: facebook.com/lancshealthwatch