

## Homes Of Rest For Old People Also Known As Radcliffe Manor House

# Radcliffe Manor House

### Inspection report

52 Main Road  
Radcliffe-on-Trent  
Nottingham  
Nottinghamshire  
NG12 2AA

Tel: 01159110138  
Website: [www.radcliffemanorhouse.co.uk](http://www.radcliffemanorhouse.co.uk)

Date of inspection visit:  
28 June 2023

Date of publication:  
17 July 2023

### Ratings

Overall rating for this service

Inspected but not rated

Is the service safe?

**Inspected but not rated**

# Summary of findings

## Overall summary

Radcliffe Manor House is a 'care home' for 26 older people. The building has 2 floors accessible by stairs or lift. There are extensive gardens to the front and rear of the property with accessible pathways. At the time of our inspection there were 21 people using the service.

People's experience of using this service and what we found.

We undertook this targeted inspection to check whether the Warning Notice we previously served in relation to Regulation 12 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014 had been met.

You can read the report from our last comprehensive inspection, by selecting the 'all reports' link for Radcliffe Manor house on our website at [www.cqc.org.uk](http://www.cqc.org.uk).

Rating at last inspection and update

The last rating for this service was Requires Improvement (published on 23 May 2023)

Why we inspected

We undertook this targeted inspection to check on a specific concern we had about personal safety. The overall rating for the service has not changed following this targeted inspection and remains Requires improvement.

We use targeted inspections to follow up on Warning Notices or to check concerns. They do not look at an entire key question, only the part of the key question we are specifically concerned about. Targeted inspections do not change the rating from the previous inspection. This is because they do not assess all areas of a key question.

Follow up

We will continue to monitor information we receive about the service, which will help inform when we next inspect.

## The five questions we ask about services and what we found

We always ask the following five questions of services.

### **Is the service safe?**

At our last inspection we rated this key question Requires improvement We have not reviewed the rating as we have not looked at all of the key question at this inspection.

**Inspected but not rated**

# Radcliffe Manor 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 was planned to check whether the provider is meeting the legal requirements and regulations associated with the Health and Social Care Act 2008.

This was a targeted inspection to check on a concern we had about personal safety and the safe environment of the service.

#### Inspection team

This inspection was carried out by 1 inspector.

#### Service and service type

Radcliffe Manor is a 'care home'. People in care homes receive accommodation and nursing or personal care as a single package under one contractual agreement. CQC regulates both the premises and the care provided, and both were looked at during this inspection.

#### Registered Manager

This provider is required to have a registered manager to oversee the delivery of regulated activities at this location. A registered manager is a person who has registered with the Care Quality Commission to manage the service. Registered managers and providers are legally responsible for how the service is run, for the quality and safety of the care provided and compliance with regulations.

At the time of our inspection there was a registered manager in post.

#### Notice of inspection

This inspection was unannounced.

#### What we did before inspection

We reviewed information we had received about the service since the last inspection. We sought feedback from the local authority and professionals who work with the service. The provider was not asked to complete a Provider Information Return (PIR) prior to this inspection. A PIR is information providers send us to give some key information about the service, what the service does well and improvements they plan to

make. We used all this information to plan our inspection.

During the inspection

We spoke with the registered manager and 2 members of staff. We reviewed the safety of the environment and reviewed relevant processes and documents relating to the safety for people and the environment of the service.

# Is the service safe?

## Our findings

Safe – this means we looked for evidence that people were protected from abuse and avoidable harm.

At our last inspection this key question was rated Requires Improvement. We have not changed the rating as we have not looked at all of the safe key question at this inspection.

The purpose of this inspection was to check the warning notice served at our last inspection published on 23 May 2023 had been met. We will assess the whole key question at the next comprehensive inspection of the service.

### Assessing risk, safety monitoring and management

At a previous inspection in February 2023 the provider failed to manage and mitigate all risks. This placed people at risk of harm. This was a breach of regulation 12(2)(a) and 12(2)(c) of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014. We issued the provider with a warning Notice.

Enough improvement had been made at this inspection and the provider was no longer in breach of Regulation 12.

- Risk to people's safety was managed. We found three entrance and exit doors had secure coded access fitted to ensure people who lacked capacity to leave the building were kept safe. Where people had capacity, they had access to the secure codes.
- Fire exits that were also potential risk for someone at risk of absconding or leaving the home undetected had alarms fitted to identify to staff on handheld devices when and where the door had been breached. This meant the building had been made more secure. The risk of people leaving the service undetected had been diminished.
- Control measures were more robust. We found if a person was at risk of leaving the building unattended, they were put on observation with 15-to-30-minute intervals to ensure staff knew where the person was at all times, to reduce and mitigate risk of absconding without detection.
- Risks for people were assessed and risk assessments were completed to identify and manage people's risks. There were instructions how staff would manage people who lacked capacity and may become agitated or wish to leave the service. However, we found more detail was required. The registered manager addressed this during our inspection.
- Accidents and incidents were reviewed in order to reduce reoccurrence. The registered manager told us they were in the process of transferring the accident and incidents to the electronic system. This would mean they had better oversight and would be able to identify themes, triggers, and trends more efficiently. We found one person had left the building on 4 occasions since our last inspection, but staff had identified this through the control measures in place. The registered manager told us there had been a delay from the suppliers in implementing some of the fire door alarm detectors, but these were now in place and the person had not had any incidents of leaving without being undetected since the work had been completed.

- Staff told us they knew what to do if people were at risk of leaving the building undetected. However, they felt written instructions could be clearer. Staff also confirmed since the new control measures had been put in place and updated, this had mitigated the risk for people who were at risk of leaving the service without detection.
- Staff had received face to face dementia training since our last inspection. This meant staff had the skills to support people at risk of agitation, frustration or wanting to leave the service, including distraction techniques.
- Staff confirmed the systems in place were effective and mitigated the risk for people at risk of leaving the service undetected or absconding.