

Sycamore Meadows Homes Limited

# Kings Court Nursing Home

## Inspection report

Church Street  
Grantham  
Lincolnshire  
NG31 6RR

Tel: 01476576928

Date of inspection visit:  
05 January 2022

Date of publication:  
01 March 2022

## Ratings

Overall rating for this service

Requires Improvement ●

Is the service safe?

**Requires Improvement** ●

# Summary of findings

## Overall summary

### About the service

Kings Court Nursing Home is a residential care home providing personal care to 22 people aged 65 and over at the time of the inspection. The service can support up to 29 people in one adapted building.

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

This was a targeted inspection that considered the key question safe. Based on our inspection of safe we found the service did not have a system in place to record the vaccination status of visiting professionals, nor were they asking to see evidence of vaccination. It has been a requirement for registered managers to see evidence that visiting professionals are double vaccinated against COVID-19 since 11 November 2021. Following the inspection, the registered manager acted and implemented an effective process.

All visitors were screened for symptoms of COVID-19 and were required to show a negative Lateral Flow Device (LFD) test result before they entered the home. Visiting took place in a designated area of the home. Unless a person was unable to access the visiting area, in such cases visits took place in the persons bedroom. People and most relatives were happy with these arrangements.

Several areas in the home were in need of maintenance and refurbishment, as a result infection prevention and control (IPC) risks were not always mitigated. Some of these concerns had been picked up when the registered manager and maintenance team completed audits of the home, but not all of the concerns found had been identified prior to the inspection.

Hazards such as chemical and maintenance equipment were not stored safely. The registered manager acted ensuring all hazards were locked away.

People and their relatives told us they felt safe at Kings Court Nursing home. Staff understood their responsibilities to safeguard the people they were caring for and had received safeguarding training. However, not all staff were up to date with their mandatory training, including safeguarding, infection control and moving and handling training.

There were sufficient staff to meet the needs of the people at the home. The registered manager used a dependency tool to ensure they could meet the needs of people before accepting new admissions to the home.

Medicines were administered and stored safely by suitably trained staff.

For more details, please see the full report which is on the CQC website at [www.cqc.org.uk](http://www.cqc.org.uk)

Rating at last inspection.

The last rating for this service was requires improvement (published 15 September 2021).

### Why we inspected

We received concerns about the visiting policy at the home. As a result, we undertook a focused inspection to review the key questions of safe.

We looked at infection prevention and control measures under the safe key question. We look at this in all care home inspections even if no concerns or risks have been identified. This is to provide assurance that the service can respond to COVID-19 and other infection outbreaks effectively.

We reviewed the information we held about the service. No areas of concern were identified in the other key questions. We therefore did not inspect them. Ratings from previous comprehensive inspections for those key questions were used in calculating the overall rating at this inspection.

We have found evidence that the provider needs to make improvement. Please see the safe section of this report.

You can see what action we have asked the provider to take at the end of this report.

### Enforcement

We are mindful of the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on our regulatory function. This meant we took account of the exceptional circumstances arising as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic when considering what enforcement action was necessary and proportionate to keep people safe as a result of this inspection. We will continue to monitor the service and to discharge our regulatory enforcement functions required to keep people safe and to hold providers to account where it is necessary for us to do so.

We have identified a breach in relation to evidencing vaccination status of visiting professionals and the maintenance of the home.

Please see the action we have told the provider to take at the end of this report.

Full information about CQC's regulatory response to the more serious concerns found during inspections is added to reports after any representations and appeals have been concluded.

### Follow up

We will meet with the provider following this report being published to discuss how they will make changes to ensure they improve their rating to at least good. We will work with the local authority to monitor progress. We will return to visit as per our re-inspection programme. If we receive any concerning information we may inspect sooner.

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

We always ask the following five questions of services.

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

The service was not always safe.

Details are in our safe findings below.

**Requires Improvement** ●

# Kings Court Nursing Home

## Detailed findings

### Background to this inspection

#### The inspection

We carried out this inspection under Section 60 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (the Act) as part of our regulatory functions. We checked whether the provider was meeting the legal requirements and regulations associated with the Act. We looked at the overall quality of the service and provided a rating for the service under the Care Act 2014.

As part of this inspection we looked at the infection control and prevention measures in place. This was conducted so we can understand the preparedness of the service in preventing or managing an infection outbreak, and to identify good practice we can share with other services.

#### Inspection team

The inspection was carried out by two inspectors.

#### Service and service type

Kings Court Nursing Home is a 'care home'. People in care homes receive accommodation and nursing or personal care as a single package under one contractual agreement. The Care Quality Commission (CQC) regulates both the premises and the care provided, and both were looked at during this inspection.

The service had a manager registered with the CQC. This means that they and the provider are legally responsible for how the service is run and for the quality and safety of the care provided.

#### Notice of inspection

This inspection was unannounced.

#### What we did before the inspection

We reviewed information we had received about the service since the last inspection. We received feedback from the local authority who work with the service. This information helps support our inspections. The provider was not asked to complete a provider information return prior to this inspection. This is information providers are required to send us with key information about their service, what they do well, and improvements they plan to make. We took this into account when we inspected. We used all of this

information to plan our inspection.

#### During the inspection

We spoke with three people who used the service and two relatives about their experience of the care provided. We spoke with six members of staff including the provider, registered manager, assistant manager, senior care workers and care workers. We spoke with one visiting professional. We reviewed a range of records. This included two people's care records and multiple medication records. We looked at two staff files in relation to recruitment. A variety of records relating to the quality audits, including policies and procedures were reviewed.

#### After the inspection

We continued to seek clarification from the provider to validate evidence found. We looked at training data and quality assurance records.

# Is the service safe?

## Our findings

### Our findings

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

At the last inspection this key question was rated as good. At this inspection this key question has deteriorated to requires improvement. This meant some aspects of the service were not always safe and there was limited assurance about safety. There was an increased risk that people could be harmed.

### Preventing and controlling infection

- We were not assured that the provider was promoting safety through the layout and hygiene practices of the premises. Several areas of the home required maintenance and refurbishment, leading to areas that could not be cleaned effectively in order to prevent the risk of infection.
- There were two sluice facilities in the service. The sluice machine downstairs had not worked for some time, despite funding being available to support improvements in IPC, the provider had not replaced the broken machine. Due to this staff were washing soiled commode and bed pans in the manual sluices. Water damage had caused the skirting boards in the room to need replacing.
- Carpets in both the upstairs and downstairs lounges were stained. The upstairs lounge carpet had holes in it, which could harbour dirt.
- A kitchenette upstairs had damaged skirting and gaps between the floor, skirting and walls, allowing food and dirt to build up in the gaps and making cleaning ineffective. Audits carried out by the service had not identified this as an area of concern.
- We were assured that the provider was using PPE effectively and safely. However, we observed that PPE was not always disposed of correctly in the appropriate bins.
- There were no systems or processes in place to identify if visiting professionals had been double vaccinated against COVID-19. Legislation came into effect on 11 November 2021, making it the responsibility of registered managers to check the vaccination status of visiting professionals prior to entering the service.

We found no evidence that people had been harmed. However, the provider had not consistently ensured risks of infection were mitigated, and this placed people at risk of harm. This was a breach of regulation 12 (Safe care and treatment) of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014.

The registered manager responded during the inspection to ensure a system was in place to check visiting professionals have evidence of being double vaccinated against COVID-19. This was evident on the second day of the inspection.

- The provider was not following all aspects of government guidance on care home visiting. We found that people who wanted to visit their relatives at the home were under additional restrictions to those set out in the government guidance.
  - Not everyone at the service had been offered an essential care giver and only people at the end of their life or those unable to access the visiting area in the home were able to have visits in their own room. All other visits were taking place in a small visitor area. Despite this we found no impact on people and their

needs were being met.

- We met with the provider following the inspection to discuss their approach to visiting and signposted them to government guidance to develop their approach.
- We were assured that the provider was preventing visitors from catching and spreading infections.
- We were assured that the provider was meeting shielding and social distancing rules.
- We were assured that the provider was admitting people safely to the service.
- We were assured that the provider was accessing testing for people using the service and staff.
- We were assured that the provider was making sure infection outbreaks can be effectively prevented or managed.
- We were assured that the provider's infection prevention and control policy was up to date.

#### Assessing risk, safety monitoring and management

- The risks associated with people's care had been assessed and measures were in place to reduce identified risks. However, one care record we reviewed needed aspects of the person's care clarified. For example, the person had been identified as needing a modified diet. There were recommendations for two different modified diets in the care records making it difficult for staff that did not know the person to give the correct diet. Staff at the home knew the person well and were giving the correct diet.
- The registered manager informed us they would look into getting the care plan reviewed and the information simplified in order that it was easier to read.

#### Systems and processes to safeguard people from the risk of abuse; Learning lessons when things go wrong

- There were systems and processes in place to keep people safe from harm and abuse. However, these systems would benefit from improvements.
- The registered manager is aware of their responsibilities to report concerns to the local authority safeguarding team and to notify the CQC. However, they do not keep a log of any safeguarding concerns. Leading to missed opportunities around lessons learnt.
- Staff who we spoke with were aware of their responsibility to report safeguarding concerns. However, not all staff had completed mandatory refresher training on safeguarding adults.
- People and their relatives told us they felt safe living at Kings Court Nursing Home.

#### Staffing and recruitment

- There were sufficient trained staff deployed to meet the needs of people at the service. However, not all staff were up to date with mandatory training, such as manual handling and infection control. The registered manager said that they would be addressing the training with staff.
- There are safe recruitment processes in place at the service. Ensuring pre-employment checks are carried out, such as disclosure and barring service (DBS) checks. These checks identify if staff have any criminal convictions that may affect their suitability to work with vulnerable people.
- People using the service told us they did not have to wait for care and support when they needed it. We observed that people did not have to wait for their care.

#### Using medicines safely

- Medicines were administered and stored safely by suitable trained staff.
- People received their prescribed medicines in their preferred method. We saw electronic medicine administration records (EMAR) were completed when people had taken their medicines.
- Protocols were in place to ensure medicines people only needed when required (known as PRN) were administered consistently.



This section is primarily information for the provider

## Action we have told the provider to take

The table below shows where regulations were not being met and we have asked the provider to send us a report that says what action they are going to take. We will check that this action is taken by the provider.

Regulated activity	Regulation
Accommodation for persons who require nursing or personal care	<p>Regulation 12 HSCA RA Regulations 2014 Safe care and treatment</p> <p>The provider did not ensure systems or processes were in place to evidence that visiting professionals were double vaccinated against COVID-19.</p> <p>The provider did not ensure the home was well maintained, which lead to IPC risks.</p>