

The Gables Care Home Surrey Owners, Mr & Mrs Boodia

By Eileen Chubb©

Below is the transcript of Eileen Chubbs BBC radio Surrey interview, followed by my report into this home.

Re Gables Care Home on BBC Radio Surrey, Danny Pike programme 11.06.21

<https://www.bbc.co.uk/sounds/play/p09jkzb8> (starts at around 3.10.00)

“DP This is a care home in Woking which has been ordered to improve or be closed in six months. Inspectors say the Gables Home in Maybury doesn’t have enough Staff and they’re not properly trained or supervised. There’s also risks to elderly Residents from mistakes with medicines and problems with fire safety. The Care Quality Commission has rated the Gables “Inadequate” and put it into “Special Measures”.

Let’s hear from Christina Sell who’s a former Commissioner for Older People in Surrey.

CS It’s a very lonely job in care at the moment and when I read the report first of all I was as horrified, as everybody is, but then I looked into it more and they were good in 2018 and there was a line in there that said the manager was “hardworking and kind”. I’m afraid I felt a huge, my heart went out to her really. It’s been a tough year. I also wondered whether it was about, whether how she’d been recording, whether that was one of the problems and there was a theme running through that report about “There were no records to show” and that’s a big challenge for us in the care sector, is how we show the care that we’re giving, how we demonstrate it clearly.

DP Some bits seemed to be quite easy to sort out, like fire hazards, you know, that is something that could be sorted out quite easily, don’t you think?

CS Well, more than easily. I mean, I have to say fire hazards is top of every care home and that should be, you shouldn’t have furniture in the corridors, no. You should have fire protection. I’m more worried about fire than I am about anything and I’m not sure what’s behind that one. The other one was the medicines management. When you’re giving somebody a medicine, it’s got the potential for huge harm as well as huge cure and you have to be absolutely accurate in medicines management. But again, there are lots of, lots of courses available on this.

DP The Head of the Surrey Care Association, Bex Pritchard, says families shouldn't have to put up with homes like this but they are rare examples.

BP They shouldn't and fortunately they are extremely rare. The Care Quality Commission inspects all care homes across England and the last report that they produced found that 80% of them were Good, with 5% Outstanding and just 1%, which is about 275 across the whole country, are registered as, or found to be Inadequate and that's 275 too many but there is scope to improve, and you know, hopefully the, the provider will be supported to do that for the sake of the people that they're looking after.

DP Let me just read you some more findings about the Gables in this report. Fire safety problems that were identified in 2016 hadn't been addressed. There is no formal recording of when Residents went out or came back to the home. One person who lived on the first floor and couldn't use stairs without help from Staff, the lift hadn't worked since at least last December, and a member of Staff supposed to be on duty at night, actually went to bed at 10.30.

The people in charge of the care home have declined to comment. If they're allowed to keep their registration the Gables will be reinspected within six months. Let's get some more reaction to this. Eileen Chubb is from the group Compassion In Care and joins us now. Eileen, good evening.

EC Good evening.

DP Well, what do you think of all the things you just heard?

EC I'd like to respond to some of those comments first. My heart goes out to the Residents in that care home, first and foremost, OK. The second thing, we've had 15000 plus calls on our helpline, all recorded and documented, we regularly publish data. 95% of the calls we get are about care homes rated Good. Now that tells us there's something very wrong with how these homes are rated and to be quite honest, I'm shocked at the lady from Surrey Council that she's commissioned services, that she can't see the endemic culture that the, the signs in this report tell me very clearly. For example, six years to put fire safety things correct.

Throughout the report the manager of the home, while she might be hardworking and well-intentioned, she's over-ridden medical advice to turn somebody every two hours to prevent pressure sores. Now pressure sores do more damage and are more excruciatingly painful than a knife wound except pressure sores are not treated as illegal and they should be treated as a criminal offence. To say, "do not turn that person because despite what the medical person said, it's ok", that to me screamed off the page and the fact that the care home was rated Good last time, there were actual

concerns raised last time, but they weren't acted on by the CQC. All the warning signs were there. All the warning signs are always there but people think you can leave these kinds of situations for six months. If you're living in that home, six months is.

DP At what point Elaine (sic) does somebody take some action? You know, the fire safety thing from 2016, the fact about the medicines register, at what point do you say, "Enough is enough, we're going to protect the Residents"? Because if you're a relative of one of those Residents, you're very scared I'd imagine.

EC Yes and six months, to say you're coming back in six months, if you're suffering from poor care and you're sat in a care home at the mercy of that care home, six months is an eternity and often six months will be way too late for some people. It should be put right now, and it seems to me as well, things like the owner employing her family members, what happens when whistleblowing, when somebody needs to whistleblow, is her family member going to whistleblow on her if things go wrong? I don't think so.

DP Again we'd like to ask these questions to the owners of this care home, but they declined to speak to us.

EC Also, some of the comments about what's been written in the care plans, calling Residents "uncooperative". I've seen those kind of terms used in the worst of cases of care home abuse, where they view people calling for help as being uncooperative.

DP Just let me put this to you Eileen.

EC The signs are there, and it really concerns me that Surrey County Council have read this report and given the comments they have to you today because I think that's appalling and I think they need some serious training on looking out for the signs of abusive cultures.

DP Yeah, we heard earlier from the Surrey Care Association, not Surrey County Council I should just remind you. But inspectors say they spoke to the funding authority about the unsafe staffing levels at night and it took steps to work with the provider to ensure people's safety. How much of an issue is funding in cases like this do you think?

EC In cases like this, it's, it's not, it's not a great part, there's many different reasons why a care home is bad. We've had care homes where the owners have got three or four houses, luxury cars and they're buying Rolex watches for their children and putting it on Facebook, and then telling people that they haven't got income, and they're not getting enough income. In some cases, that's, that is, you know, that is the case but in many other cases there are lots of other issues at play here and it's not just about

income. I mean we have offshore profits from the care industry here running into the billions, and yet those, there's still poor care. We can't put everything down to funding.

DP Right.

EC Because the care industry will tell you "It's all down to funding, if you give us more funding, we'll put it right". To be quite honest they've been doing that for decades and since we've been doing this, I've heard that most years for two decades and it's never put right.

DP Just a final thing Elaine (sic) while you're here, for any people who have Residents in that home, what advice would you give to them on how to keep an eye on their loved one in the next six months?

EC I'd say to people they can contact the Compassion in Care charity; we have a helpline. If you look for the Compassion in Care website, it gives you full details how to contact us. If you've got concerns, we'll support you in getting those concerns addressed. The other thing is that the authorities must be informed constantly, no matter

how many times it takes and often as not, when people try to get things put right in a care home for family members, they often have an uphill battle and they come up against a brick wall of denial, and to be quite honest I think that that's what's going on here as well.

DP Shouldn't the CQC go back in within six months? Shouldn't they go back within the next two months, the next four months?

EC In one week.

DP Sorry, how long?

EC If a home is that bad, it's dangerous and they should be monitoring that home at least weekly.

Elaine Chubb from Compassion in Care. Eileen thank you for joining us on the programme this evening.

Obviously, it was a very short interview and its hard to say everything in such a short space of time, so I am going to comment further on the issues I picked up in both the report and from the other interviewees during the broadcast.

The interviewee Christina Sell, a former Surry County Council commissioner for older people whose full profile can be read here;

<https://www.careengland.org.uk/members-voice/profile-small-care-provider-5-minutes-christina-sell-langton-care-ltd>

I was really concerned that someone who was a former commissioner for Surry Council, could read the CQC report and not only miss crucial information but take an entirely contradictory stance on the facts.

“The home was rated good last time” Christina Sell

My response. Just because the home was rated good last time does not mean it was actually good. As I stated nearly 95% of all calls to our helpline are from over sixteen thousand people raising serious concerns about care homes rated “Good”

Looking at the last inspection report for the Gables, anonymous concerns were reported to CQC, who whilst acknowledging their existence: did not uphold the concerns. I have seen this early warning sign again and again and the same pattern of subsequent widespread failures that follows, because the alarms were ignored.

It is not a question of the home being suddenly rated bad, but of how long, it has actually been bad, contrary to what CQC state. It is also worth noting that the concerns were made anonymously which is an indication of a culture where concerns cannot be raised.

“There was a theme on reporting” Christina Sell

The failures throughout the CQC inspection report were not about a lack of reporting, but a theme of making untrue statements (Lies) That were contradicted by the reality.

Examples;

. The Manager said they consulted with the district nurse over a residents pressure sore but had ignored what the district nurse advised.

. The manager said there was a member of staff awake on duty at night. Untrue there was not.

. The manager said they were covid testing but could not produce the evidence.

. The manager must have told inspectors in previous CQC inspections reports that training was completed, or they would not have been rated good before. However, it turns out at this inspection that training had not been completed and that even the manager had not received training other than moving and handling and that was in 2014. This begs the question, why was this not picked up sooner?

. At earlier inspections, the manager said they had a policy that said people must be assessed prior to being admitted but this turns out to be just a policy and not an actual practice.

. At earlier inspections, the manager stated the home was compliant with the mental Capacity Act or they would have not received a good rating but now this turns out to be completely untrue.

. 5 people were being restricted but no Dols applications had been made, 3 staff were alleged to be Dols trained, however, they still did not understand.

. Despite the previous good ratings in this area the manager/owner now states that despite all the homes policies being compliant previously that *“I don’t do mental capacity assessments. Surry county council does that. Do you want us to do MCA then? How do we do that?”*

Obviously CQC had not picked up this level of ignorance before and we have to ask why?

There were two care staff on duty but only one spoke English which raises the question, how could they read the policies or care plans CQC rely on, as evidence of care?

I could give many more examples.

“it’s been a tough year” Christina Sell

The failings in this report are not about the last year, the fire safety failings are from 6 years ago and still not acted on.

The fact the Owner/Manager is employing her relatives and the impact of a large proportion of the staff being unlikely to whistleblow, has not occurred to her nor to anyone else in their interviews with BBC Surry, neither has it occurred to CQC who focus on only the lack of recruitment checks. The manager continues to rota a family member on each shift, could this be a way to control other staff.

All records are being filled in retrospectively and MAR sheets were signed by only the manager/ owner, this says to me that all information is being directly controlled by the manager. It is something I have seen happen before and always in the worst homes.

This manager may work hard because she is controlling everything and that is not a good sign at all.

People are treated as care tasks rather than as human beings
And spoken of in terms of being “*Uncooperative*”

I could comment on many more aspects that show the same theme over and over and am concerned that so much could have been missed by CQC in previous inspections.

I am also concerned that a home being rated good is being taken as a guarantee of good care, when robust evidence clearly shows otherwise.

Eileen Chubb