

Tales of the Un-Inspected
Home Number 96
By Eileen Chubb
(Copyright 2011)

This Home is owned by the same company as homes, 33, 36, 41, 48, 49, 50, 54, 59, 60, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 70, 71, 72, 82, 84, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, (See archive section for all reports)

Home 96 has recently been registered by the CQC under a new name but with the same owners, this has resulted in the previous history of the home been erased. Because I knew these reports existed I was able to write to the CQC and request copies. The ordinary member of the public looking for a care home would believe a home listed as a new service had no history. This is what I discovered about home 96,

2006, the current owners take over the home, which is set in large grounds with an orchard and large garden at the back and front all greatly enjoyed by the residents. The land is sold to a developer who starts building at the rear and the front gardens are turned into a car park, the residents are allocated a small patio area at the rear but with no ramp it cannot be accessed by most. It takes several years before a ramp is put in place but because there are no rails it is too dangerous to use.

The report also contains the information that the company is in discussions with the regulator about how resident's monies are held. An underlying theme throughout the reports is the company's relationship with the regulator, the inspector on the ground is being told what has been agreed with their superiors.

The company's internal audits are accepted as evidence that medication and care plans are in order, which is always a concern as such evidence is flawed. The home is graded good.

The home is inspected again one year later in January 2007,

The suffering is beginning to show through the gloss, the regulator gives

prominence of course to all the positive information and I had to search to the back of each section to find the information that mattered.

Firstly all the positive comments from relatives, residents and other visitors sounds glowing until I discovered the information came from internal company surveys

The information that is relegated to the back of each section which I found of concern is listed below

- 1. Residents needs are not so they are neglected.**
- 2. Bathrooms are not suitable for residents with mobility problems, this applies to most residents which means they are not being bathed, have not been bathed and are unlikely to get a bath any time soon.**
- 3. The beds are not suitable for residents and adjustable beds are needed, which tells me the home has more dependent residents than the staffing levels can meet.**
- 4. Food is being delivered cold, two staff members were feeding people standing over them, one resident was fed from behind and both were being fed whilst lying down in bed which means they could easily choke.**
- 5. Its clear the majority of staff in the home are good but are being run ragged.**
- 6. People who were at high risk of pressure sores did not have the right equipment.**
- 7. Residents who were in need of strong pain relief were not always getting their medication as prescribed.**
- 8. Many residents were still being got up late in the morning and given their breakfast; this is clearly due to low staffing levels and puts residents at risk of pressure sores, being left for long periods without food, drink or human contact.**
- 9. Many residents, relatives and staff told inspectors about the poor state of the home and furniture. One resident asked an inspector why they could not go into what was left of the garden. The ceilings were heavily stained, carpets were old and stained and the home generally poorly maintained.**
- 10. There is again reference to how resident's monies are held; one resident who had died still had a very large sum of money held by the company. Two other relatives spoken to be not sure what money was held by the home. Again I note that the company are still negotiating**

with the regulators (Provider Relationship Team) in Newcastle, which by coincidence is just around the corner from another of the companies homes (See 71) whose manager stole the life savings of several residents over a long period of time without anyone noticing. That's the price when a company dictates the regulations to the regulator.

It states in the report the company's business plan for the home was seen and that it showed a lack of intention to invest in the home. Any neglect that follows will therefore be premeditated.

The home is inspected again six months later in July 2007.

- 1. It is stated that the when requirements are made the home is not complying with them.**
- 2. The company is paying resident's money into bank accounts not in the resident's name.**
- 3. Some residents have not had a bath for over 4 months.**
- 4. The local authority is investigating a safeguarding incident regarding the unauthorized use of a resident's credit card.**
- 5 There are still not enough staff especially nursing staff.**
- 6. Only a small amount of the equipment needed has been provided and the home is still shabby and poorly maintained.**

The next inspection is One Year and Three Months later, the home is in crisis and rated Zero Star, Sub Zero would be more apt.

- 1. This inspection report is a crucial one which would explain why CQC withheld 24 pages of the contents; however there is clearly a reason for this. Social Services have discovered numerous concerns about the home and the regulator is caught on the back foot again.**
 - 2. Most of the staff have left the home which is cause for real concern as those good staff were all that held this home together in the onslaught of this companies profiteering.**
 - 3. There are investigations under way by the local authority.**
- The rest of the information is withheld.**

The next three inspection reports take place over the next 16 weeks and list a catalogue of suffering and despair,

1. Two thirds of the residents in the home had bed sores that care, equipment and staff could have prevented, this is so serious most of these residents are removed from the home by Social Services for their protection. When the company is made aware of how bad things are it fails to act not only once but consistently and even more residents suffer. The local authority is providing staff to care for the 11 residents left in the home and as a result more concerns are being raised.

2. The home has an embargo on it when the company decides not to accept new residents.

3. The company finally draft in some managers from other homes to write out care plans which turn out to be totally inaccurate and no guarantee of care.

4. The home is filthy and stinks of urine.

5. Pressure sore prevention equipment was brought in but staff did not know how to use it correctly never having had any before so bedsores are still inflicted.

6. People were seriously dehydrated and malnourished also, fluid charts seen filled in during the inspection were not correct. There were not enough staff provided by the company to even guarantee care even though the home was only a third full.

7. People have not been given pain relief, have been left in squalor, have developed agonizing bed sores, left without food and drink and found to have untreated scabies.

8. Senior company managers arrange to meet the regulator at the home but had to meet standing up as the chairs were too filthy to sit on.

9. Medication is a complete shambles, staff are all said to have been trained at the same time, people who are known to be at risk of choking are being fed solid food and seen choking on it. Many people are not receiving food or fluids and are at serious risk.

10. This continues for weeks whilst the inspectors ask the company to act, finally even the 11 people left in the home are said to be at risk despite social services staff being in the home daily. When a home like this is in the spotlight, under investigation, has had residents moved out

to protect them and still continues to neglect residents, it is a measure of what has been suffered when no one was looking. The homes registration is said to be cancelled which means it should have closed.

No such closure took place the home changed its name and the same staff, the same owners, the same problems just continue under the pretense of a new service. CQC have not only failed to protect the residents in this home they have colluded with the care company to conceal the shocking truth from the public, would anyone who knew this homes past place a relative there? I think not.

Eileen Chubb