Care Quality draft assessment for The Broad Group - 85 Bath Road - Care Homes

Overview

Overall Rating: Good

The service is performing well and meeting our expectations.

Summary

Safe	Good	Read this section
Effective	Good	Read this section
Caring	Good	Read this section
Responsive	Good	Read this section
Well-led	Good	Read this section

Overall Service Commentary

About the service

The Broad Group - 85 Bath Road is a residential care home providing accommodation and personal care for up to 5 people. At the time of our assessment 5 people were using the service.

Who the service is for

The Broad Group - 85 Bath Road provides support to people under the age of 65. The service specialises in providing support to Deaf adults with learning disabilities and autistic people. We assessed the service against ‘Right support, right care, right culture’ guidance to make judgements about whether the provider guaranteed people with a learning disability and autistic people respect, equality, dignity, choices, independence and good access to local communities that most people take for granted.

Key findings

We carried out this assessment on 21 October 2026. This service was previously rated as good. We carried out this assessment to confirm whether the rating of good remains accurate. This report does not provide detailed information on areas where we found practice continues to meet a good standard. Instead, our findings focus on any areas where the service needs to improve or where we found exceptional practice.

People can only be deprived of their liberty to receive care and treatment with appropriate legal authority. In care homes, this can be done through a procedure called the Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoLS), which is part of the Mental Capacity Act 2005 (MCA). We checked whether the service was working within the principles of the MCA and how they managed DoLS within the service. We found staff and management worked within the MCA. DoLS authorisations were appropriately applied for and overseen. People were not subject to unlawful or excessive restrictions they had choice, control and freedom over their lives.

People were supported by sufficient numbers of staff who had the skills and knowledge to support them safely and effectively. Staff had received relevant training in areas such as communication, learning disabilities and positive behaviour support training. All staff were required to complete British Sign Language (BSL) level 1. This enabled staff to communicate effectively with the people they supported, as well as with colleagues who were Deaf or had hearing impairments. A relative said, “The service has improved [person’s] quality of life by them being able to communicate with all the staff, as they have all been trained in BSL to a good standard. They understand [person’s] particular version of BSL and are helping them to improve their communication skills.”

Some people had lived at the home for many years. Their needs had been assessed before they moved into the service to ensure staff could provide safe and effective support. For people who had not lived at the home for as many years their needs had been assessed as and when appropriate and involving those important to them, before they moved in. This helped ensure their needs could be met, and consideration was given to their compatibility with other people living at the service.

Care plans contained detailed information about people’s health needs. Risk assessments reflected people’s individual risks and provided staff with guidance on how to manage these safely, including risks associated with eating and drinking, mobility and accessing the community.

People were supported to access health and social care services and had health action plans in place, which set out their individual health needs and the support required to

maintain their health and wellbeing. A relative highlighted the importance of new staff knowing people well and being able to recognise changes in their health. They told us, “[Person’s] health will go down quickly if not picked up by staff.”

Although there had been no recent accidents or incidents, processes were in place to ensure any future occurrences would be recorded and reviewed monthly. The registered manager told us accidents and incidents would be analysed to identify any themes or trends, and any updates or changes would be shared with the staff team.

There were effective systems in place to safeguard people from abuse. Staff had received safeguarding training and demonstrated a good understanding of how to recognise potential signs of abuse. Staff told us they would not hesitate to raise concerns and were confident any concerns would be listened to and acted upon appropriately.

Staff were recruited safely. Recruitment records confirmed appropriate pre-employment checks had been completed, including full employment histories, explanations for any gaps, references and Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) checks. DBS checks provide information about relevant convictions and cautions to support safer recruitment decisions. These checks helped ensure staff were suitable to work with people who may be vulnerable.

Medicines were administered safely by staff who had received appropriate training. Staff competency was regularly assessed to ensure they continued to administer medicines safely and as prescribed.

There were systems in place to ensure the environment was safe and well maintained. For example, the provider employed a maintenance person to ensure any requests were addressed in a timely manner.

The registered manager understood their regulatory responsibilities and there were clear systems and processes in place to ensure the service ran safely and effectively.

The registered manager and senior management team were passionate about ensuring people remained at the focus of everything they did and were committed to achieving positive outcomes for them. A staff member told us, "Management is brilliant. [Registered manager name] is so supportive, has plenty of time for the team, and is passionate about looking after us. That creates a great environment, which in turn benefits the people we support."

The provider had clear aims and objectives which all staff were committed to meeting which were outlined in their statement of purpose, “To enable each person to lead an ordinary life by offering a wide and varied spectrum of services tailored to their individual needs. By promoting independence, autonomy and integration into the community, everyone can develop the skills to lead a fulfilling and empowered life.”

Throughout the assessment, our observations showed people were clearly comfortable in their home and with staff. People were offered choices, communicated with in a way which was meaningful to them, and had their dignity and privacy respected.

↑ Back to top

Overall People's Experience

We observed warm and positive interactions between people and staff. We used sign language to ensure people who did not communicate verbally were able to share their experiences of care and support. One person told us, “I’m happy, feel safe, like staff.”

Relatives also spoke positively about the service. One relative said, “[Person’s name] receives excellent support. I'm very lucky, [person] is very happy.” Another relative described the service as, “Home from home. Part of a family.”

People lived in comfortable homely environment. Bedrooms reflected people’s individual tastes and preferences, and communal spaces contained artwork, photographs and personal items. The dining room was decorated for Halloween during our visit.

People were supported to have choice and control over their daily lives and to take part in activities which were meaningful to them, both within the service and in the wider community. People were involved in everyday tasks, such as cooking and shopping in the local town. During our visit, we saw one person being supported to attend a deaf club. Other activities available to people included swimming, sensory sessions, Tuesday club, Zumba, gentle dance and bowling. This promoted people’s independence, choice, wellbeing and inclusion in their community.

Information was provided in accessible formats and reflected the different needs of people at the home. Visual menus were displayed in the kitchen, and visual boards in the hallway informed people which staff were on duty, and which people were out of the building.

People were supported to be involved in the service through meetings and with their individual keyworkers. Monthly visual newsletters helped people stay informed about events and activities they had taken part in. For example, in August 2026, people using the provider’s services took part in a summer fair, which raised money for Hearing Dogs for Deaf People, and a sports day which was held during the summer.

Relatives were welcome to visit and were included in events and celebrations. One relative described attending a fundraising as a surprise for their family member. They said the look on their family member’s face and their body language when they saw them was ‘lovely.’ They also told us how they had recently celebrated their loved one’s special birthday with them and staff. They said, “[Person’s name] is absolutely happy and well looked after. Staff care enormously about them.”

Relatives spoke positively about the culture and atmosphere of the service. One relative told us, “The ethos of the home is to maintain a calm and friendly atmosphere which all the staff do extremely well. We are so happy that [person] was able to become a resident at 85 Bath Road.”

Another relative described The Broad Group 85 Bath Road as an, “Amazing place,” and told us, “I absolutely would recommend the home. I would recommend all of The Broad Group services. [Founder’s name] left a legacy. Family run service.”

↑ Back to top

Safe

Rating: Good

Percentage Score: 75.00 %

▶ How do we score this?

Summary

This service is safe

Commentary

Safe – this means we looked for evidence that people were protected from abuse and avoidable harm. At our last assessment we rated this key question as good. At this assessment the rating has remained as good. This meant people were safe and protected from avoidable harm.

↑ Back to top

Safe

Learning culture

Overall Score

1 2 3 4

▶ How do we score this?

Summary

Good – This service maximises the effectiveness of people's care and treatment by assessing and reviewing their health, care, wellbeing and communication needs with them.

Processes

Score: 1 2 **3** 4

The provider had a proactive and positive culture of safety, based on openness and honesty. Staff listened to concerns about safety and investigated and reported safety events. Lessons were learnt to continually identify and embed good practice.

↑ Back to top

Safe

Safeguarding

Overall Score

1 2 **3** 4

▶ How do we score this?

Summary

Good – This service maximises the effectiveness of people's care and treatment by assessing and reviewing their health, care, wellbeing and communication needs with them.

Processes

Score: 1 2 3 4

The provider worked with people and healthcare partners to understand what being safe meant to them and the best way to achieve that. Staff concentrated on improving people's lives while protecting their right to live in safety, free from bullying, harassment, abuse, discrimination, avoidable harm and neglect. The provider shared concerns quickly and appropriately.

↑ Back to top

Safe

Involving people to manage risks

Overall Score

1 2 **3** 4

▶ How do we score this?

Summary

Good – This service maximises the effectiveness of people's care and treatment by assessing and reviewing their health, care, wellbeing and communication needs with them.

Processes

Score: 1 2 **3** 4

The provider worked with people to understand and manage risks by thinking holistically. Staff provided care to meet people's needs that was safe, supportive and enabled people to do the things that mattered to them.

↑ Back to top

Safe

Safe environments

Overall Score

1 2 **3** 4

▶ How do we score this?

Summary

Good – This service maximises the effectiveness of people's care and treatment by assessing and reviewing their health, care, wellbeing and communication needs with them.

Processes

Score: 1 2 **3** 4

The provider detected and controlled potential risks in the care environment. They made sure equipment, facilities and technology supported the delivery of safe care.

↑ Back to top

Safe

Safe and effective staffing

Overall Score

1 2 3 4

▶ How do we score this?

Summary

Good – This service maximises the effectiveness of people's care and treatment by assessing and reviewing their health, care, wellbeing and communication needs with them.

Processes

Score: 1 2 3 4

The provider made sure there were enough qualified, skilled and experienced staff, who received effective support, supervision and development. They worked together well to provide safe care that met people's individual needs.

↑ Back to top

Safe

Medicines optimisation

Overall Score

1 2 3 4

▶ How do we score this?

Summary

Good – This service maximises the effectiveness of people's care and treatment by assessing and reviewing their health, care, wellbeing and communication needs with them.

Processes

Score: 1 2 **3** 4

The provider made sure that medicines and treatments were safe and met people's needs, capacities and preferences. Staff involved people in planning, including when changes happened.

Effective

Rating: Good

Percentage Score: 75.00 %

▶ How do we score this?

Summary

This service is effective

Commentary

Effective – this means we looked for evidence that people's care, treatment and support achieved good outcomes and promoted a good quality of life, based on best available evidence. At our last assessment we rated this key question as good. At this assessment the rating has remained as good. This meant people's outcomes were consistently good, and people's feedback confirmed this.

↑ Back to top

Effective

Effective

Assessing needs

Overall Score

1 2 **3** 4

► How do we score this?

Summary

Good – This service maximises the effectiveness of people's care and treatment by assessing and reviewing their health, care, wellbeing and communication needs with them.

Processes

Score: 1 2 **3** 4

The provider made sure people's care and treatment was effective by assessing and reviewing their health, care, wellbeing and communication needs with them.

↑ Back to top

Effective

Delivering evidence-based care and treatment

Overall Score

1 2 **3** 4

1 2 3 4

▶ How do we score this?

Summary

Good – This service maximises the effectiveness of people's care and treatment by assessing and reviewing their health, care, wellbeing and communication needs with them.

Processes

Score: 1 2 **3** 4

The provider planned and delivered people's care and treatment with them, including what was important and mattered to them. They did this in line with legislation and current evidence-based good practice and standards.

↑ Back to top

Effective

Monitoring and improving outcomes

Overall Score

1 2 **3** 4

▶ How do we score this?

Summary

Good – This service maximises the effectiveness of people's care and treatment by assessing and reviewing their health, care, wellbeing and communication needs with them.

Processes

Score: 1 2 **3** 4

The provider routinely monitored people's care and treatment to continuously improve it. They ensured that outcomes were positive and consistent, and that they met both clinical expectations and the expectations of people themselves.

↑ Back to top

Effective

Consent to care and treatment

Overall Score

1 2 **3** 4

▶ How do we score this?

Summary

Good – This service maximises the effectiveness of people's care and treatment by assessing and reviewing their health, care, wellbeing and communication needs with them.

Processes

Score: 1 2 **3** 4

The provider told people about their rights around consent and respected these when delivering person-centred care and treatment.

Caring

Rating: Good

Percentage Score: 75.00 %

▶ How do we score this?

Summary

This service is caring

Commentary

Caring – this means we looked for evidence that the provider involved people and treated them with compassion, kindness, dignity and respect. At our last assessment we rated this key question as good. At this assessment the rating has remained as good. This meant people were supported and treated with dignity and respect and involved as partners in their care.

↑ Back to top

Caring

Kindness, compassion and dignity

Overall Score

1 2 3 4

▶ How do we score this?

Summary

Good – This service maximises the effectiveness of people's care and treatment by

Good – This service maximises the effectiveness of people's care and treatment by assessing and reviewing their health, care, wellbeing and communication needs with them.

People's Experience

Score: 1 2 **3** 4

The provider always treated people with kindness, empathy and compassion and respected their privacy and dignity. Staff treated colleagues from other organisations with kindness and respect.

↑ Back to top

Caring

Independence, choice and control

Overall Score

1 2 **3** 4

▶ How do we score this?

Summary

Good – This service maximises the effectiveness of people's care and treatment by assessing and reviewing their health, care, wellbeing and communication needs with them.

Processes

Score: 1 2 **3** 4

The provider promoted people's independence, so people knew their rights

and had choice and control over their own care, treatment and wellbeing.

Responsive

Rating: Good

Percentage Score: 75.00 %

▶ How do we score this?

Summary

This service is responsive

Commentary

Responsive – this means we looked for evidence that the provider met people's needs. At our last assessment we rated this key question as good. At this assessment the rating has remained as good. This meant people's needs were met through good organisation and delivery.

↑ Back to top

Responsive

Person-centred Care

Overall Score

1 2 3 4

▶ How do we score this?

Summary

Good – This service maximises the effectiveness of people's care and treatment by assessing and reviewing their health, care, wellbeing and communication needs with them.

People's Experience

Score: 1 2 **3** 4

The provider made sure people were at the centre of their care and treatment choices and they decided, in partnership with people, how to respond to any relevant changes in people's needs.

↑ Back to top

Responsive

Listening to and involving people

Overall Score

1 2 **3** 4

▶ How do we score this?

Summary

Good – This service maximises the effectiveness of people's care and treatment by assessing and reviewing their health, care, wellbeing and communication needs with them.

Processes

Score: 1 2 **3** 4

The provider made it easy for people to share feedback and ideas, or raise complaints about their care, treatment and support. Staff involved people in decisions about their care and told them what had changed as a result.

↑ Back to top

Responsive

Equity in experiences and outcomes

Overall Score

1 2 **3** 4

▶ How do we score this?

Summary

Good – This service maximises the effectiveness of people's care and treatment by assessing and reviewing their health, care, wellbeing and communication needs with them.

Processes

Score: 1 2 **3** 4

Staff and leaders actively listened to information about people who are most likely to experience inequality in experience or outcomes and tailored their care, support and treatment in response to this.

Well-led

Rating: Good

Percentage Score: 75.00 %

▶ How do we score this?

Summary

This service is well-led

Commentary

Well-led – this means we looked for evidence that service leadership, management and governance assured high-quality, person-centred care; supported learning and innovation; and promoted an open, fair culture. At our last assessment we rated this key question as good. At this assessment the rating has remained as good. This meant the service was consistently managed and well-led. Leaders and the culture they created promoted high-quality, person-centred care.

↑ Back to top

Well-led

Shared direction and culture

Overall Score

1 2 **3** 4

▶ How do we score this?

Summary

Good – This service maximises the effectiveness of people's care and treatment by assessing and reviewing their health, care, wellbeing and communication needs with them.

Processes

Score: 1 2 **3** 4

The provider had a shared vision, strategy and culture. This was based on transparency, equity, equality and human rights, diversity and inclusion, engagement, and understanding challenges and the needs of people and their communities.

↑ Back to top

Well-led

Governance, management and sustainability

Overall Score

1 2 **3** 4

► How do we score this?

Summary

Good – This service maximises the effectiveness of people's care and treatment by assessing and reviewing their health, care, wellbeing and communication needs with them.

Processes

Score: 1 2 **3** 4

The provider had clear responsibilities, roles, systems of accountability and good governance. They used these to manage and deliver good quality, sustainable care, treatment and support. They acted on the best information about risk, performance and outcomes, and shared this securely with others when appropriate.

↑ Back to top

Well-led

Learning, improvement and innovation

Overall Score

1 2 **3** 4

▶ **How do we score this?**

Summary

Good – This service maximises the effectiveness of people's care and treatment by assessing and reviewing their health, care, wellbeing and communication needs with them.

Processes

Score: 1 2 **3** 4

The provider focused on continuous learning, innovation and improvement across the organisation and local system. They encouraged creative ways of delivering equality of experience, outcome and quality of life for people. They actively contributed to safe, effective practice and research.