

Report on an unannounced inspection of the
short-term holding facility at

Pennine House Manchester Airport

by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

12 January 2016

Glossary of terms

We try to make our reports as clear as possible, but if you find terms that you do not know, please see the glossary in our 'Guide for writing inspection reports' on our website at: <http://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprisons/about-our-inspections/>

Crown copyright 2016

You may re-use this information (excluding logos) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence. To view this licence, visit <http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/> or email: psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk

Where we have identified any third party copyright material you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.

Any enquiries regarding this publication should be sent to us at the address below or: hmiprisons.enquiries@hmiprisons.gsi.gov.uk

This publication is available for download at: <http://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprisons>

Printed and published by:
Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons
Victory House
6th floor
30–34 Kingsway
London
WC2B 6EX
England

Contents

Fact page	4
Overview	5
About this inspection and report	6
Summary	7
Section 1. Safety	9
Respect	15
Activities	18
Preparation for removal and release	19
Section 2. Recommendations and housekeeping points	20
Section 3. Appendices	23
Appendix I: Inspection team	23
Appendix II: Progress on recommendations from the last report	24

Fact page

Task of the establishment

To hold immigration detainees for up to seven days.

Location

Terminal 2, Manchester Airport

Name of contractor

Tascor

Last inspection

13-14 March 2013

Escort provider

Tascor

Overview

Pennine House is a short-term holding facility (STHF) run by the private contractor Tascor on behalf of the Home Office. The facility is one of only two residential STHFs in the immigration estate (the other is Larne House in Northern Ireland). Pennine House is located landside at Manchester Airport's Terminal 2. The facility holds adult foreign nationals subject to immigration control against whom the Home Office is taking enforcement action. Thirty-two detainees can be held in eight rooms. Many detainees arrive from police stations after being picked up in the community. Some are moved between immigration removal centres (IRCs), while others have been refused entry to the UK at the airport and are waiting to fly to their country of origin.

Logs showed that in the previous three months the number of detainees held at the facility had totalled 715,¹ of whom 84% were male, and the average age was 32, with ages ranging from 18 to 72 years. The proportion of detainees travelling individually was 99.7%. Detainees originated from 75 different countries, with the highest numbers from Pakistan (28%), India (11%), Nigeria (7%) and China (6%).

The average (mean) length of detention was 37 hours 51 minutes,² with the longest single period of detention at 7 days. Seventy-nine per cent were held for over 12 hours, and 59% for over 24 hours, during a single period of detention, and 16% of detainees had been held at the facility more than once. No accompanied or unaccompanied minors had been held.³

On the day of inspection there were 16 detainees at the facility, 12 men and four women.

Little had changed since our last visit in 2013. Detainees felt safe, but we were concerned that men and women were still held together and shared the same facilities. Exhausting and unnecessary overnight transfers still took place. The facility remained austere and had no natural light. While this was not a problem for those held for a few hours, it was unsuitable for those detained for days at a time. Activities available were adequate for short-stay detainees, but outside areas were poor and access depended on staff availability. Detainees had good access to telephones but there were excessive and unnecessary restrictions on use of the internet. The Independent Monitoring Board visited the facility regularly, and a Home Office monitor visited daily.

¹ Individual detainees within the dataset were identified using a port reference number (PRN). From the 848 detention events recorded, details of a PRN were available in all cases. Initial data suggested one detainee was held for a period of 12 days, but the Home Office investigated this and established it was a recording error. This case was excluded from our analyses. A further three cases (involving three different individuals) with detention lengths of less than four minutes were also identified as errors by the Home Office and removed from our analyses.

² The median length of the detention events logged was 34 hours 55 minutes (N=820).

³ Details of the detainees' age were not recorded for two detention events.

About this inspection and report

Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons is an independent, statutory organisation which reports on the treatment and conditions of those detained in prisons, young offender institutions, immigration detention facilities and police custody.

All inspections carried out by HM Inspectorate of Prisons contribute to the UK's response to its international obligations under the Optional Protocol to the UN Convention against Torture and other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (OPCAT). OPCAT requires that all places of detention are visited regularly by independent bodies – known as the National Preventive Mechanism (NPM) – which monitor the treatment of and conditions for detainees. HM Inspectorate of Prisons is one of several bodies making up the NPM in the UK.

All Inspectorate of Prisons reports carry a summary of the conditions and treatment of detainees, based on the four tests of a healthy prison that were first introduced in this inspectorate's thematic review *Suicide is everyone's concern*, published in 1999. The tests have been modified to fit the inspection of short-term holding facilities, both residential and non-residential. The tests for short-term holding facilities are:

Safety – that detainees are held in safety and with due regard to the insecurity of their position

Respect – that detainees are treated with respect for their human dignity and the circumstances of their detention

Activities – that the centre encourages activities and provides facilities to preserve and promote the mental and physical well-being of detainees

Preparation for removal and release – that detainees are able to maintain contact with family, friends, support groups, legal representatives and advisers, access information about their country of origin and be prepared for their release, transfer or removal. Detainees are able to retain or recover their property.

Inspectors kept fully in mind that although these were custodial facilities, detainees were not held because they had been charged with a criminal offence and had not been detained through normal judicial processes.

Summary

Safety

- S1 At our inspection in 2013, we made six recommendations in relation to this healthy establishment test, two of which were achieved, one was partially achieved and three not achieved.
- S2 Detainees we spoke to were generally positive about their treatment by escort staff. Some detainees were still transferred to Pennine House during the night. Detainees were no longer routinely handcuffed. Reception could be chaotic and the area was inadequate, causing long delays for some detainees waiting on escort vans. Detainees were searched in front of others. Induction consisted of a helpful tour around the centre. We observed detainee custody officers (DCOs) use telephone interpreting with a detainee who required it, but we were not assured that all detainees understood what was said to them.
- S3 The facility continued to hold a mixture of male and female detainees. Women were not able to lock their bedroom doors. Despite this, detainees we spoke to said they felt safe. The number of self-harm incidents, and the number of detainees managed on assessment, care in detention and teamwork (ACDT) case management for those at risk of suicide or self-harm, was low. Staff were unclear about emergency response codes, and there were unnecessary delays in calling an ambulance.
- S4 DCOs had not undertaken safeguarding adults training and were not familiar with trafficking indicators or the national referral mechanism.⁴ Detention staff had failed to inform the local immigration team of a detainee who disclosed she was a sex worker. There was no policy or care planning for vulnerable adults. During the inspection a detainee was held who claimed to be 16, but who had been assessed as an adult without involvement from children's services. We were told force was rarely used in the centre.
- S5 Detainees had good access to telephones, legal visits and a fax machine. Bail information was not available, and we observed a DCO providing incorrect information about bail to a detainee. Some legitimate websites were blocked to detainees. One detainee was unable to access a lawyer because he spoke no English and could not read and write. Detainees could also not open any PDF documents online, including country of origin reports.

Respect

- S6 At our inspection in 2013, we made five recommendations in relation to this healthy establishment test, none were achieved, two were partially achieved and three not achieved.
- S7 The environment was clean but sterile with no natural light, but some soft seating in the association room helped to lessen the austere appearance slightly. There were no duvets or quilts for detainees, and blankets were lightweight; some detainees told us they were too cold in bed. Bedroom cupboards could not be locked, although detainees each had a small safe for valuables. Helpful information was displayed, although most was in English only. Women had a separate bedroom but otherwise shared accommodation with men.

⁴ Put in place in the UK in April 2009 to identify, protect and support victims of trafficking.

- S8 Staff were polite, courteous and easily accessible but some were not proactive enough in interacting with detainees.
- S9 DCOs we spoke to said they had not had any recent diversity training. Detainees could practise their faith and had access to a chaplaincy service. The number of complaints in the past year was low. Complaints forms were available in a range of languages. Catering arrangements were adequate.

Activities

- S10 At our inspection in 2013, we made one recommendation in relation to this healthy establishment test, which was not achieved.
- S11 The provision of activities was reasonable, although the outside caged areas remained unwelcoming and detainees did not have ready access to them.

Preparation for removal and release

- S12 At our inspection in 2013, we made two recommendations in relation to this healthy establishment test both of which were not achieved.
- S13 Detainees could receive social visits, although the visits room doubled up as the reception waiting room; both staff and detainees told us this sometimes delayed booked visits. Clothing packs and bags were available on discharge if needed. All detainees were seen by a nurse before discharge. Detainees had no access to social networks or Skype, which was an unnecessary restriction.

Section 1. Safety

Escort vehicles and transfers

Expected outcomes:

Detainees under escort are treated safely, decently and efficiently.

- I.1 Detainees we spoke to were generally positive about their treatment by escort staff. The escort vehicles we saw were clean, had CCTV, and carried a first aid box and refreshments. Escorts made the centre aware of who they were bringing in and what time they would arrive.
- I.2 We saw little evidence of detainees who had spent long periods detained in police cells or been moved around the estate excessively. However, some detainees were still transferred to the facility from other places of detention during the night for what appeared to be administrative convenience only, which was unacceptable. Person escort records (PERs) indicated that detainees were offered refreshments and toilet breaks on long journeys to the facility, but some were not fully completed so it was not possible to assess the length of some journeys.
- I.3 Detainees were no longer routinely handcuffed when going through the security checkpoint in the airport (see paragraph I.27).

Recommendations

- I.4 **Routine transfers between centres should not take place at night.** (Repeated recommendation I.5)
- I.5 **Person escort records should be completed fully by escort staff.**

Arrival

Expected outcomes:

Detainees taken into detention are treated with respect, have the correct documentation, and are held in safe and decent conditions. Family accommodation is suitable.

- I.6 The reception area remained unchanged from our last inspection, with a cramped space that had a small waiting room that doubled as a visits room. There was also a health care room and an open desk area with an adjacent staff office. Detainees were searched in view of others due to the lack of a designated searching area. A nurse was on duty 24 hours a day and detainees were given a health screening interview on arrival. Subject to risk assessment, detainees could now keep their medication in possession.
- I.7 The lack of a suitable reception and waiting area continued to cause delays for arriving detainees if several escort vehicles arrived at the same time. We were told about a recent occasion when four escort vans had had to queue up outside the centre, with the detainee in the last van to arrive waiting on board for three-and-a-half hours.
- I.8 The reception area was chaotic at times; we observed a new arrival being interviewed at the desk at the same time as another officer was talking to three detainees about to be

transferred to another centre. Room-sharing risk assessments were completed and some sensitive questions were asked in this environment, which was not confidential and therefore inappropriate. Despite this, we observed the officer going to great lengths to talk through processes with the new arrival, explaining that as he was being transferred onwards the next day he needed to contact his family as a priority to organise a visit. The detainee was given a mobile phone and a SIM card, and a free telephone call to family to inform them of what was happening. Clothing, bed and toiletry packs were also provided.

- I.9** On leaving reception, an officer gave detainees a basic induction tour of the centre, using an induction checklist, but did not give them written information specific to the facility. The Tascor information sheet about detention was available in 16 languages in the association room but contained generic information that was of limited relevance to Pennine House. The induction checklist included some points specific to women, such as the availability of sanitary items and that they could ask to eat separately from the men if desired; the women we spoke to confirmed these points had been covered during their induction.
- I.10** We saw one Pashtu-speaking detainee receive his induction from an officer using telephone interpreting. However, during the induction another detainee looked over his shoulder at his details on the record sheet, and there was noise and distraction in the dining room where much of the induction took place. The officer pointed out many notices on boards, and the Pashtu content in the generic Tascor information sheet, without taking into account that the detainee could not read or write in his own language.

Recommendations

- I.11 The reception area should have suitable private searching and interview spaces.**
(Repeated recommendation I.15)
- I.12 Written induction information specific to Pennine House should be available in a range of languages.**

Housekeeping point

- I.13** Staff should ensure that detainees have understood all elements of the induction.

Bullying and personal safety

Expected outcomes:

Detainees feel and are safe from bullying and victimisation.

- I.14** Detention custody officers (DCOs) were available along the main corridor and in the dining and TV rooms at most times, and supervision of detainees was generally good. There had been no recorded incidents of bullying in the centre in the last year.
- I.15** Women lived together with men. They had a separate shower and dormitory bedroom. They were able to lock the shower but not the bedroom door. An intercom in the women's bedroom enabled them to request any assistance they needed. DCOs told us a woman could request an officer to stand outside their door if they felt unsafe, and a female detainee told us she was advised of this when she first arrived. Women we spoke to said they felt safe and well looked after by staff. Nonetheless, we remained concerned that women, including some who would have been particularly vulnerable – such as possible victims of trafficking – were detained with men (see recommendation I.39).

Self-harm and suicide prevention

Expected outcomes:

The facility provides a safe and secure environment which reduces the risk of self-harm and suicide.

- I.16** Most, but not all, DCOs had received recent training in assessment, care in detention and teamwork (ACDT) case management for detainees at risk of suicide or self-harm. All staff carried anti-ligature knives. According to the ACDT log, four detainees had been cared for under the process in 2015. We requested copies of closed ACDT documents but had not received them at the time of writing.
- I.17** Five self-harm incidents were recorded in the incident log, and the documentation indicated that most were responded to effectively. However, we were concerned about the response in one case of a detainee who was found with a ligature around his neck. Although detention staff responded promptly and the outcome for the detainee was good, the wrong emergency code had been called on the staff radio network ('code red', indicating the detainee was suffering from blood loss, rather than the appropriate 'code blue,' indicating a breathing issue). We were further concerned that an ambulance was not called immediately. We were told that staff only called an ambulance after a nurse had arrived and assessed need.

Recommendation

- I.18 Staff should be familiar with emergency response procedures, and an ambulance should be called immediately an emergency code is called.**

Safeguarding (protection of adults at risk)

Expected outcomes:

The centre promotes the welfare of all detainees, particularly adults at risk, and protects them from all kinds of harm and neglect.⁵

- I.19** DCOs we spoke to were aware of the general vulnerability of detainees and the need to keep them safe in the centre, but had little understanding of the concept of adult safeguarding and had received no training on this. There was no policy for managing vulnerable detainees, no care planning arrangements for vulnerable adults and no agreed procedures for managing victims of alleged or suspected abuse.
- I.20** DCOs were unfamiliar with the national referral mechanism (NRM)⁶ for suspected trafficking victims and were not aware of trafficking indicators. The day before the inspection, a woman detainee had disclosed to staff that she was a sex worker. This information was not passed to immigration staff to consider an NRM referral and subsequently release, and instead the woman was transferred that day into further detention in an immigration removal centre (IRC).

⁵ We define an adult at risk as a person aged 18 years or over, 'who is or may be in need of community care services by reason of mental or other disability, age or illness; and who is or may be unable to take care of him or herself, or unable to protect him or herself against significant harm or exploitation'. 'No secrets' definition (Department of Health 2000).

⁶ Put in place in the UK in April 2009 to identify, protect and support victims of trafficking.

Recommendations

- I.21 The facility should develop policy and procedures for managing vulnerable adult detainees in liaison with the local director of adult social services and the local safeguarding adults board.**
- I.22 Staff should be trained in the identification of trafficking victims, and concerns relating to trafficking should be shared by DCOs with immigration staff at the earliest opportunity.**

Safeguarding children

Expected outcomes:

The facility promotes the welfare of children and protects them from all kinds of harm and neglect.

- I.23** All, DCOs had received safeguarding children refresher training in 2015 from Barnardo's. There was a national Tascor safeguarding policy, and DCOs were aware of their duty to safeguard and promote the welfare of children.
- I.24** It was Home Office policy not to hold children in the facility. DCOs said it was very rare for an age-dispute case to arise while a detainee was held there, as detainees claiming to be children had usually been assessed as an adult before they arrived. During the inspection a detainee was held who claimed to be 16 (detainee 'AK'); he did not appear to us to be significantly over 18. He had been assessed to be an adult some months previously by a chief immigration officer and not by children's services⁷ (see also paragraphs 1.28 and 1.33). This was inappropriate as immigration officers are not sufficiently independent or qualified for this role.

Recommendation

- I.25 No one claiming to be a minor should be detained unless they have been properly assessed by local authority children's services to be an adult.**

Use of force

Expected outcomes:

Force is only used as a last resort and for legitimate reasons.

- I.26** All staff had been trained in the use of force in 2015, including de-escalation techniques. Force was used rarely, twice in 2015. Its use was appropriately documented and the documentation indicated it had been used proportionately and with appropriate authorisation.
- I.27** Detainees being transferred to the airport were no longer routinely and unnecessarily handcuffed as they passed through security at the airport perimeter gates. However,

⁷ Home Office policy only allows a chief immigration officer to define someone as an adult if their appearance strongly suggests they are significantly over 18. Otherwise they must refer the person to local authority children's services for a rigorous and detailed assessment, in line with the case law on the matter.

immigration enforcement arrest teams continued to bring detainees to the facility in handcuffs.

Legal rights

Expected outcomes:

Detainees are fully aware of and understand their detention. Detainees are supported by the facility staff to exercise their legal rights freely.

- I.28** Legal visits could be booked at short notice, and most detainees who had lawyers could maintain contact with them while they were in the facility. However, detainee AK (see paragraph I.24), who claimed to be 16, spoke no English and could not read or write, was unable to contact a lawyer (see also paragraph I.33). Although a notice in the holding room promoted the Civil Legal Advice (CLA) helpline in different languages, and the CLA informed us they could arrange to speak to a detainee through an interpreter, AK could not read the notice. As he spoke no English he was unable to talk to officers who, despite having used telephone translation during the detainee's induction, did not use it subsequently to communicate with him, and therefore did not identify his need (see also paragraph I.49).
- I.29** We saw DCOs faxing documents on behalf of detainees from the staff office and giving them confirmation receipts. Bail application forms were unavailable and we observed a DCO giving incorrect advice on bail to a detainee. The Bail for Immigration Detainees handbook was not available.
- I.30** Although detainees had access to the internet, many useful websites were inappropriately blocked, including those for the Refugee Council, Amnesty international and Human Rights Watch (see recommendation I.63). Other useful sites, such as those of the Law Society and Bail for Immigration Detainees were available. Detainees had no access to documents online in PDF format, including Home Office country information reports.

Recommendation

- I.31 All detainees should be able to access a lawyer, or the Civil Legal Advice helpline where relevant. A professional translation service should be used by the staff to ensure access is facilitated for detainees who do not understand English.**

Casework

Expected outcomes:

Detention is carried out on the basis of individual reasons that are clearly communicated. Detention is for the minimum period necessary.

- I.32** Logs showed that in the previous three months, the number of detainees held at the facility had totalled 715. The average length of detention was 37 hours 51 minutes; 79% were held for over 12 hours during a single period of detention and 59% for over 24 hours (which was to be expected, given the facility was residential). The longest single period of detention was 7 days.⁸ Sixteen per cent of detainees had been held at the facility more than once.

⁸ Initial data suggested that one detainee was held for a period of 12 days, but the Home Office investigated this and established it was a recording error.

- I.33** Most detainees we spoke to understood why they were being detained. They received a written document outlining the reasons for their detention (IS91R), but in English only. We were told that it was the practice of immigration staff to read the document to non-English speaking detainees through an interpreter. However, detainee AK (see paragraphs I.24 and I.28) had little understanding of his position, which was likely to have been compounded by the failure of both immigration staff and DCOs in the facility to realise that he was illiterate.
- I.34** A monitor from the Detainee Escorting and Population Management Unit of the Home Office visited the facility every weekday to check on detainees' welfare and the condition of the facility.

Respect

Accommodation

Expected outcomes:

Detainees are held in a safe, clean and decent environment.

- I.35** The facility remained generally unchanged since our previous inspection. The communal areas were clean but sterile, with few pictures or displays to make them more welcoming. There was no natural light anywhere. Some soft seating had been added in the association room, which helped to make it feel slightly less austere.
- I.36** The accommodation consisted of 32 beds in eight rooms, a dining room and an association room, which were all along one main corridor on the upper floor. The bedrooms were also austere with no decoration or furnishings other than small beds, each with a plastic-covered mattress, and cupboards that could not be locked. There were no duvets or quilts and blankets were lightweight; some detainees told us they were too cold in bed. There were two payphones in the main corridor along with two telephones specifically for incoming calls. Each detainee had a small safe for money, medication or other valuables, and could buy basic items, including tobacco and toiletries, from a stock held at the centre. Helpful information was displayed in the corridor and the association room about meal times, how to contact the volunteer visitors group etc, although most was in English only (see recommendation I.12).
- I.37** Women had a separate bedroom but otherwise shared accommodation with men. Bedrooms, including the women's bedroom, could not be locked (see paragraph I.15). There were separate male and female showers and toilets, which were located side by side, although they could be locked. Toilets were clean. A range of sanitary products was available in the female toilet.

Recommendations

- I.38** **There should be warm bedding, and measures should be taken to create a more comfortable, less austere environment.**
- I.39** **Women's accommodation should be separated from men's, with bedrooms, toilets and showers and an association area inaccessible to male detainees.**
(Repeated recommendation I.42)

Positive relationships

Expected outcomes:

Detainees are treated with respect by all staff, with proper regard for the uncertainty of their situation and their cultural backgrounds.

- I.40** Staff were polite and courteous towards detainees, and were easily accessible through their consistent presence on the main corridor and in the association room. While all were helpful if approached by detainees, some were more proactive than others in engaging with them.
- I.41** Staff wore identification cards but their names or status were too small to read clearly, and some cards were concealed underneath fleece jackets and could not be read at all.

Recommendation

I.42 All DCOs should be proactive in engaging with detainees.

Housekeeping point

I.43 Staff should wear clearly legible name badges.

Equality and diversity

Expected outcomes:

There is understanding of the diverse backgrounds of detainees and different cultural backgrounds. The distinct needs of each protected characteristic, including race equality, nationality, religion, disability, gender, transgender, sexual orientation, age and pregnancy, are recognised and addressed.

- I.44** DCOs had undertaken diversity training as part of their initial training course, which was over 10 years previously for some, but none we spoke to had received any refresher training. Despite this, the more experienced staff demonstrated an awareness of diversity issues and cultural differences.
- I.45** The facility was not suitable for detainees with mobility needs as the accommodation was on the first floor and there was no lift.
- I.46** While additional attention was now paid to the needs of women during induction (see paragraph I.9), the lack of separate designated accommodation and care meant their needs were not entirely met (see recommendation I.39).
- I.47** We were told that a male-to-female transgender detainee had been held at the facility some months previously. Detention staff were unaware if there were a Tascor policy relating to the management of such detainees and lacked knowledge in this area, but described a pragmatic approach and had seemingly managed the detainee well.
- I.48** Detainees could practise their religion; copies of the Bible and Qur'an and prayer mats were freely available, and the airport chaplaincy could be contacted on request. An arrow on the back of bedroom doors indicated the direction for Muslim prayer.
- I.49** In the three months before inspection, telephone translation had been used 229 times, substantially more than at the last inspection. We observed it being used by DCOs with newly-arrived detainees, but not thereafter to communicate with at least one detainee who required it (see paragraph I.28 and recommendation I.31).

Recommendation

I.50 Staff should receive ongoing equality and diversity training. (Repeated recommendation I.53)

Housekeeping point

I.51 There should be policies and procedures for the management of transgender detainees and all staff should be familiar with these.

Complaints

Expected outcomes:

Effective complaints procedures are in place for detainees which are easy to access and use, in a language they can understand. Responses are timely and can be understood by detainees.

- I.52** Complaint forms and locked complaints boxes were available in the television room, the main residential corridor and the visits room. Forms were available in English and 16 other languages. Boxes were emptied every weekday by the Home Office monitor (see paragraph I.34) who sent them off to the central detention services complaints unit to be processed. A test complaint form we submitted during the inspection was responded to promptly the following day.
- I.53** Detainees had submitted 35 complaints in the previous 12 months; it was not possible to assess the nature of the complaints or the responses from staff as we were advised by the Home Office, after requesting this information, that it was not available.

Catering

Expected outcomes:

Detainees are offered varied meals to meet their individual requirements. Food is prepared and served according to religious, cultural and prevailing food safety and hygiene regulations.

- I.54** There was a separate dining room where pre-selected frozen oven-cooked meals, including vegetarian, halal and kosher meals, were served. Meal times were reasonable, and outside these times detainees could freely obtain snacks, fruit and hot and cold drinks, and could also request toast. The quality and range of food was adequate.

Activities

Expected outcomes:

The facility encourages activities to preserve and promote the mental and physical well-being of detainees.

- I.55** Detainees could watch television in the large association room. There was no DVD player. The room contained a selection of books and magazines, some in non-English languages. Two PCs provided internet access but too many websites were blocked (see paragraph I.30). Two games consoles were available and were used during our inspection. There was also table football and some board games.
- I.56** There were two small outside areas, one for fresh air and the other for smoking, but both had insufficient space for exercise. They were surrounded by steel caging, and so particularly unwelcoming. The areas were accessible through locked doors and detainees had to be accompanied by a staff member if they wished to use them. Detainees were supposed to be offered at least two fresh air or cigarette breaks a day, although staff told us this could not be guaranteed if there were staffing shortages.

Recommendation

- I.57 All detainees should have unimpeded access to welcoming outside areas.**
(Repeated recommendation I.60)

Preparation for removal and release

Expected outcomes:

Detainees are able to maintain contact with the outside world and be prepared for their release, transfer or removal. Detainees are able to retain or recover their property. Families with children and others with specific needs are not detained without items essential to their welfare.

- I.58** Detainees could receive visitors from 2pm to 9pm daily. Signage from the airport terminal assisted visitors to find the facility.
- I.59** The small and unwelcoming visits room was also the reception waiting room and could only accommodate one detainee and their visitors at a time. At certain times, visits competed with receptions and discharges, and both staff and detainees told us visitors could be kept waiting as a result. Detainees also received visits from the Manchester Immigration Detainee Support Team, whose volunteers attended the centre three times a week.
- I.60** There was a stock of men's and women's clothing for detainees, including warm clothing and underwear. Appropriate luggage bags were also available if required. Information about all the IRCs was displayed in the association room for those being transferred to other centres, and was also given to detainees. The nurse saw all detainees before their departure.
- I.61** Detainees had access to the internet but a range of legitimate websites were blocked (see paragraph I.30). Detainees with a Yahoo email account could use it but other popular email providers were blocked, and there was no access to Skype or social networks to allow detainees to maintain contact with family and friends. These were disproportionate restrictions for a detainee population.

Recommendations

- I.62 A more suitable location should be found for visits.** (Repeated recommendation I.67)
- I.63 The internet should become a meaningful resource for communication, information and recreation for detainees at all immigration facilities. Detainees should have access to all documents and websites, including social networking sites and Skype, unless an individual risk assessment indicates otherwise.** (Repeated recommendation I.68)

Section 2. Recommendations and housekeeping points

Recommendation

To the Home Office

- 2.1 The internet should become a meaningful resource for communication, information and recreation for detainees at all immigration facilities. Detainees should have access to all documents and websites, including social networking sites and Skype, unless an individual risk assessment indicates otherwise. (1.63, repeated recommendation 1.68)

Recommendation

To the escort contractor

- 2.2 Person escort records should be completed fully by escort staff. (1.5)

Recommendations

To the facility contractor

Escort vehicles and transfers

- 2.3 Routine transfers between centres should not take place at night. (1.4, repeated recommendation 1.5)

Arrival

- 2.4 The reception area should have suitable private searching and interview spaces. (1.11, repeated recommendation 1.15)
- 2.5 Written induction information specific to Pennine House should be available in a range of languages. (1.12)

Self-harm and suicide prevention

- 2.6 Staff should be familiar with emergency response procedures, and an ambulance should be called immediately an emergency code is called. (1.18)

Safeguarding (protection of adults at risk)

- 2.7 The facility should develop policy and procedures for managing vulnerable adult detainees in liaison with the local director of adult social services and the local safeguarding adults board. (1.21)
- 2.8 Staff should be trained in the identification of trafficking victims, and concerns relating to trafficking should be shared by DCOs with immigration staff at the earliest opportunity. (1.22)

Safeguarding children

- 2.9** No one claiming to be a minor should be detained unless they have been properly assessed by local authority children's services to be an adult. (1.25)

Legal rights

- 2.10** All detainees should be able to access a lawyer, or the Civil Legal Advice helpline where relevant. A professional translation service should be used by the staff to ensure access is facilitated for detainees who do not understand English. (1.31)

Accommodation

- 2.11** There should be warm bedding, and measures should be taken to create a more comfortable, less austere environment. (1.38)
- 2.12** Women's accommodation should be separated from men's, with bedrooms, toilets and showers and an association area inaccessible to male detainees. (1.39, repeated recommendation 1.42)

Positive relationships

- 2.13** All DCOs should be proactive in engaging with detainees. (1.42)

Equality and diversity

- 2.14** Staff should receive ongoing equality and diversity training. (1.50, repeated recommendation 1.53)

Activities

- 2.15** All detainees should have unimpeded access to welcoming outside areas. (1.57, repeated recommendation 1.60)

Preparation for removal and release

- 2.16** A more suitable location should be found for visits. (1.62, repeated recommendation 1.67)

Housekeeping points

To the facility contractor

- 2.17** Staff should ensure that detainees have understood all elements of the induction. (1.13)
- 2.18** Staff should wear clearly legible name badges. (1.43)
- 2.19** There should be policies and procedures for the management of transgender detainees and all staff should be familiar with these. (1.51)

Section 3. Appendices

Appendix I: Inspection team

Beverley Alden
Deri Hughes-Roberts
Martin Kettle

Team leader
Inspector
Inspector

Appendix II: Progress on recommendations from the last report

The following is a list of all the recommendations made in the last report, organised under the four tests of a healthy establishment. The reference numbers at the end of each recommendation refer to the paragraph location in the previous report. If a recommendation has been repeated in the main report, its new paragraph number is also provided.

Safety

Detainees are held in safety and with due regard to the insecurity of their position.

Recommendations

Routine transfers between centres should not take place at night. (1.5)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, 1.4)

Restraints should only be applied to detainees transferring between the residential and non-residential facilities if they can be justified by an individual risk assessment. (1.6)

Achieved

The reception area should have suitable private searching and interview spaces. (1.15)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, 1.11)

Professional interpretation services should be used with detainees who do not understand English and written induction information specific to Pennine House should be available in a range of languages. (1.16)

Partially achieved

Detainees should be able to hold their medication in possession following an appropriate risk assessment. (1.17)

Achieved

A policy for managing vulnerable detainees should be developed in liaison with the local director of adult social services and the local safeguarding adults board. (1.23)

Not achieved

Respect

Detainees are treated with respect for their human dignity and the circumstances of their detention.

Recommendations

There should be comfortable furniture, duvets and other warm bedding, soft furnishings, pictures, posters and plants to create a more welcoming, comfortable environment. (1.41)

Not achieved

Women's accommodation should be separated from men's, with bedrooms, toilets and showers and an association area inaccessible to male detainees. (1.42)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, 1.40)

Detainee custody officers should be proactive in engaging with detainees, establishing and promptly addressing concerns. (1.46)

Partially achieved

Staff should receive ongoing diversity and equality training. (1.53)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, 1.51)

The specific needs of women detainees should be assessed and met. (1.54)

Partially achieved

Activities

The centre encourages activities and provides facilities to preserve and promote the mental and physical well-being of detainees.

Recommendation

All detainees should have unimpeded access to welcoming outside areas. (1.60)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, 1.58)

Preparation for removal and release

Detainees are able to maintain contact with the outside world and be prepared for their release, transfer or removal.

Recommendations

A more suitable location should be found for visits. (1.67)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, 1.63)

The internet should become a meaningful resource for communication, information and recreation for detainees at all immigration facilities. Detainees should have access to all documents and websites, including social networking sites and Skype, unless an individual risk assessment indicates otherwise. (1.68)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, 1.64)