

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

Pennine House Manchester Airport

by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

13–14 May 2013

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 of terms on our website at:
http://www.justice.gov.uk/downloads/about/hmipris/Glossary-for-web-rps_.pdf

Crown copyright 2013

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:
hmiprison.enquiries@hmiprison.gsi.gov.uk

This publication is available for download at: <http://www.justice.gov.uk/about/hmi-prison>

Printed and published by:
Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons
1st Floor, Ashley House
Monck Street
London SW1P 2BQ
England

Contents

Fact page	4
Overview	5
Summary	7
Section 1. Safety	9
Respect	15
Activities	18
Preparation for removal and release	19
Section 2. Recommendations and housekeeping points	21
Section 3. Appendices	23
Appendix I: Inspection team	23

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

4–5 October 2011

Escort provider

Tascor

Overview

Pennine House is a short-term holding facility run by the private contractor Tascor on behalf of the Home Office. The facility is one of only two residential short term holding facilities in the immigration estate (the other is Larne House in Northern Ireland). Pennine House is located land side 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 could be held in eight rooms.

Many detainees arrived from police stations after being picked up in the community. Some were moved between immigration removal centres, while others had been refused entry to the UK at the airport and were waiting to fly to their country of origin.

We were disappointed to find that little had changed since our last visit in 2011. Male detainees felt safe, but we were concerned that men and women were held together and shared the same facilities. Little was done to address the specific needs of women. In the three months before our inspection logs showed that people were detained on 1035 occasions. This included 94 women. Exhausting and unnecessary overnight transfers were common. The facility remained austere and had no natural light. While this was not problematic for those held for a few hours, it was unsuitable for those detained for days at a time. Activities were adequate for short-stay detainees. Detainees had good access to phones but there were excessive and unnecessary restrictions on internet use. The Independent Monitoring Board visited the facility regularly.

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 criteria have been modified to fit the inspection of short-term holding facilities, both residential and non-residential. The criteria 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 Escort staff treated detainees well. Escort vehicles were clean. In the three months before our inspection, most detainees had arrived from Dungavel House Immigration Removal Centre (IRC). The quality of entries in personal escort records varied. While we did not see cases where detainees were moved around the estate excessively, many were moved between centres at night, which was unnecessary and exhausting. Detainees were inappropriately handcuffed when being transferred through gates into the airport.
- S2 The facility's reception area was too small and detainees could be kept waiting in escort vehicles outside reception for long periods as a result. Searching was generally respectful but neither this nor the booking in process were conducted in private. Telephone interpretation was not always used when it was required. A nurse was present in the facility 24 hours a day. Detainees received a tour of the centre but no bespoke written information.
- S3 Most detainees said they felt safe and there was little evidence of bullying, but women felt more insecure about sharing the centre with unrelated men. A woman had at one point barricaded herself in her room because she felt unsafe. Those at risk of self-harm were managed through the assessment, care in detention and teamwork (ACDT) system. Three men had injured themselves in the previous year, and available records suggested that staff acted appropriately to manage self-harm risks. There were no safeguarding procedures for adults at risk. Force was used infrequently and proportionately.
- S4 Detainees could maintain contact with their lawyers. Asylum claimants could contact legal aid lawyers through the Civil Legal Advice helpline. Detainees could receive legal visits but many legal websites were inappropriately blocked. The facility logs showed over 1000 instances of detention in the three months before our inspection for an average of about one and a half hours. However, 14 detainees were held for more than five days.

Respect

- S5 The facility was clean but austere, with few pictures or notices, creating a sterile environment. There was no natural light and detainees could go for several days without being able to look outside. Insufficient bedding meant detainees found it difficult to keep warm at night. Women had separate bedrooms but shared communal areas with men. Toilets were fairly clean and detainees had good access to showers. Staff were fair and polite towards detainees but were not proactive. They wore ID cards but their names were not clearly visible.
- S6 Staff did not receive regular diversity training. The facility was not suitable for detainees with mobility issues. Women's particular needs were not sufficiently considered. Detainees could practise their religion and make formal complaints.
- S7 Detainees could freely obtain snacks, some fruit and hot and cold drinks from the dining area. Staff prepared hot microwavable meals and toast for them.

Activities

- S8 Detainees had access to a large television, some games, books and magazines, some of which were in foreign languages. There were two small, caged and unwelcoming outside areas where detainees could take fresh air or smoke. Smokers were regularly invited outside but non-smokers were not, and we spoke to many who did not know they could go outside.

Preparation for removal and release

- S9 Visitors could see detainees in the afternoons and evenings but could be kept waiting as the small visits room was sometimes used for other purposes. A non-governmental organisation Manchester Immigration Detainee Support Team visited detainees regularly. Detainees were provided with clothes and luggage bags if they needed them. A nurse examined all detainees before their departure. Detainees had good access to phones. They could also use the internet freely, but a large number of sites were blocked, including those offering legal support and information. Most detainees who left Pennine House went to an IRC.

Section 1. Safety

Escort vehicles and transfers

Expected outcomes:

Detainees under escort are treated safely, decently and efficiently.

- I.1 Detainees were generally positive about their treatment by escort staff. The escort vehicles we saw were clean and had CCTV. One escort vehicle could hold four detainees in small caged compartments.
- I.2 In the three months before our inspection, most detainees arrived from Dungavel House Immigration Removal Centre (IRC). However, during our inspection, most arrived from police stations, which were unsuitable for long periods of detention. Most detainees had spent less than a day in police cells. We found fewer long detentions than at previous inspections, although one detainee had spent two nights (nearly 33 hours) in police custody. Person escort records were filled in inconsistently and not all recorded the offer of regular comfort breaks. Few detainees said they had been given a comfort break even on long journeys.
- I.3 We found no examples of detainees being moved around the detention estate excessively, but some were arriving from other centres in the early hours of the morning, exhausted. Most of these movements appeared to be purely for administrative convenience and were not justified by the risk of imminent flight. One detainee had submitted a written complaint about being transferred at 'awkward hours of the night, depriving us of sleep. We request that transportation be done at reasonable hours giving us good time to rest ...'
- I.4 Detainees were still being routinely handcuffed through the airport security checkpoint, causing those who had no previous experience of restraints particular distress.

Recommendations

- I.5 **Routine transfers between centres should not take place at night.**
- I.6 **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.**

Housekeeping point

- I.7 Regular comfort breaks should be offered during escorts and recorded.

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.8** The cramped reception area had a small waiting room that doubled as a visits room. There was also a nurses' room and an open desk area with an adjacent staff office. Little information was available in the waiting room.
- I.9** Reception staff said they normally received a phone call from escorts to tell them they were on their way. Detainees were aware that they were being taken to Pennine House. They arrived with IS91 documents (authorising their detention) that were usually completed appropriately.
- I.10** The lack of a suitable reception and waiting area continued to cause delays for arriving detainees if, as occasionally happened, several escort vehicles arrived at the same time. During the inspection, one detainee waited in an escort van for two hours, while other new arrivals were being booked in. He had been desperate to use the toilet and was given a toilet bag to use in the vehicle.
- I.11** Detainees were usually given a rub-down search respectfully (see section on equality and diversity) but the lack of a dedicated search area meant that searching was not carried out in private. They were also interviewed at an open reception desk. Room-sharing risk assessments were completed and some sensitive questions were asked, including about self-harm and other vulnerabilities. The reception area sometimes became very busy, and we observed staff having social conversations over the heads of detainees who were being interviewed at the desk. The overall impression was that the reception process was not centred on detainees. We also saw some people who clearly needed interpretation being booked in without any attempt to use the telephone interpretation service.
- I.12** A nurse was on duty 24 hours a day and detainees were given a health screening interview on arrival. The nursing team included mental health qualified nurses and there was an on-call doctors' service. Medication was held in the nurses' office; detainees could not hold medicines in possession.
- I.13** After the reception process was completed, detainees without mobile phones were given a free phone call (see paragraph I.65). Some, but not all, were given a basic hygiene pack.
- I.14** Staff gave detainees a basic induction tour of the facility but did not give them written information specific to the facility. The Tascor information booklet was available in the waiting and TV room in 16 languages but it contained generic information that was of limited relevance to detainees at Pennine House. Important information, such as the fact that detainees could ask to be taken out for some fresh air as well as to smoke, was not provided routinely (see section on activities). Apart from being alerted to the intercom in one of the female bedrooms, women were not given specific induction information.

Recommendations

- I.15** **The reception area should have suitable private searching and interview spaces.**
- I.16** **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.**
- I.17** **Detainees should be able to hold their medication in possession following an appropriate risk assessment.**

Housekeeping points

- I.18 Staff should focus on detainees throughout the reception process.
- I.19 All detainees should be given a hygiene pack on reception.

Bullying and personal safety

Expected outcomes:

Detainees feel and are safe from bullying and victimisation.

- I.20 Most detainees told us they felt safe. There was a cooperative atmosphere and staff were available along the main corridor, in the dining or TV rooms at most times. There had been no recorded incidents of bullying in the centre since our last inspection. However, women could not lock their doors and felt more vulnerable. If they wanted extra security, staff could lock them in a bedroom that had an intercom (see sections on accommodation and equality and diversity and recommendations 1.42 and 1.54). One of the three females held during our inspection told us she felt insecure and unhappy at having to share living space with men.

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.21 At least 11 detainees had been cared for through the assessment, care in detention and teamwork (ACDT) system in 2012, and two in 2013. It was not possible to be certain of the numbers as recording was inconsistent and computer and paper records did not tally. Thoughts of self-harm had triggered five assessments, one man had refused to take prescription medication and two had refused food and fluids. Three men had injured themselves: two by cutting themselves and one by banging his head, pulling at his hair and tying a ligature around his neck. The outcome in all cases was not clear, but the latter had led to a transfer to Dungavel House IRC. From the records available, it appeared that staff had behaved proportionately and appropriately to reduce and manage the risks in these cases. Staff had received training in managing detainees on ACDT documents but no broader training in suicide and self-harm prevention after their initial training courses. All staff routinely carried anti-ligature knives.

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.¹

- I.22 Staff were not familiar with safeguarding adults procedures, and had received no training. There were no care planning arrangements for vulnerable detainees and no agreed procedures for managing victims of alleged or suspected abuse.

¹ 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).

Recommendation

- I.23 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.**

Safeguarding children

Expected outcomes:

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

- I.24** It was Home Office policy not to hold children in the facility. Staff were not aware of any detainees subject to an age dispute having been held at the facility since our last inspection. Detainee custody officers (DCOs) were aware of their duty to safeguard and promote the welfare of children. If they had concerns about the safety of a child visitor they would report it to the facility manager, the duty chief immigration officer and the Tascor national safeguarding lead member of staff.
- I.25** Some, but not all, DCOs had received safeguarding children training from a workplace coordinator. Recent recruits had received training on their initial course. There was no local safeguarding policy but there was a national Tascor safeguarding policy.

Use of force

Expected outcomes:

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

- I.26** Force had been used three times in the previous six months to prevent self-harm (see section on self-harm and suicide prevention). Records assured us that it was used as a last resort, proportionately and for no longer than was necessary. Staff received annual control and restraint training.
- I.27** Detainees being transferred to the airport were routinely and unnecessarily handcuffed as they passed through security at the airport perimeter gates (see section on escort vehicles and transfers).
- I.28** Incident reports were completed when removal directions were served on detainees. Managers told us they were a way of providing evidence of removal directions having been served on time but this was not an appropriate use of the incident reporting system. This practice undermined the system for reporting concerns, and meaningful trends were obscured by the mass of routine information.

Housekeeping point

- I.29** Incident reports should not be used to record the routine serving of removal directions.

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.30** Detainees who had lawyers could maintain contact with them while they were in the facility. They could retain mobile phones if they did not have cameras (see paragraph 1.65). Two payphones were available in the main corridor along with two phones for incoming calls. We saw DCOs faxing documents on behalf of detainees from the staff office and giving them confirmation receipts. Legal visits took place from 9am until 2pm in the small visitors' room. However, staff would arrange visits later than this if necessary.
- I.31** A notice promoted the Civil Legal Advice (CLA) helpline in different languages but the CLA's online free call back service was not advertised at the facility. We called the number and were provided with the details of four local organisations that offered asylum claimants legal advice and representation. There was also a notice promoting the Office of the Immigration Services Commissioner but not the Legal Ombudsman. Some detainees complained about poor quality representation.
- I.32** Many legal websites were inappropriately blocked, for example, the Detention Advice Service, Refugee Council and the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. We were unable to download forms for the First-tier Tribunal (Immigration and Asylum Chamber), which deals with appeals against immigration, asylum and nationality decisions. Bail application forms were not available and could not be downloaded (see also section on preparation for removal and release). The *Bail for Immigration Detainees* handbook was not available.

Housekeeping points

- I.33** Notices should promote the Civil Legal Advice's free call back service, the Legal Ombudsman and local immigration lawyers willing and able to advise detainees.
- I.34** Bail application forms and the *Bail for Immigration Detainees* handbook should be freely available.

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.35** In the three months before our inspection there had been 1035 instances of detention. The same person was sometimes detained more than once, often on the way to or from Dungavel House IRC in Scotland. The average length of detention was one hour and 28 minutes, but 14 detainees were held for more than five days, with the longest detained for seven days and six hours. This may have been unlawful given the detention limit of seven days in a short-term holding facility. Three-hundred and seventy-six detainees, about a third of all detainees, were held for less than a day.
- I.36** Most detainees we spoke with understood why they were being detained. They received a written document outlining the reasons for their detention (document IS91R) but in English only. They could retain their legal documents. In theory detainees could phone or fax their

caseworkers, but not all had the relevant contact details. An officer from the detainee escorting and population management unit of the Home Office visited the facility every day Monday to Friday to check on detainees' welfare and the condition of the facility. She did not intervene in casework but we saw her help a detainee to contact a caseworker. Country of origin reports could not be viewed on the internet (see also sections on legal rights and preparation for removal and release).

Respect

Accommodation

Expected outcomes:

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

- I.37** The communal areas were clean but sterile with few pictures or displays to make them more welcoming. There was no natural light in the entire facility and no comfortable seating other than one bean bag in the association room. This, together with the absence of soft-furnishings or plants, created a particularly austere environment.
- I.38** The main accommodation area had 32 beds in eight rooms, a dining room and an association room. In keeping with the facility in general, bedrooms were austere. Other than small beds, each with a plastic covered mattress, and cupboards, which could not be locked, there were no other furnishings or decoration. Blankets were light, many had become thin and some were threadbare. The facility was cold and two detainees reported being unable to sleep because of the temperature and lack of appropriate bedding. Detainees could request extra blankets, but not all were aware of this, and even those with extra blankets found they made little difference. There were no duvets or quilts.
- I.39** Women had a separate bedroom but otherwise shared accommodation with men. Bedrooms, including the women's bedroom, could not be locked (see sections on bullying and personal safety and equality and diversity). There were separate male and female showers and toilets. These were located side by side, although they could be locked.
- I.40** Toilets were fairly clean, but the seat on one of them was broken and had come off. A range of sanitary products was available in the female toilet.

Recommendations

- I.41** **There should be comfortable furniture, duvets and other warm bedding, soft furnishings, pictures, posters and plants to create a more welcoming, comfortable environment.**
- I.42** **Women's accommodation should be separated from men's, with bedrooms, toilets and showers and an association area inaccessible to male detainees.**

Housekeeping points

- I.43** All detainees should have lockable cupboards.
- I.44** The facility should be kept at an appropriate temperature.

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.45** Staff were fair and courteous towards detainees. DCOs were present throughout the facility and easily available but not always proactive. For example, it was well known that many important internet sites were blocked but no one had taken any action to deal with the issue (see sections on legal rights and preparation for removal and release). Staff wore ID cards but their names or status were too small to read clearly.

Recommendation

- I.46** **Detainee custody officers should be proactive in engaging with detainees, establishing and promptly addressing concerns.**

Housekeeping point

- I.47** 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.48** Recently recruited DCOs received diversity training during their initial course but there was no refresher training. Despite this, most staff showed an understanding of diversity issues with one notable exception. While searching a man of Rastafarian appearance, an escort found an asthma inhaler and said: ‘You could keep drugs in here’, which displayed stereotyping and a lack of cultural sensitivity.
- I.49** The facility was not suitable for detainees with mobility issues as the accommodation was on the first floor.
- I.50** Women’s needs were not fully appreciated. There was no tailored induction for women or additional written material. Women we spoke with did not know they could ask to eat separately from the men. They slept in dedicated rooms at the end of the corridor but could not lock their doors. We were told that in the past one woman had barricaded herself into her room because she did not feel safe (see also sections on arrival, bullying and accommodation).
- I.51** Detainees could practise their religion. Copies of the Bible, Qur’an and prayer mats were available in the television room. The airport chaplain visited the facility and could be contacted on request.
- I.52** Telephone interpretation was not always used when necessary (see section on arrival). In the three months before our inspection, telephone interpreting had been used 56 times. The most commonly requested language was Mandarin (22 times), Russian (five times) and Albanian, Farsi, Turkish and Vietnamese (four times).

Recommendations

- I.53** **Staff should receive ongoing diversity and equality training.**

I.54 The specific needs of women detainees should be assessed and met.

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.55** Complaints forms and locked complaints boxes were available in the television and visiting rooms. Forms were available in English and 15 other languages. Boxes were emptied daily, Monday to Friday.
- I.56** Detainees had submitted 37 complaints in the previous 12 months (five in the previous three). Complaints were promptly faxed to the detention services customer complaints unit. Some complaints were submitted in languages other than English. A number of them were substantiated but action was not always taken to resolve the issues raised: for example, two complaints related to insufficient internet access, which was still poor (see also section on escort vehicles and transfers).

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.57** There was a separate dining room where pre-selected frozen oven-cooked meals, including vegetarian, halal and kosher meals, were served. Detainees were not allowed to cook their own meals. Outside meal times, detainees could obtain crisps, biscuits, 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.58** Detainees could watch a television in a large association room. The room contained a selection of books and magazines, some of which were in languages other than English. Two PCs provided internet access but too many sites were blocked (see sections on legal rights and preparation for removal and release). Detainees could watch TV programmes on BBC iPlayer but, as there were no headphones, could not listen to them. A Wii console was available but not used during our inspection. There were also some DVDs and handheld computer games.
- I.59** There were two small outside areas, one for fresh air and the other for smoking. Detainees we spoke to were only aware of the smoking area and some non-smokers thought they could not get any fresh air. We saw staff regularly asking detainees if they wanted to go outside to smoke, but not asking non-smokers if they wanted fresh air. The areas were accessible through locked doors and detainees had to be accompanied by a staff member if they wished to use them. The two areas were identical and offered insufficient space for outside exercise. They were boxed off by steel caging creating a particularly unwelcoming environment.

Recommendation

- I.60 All detainees should have unimpeded access to welcoming outside areas.**

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.61** Detainees could receive visitors from 2pm to 9pm daily. 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 visitors could be kept waiting as a result.
- I.62** Visiting slots were for half an hour and we saw examples of appropriate discretion being used to extend the time when it was possible. Detainees also received visits from the Manchester Immigration Detainee Support Team (MIDST), which had a long involvement with the centre. A large triangular mountain emblem on the outside was an unclear way to identify the facility and it was hard to see why its name could not be displayed outside to allow visitors to find it more easily.
- I.63** There was a stock of clothing for detainees about to be removed, including some warm clothing and underwear, and appropriate luggage bags. Information about each of the IRCs was displayed in the association room for those being transferred to other centres. The vast majority of detainees leaving Pennine House in the previous three months went to IRCs, particularly Dungavel House and Colnbrook. A small number, 37, had been released into the community.
- I.64** All detainees were seen by the nurse before departure. We observed her verbally relaying important information about self-harm risk to escort staff, as well as providing some written information.
- I.65** Detainees had good access to phones. They could retain phones without cameras or internet access, or could borrow a suitable phone from staff and place their SIM card in it. There were also pay phones and phones for incoming calls.
- I.66** Although detainees had easy access to the internet, we were surprised to find that a wide range of useful recreational and information websites were blocked, including Amnesty International, Skype and social networking sites. Detainees with a Yahoo email account could receive and send emails but other popular online email accounts were blocked. Detainees could not download translated PDF documents, such as information from MIDST, and they could not access country of origin information reports. Staff were unclear about who was responsible for blocking websites and how to request that specific sites be unblocked (see also section on legal rights).

Recommendations

- I.67 A more suitable location should be found for visits.**
- I.68 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.**

Housekeeping points

- I.69** The facility's name should be clearly displayed on the outside to enable visitors to find it easily.
- I.70** There should be clear, swift and effective procedures for requesting that websites be unblocked and for the restrictions to be lifted.

Section 2. Recommendations and housekeeping points

Recommendation

To the escort contractor

Escort vehicles and transfers

- 2.1** 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)

Recommendations

To the facility contractor

Escort vehicles and transfers

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

Arrival

- 2.3** The reception area should have suitable private searching and interview spaces. (1.15)
- 2.4** 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)
- 2.5** Detainees should be able to hold their medication in possession following an appropriate risk assessment. (1.17)

Safeguarding (protection of adults at risk)

- 2.6** 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)

Accommodation

- 2.7** 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)
- 2.8** Women's accommodation should be separated from men's, with bedrooms, toilets and showers and an association area inaccessible to male detainees. (1.42)

Positive relationships

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

Equality and diversity

- 2.10 Staff should receive ongoing diversity and equality training. (1.53)
- 2.11 The specific needs of women detainees should be assessed and met. (1.54)

Activities

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

Preparation for removal and release

- 2.13 A more suitable location should be found for visits. (1.67)
- 2.14 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)

Housekeeping points

- 2.15 Regular comfort breaks should be offered during escorts and recorded. (1.7)
- 2.16 Staff should focus on detainees throughout the reception process. (1.18)
- 2.17 All detainees should be given a hygiene pack on reception. (1.19)
- 2.18 Incident reports should not be used to record the routine serving of removal directions. (1.29)
- 2.19 Notices should promote the Civil Legal Advice's free call back service, the Legal Ombudsman and local immigration lawyers willing and able to advise detainees. (1.33)
- 2.20 Bail application forms and the Bail for Immigration Detainees handbook should be freely available. (1.34)
- 2.21 All detainees should have lockable cupboards. (1.43)
- 2.22 The facility should be kept at an appropriate temperature. (1.44)
- 2.23 Staff should wear clearly legible name badges. (1.47)
- 2.24 The facility's name should be clearly displayed on the outside to enable visitors to find it easily. (1.69)
- 2.25 There should be clear, swift and effective procedures for requesting that websites be unblocked and for the restrictions to be lifted. (1.70)

Section 3. Appendices

Appendix I: Inspection team

Hindpal Singh Bhui
Colin Carroll
Deri Hughes-Roberts

Team leader
Inspector
Inspector