

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

Larne House

by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

2 February 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	14
Activities	16
Preparation for removal and release	17
Section 2. Recommendations and housekeeping points	18
Section 3. Appendices	20
Appendix I: Inspection team	20
Appendix II: Progress on recommendations from the last report	21
Appendix III: Photograph	23

Fact page

Task of the establishment

To hold immigration detainees for up to seven days before their removal from the UK or transfer to an immigration removal centre.

Location

Antrim, Northern Ireland

Name of contractor

Tascor

Last inspection

18 November 2013

Escort provider

Tascor

Overview

Larne House is one of three residential short-term holding facilities (STHFs) in the immigration detention estate.¹ The facility is open 24 hours a day, seven days a week. The Home Office can hold detainees for up to five days in a residential STHF, seven if removal directions have been set. The Larne House facility is run on behalf of the Home Office by the private company Tascor, which is part of the outsourcing company Capita. The facility holds up to 19 men and women. Detainees arrive from Drumkeen House STHF in Belfast, police stations, prisons or directly from enforcement operations in the community. On departure, detainees are often transferred to immigration removal centres (IRCs) in Britain, removed from the UK or released into the community.

During the inspection, eight detainees were held, all men. We observed one detainee arrive and one depart. The facility remained largely unchanged from our previous inspections. An independent monitoring board now visited the facility.

¹ The others are at Yarl's Wood IRC and Manchester Airport (Pennine House STHF).

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 10 recommendations in relation to this healthy establishment test, five of which we found at this inspection were achieved and five were not achieved.
- S2 Escort vehicles were appropriate. Escort staff interacted well with detainees. The facility was staffed by both male and female officers. Induction to the centre was thorough but the booking-in process was not conducted in private. Detainee custody officers (DCOs) did not assess detainees' mood during the booking-in process; this assessment was carried out by the nurse. Some restrictions to prevent detainees from self-harming were disproportionate to the risks posed. A nurse was based at the facility 24 hours a day and saw all new arrivals. Detainees had good access to telephones.
- S3 Men and women were held together. Local managers could not immediately retrieve and review closed-circuit television (CCTV) footage. Most staff were trained in assessment, care in detention and teamwork (ACDT) case management processes for detainees at risk of suicide or self-harm. ACDT documentation was reasonably good. Staff took steps to safeguard at-risk detainees who were being released from detention.
- S4 All DCOs had been trained to use the restraint techniques contained in the Home Office Manual for Escorting Safely. Force had been used once in the previous six months. The austere separation cell had been used once since the previous inspection.
- S5 Detainees could maintain contact with their legal representatives. The facility was used more often than at the time of the previous inspection but for shorter periods. A total of 174 detainees had been held in the previous three months. Detainees were held for an average of two days, 16 hours and 34 minutes.

Respect

- S6 At our inspection in 2013, we made four recommendations in relation to this healthy establishment test, all of which we found at this inspection were achieved.
- S7 Detainees in single rooms could lock their doors from the inside and all detainees had access to a small safe in which they could store valuables. Couples could share rooms. The facility was accessible to those using a wheelchair, and detainees could practise their religion. An Imam would visit the facility if requested. Detainees could make formal complaints in writing. Catering arrangements were satisfactory.

Activities

- S8 At our inspection in 2013, we made two recommendations in relation to this healthy establishment test, both of which we found at this inspection were partially achieved.
- S9 There were enough activities for detainees held for short periods but they did not have free access to the exercise yard. They could freely access the internet and email but could not use video conferencing or social media, which was a disproportionate security measure.

Preparation for removal and release

- S10 At our inspection in 2013, we made one recommendations in relation to this healthy establishment test, which we found at this inspection was achieved.
- S11 DCOs helped to prepare detainees for their release by carefully explaining their conditions of temporary release and travel arrangements to their destination. Facility staff issued detainees with cash rather than travel warrants to reach their destinations. Detainees were not routinely handcuffed onto the ferry to Scotland. They could receive visitors. Volunteers from the Larne House visiting group visited the centre.

Section 1. Safety

Escort vehicles and transfers

Expected outcomes:

Detainees under escort are treated safely, decently and efficiently.

- 1.1 One detainee arrived at the facility during the inspection. He was transferred in a suitable vehicle. Escort staff collected him from a local police station. Unlike in England and Wales, person escort records (PERs) were completed by DCOs, rather than the police; DCOs gathered the risk information from the movement order and also orally from the police. In this case, it was established that the detainee had no known risks and he was not handcuffed during the journey to the facility, which took around 30 minutes. On arrival at Larne House, escort staff interacted well with the detainee, explaining that he would have to wait in the reception area for a short time as another detainee was being released.

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.

- 1.2 The centre was open 24 hours a day, seven days a week, and was staffed at the time of the inspection by a duty operations manager and five DCOs, two of whom were women. We were told that it would be rare for there to be no female officer on duty. Seven male detainees were in the centre when we arrived, one of whom was released on temporary admission, and a further one arrived during the inspection.
- 1.3 DCOs were notified of new arrivals well in advance, allowing sufficient time to prepare for their arrival. We were told that detainees would not be admitted without the necessary paperwork authorising detention (IS91 form). DCOs welcomed new arrivals appropriately and gave them a rub-down and wand search in a discrete area just off the main reception.
- 1.4 DCOs booked in detainees using professional telephone interpreting services when necessary. They then provided them with a thorough induction and a room-sharing risk assessment, which were carried out at the reception desk in front of the waiting room; this prevented confidential communication between DCOs and detainees and was a serious failing. DCOs asked detainees if they had any needs or concerns about living with others but failed to assess the detainee's mood and state of mind. This meant that they did not always identify detainees who required additional support (see section on self-harm and suicide prevention). Instead, the nurse was left to identify how the detainee was feeling.
- 1.5 Some measures to prevent self-harm were disproportionate. Detainees were not allowed to keep phone chargers, belts or items of corded clothing that were deemed to present a risk of self-harm. We saw DCOs remove a jacket with a corded hood from one low-risk detainee, and also his baseball cap as it had a buckle on the rear which staff believed he could use to injure himself. Toiletries in large glass or metal containers were kept locked in an office cupboard, and detainees had to ask to use these, irrespective of their risk level (see section on self-harm and suicide).

- I.6** New arrivals were issued with a toothbrush, toothpaste and a replacement clothing pack. They were told that the centre was monitored by CCTV and that staff would check on them during the night to make sure that they were well; if they did not wish to be disturbed, they were told to wedge their room doors open with a shoe.
- I.7** A nurse was based at the facility 24 hours a day, seven days a week, and all new arrivals were seen for a health assessment. Consultations were conducted in a dedicated health care room, which was off the main reception area. We saw a consultation conducted with the treatment door open, with a DCO standing in the corridor outside; staff told us that this practice was routine, rather than on the basis of a risk assessment, and we considered it to be inappropriate. This detainee was examined, with his consent, in the presence of a fellow detainee, who interpreted on his behalf. As the fellow detainee was not a professional interpreter, the accuracy of his interpretation could not be assured.
- I.8** Detainees were allowed to retain cash but not mobile phones with cameras and internet access for security reasons. In these cases, replacement mobile phones were routinely given to detainees to use with their own SIM card. Detainees who had SIM cards that were not compatible with the facility's loan phones were given an opportunity to retrieve telephone numbers from their mobile phone. They were also told that two payphones, with privacy hoods, were available, and phone cards could be purchased from the facility's shop. Detainees were encouraged to give their family, friends and legal representatives the telephone numbers of the payphones, for incoming calls.

Recommendations

- I.9 Reception interviews and medical consultations should be conducted in private.**
- I.10 Detainee custody officers should ascertain detainees' mood on arrival and assess any risks.**
- I.11 Detainees' clothing and toiletries should not be removed unless an individualised risk assessment indicates otherwise.** (Repeated recommendation I.9)

Bullying and personal safety

Expected outcomes:

Detainees feel and are safe from bullying and victimisation.

- I.12** Men and women were held together in the facility. Three rooms, on a single corridor, had been designated for use by women but this corridor was not separate from the rest of the facility, and men walked through it to go to the dining room. However, women could lock the doors to their rooms. These locks could be overridden by staff in the event of an emergency. Communal areas were shared by men and women.
- I.13** Staff were visible around the centre and detainees could easily get their attention. CCTV cameras monitored the facility, and the footage was stored on a hard drive, although local managers could not easily retrieve and review it. Instead, they had to make a request to the Home Office to access the footage; Home Office staff would then contact a subcontractor, who would visit the facility to download it.

Recommendations

- I.14 Men and women should be held separately.** (Repeated recommendation I.13)
- I.15 Onsite managers should be able to retrieve and review closed-circuit television footage easily.**

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** Nearly all DCOs had been trained in assessment, care in detention and teamwork (ACDT) case management procedures. Staff opened ACDT documents for detainees who were at risk of self-harm, and 14 had been opened in the six months from August 2015 to January 2016. The quality of the closed ACDT documents that we reviewed was reasonably good, although we found some unanswered questions on the assessment interview page. Care maps were often good. The section of the document recording possible triggers for self-harm was sometimes incomplete. Observational entries were good and demonstrated good care and support for detainees in crisis, although we were not assured that DCOs were sufficiently focused on detainees' mood when they first arrived at the centre (see section on arrival). In two ACDT documents that we reviewed, it was the nurse, rather than DCOs, who had raised concerns that the detainee might be at risk of self-harm.
- I.17** Although the rules preventing self-harm had been relaxed since the previous inspection, some remained disproportionate to the risks posed and were not tailored to the individual. For example, detainees were not allowed to retain their own razor blades; DCOs issued these one at a time. If a detainee did not return the razor blade, staff would check that the detainee had not self-harmed. This may have been an appropriate response for a detainee who was known to be at risk of self-harm but the blanket application of this policy to all detainees was intrusive.

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.²

- I.18** DCOs were not aware of a Tascor safeguarding adults policy. However, we saw evidence of support being given to at-risk adults who were released from the facility. In one case, staff gave a detainee details of the Samaritans and made an appointment for her to see her GP shortly after release. Details of all at-risk detainees were forwarded to the Home Office UK Visa and Immigration safeguarding coordinator for Scotland and Northern Ireland.

² 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).

Safeguarding children

Expected outcomes:

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

- I.19** Children were not held at the facility. AccessNI, the criminal history disclosure service in Northern Ireland, had checked the criminal backgrounds of Tascor staff working in the facility.

Use of force

Expected outcomes:

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

- I.20** By the end of 2015, all staff had been trained in the new restraint methods contained in the Home Office Manual for Escorting Safely. Waist and leg restraints were held in the facility but had not been used in the previous six months.
- I.21** Force had been used once in the previous six months. Paperwork showed that it had been used proportionately and as a last resort.
- I.22** The separation cell had been used once since the previous inspection, for a detainee who had been due to be transferred from Larne House to Scotland by ferry. He had self-harmed at the facility and threatened to harm staff. In order to manage the situation, he had been placed in the separation cell for two hours 45 minutes, while arrangements had been made to return him to the police station. The door to the cell had remained open and two members of staff had watched him constantly. The cell was stark, with no toilet, sink, drinking water or furniture. Written guidance for its use was being developed locally but had not yet been published.

Recommendation

- I.23** **The separation cell should be formally taken out of commission until appropriate governance is in place.**

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.24** Detainees who already had a legal representative could maintain contact with them. Lists of local legal representatives and their telephone numbers were displayed in the facility. We spoke to one detainee who had used the list and was due to be seen the next day by one of the representatives. Details of the Civil Legal Advice helpline were displayed in English and other languages. Although the helpline was not able to help detainees while they were in Northern Ireland, it could assist those being transferred to an IRC in Britain. Detainees could consult their legal representatives in private, in one of the two interview rooms, subject to availability.

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.25** The Home Office used the facility more often than at the time of the previous inspection but for shorter periods. In the previous three months, 174 detainees had been held. Ten per cent of all detainees who had been detained at the facility had been held there on more than one occasion. The average length of detention was two days, 16 hours and 34 minutes. The longest period of detention had been just over six and a half days. Detainees were issued with the reasons for their detention but in English only.

Recommendation

- I.26 Detainees should be issued with and allowed to keep the reason for detention (IS91R) document in a language they can understand.**

Respect

Accommodation

Expected outcomes:

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

- I.27** The centre could accommodate 19 detainees in 10 bedrooms. However, at the time of the inspection, four of the bedrooms were out of use owing to a faulty heating system. The facility comprised a reception area, health care room, two interview rooms, an association room, a dining room, an exercise yard, a prayer room, a segregation cell and staff offices.
- I.28** The bedrooms were basic but clean, and contained one to four beds. Unlike at the time of the previous inspection, detainees in single rooms could now lock their rooms from the inside. Clean pillows and blankets were issued to new arrivals. Since the previous inspection, personal safes had been installed, which enabled detainees to store valuable items. One room had a television and an intercom connecting with reception, and was used for vulnerable detainees who needed additional support. Couples could share a room. Staff told us about a Mauritian family (parents and two adult children) who had been held overnight recently and had been allowed to share one room, at their request.

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.29** DCOs introduced themselves to detainees and were polite and respectful. Staff spent time interacting with detainees in the association room, and the atmosphere in the facility was relaxed. Detainees told us that they were satisfied with their treatment in the facility but were anxious about their immigration cases and what would happen next. Staff wore several name badges, which they needed to allow them to access various buildings and facilities, but the writing on them was too small for detainees to read easily.

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.30** Staff had completed equality and diversity refresher training within the previous year. The centre had an external access ramp and two accessible toilets but only one of these had an alarm installed within. Staff were aware of the need to open a care plan for all detainees with a disability.
- I.31** Professional telephone interpreting had been used 122 times in the previous three months and staff were clearly comfortable using the service. We saw this being used in the reception

area to book in a detainee, and also in an interview room, to confirm release details to a detainee who was being temporarily admitted to the country.

- I.32** The facility had a designated prayer room, which was accessible to detainees 24 hours a day to enable them to practise their religion, but the room was poorly ventilated. It was equipped with religious texts and prayer mats, and the direction of Mecca was indicated on the ceiling. A rota for a visiting chaplaincy service, which provided for most mainstream religions, was displayed on the wall and a chaplain visited the centre during the inspection. Contact details for a local Imam were available and he visited when requested.

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.33** Detainees could complain formally in writing. Complaints forms in English and other languages were available. Detainees could deposit complaints in one of three secure complaints boxes. A Tascor detainee operations manager emptied the boxes each day.

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.34** Overall, catering arrangements were adequate. Detainees had free access to the dining room, 24 hours a day. All food and drink had to be consumed in the dining room and could not be taken to other parts of the facility. The dining room contained a television, DVD player and four fixed tables, each with four seats attached. If the facility was operating at full occupancy, detainees ate in two shifts as there was not enough space for them all to eat at the same time.
- I.35** Biscuits, porridge, cereal, fruit, and hot and cold drinks were freely available and a variety of frozen ready meals, including vegan, halal and kosher, which were cooked in an oven, were provided at regular mealtimes. A menu card containing the names of meals had been translated into a range of languages, and staff maintained a record of if and when detainees ate. Staff told us that they would provide meals for detainees arriving outside mealtimes, and that they would buy items from a nearby supermarket if needed. The food storage and preparation areas were clean and well stocked. The hot meal we tasted was reasonably good.
- I.36** Detainees were able to buy a limited amount of confectionery and soft drinks from the facility shop.

Activities

Expected outcomes:

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

- I.37** There were sufficient activities to occupy detainees held for short periods, including newspapers, magazines and books, although most were in English. A television, games console, two computers, board games and a selection of jigsaws were also available in the association room. Detainees could access the internet and web-based email accounts but Skype and social networking sites were blocked, which was a disproportionate measure.
- I.38** The small, cage-like exercise yard was kept locked, preventing free access by detainees. Detainees were told during booking-in that they could only use this area when staff were available and that they were only allowed to smoke in it at set times throughout the day as it was overlooked by neighbouring offices.

Recommendations

- I.39** **Detainees should be permitted access to legitimate websites and email, including Skype and social networking sites, subject to risk assessment.** (Repeated recommendation I.57)
- I.40** **Detainees should have free access to the exercise yard.**

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.41** During the inspection, one detainee left the centre on temporary admission. He was released with reporting conditions to stay at an address in London and report to Beckett House. With the assistance of the telephone interpreting service (see paragraph I.31), DCOs patiently advised the detainee of his release conditions and explained his travel arrangements to London. He was given a large amount of money to buy a train ticket to Belfast and then a coach ticket to travel onwards via the ferry. Staff told us that they had to give detainees cash as they did not have access to travel warrants. This increased the chances of detainees purchasing the incorrect ticket as some had a poor command of English. Before departure, the detainee was seen by the nurse, given a rub-down search and had his personal belongings returned to him. A member of staff accompanied him to the nearby train station to ensure that he did not get lost, and to help him buy the train ticket. Staff made good efforts to prepare vulnerable detainees for their release (see section on safeguarding (protection of adults at risk)).
- I.42** Staff told us that detainees were not routinely handcuffed when boarding the ferry to Scotland en route to Dungavel IRC.
- I.43** Detainees were allowed personal and legal visits, conducted in the two interview rooms. These were booked in 30-minute slots between 2pm and 9pm daily, although staff told us that this arrangement would be flexible if a family member had travelled a long distance to get to the centre and arrived outside this period. Visitors could bring medication and property into the centre for detainees, up to a maximum weight of 22kg. Detainees were able to advise family, friends and legal representatives of their transfer by telephone. Information cards with the address and telephone number of IRCs were available for detainees transferring to further detention.
- I.44** A group of volunteers, known as the Larne House visiting group, visited detainees in the centre on an *ad hoc* basis to provide additional support and advice. Posters advertising this service were displayed throughout the centre.

Recommendation

- I.45 Detainee custody officers should issue travel warrants, rather than cash, to detainees being released from detention.**

Section 2. Recommendations and housekeeping points

Recommendations To the Home Office and facility contractor

Bullying and personal safety

- 2.1 Men and women should be held separately. (1.14, repeated recommendation 1.13)

Use of force

- 2.2 The separation cell should be formally taken out of commission until appropriate governance is in place. (1.23)

Preparation for removal and release

- 2.3 Detainee custody officers should issue travel warrants, rather than cash, to detainees being released from detention. (1.45)

Recommendations To the Home Office

Activities

- 2.4 Detainees should be permitted access to legitimate websites and email, including Skype and social networking sites, subject to risk assessment. (1.39, repeated recommendation 1.57)

Recommendations To the facility contractor

Arrival

- 2.5 Reception interviews and medical consultations should be conducted in private. (1.9)
- 2.6 Detainee custody officers should ascertain detainees' mood on arrival and assess any risks. (1.10)
- 2.7 Detainees' clothing and toiletries should not be removed unless an individualised risk assessment indicates otherwise. (1.11, repeated recommendation 1.9)

Bullying and personal safety

- 2.8 Onsite managers should be able to retrieve and review closed-circuit television footage easily. (1.15)

Casework

- 2.9** Detainees should be issued with and allowed to keep the reason for detention (IS91R) document in a language they can understand. (1.26)

Activities

- 2.10** Detainees should have free access to the exercise yard. (1.40)

Section 3. Appendices

Appendix I: Inspection team

Colin Carroll
Fiona Shearlaw
Dr Ian Cameron

Inspector
Inspector
Criminal Justice Inspection Northern Ireland

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

Reception interviews should be conducted in private. (1.8)

Not achieved

Detainees' clothing and toiletries should not be removed unless an individualised risk assessment indicates otherwise. (1.9)

Not achieved (Recommendation repeated 1.11)

All new detainees should have an overnight welfare check during their first night in the centre. (1.10)

Achieved

Men and women should be held separately. (1.13)

Not achieved (Recommendation repeated 1.14)

All detainees should be able to lock their bedrooms from the inside, with a locking mechanism that allows staff to enter rooms in an emergency. (1.14)

Achieved

All staff should be trained in ACDT processes. Sufficient staff should be trained to act as case managers. (1.20)

Achieved

Tascor should develop local safeguarding processes with the Department of Health, Social Services and Public Safety and the Local Safeguarding Adult Partnership. (1.22)

Not achieved

The segregation cell should be formally taken out of commission given the absence of guidance on its use or obvious need for it. (1.27)

Not achieved

Detainees should only be interviewed on chairs bolted to the floor after an individual risk assessment. (1.32)

Achieved

Detainees should not be held in residential short-term holding facilities for longer than the published maximum periods. (1.36)

Achieved

Respect

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

Recommendations

Bedrooms should be equipped with lockable cupboards. (I.41)

Achieved

Couples should be able to share a room. (I.42)

Achieved

A Muslim chaplain should be available to provide services to detainees. (I.48)

Achieved

Complaint investigations should focus on establishing facts and addressing pertinent issues raised by the complainant. (I.51)

Achieved

Activities

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

Recommendations

Books and newspapers should be available in a range of languages, and detainees should have free access to the exercise yard. (I.56)

Partially achieved

Detainees should be permitted access to legitimate websites and email, including Skype and social networking sites, subject to risk assessment. (I.57)

Partially achieved (recommendation repeated, I.39)

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

Handcuffs should only be applied during transfer if justified by an individual risk assessment. (I.61)

Achieved

Appendix III: Photograph



Dining room at Larne House