

Fact page

Task of the establishment

The detention, care and welfare of adult male detainees subject to immigration control.

Location

Gatwick Airport

Name of contractor

G4S

Number held

421 on 29 May 2013

Certified normal accommodation

448

Operational capacity

448

Last inspection

12 – 23 September 2011

Brief history

Brook House opened in March 2009 and is a purpose-built immigration removal centre with a prison design. It holds a mix of detainees, including a number who are regarded as more challenging or difficult to manage within less secure centres and those waiting to be removed en masse from the UK on organised charter flights. Operational capacity was increased by 22 bed spaces on 12 April 2013; all are certified as normal accommodation and are predominantly used as pre-departure accommodation.

Name of centre manager

Ben Saunders

Escort provider

Tascor

Short description of residential units

The centre has four wings, one of which is for enhanced detainees. Three wings have three landings and the fourth, the induction wing, has two landings. The ground floor of the induction wing is used as pre-departure accommodation and removal from association/ temporary confinement.

Health service provider

G4S

Learning and skills provider

G4S

Independent Monitoring Board chair

Mrs Bobbie Fairclough

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 include a summary of an establishment's performance against the model of a healthy establishment. The four criteria of a healthy establishment 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. |

Under each test, we make an assessment of outcomes for detainees and therefore of the establishment's overall performance against the test. In some cases, this performance will be affected by matters outside the establishment's direct control, which need to be addressed by the Home Office.

- **outcomes for detainees are good against this healthy establishment test.**
There is no evidence that outcomes for detainees are being adversely affected in any significant areas.
- **outcomes for detainees are reasonably good against this healthy establishment test.**
There is evidence of adverse outcomes for detainees in only a small number of areas. For the majority, there are no significant concerns. Procedures to safeguard outcomes are in place.
- **outcomes for detainees are not sufficiently good against this healthy establishment test.**
There is evidence that outcomes for detainees are being adversely affected in many areas or particularly in those areas of greatest importance to the well-being of detainees. Problems/concerns, if left unattended, are likely to become areas of serious concern.
- **outcomes for detainees are poor against this healthy establishment test.**
There is evidence that the outcomes for detainees are seriously affected by current

improved environment. Detainees usually spent little more than a night there, and a complex mix of people was managed appropriately, although detainees received a limited regime.

- S7 In our survey, few detainees said they felt unsafe, and the level of victimisation and intimidation was reducing and lower than in comparable IRCs. Consultation with detainees about safety was good and included a recently introduced monthly questionnaire. Individual bullying incidents were investigated promptly and thoroughly, but there was some evidence of under-reporting of victimisation. The reasons for bullying and victimisation were not routinely collated and data were not discussed thoroughly enough by the safer community meeting to identify potential trends or inform the strategy.
- S8 There was considerable frustration and despair in the centre, and this was reflected in the high number of self-harm incidents and self-harm case management documents (ACDTs – assessment, care in detention and teamwork). Case management was largely effective but triggers, care maps and daily entries were not comprehensive. Constant supervision was used regularly and appropriately for detainees in crisis, but there was little evidence of staff interaction with or constructive activities for such detainees. There was no care suite and the constant watch cells were still in use. The new detainee-led befriender scheme was promising.
- S9 An adult safeguarding strategy had been developed and training was planned for detainee custody managers. There was a detailed children's safeguarding policy. Detainees whose age was disputed were carefully risk assessed and promptly transferred to more appropriate facilities at Tinsley House. Social services were sometimes slow to respond, with delays of up to five days. Two of the four detainees whose age had been disputed in the previous year had been found by social services to be children.
- S10 In our survey, fewer detainees than in other centres said that they had a lawyer or that they received a visit from their lawyer. The legal advice surgeries were unable to meet demand, and some detainees were unable to seek legal advice before they were removed. The library contained up-to-date country of origin reports but electronic copies and some legal websites were blocked.
- S11 The average length of stay at the centre had reduced to 28 days, but some detainees were still held for unreasonable periods: 23 had been held for more than a year, and the longest detention was for more than three years. The on-site Home Office contact management team was under-resourced. Many detainees had not received induction interviews or monthly progress reports. Induction interviews that we observed were brief and superficial. This lack of information exacerbated detainees' frustration and confusion. The quality of rule 35² reports had improved. They were written by a doctor, typed and contained body maps. Some contained clear diagnostic findings and had led to release. Detainees did not always receive copies of their bail summaries before hearings.

Respect

- S12 *Despite efforts to soften the environment, the centre continued to look and feel like a prison. Staff-detainee relationships were good. Only 18% of detainees thought that the standard of food was good or very good and the cultural kitchen was underused. Diversity outcomes were reasonable for most detainees but a strategic approach to long-term outcomes was lacking. Faith provision was*

² Detention Centre Rule 35 requires medical practitioners to report on detainees whose health is likely to be injuriously affected by detention as a result of a special illness or experience of torture.

*good. Complaints were generally well managed but detainees were asked to withdraw complaints that had been resolved, which was inappropriate. Health care services had improved and were good. **Outcomes for detainees against this healthy establishment test were reasonably good.***

- S13 *At the last inspection in 2011, we found that outcomes for detainees in Brook House were reasonably good against this healthy establishment test. We made 43 recommendations about respect. At this follow-up inspection we found that 18 of the recommendations had been achieved, seven had been partially achieved, 17 had not been achieved and one was no longer relevant.*
- S14 The centre continued to look and feel like a prison, although some redecoration had taken place. Ventilation in the sealed environment remained a major concern for detainees. External and internal communal areas were clean, well decorated and free of graffiti. Many rooms were dirty and in need of redecoration. Toilets and showers did not afford complete privacy. Access to showers, cleaning materials and bedding was good, but detainees found it difficult to retrieve stored property and clothing.
- S15 In our survey, about three-quarters of detainees said they were treated with respect by most staff, and we saw and heard generally good staff-detainee interactions. Although staff were responsive to detainee requests, they did not have routine support from a care officer or welfare. There were no regular centre-run group meetings, using interpreters where necessary, to inform detainees of relevant issues and keep staff abreast of detainee concerns.
- S16 Diversity outcomes were reasonable; some staff, including the newly appointed diversity manager, were active in this area and support was provided by diversity orderlies. However, there was a lack of strategic planning to sustain and improve outcomes. While some useful information was collated, monitoring and analysis of trends were underdeveloped. There was a clear assessment and support procedure for older and disabled detainees, but no provision for young adults. Disability was under-identified and there were no paid carer roles for detainees needing support. Detainee custody officer initial training courses included a good diversity component and there were annual diversity refresher courses. There were no forums for detainees with protected characteristics. Professional interpretation was used, but we saw several examples of it not being used when needed.
- S17 Most detainees said that their religious beliefs were respected. Access to faith leaders was good and the chaplaincy was well integrated in the centre. The mosque was too small for the population.
- S18 Replies to complaints were legible, polite and constructive, but some investigations took too long given the short stay of most detainees. Some detainees were inappropriately asked to formally withdraw complaints once they were resolved. Trends were monitored through a monthly report. There was a useful procedure for the speedy informal resolution of complaints, but it was underused.
- S19 In our survey, only 18% of detainees said the food was good against the comparator of 28% and 28% at the previous inspection. Consultation had improved with the introduction of a food forum and surveys, and we saw evidence of changes being made as a result. The cultural kitchen was small and underused. The shop sold a wide range of goods.
- S20 Improvement in health care provision was reflected in our survey and the largely positive comments of detainees. Access to the health care centre was good and there was a wide range of nurse-led clinics with short waiting times. Most medicines were held in possession and pharmacy services were well organised following recent improvements. There was no waiting list for the dentist and detainees requiring treatment were seen at an outside clinic. Access to mental health services had improved with additional mental health nurses now

available based on a needs analysis. Recent transfers to secure mental health units had been prompt. All custody officers attended a rolling programme of mental health awareness training, but there were no professional counsellors.

Activities

- S21 There was an appropriate range of recreational activity and more detainees than at the last inspection said they could fill their time while at the centre. Education provision was limited and required improvement. There was an adequate range of work for the population. PE provision was good. The library was small but well stocked and accessible. **Outcomes for detainees against this healthy establishment test were reasonably good.***
- S22 At the last inspection in 2011, we found that outcomes for detainees in Brook House were not sufficiently good against this healthy establishment test. We made 17 recommendations about activities. At this follow-up inspection we found that eight of the recommendations had been achieved, three had been partially achieved and six had not been achieved.*
- S23 Detainees were out of their rooms for between 11.5 and 13 hours a day, but they were all locked up by 9pm. This was too early and it was unclear why detainees needed to be locked in their rooms at all. In our survey, 50% of detainees said that they had enough to do to fill their time compared with 33% at the previous inspection. About a third of the population was involved in work or education. There were good recreational activities, including competitions, access to IT and well delivered arts and craft and music sessions. There was limited learning and skills provision for longer-stay detainees. There was an over-reliance on the promotion of activities among detainees by word of mouth. Quality assurance arrangements were underdeveloped.
- S24 Participation in education had improved but was still low. Evening classes were available but at the expense of classes run during the day. Attendance was low and punctuality poor. There was a limited range of education. In particular, there were only beginners' English classes and there was no ESOL (English for speakers of other languages) provision. Detainees in the care and separation unit could not undertake education or work. Only basic food hygiene and food safety qualifications were offered through Aramark.
- S25 There were 86 work places, about a third more than the previous inspection. Detainees could earn a reasonable amount each week and waiting lists were short. However, work was inappropriately limited to enhanced detainees and a few detainees were barred from work for non-compliance with the Home Office.
- S26 The library was small but reasonably well stocked and accessible for 12 hours every day, including weekends. Books were also available on B wing and in reception, and suitable arrangements were made for detainees on E wing to use the library. An improved range of newspapers was available in a variety of languages.
- S27 There was a reasonable range of gym equipment and the fitness suite on B wing was used effectively to deliver induction to PE. There was no sports hall or dedicated outdoor sports area. Participation was monitored by group and wing. There was appropriate communication between health care and PE staff before detainees participated.

- I.48** There was a comprehensive policy on how children would be safeguarded, although it was in need of some minor updating.
- I.49** The manager responsible for safeguarding children met Gatwick Children's Services each quarter and a memorandum of understanding underpinned what social workers confirmed was a positive relationship. A Home Office regional manager attended the West Sussex Local Safeguarding Children Board. Notices around the centre reminded staff of their duty to safeguard and promote the welfare of children. The safeguarding children manager delivered comprehensive safeguarding training to all staff and some staff also took the NSPCC 'Child protection: staying aware' course.
- I.50** There had been four age disputes during the previous year; two of the detainees had been found to be minors by social services. Individual care plans were implemented promptly. Age dispute detainees were no longer held in the separation unit but transferred to the more appropriate family unit at Tinsley House (see HMIP's 2012 Tinsley House report). Social workers from Gatwick Children's Services were sometimes slow to attend and in one case they attended five days after the referral had been made.
- I.51** Visits staff held a list with photographs of detainees who were a risk to women and children. They monitored these detainees carefully and ensured that they sat away from children during visits. However, one detainee who had served a sentence for sexually assaulting a 14-year old girl and was identified as a risk to women and children, was not on the list. The risk was not recorded on his person escort record or the authority to detain (IS91).

Recommendation

- I.52** **Staff should be aware of detainees who are a risk to women or children and monitor them during visits. Risks to women and children should be documented on the detainee's person escort record and authority to detain (IS91).**

Housekeeping point

- I.53** The safeguarding children policy should be up to date.

Security

Expected outcomes:

Detainees feel secure in an unoppressive environment.

- I.54** *Some security procedures were disproportionate. Dynamic security arrangements were good.*

- I.55** Some security procedures were disproportionate for the population. There was restricted movement on and off wings. Detainees were unnecessarily locked up each day for two 30-minute roll checks and were routinely handcuffed on escort to external appointments, regardless of their risk assessment. Detainees and their visitors could embrace at the beginning and end of a visit but were not allowed to sit next to each other during the visit. This was based on the perceived increased opportunity to pass drugs, but was an intrusive over-reaction. There was little evidence of ongoing drug supply problems in the centre. The number of ex-prisoners had dropped dramatically since the previous inspection from 33% to

Section 2. Respect

Residential units

Expected outcomes:

Detainees live in a safe, clean and decent environment. Detainees are aware of the rules, routines and facilities of the unit.

- 2.1** *Communal areas were clean but some rooms required decorating. The general environment was prison like. Toilet and shower screening was inadequate. Access to cleaning materials and bedding was good but less so for clothes and property. Consultation arrangements were good.*
- 2.2** External and internal communal areas were clean, well maintained and free of graffiti. The wings had the appearance of a prison and were noisy. Little had been done since our last inspection to soften the harsh appearance or reduce noise levels, although there were plans to pilot the installation of art work and soft furnishings on A wing. Detainees said that ventilation in their rooms was a problem. Sealed window units in rooms made them feel stuffy. Detainees had access to small exercise yards but, with the exception of D wing, there was nowhere for them to sit.
- 2.3** Bedrooms were spacious but many were dirty and required decorating. A sheet was used to screen the toilet entrance which afforded little privacy. Many toilets were heavily scaled and required deep cleaning. Detainees had free access to hot water boilers in the residential corridors. Access to showers was good and most were clean, but shower cubicles still lacked privacy. Detainees could easily obtain cleaning materials.
- 2.4** There was good access to laundry facilities and weekly freshly laundered bedding. The centre had recently run out of clothing for detainees who had few or no clothes, but we were assured that steps had been taken to rectify this.
- 2.5** In our survey, 45% of detainees said it was easy to access stored property against the comparator of 52%. Detainees had to book one of the five 10-minute slots per wing each day to retrieve stored property which meant that some detainees with several property bags had to wait a number of days.
- 2.6** Detainees were given rules and information about the centre on arrival. These had been translated into 15 languages.
- 2.7** Monthly detainee consultation meetings generated positive changes to the regime. The centre conducted monthly questionnaires with a random sample of detainees to identify trends and take remedial action when required.

Recommendations

- 2.8 Plans to soften the environment should be implemented across the centre.**
- 2.9 Rooms should be decorated and adequately ventilated.**
- 2.10 Showers and toilets should be adequately screened for privacy and toilets should be deep cleaned.**

Recommendations

- 3.6** The volume and range of education provision should significantly increase, and its structure and planning should meet the needs of all detainees. (Repeated main recommendation HE.49)
- 3.7** A comprehensive needs analysis should be carried out to determine the needs of all detainees and plan to meet those needs.
- 3.8** Detainees on E wing and in the care and separation unit should be able to access a programme of activities.
- 3.9** Detainees should not be locked into cells and should be allowed free movement around the centre until later in the evening.

Housekeeping point

- 3.10** Education should be discussed routinely at the activity steering group meetings.

Learning and skills

- 3.11** The structure of education had been affected adversely by changes in the detainee population and short stays of about 28 days, together with changes in management and long-term absences of teaching staff. In our survey, 16% of detainees said that they were taking part in education, more than the 6% at the previous inspection but less than the comparator of 24%. The range of education programmes was narrow, attendance was low and punctuality was often poor, but of those attending 92% in our survey said the education was helpful. A comprehensive needs analysis had not been carried out and there were no formal targets for participation, attendance and punctuality.
- 3.12** Education provision included English assessments, classroom study for beginners English and one session each of English vocabulary, English grammar and English conversation. One afternoon session was devoted to other languages. There were not enough opportunities to reinforce and consolidate learning. Information and communications technology and access to email facilities throughout the centre were good.
- 3.13** Staff were available in computer rooms to support detainees and monitor access, but the rooms were seldom fully occupied. Better use was made of computers on the residential units and in the library. The arts and crafts programme had been significantly enhanced and provided a variety of arts, crafts and cultural baking. Several detainees had received Koestler awards for their inspirational creative work.
- 3.14** Lifestyle programmes, such as preparing CVs and resettlement, had been introduced very recently and were not fully developed. Cultural discussion groups were offered in the evenings but were poorly attended. Music sessions led by the chaplaincy were well supported and provided detainees with the opportunity to express and share their cultural experiences in music.
- 3.15** There were no opportunities for longer-stay detainees to progress to higher level programmes or gain higher level qualifications. None of the education programmes was accredited to national standards. Some internal certificates were awarded but many detainees left the centre with no recognition or record of their educational progress or achievements.

- 5.27** The safer community group should analyse data, identify trends and oversee the implementation of a comprehensive action plan. (1.30)

Self-harm and suicide prevention

- 5.28** Detainees subject to constant supervision should be able to move around the centre and participate in constructive activities. (1.41)
- 5.29** ACDTs should identify specific triggers, and care maps and daily entries should reflect interactions with detainees in crisis. Post-closure reviews should be consistently completed and recorded. (1.43)

Safeguarding (protection of adults at risk)

- 5.30** Formal arrangements for safeguarding adults should be developed in partnership with the local authority. (1.46)

Security

- 5.31** All security procedures should be proportionate to a detainee population. (1.59)

Rewards scheme

- 5.32** The rewards scheme should not involve an enhanced wing or a prison-style three-tier incentives and earned privileges system. (1.62)

The use of force and single separation

- 5.33** Accommodation in the separation unit should be fully furnished, toilets should be cleaned regularly and the shower should afford privacy. (1.72)
- 5.34** The regime in the separation unit should be developed and should include purposeful activity. (1.73)
- 5.35** Detainees in the pre-departure unit should be allowed off the unit subject to risk assessment. (1.75)

Residential units

- 5.36** Plans to soften the environment should be implemented across the centre. (2.8)
- 5.37** Rooms should be decorated and adequately ventilated. (2.9)
- 5.38** Showers and toilets should be adequately screened for privacy and toilets should be deep cleaned. (2.10)
- 5.39** Detainees should be able to retrieve clothes and stored property easily. (2.11)

Staff-detainee relationships

- 5.40** Weekly group meetings should be held, with the help of interpreters where necessary, to enhance communication with detainees, especially those who speak little English. The