



Report on an inspection visit to police custody suites in Southwark Basic Command Unit

21 – 22 April 2008

by

HM Inspectorate of Prisons and

HM Inspectorate of Constabulary

Crown copyright 2008

Printed and published by:

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

Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary
Ground Floor, Ashley House
Monck Street
London SW1P 2BQ
England

Contents

1. Introduction	5
2. Background and key findings	7
3. Strategy	11
4. Treatment and conditions	
Peckham custody suite	15
Walworth Road custody suite	20
Southwark custody suite	25
5. Individual rights	
Peckham custody suite	31
Walworth Road custody suite	36
Southwark custody suite	41
6. Healthcare	47
7. Summary of recommendations	53

Appendices

I Inspection team	59
II Prisoner survey methodology	60

1. Introduction

This is the first in a published series of reports of inspections of police custody suites carried out by both of our inspectorates. This is a key part of the joint work programme for criminal justice inspectorates, agreed with Ministers. It arises from the UK's international obligation to ensure regular and independent inspection of all places of detention.¹ The inspections look not only at the implementation of statutory requirements, but also at the conditions of detention and the treatment of detainees.

Southwark Basic Command Unit contains three custody suites. Two, at Peckham and Walworth Road, are busy metropolitan facilities, holding a mixture of adults, juveniles and immigration detainees. The third, at Southwark, is reserved almost exclusively for immigration detainees, who may spend up to seven days there.

We found that the requirements in the Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984 codes were rigorously and consistently applied in all these suites. Procedures existed to mitigate any risks that detainees might harm themselves. In addition, there was extremely good support for substance misusers provided by the borough's arrest referral team. All detainees were held in single cells, provided with appropriate food, and treated professionally and with courtesy. We received no complaints about improper treatment from the detainees, from previous detainees or from the solicitors and families we contacted.

However, there were also some negative findings, which we believe are associated in part with the disbanding of specialist custody teams, and a consequent lack of ownership of facilities and custodial practice. All the suites had dirty cells and inadequately cleaned showers; there was limited access to showers and toilet paper; and all staff did not carry ligature knives and none routinely carried keys. This problem was acute at Southwark, a suite run entirely on overtime and which, in spite of an earlier extremely critical internal report, was still unfit for use, being both unhygienic and unsafe.

Other issues that we raise that require management attention within the borough include: the consequence of long 12-hour shifts, with no handover period; the need to develop specific procedures for juveniles; the lack of opportunity for confidential conversation about potentially sensitive information; and the need for more proactive work and training on self-harm.

In relation to healthcare, the service provided was adequate. However, there was no audit of the service provision, no clinical governance and poor clinical record-keeping. It was of particular concern that the FME rooms were unhygienic to the point of being inappropriate for the collection of forensic samples.

This inspection also raises issues for the UK Border Agency (UKBA), which contracts with the Metropolitan Police to provide short-term holding facilities for immigration detainees. The UKBA was insufficiently diligent in ensuring that immigration detainees in general were detained for the shortest possible period in facilities that are clearly not designed for lengthy detention, or that they were provided with information on access to legal advice. Southwark is contracted for the exclusive use of the UKBA, yet there was no oversight to ensure that this expenditure had resulted in decent, safe and acceptable conditions.

¹ Now required under the Optional Protocol to the United Nations Convention on the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman and Degrading Treatment

Our two inspectorates have found this to be a very productive joint venture, which has raised some important issues as well as confirming the generally sound approach of custody staff in very busy and pressurised environments. We believe that it will be of assistance to the Borough Commander and the Metropolitan Police's Custody Directorate in driving forward best practice.

Anne Owers
HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

Sir Ronnie Flanagan
HM Chief Inspector of Constabulary

June 2008

2. Background and key findings

- 2.1 HM Inspectorates of Prisons and Constabulary have begun a programme of joint inspections of police custody suites, as part of the UK's international obligation to ensure regular independent inspection of places of detention. These inspections do not look only at the implementation of the Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984 (PACE) codes. They are also informed by *Expectations* about the appropriate treatment of detainees and conditions of detention, which have been developed by the two inspectorates to assist best custodial practice.
- 2.2 The Metropolitan Police Service has 76 custody suites designated under PACE for the reception of detainees. Twenty-three are 'overflow custody suites', used for various operational matters such as charging centres for football matches or immigration detention. The remaining custody suites operate 24 hours a day and deal with detainees arrested as a result of mainstream policing.
- 2.3 This inspection was conducted in the three custody suites in the London Borough of Southwark. Inspectors examined force-wide and borough custody strategies, as well as treatment and conditions, individual rights and healthcare in each suite. A survey of prisoners at HMP Brixton who had formerly been detained in the Peckham or Walworth Road custody suites was conducted by HM Inspectorate of Prisons researchers to obtain additional evidence (see appendix II).
- 2.4 The custody suites were generally open 24 hours a day. Walworth Road was the busiest station and, like Peckham, held a mix of adults, juveniles and immigration detainees. At the time of inspection, figures for Walworth Road were not available. However, Peckham had received nearly 1,300 detainees in the previous two months, an average of 22 each day. This included 264 juveniles and approximately 76 immigration detainees. The number of immigration detainees held at both Peckham and Walworth Road was higher than normal during the inspection because Southwark was temporarily closed for fire safety work.
- 2.5 The custody suite at Southwark was unusual. Since 2004, it had been used almost exclusively as a short-term holding facility for the detention of Immigration Act detainees, funded by the UK Border Agency (UKBA). The suite contained 13 cells and had held 182 immigration detainees in the previous three months. Many were transferred from other police stations or the local UKBA reporting centre at Becket House and were usually held for a few days. The suite was occasionally used by police for special operations; for example, it had recently been used as a charging centre during a football match.

Strategic overview

- 2.6 The Metropolitan Police's Custody Directorate has an internal inspection function, but the mechanism for following up and ensuring compliance with these inspections was ineffective. A critical and accurate report on the Southwark police custody suite written in January 2008 had had no apparent effect and there was no visible evidence that it had been actioned. Responsibility for day-to-day management of custody suites and delivery of services had been devolved to boroughs. Responsibility and accountability therefore rested with the Borough Commander, who was a chief superintendent. Some custody staff had received nationally approved custody training, but others had not. There were no longer any permanent custody teams and this appeared to have had a detrimental effect on the level of ownership of the work

in the custody suites. This applied particularly to Southwark, which had no permanent staff or effective local management. Custody officers were organised and professional in their approach, but some complained that the recently introduced shift pattern did not allow time for a handover between the 12-hour shifts, between 6am and 6pm. Many found the 12-hour shift in a busy custody suite too long. Independent custody visitors visited the custody suites regularly, but there was no protocol governing their access to the National Strategy for Police Information Systems custody system. There was no evidence of UKBA oversight of the custody suite used for immigration detainees.

Peckham

Treatment and conditions

- 2.7 No detainees had to share cells and all cell bells tested worked. Cells were in a poor condition, dirty and with some graffiti. They had not been decorated for many years. There was a good stock of clothes, but paper suits were used for convenience rather than to protect evidence. There was no clear policy on the use of paper suits and it was unnecessary to subject detainees to such undignified clothing. As in other stations, sweatshirts and jogging bottoms were thrown away after use rather than washed and re-used. There was confusion among staff over the provision of toilet paper, so some cells had some while others did not. Detainees waiting to be dealt with sometimes sat on chairs in the yard, which regularly had bird droppings falling on them. Not all staff carried ligature knives and keys, limiting their ability to respond in an emergency.

Individual rights

- 2.8 Staff followed the requirements of PACE rigorously and consistently. Personal information about detainees was discussed openly, without respect for confidentiality. Telephones could not be used in private. Interpreters were easily accessible and used regularly. Rights and entitlements books were issued in 48 languages. Staff had not had specific training in the supervision of juveniles or immigration detainees. The latter were often held for up to five days without clear advice from the immigration authorities about what was happening to them.

Walworth Road

Treatment and conditions

- 2.9 No detainees had to share cells and all cell bells tested worked. The cells and walls were dirty, as were the toilets. Graffiti was commonplace. Some detainees complained that cells were either too hot or too cold. There was a limited stock of clothes and, as at Peckham, paper suits were used inappropriately. One detainee at risk of self-harm was on constant watch, but we did not see staff interacting with him and it was unclear whether officers were adequately briefed on the best way to manage such detainees. Not all staff carried ligature knives and keys, limiting their ability to respond in an emergency. Walworth Road had the same number of staff as Peckham despite being a much busier suite.

Individual rights

- 2.10 Staff followed the requirements of PACE rigorously and consistently. The custody suite was busy and chaotic and staff had little opportunity for breaks during their 12-hour shifts. Personal information about detainees was discussed openly, without respect for confidentiality. Telephones could not be used in private. The suite held a number of juveniles, but there was little evidence that staff were aware of the heightened impact of detention on young people. Interpreters were easily accessible and used regularly. Rights and entitlements books were issued in 48 languages. Fingerprints ('Livescan') were done immediately when detainees were booked in, which was good practice.

Southwark

Treatment and conditions

- 2.11 No detainees had to share cells and all cell bells tested worked. However, little had changed to improve the environment since a highly critical Custody Directorate report in January 2008. Conditions in the cells were squalid and lacked decency. There was hair and pubic hair on mattress plinths and congealed blood and human waste on some walls. Cells were fitted with safer custody doors, but some cell viewing holes were covered up. Not all staff who provided cover for Southwark carried ligature knives and cell keys, limiting their ability to respond in an emergency. There were ligature points in some cells. Stores and cupboards were disorganised and contained a few clean clothes packed in with foodstuffs and dirty blankets. We found a file with medication and some money that had not been passed on or returned to detainees. The one shower was dirty and unpleasant. There was a reasonable selection of food for detainees.

Individual rights

- 2.12 Southwark operated as an immigration short-term holding facility, which could hold immigration detainees for a maximum of seven days. From 26 recent custody records sampled, the average stay was four days. Five detainees had been held for more than five days and one for seven days. Due to the length of stay, the regime included periods of free association, fresh air and visits. Visits were allowed every afternoon and there was daily association. There was little information about legal advice on immigration. The UKBA did not actively seek to minimise periods of detention and custody staff did not pursue this with them even in cases of relatively lengthy detention. There was limited access to telephones and no payphone. Rubbish bags in the custody suite were full of unshredded confidential documents.

Healthcare

- 2.13 Detainees appeared to receive reasonable health services. However, service provision was not audited and it was therefore impossible to establish whether the contracted medical services were actually provided. Clinical governance arrangements were poor and health service providers lacked awareness of the Caldicott principles governing patient confidentiality. Clinical record-keeping was poor, with evidence of non-contemporaneous notes. Custody sergeants did not keep a log of why people were sent out to hospital. At Southwark, we found a medical letter in an immigration file that had not travelled with a departing detainee.

- 2.14 Mental health services were provided by Southwark social services and included an appropriate adult scheme. Appropriate adults often had to wait for long periods before they could access detainees because of difficulties in gaining admission to the police station. There were some links with the mental health trust, but not all doctors were approved under section 12 of the Mental Health Act 1983². Although we were assured that section 136 detainees were not routinely taken to police stations, there were no logs of people brought to the stations under section 136 of the Mental Health Act 1983³. There was no mental health awareness training for custody officers.
- 2.15 Forensic medical examination facilities at each station were unfit for purpose. The physical conditions were unhygienic and an inappropriate environment for collecting forensic samples. The FME room at Southwark contained layers of dust, tablet packets were strewn around and two packs of DNA, which should have been frozen, were kept in a fridge mixed with foodstuffs.
- 2.16 Medicines management was poor. At Peckham, a large amount of medication, much of it out of date, was held in the general stock cupboard. There were no locked cupboards for controlled drugs.
- 2.17 There was good support for detainees who misused drugs or alcohol. The arrest referral team spoke to all detainees individually to establish any substance use needs. The team had strong links with local prisons and followed up detainees in the community.

² Doctors approved under Section 12 of the Mental Health Act 1983 have particular experience in the diagnosis or treatment of mental disorder.

³ Section 136 of the Mental Health Act 1983 enables a police officer to remove someone from a public place and take them to a 'place of safety' for a mental health assessment.

3. Strategy

- 3.1 The Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) has a Custody Directorate within the Territorial Policing team led by a commander, with day-to-day management by a detective superintendent. Custody Directorate staff conducted internal inspections, but there was no formal mechanism for following up and ensuring compliance. Not all of the custody staff we spoke to had received nationally approved custody training. The lack of a permanent custody team appeared to have had a detrimental effect on the level of ownership of work in the custody suites. There was no evidence of UK Border Agency (UKBA) oversight of the Southwark custody suite used for immigration detainees.

Expectation

- 3.2 There is a policy focus on custody issues at a chief officer level that is concerned with developing and maintaining the custody estate, staffing custody suites with trained staff, managing the risks of custody, meeting the health and wellbeing needs of detainees and working effectively with colleagues in the health service, immigration service, youth offending service, criminal justice teams, Crown Prosecution Service (CPS), courts and other law enforcement agencies.

Findings

- 3.3 The commander was the chief officer lead on custody for the MPS. The Custody Directorate had an inspection function: one police inspector and one health and safety officer had individual responsibilities for audit and inspection, health and safety and the implementation of 'guidance on the safer detention and handling of persons in police custody'.
- 3.4 The Custody Directorate provided standard operating procedures (SOPs) for custody suites in each London borough, which supported MPS custody policy. These covered police custody, use of closed-circuit television and guidance to custody staff on the supervision of detainees. The SOPs were designed to assist boroughs to deliver consistent levels of service, although responsibility and accountability had been delegated to borough commanders.
- 3.5 There were national policies with partner organisations in the criminal justice system, which allowed for services tailored to local need. However, the CPS was not always able to meet police needs for charging advice, which had led to unnecessary re-bailing of suspects and subsequent pressure in custody suites.
- 3.6 Immigration detainees could be held in police custody for five days, or for seven days if removal directions were set within this time. All three custody suites had held immigration detainees for a period of days, but Southwark was a dedicated centre for immigration detainees. Custody staff were not given enough guidance on liaison with the UKBA to ensure that detainees spent the minimum possible time in custody.
- 3.7 The MPS's single point of contact for immigration matters and the UKBA's detention allocation inspector for the London South East Region both considered the main problem with immigration detainees was that they were held for lengthy periods, often up to the prescribed limits, in unsuitable facilities. We were told that station custody managers were advised to contact local enforcement offices and the UKBA's Detainee, Escorting and Population

Management Unit when cases were not progressing. UKBA staff informed us that a strategy group was about to be formed to consider how to alleviate the recurring problem of immigration detainees being held in police stations for lengthy periods. There was no evidence that the UKBA was regularly monitoring the contract with the Metropolitan Police that was costing £1.1 million annually. There was no evidence of operating instructions or standards to regulate the use of police cells for immigration detainees.

- 3.8 There was a Metropolitan Police Authority lead for the independent custody visitors (ICV) scheme, which was viewed as an important independent oversight mechanism. However, ICVs were concerned about inappropriate restrictions on the information they could access on the National Strategy for Police Information Systems (NSPIS) custody system. This had replaced manually completed whiteboards and held information on detainees. Some custody officers were unwilling to show them the computerised whiteboard and instead spent time reading the information out.

Expectation

- 3.9 There is an effective management structure for custody that ensures that policies and protocols are implemented and managed and that there are mechanisms for learning from adverse incidents, rubbing points or complaints.

Findings

- 3.10 Custody staff training was delivered corporately and refresher training at borough level. The borough no longer had a permanent custody team. Instead, staff were expected to spend a minimum of six months working in the custody suites, often assisted by PC gaolers with little experience of custody work. This had led to a lack of experience in the custody suites and one experienced custody sergeant said he had spent a considerable amount of time advising and supervising temporary colleagues, for example on the use of NSPIS. Southwark station was staffed entirely on overtime and our negative findings there indicated a lack of ownership of custody work among staff. A further issue in all stations was that staff worked tiring 12-hour shifts in a busy custody suite environment, which appeared to leave them stressed and tired. The system did not allow for an overlap period, which was not conducive to comprehensive handovers.
- 3.11 Not all custody sergeants we spoke to had received specialist custody officer training, although all had received NSPIS training. None of the PC gaolers we spoke to had received any custody training. Designated Detention Officers had received custody training. Specialist computer-based gaoler training was planned. Newsletters from the Custody Directorate provided information and advice on detainee supervision and identified health and safety learning points gleaned from investigating adverse incidents. Adverse incidents were referred to as 'successful interventions' to encourage reporting and create a positive learning environment.
- 3.12 An internal Custody Directorate inspection of Southwark station (January 2008) had identified serious deficiencies in the treatment and conditions of detainees, but had not been effectively actioned. No action plan had been produced and nothing had changed. MPS processes for following up and monitoring progress were ineffective.

Expectation

- 3.13 Maintenance of facilities only occurs when the suite is closed down.

Findings

- 3.14 Maintenance was not done when facilities were open. Southwark station was closed during the inspection for fire safety work.

Recommendations

To the Metropolitan Police Service

- 3.15 The Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) should establish the extent to which identified weaknesses in custody practices and procedures have been exacerbated by the lack of a permanent custody team and the institution of 12-hour shifts, and take action accordingly.
- 3.16 All custody staff should undergo nationally approved custody officer training.
- 3.17 The MPS should consult with the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) with the aim of developing an effective bail management system that minimises use of custody.
- 3.18 A protocol should be developed governing the access of independent custody visitors (ICVs) to information on National Strategy for Police Information Systems (NSPIS).
- 3.19 There should be an effective procedure for following up and monitoring progress on internal inspections.

To the UK Border Agency and Metropolitan Police Service

- 3.20 The UK Border Agency (UKBA) should regularly monitor the physical conditions in which detainees are held on its behalf by the Metropolitan Police.
- 3.21 There should be clear operating instructions and standards to regulate the use of police cells for immigration detainees set down by the UKBA that incorporates the following:
- The UKBA should ensure that immigration detainees are held for the shortest possible time in police cells.
 - The UKBA should review detention expeditiously and keep detainees informed of case progress in a language they can understand.
 - Immigration officials should serve and explain to detainees decision documents that have important consequences or engage appeal rights.
 - Police custody officers should communicate daily with the UKBA to ensure speedy case progression.

4. Treatment and conditions

Peckham custody suite

- 4.1 The whole suite was in poor condition and had not been decorated for many years. Some cells and detention rooms were dirty and marked with graffiti. Detainees had limited access to showers. There was a good stock of clothing, but paper suits were often used for convenience rather than to preserve evidence. Not all staff carried ligature knives and keys, limiting their ability to respond in an emergency.

Expectation

- 4.2 Custody staff are aware of the risk of self-harm from:

- attempted suicide
- drugs ingestion
- medical conditions
- alcohol

and these risks are assessed, monitored and managed appropriately.

Findings

- 4.3 The booking-in process took place at the front desk in the hearing of others, which might have discouraged detainees from answering risk assessment questions openly. The National Strategy for Police Information Systems (NSPIS) custody system, which had been used in the borough since February 2008, prompted custody officers to ask about risks of suicide or self-harm, medical conditions, drugs and alcohol. The NSPIS was linked to the Police National Computer (PNC), so any risk-related information on the PNC was also available. Custody officers then made a risk assessment based on the answers to the questions, information on the PNC and the demeanour of the detainee.
- 4.4 There was some uncertainty over whether juvenile detainees could be fingerprinted and photographed without an appropriate adult present. Custody officers were concerned that any delay in carrying out these procedures might lead to a delay in identifying detainees at risk.
- 4.5 Detainees considered at risk were monitored at 30- or 15-minute intervals and this was recorded on the custody record. Those at most risk were put under constant observation staffed by officers from the team. Staff said these were generally done with the cell door open or, if the detainee was considered a significant risk to others, through closed-circuit television. No detainees were on constant observations during the inspection.
- 4.6 We were told that all custody staff had been issued with ligature knives, but not everyone was carrying one. There was a knife on the bunch of keys containing the cell key and another hanging in the custody officers' area next to the first aid box. There were only two cell keys in the area: one on a loose bunch passed between staff and the other secured in a locked glass box that could be smashed in an emergency.

Expectation

- 4.7 Custody staff are aware of any risk of harm to others and this is managed appropriately. Detainees are not placed in cells together unless a risk assessment indicates that it is safe to do so, Risk assessments include whether the detainee has previous convictions for racially aggravated offences.

Findings

- 4.8 No detainees were located in shared cells and we were told this did not happen. The initial NSPIS procedures linked with the PNC so any known risk to others or previous convictions for racially aggravated offences were highlighted.

Expectation

- 4.9 Holding cells are equipped with call bell systems and their purpose is explained to detainees. They are responded to within a reasonable time.

Findings

- 4.10 All cells were equipped with call bells and these were answered promptly. Detainees we spoke to had been told how to use them.

Expectation

- 4.11 Holding areas, cells, detention rooms are:

- clean
- free from graffiti
- in good decorative order
- of a suitable temperature
- well ventilated
- well lit
- equipped with somewhere to sit
- free of ligature points.

Findings

- 4.12 There were four detention rooms (for juveniles) and 14 cells. The whole suite was in poor condition and had not been decorated for many years. Some detention rooms and cells were dirty and there was extensive graffiti, particularly on the wooden bed bases, but also on the walls and door frames. Some of it was offensive, although none of it racist. Much of the graffiti was carved into the surfaces and could not be removed easily.
- 4.13 A cleaner cleaned the area in the mornings and the evenings, but any routine cleaning during the day was supposed to be done by designated detention officers (DDOs) or PC gaoles. DDOs were seen clearing items from cells after use, but did not appear to clean them before another detainee was located there.

- 4.14 The bed bases were high enough for detainees to sit down and the lighting was adequate. Ventilation appeared poor, with different parts of the suite too hot or too cold at different times of the day. In a survey of prisoners at HMP Brixton who had previously been held at Peckham or Walworth Road, nearly half said that temperature and ventilation in their cells were poor. Each detention room and cell was fitted with a safer custody-type door and there were no obvious ligature points.
- 4.15 The main area where custody officers worked was generally tidy and organised and staff could easily locate leaflets, forms and property bags.

Expectation

- 4.16 A smoking policy for staff and detainees is enforced that respects the right of individuals to breathe clean air in the custody suite.

Findings

- 4.17 The custody suite was a no smoking area. Smokers were not offered nicotine patches (see recommendation under healthcare).

Expectation

- 4.18 Detainees are provided with suitable meals that cater for special dietary requirements, and drinks at appropriate intervals.

Findings

- 4.19 Detainees were given three meals a day from the staff canteen, which could cater for special dietary requirements such as halal or vegan. Custody records showed that detainees were offered meals at appropriate times and the meals seen were good quality. Drinks were provided with meals and at other times on request.

Expectation

- 4.20 Detainees are provided with a mattress, pillow and clean blankets if held overnight.

Findings

- 4.21 Every cell contained a mattress and pillow and spares were available. They were generally in good condition, although some were grimy and there were no pillow covers. Clean blankets were also available and were given to detainees, but only on request. However, over a quarter of detainees in the HMIP Brixton sample said they were given no clean bedding when held overnight.

Expectation

- 4.22 Detainees are able to use a toilet in privacy, and toilet paper and washing facilities are provided.

Findings

- 4.23 There was a toilet in every cell. None had a privacy screen, but toilet areas were concealed on closed-circuit television monitors. A notice in the custody suite stated that detainees should not be provided with toilet paper, which custody officers took to mean that small amounts could be issued on request. Many cells contained small amounts of clean toilet paper and there appeared to be some confusion over when and how much paper should be issued. One juvenile detainee who had already been held for 14 hours said he had not been given any, asked if he needed any or told he could have some on request.

Expectation

- 4.24 Detainees whose clothing is taken for forensic examination are provided with suitable alternative clothing before being released or transferred to court.

Findings

- 4.25 Relatives or friends were allowed to bring in replacement clothing and the custody suite held a stock of white tracksuits, T-shirts and sweatshirts and black plimsolls in a range of sizes.
- 4.26 Custody officers said detainees were often given paper suits to wear simply because this was more cost effective than supplying clothing until replacement items were brought in by relatives or friends. There were no arrangements for clothes to be laundered and all clothing issued from stock was thrown out after use.

Expectation

- 4.27 Detainees who are held for more than 24 hours are able to take a shower and a period of outdoor exercise.

Findings

- 4.28 There was no outdoor exercise facility. Custody officers said that if the suite was not busy, detainees were sometimes allowed out of their cell for about 30 minutes to relieve the monotony. There was one shower for the use of male and female detainees. A sign in the cell area reminded staff to offer detainees a shower, but we did not see anyone offered this or actually able to use one. A juvenile male detainee who requested a shower was told he would have to wait until a male member of staff was available to supervise him. Notably, 87% of ex-Southwark borough detainees surveyed in HMP Brixton said they had not been offered a shower while in police custody. This was despite the fact that 55% said they had been detained more than 24 hours and over a quarter more than three days.

Expectation

- 4.29 Those held in custody for several days are provided with suitable reading material. Visits are also allowed, and changes of clothing, especially underwear are facilitated.

Findings

- 4.30 Some glossy magazines had been brought in by independent custody visitors, but some were several years old. Custody officers said staff lent their own newspapers to detainees when they had finished with them. There were no books. The only visits allowed were from legal advisers or appropriate adults.
- 4.31 There was no stock of underwear and detainees were encouraged to ask family or friends to bring clothing in for them.

Expectation

- 4.32 Custody suite staff have received fire safety training and evacuation procedures are practised frequently.

Findings

- 4.33 The DDOs and PC gaolers we spoke to said they had not received fire safety training. Emergency fire evacuation plans were available and staff were aware of them and knew where they were kept. The custody manager said table top exercises took place, but that no full evacuation drill had been undertaken. The suite had been successfully evacuated on 8 April 2008 when a smoke alarm was activated (a false alarm). However, the fact that so few cell keys were available (see paragraph 4.6) could have delayed evacuation.

Other findings

- 4.34 The legal advisers we spoke to believed that detainees were generally treated reasonably well at Peckham custody suite.
- 4.35 The underground yard/car park outside the custody suite was used as a waiting area for detainees. Two threadbare and unsecured chairs were situated just outside the custody suite and very near to a clinical waste bin. The ground was covered in bird droppings, which was unpleasant and unhygienic. We saw a handcuffed detainee using one of the chairs while waiting to be processed. His seat was directly below where two pigeons were nesting and droppings fell on his face and clothing while we were talking to him.
- 4.36 A cage next to this area was labelled for holding detainees on whom CS gas had been used, but was full of motorcycles and other property.

Recommendations

- 4.37 Custody staff should receive specialist training in the management of self-harming behaviour.
- 4.38 All custody staff should carry personal cell keys and ligature knives secured to their person.

- 4.39 Cells and all other areas should be cleaned in accordance with the Metropolitan Police Authority operational custody suite cleaning contract. A daily cleaning schedule should be monitored and enforced by a designated officer.
- 4.40 Every detainee staying overnight should be offered at least two clean blankets and a clean pillowcase and told they can ask for more.
- 4.41 Detainees should routinely be given an adequate amount of toilet paper and told they can request more. Any detainees not given toilet paper following individual risk assessment should be told they can request some sheets as required.
- 4.42 All detainees should have access to washing facilities and told they can request a shower.
- 4.43 Detainees should not be given paper suits to wear except for forensic purposes to preserve evidence. A clear policy on when paper suits should be used should be published.
- 4.44 Detainees held for a day or longer, or otherwise in need of a change of clothing, should be offered basic clothes including a change of underwear.
- 4.45 A stock of reading material should be available to detainees, including newspapers, religious texts and material in languages commonly spoken by detainees.
- 4.46 Visits to detainees should be allowed when possible, and should particularly be facilitated when the detainee has been in custody for longer than 24 hours.
- 4.47 Custody suite staff should receive fire safety training and evacuation plans should be practised.
- 4.48 The waiting area outside the custody suite should be clean and supplied with suitable seating. Steps should be taken to prevent pigeons from colonising the area and the clinical waste bin should be relocated away from waiting detainees.

Walworth Road custody suite

- 4.49 There was a lack of formal procedures and work practices were too often reliant on the custody sergeant exercising discretion. Staff did not have specialist self-harm training or carry personal ligature knives and cell keys. The physical conditions were poor. Cells were dirty, poorly serviced and often cold. Detainees were not given showers, exercise or visits.

Expectation

- 4.50 Custody staff are aware of the risk of self-harm from:
 - attempted suicide
 - drugs ingestion
 - medical conditions

- alcohol

and these risks are assessed, monitored and managed appropriately.

Findings

- 4.51 Custody staff had not received specialist training. They appeared to have a reasonable understanding of the various risk factors relating to self-harm, but no one we spoke to had a detailed knowledge of this area. Detainees were categorised as 'at risk' or 'no known risk'. The formal assessment of risk was carried out by the custody sergeant, who sometimes already knew the detainee. They used the recently introduced NSPIS custody system and sometimes their personal knowledge to assess risk. Detainees considered at risk were usually referred to a doctor and monitored every 30 minutes. In practice, this depended on the custody sergeant's discretion.
- 4.52 The NSPIS custody system had only recently been introduced and staff said it took longer than the previous manual system. This frequently caused delays during initial interviews and meant some detainees waited a considerable time to be dealt with.

Expectation

- 4.53 Custody staff are aware of any risk of harm to others and this is managed appropriately. Detainees are not placed in cells together unless a risk assessment indicates that it is safe to do so, Risk assessments include whether the detainee has previous convictions for racially aggravated offences.

Findings

- 4.54 All detainees were placed in single cells. There were separate areas for men, women and juveniles, but different groups could be located next to each other when the suite was busy. They did not mix physically as they did not routinely get exercise. Formal assessments of a detainee's risk of harming others were carried out by custody sergeants using the NSPIS format. They could also identify anyone previously convicted of racially aggravated offences through the PNC link.
- 4.55 Staff did not carry ligature knives, although one was on display in the office area. There was only one set of cells keys, which was also held centrally.

Expectation

- 4.56 Holding cells are equipped with call bell systems and their purpose is explained to detainees. They are responded to within a reasonable time.

Findings

- 4.57 All cells had call bells linked to a panel in the staff area. Staff responded promptly and the system appeared to work efficiently. Not all detainees we spoke to, including a juvenile and a detainee with a mild learning disability, said they understood how to use the call bells.

Expectation

4.58 Holding areas, cells, detention rooms are:

- clean
- free from graffiti
- in good decorative order
- of a suitable temperature
- well ventilated
- well lit
- equipped with somewhere to sit
- free of ligature points.

Findings

4.59 Cells were generally dirty. The tiled walls and floors were grimy, some toilets were soiled and there was graffiti on all plinths. The plastic-covered mattresses and pillows were intact, but did not appear to have been cleaned regularly. Several detainees told us that their cells were cold and some staff confirmed that this was not unusual. Blankets were supplied, but only on request, and one juvenile detainee had not been confident enough to ask for one. The blankets were not always clean and there did not appear to be an efficient system for ensuring that they were regularly laundered. Lighting and ventilation in cells were adequate. Nearly half of the ex-Southwark Borough detainees sampled in HMP Brixton said that temperature and ventilation in their custody suite cells had been poor.

Expectation

4.60 A smoking policy for staff and detainees is enforced that respects the right of individuals to breathe clean air in the custody suite.

Findings

4.61 There was a no smoking policy, but some staff used their discretion and allowed detainees to smoke. Smokers were not offered nicotine patches (see recommendation under healthcare).

Expectation

4.62 Detainees are provided with suitable meals that cater for special dietary requirements, and drinks at appropriate intervals.

Findings

4.63 Detainees were offered regular meals, including food suitable for special diets. Canteen food was provided during office hours and microwave meals at other times. The food was generally bland and few detainees chose to eat it. Detainees were given a drink of water on request.

Expectation

- 4.64 Detainees are provided with a mattress, pillow and clean blankets if held overnight.

Findings

- 4.65 There were plastic mattresses and pillows in each cell. Blankets were issued on request, but were not always clean. Over a quarter of detainees in the HMP Brixton sample said they had not been given clean bedding when held overnight.

Expectation

- 4.66 Detainees are able to use a toilet in privacy, and toilet paper and washing facilities are provided.

Findings

- 4.67 Toilet areas were concealed from staff on closed-circuit television. Toilet paper was issued on request, but was not routinely provided in cells.

Expectation

- 4.68 Detainees whose clothing is taken for forensic examination are provided with suitable alternative clothing before being released or transferred to court.

Findings

- 4.69 Detainees whose clothes were removed were given tracksuits or paper clothing.

Expectation

- 4.70 Detainees who are held for more than 24 hours are able to take a shower and a period of outdoor exercise.

Findings

- 4.71 Detainees were not given exercise or routinely offered a shower. Notably, 87% of ex-Southwark borough detainees surveyed in HMP Brixton said they had not been able to shower while in police custody. This was despite the fact that 55% said they had been detained more than 24 hours and over a quarter more than three days. One detainee commented 'I asked for a shower before I went to court, but I got none.'

Expectation

- 4.72 Those held in custody for several days are provided with suitable reading material. Visits are also allowed, and changes of clothing, especially underwear are facilitated.

Findings

- 4.73 There was no reading material. Visits were rarely allowed and there were no formal arrangements for clothing or underwear to be changed. In the HMP Brixton sample, one detainee formerly held at Walworth Road commented that he had 'asked for clean clothes which were brought in, but not given. I had the same clothes on for almost 48 hours'.

Expectation

- 4.74 Custody suite staff have received fire safety training and evacuation procedures are practised frequently.

Findings

- 4.75 Custody suite staff had not had specialist fire safety training. Fire evacuation practices took place regularly and a complete evacuation had been carried out the day before the inspection. However, the fact that so few cell keys were available (see paragraph 4.55) could have delayed evacuation.

Recommendations

- 4.76 Custody staff should receive specialist training in the management of self-harming behaviour.
- 4.77 All custody staff should carry personal cell keys and ligature knives secured to their person.
- 4.78 Detainees should be told how to operate cell call bells.
- 4.79 Cells and all other areas should be cleaned in accordance with the Metropolitan Police Authority operational custody suite cleaning contract. A daily cleaning schedule should be monitored and enforced by a designated officer.
- 4.80 Every detainee staying overnight should be offered at least two clean blankets and a clean pillowcase and told they can ask for more.
- 4.81 Cells should be kept at a reasonable temperature.
- 4.82 Detainees should routinely be given an adequate amount of toilet paper and told they can request more.
- 4.83 Detainees should not be given paper suits to wear except for forensic purposes to preserve evidence. A clear policy on when paper suits should be used should be published.
- 4.84 All detainees should have access to washing facilities and told they can request a shower.
- 4.85 A stock of reading material should be available to detainees, including newspapers, religious texts and material in languages commonly spoken by detainees.

- 4.86 Detainees held for a day or more, or otherwise in need of a change of clothing, should be offered basic clothes, including a change of underwear.
- 4.87 Visits to detainees should be allowed when possible, and should particularly be facilitated when the detainee has been in custody for longer than 24 hours.
- 4.88 Custody suite staff should receive fire safety training and evacuation plans should be practised.

Southwark custody suite

- 4.89 Conditions in the cells were squalid and lacked decency. Not all staff normally covering duties at Southwark carried ligature knives and cell keys, and there were ligature points in some areas. Standards of hygiene were poor throughout the suite. Local management oversight was ineffective and there was no evidence that a highly critical Custody Directorate report had been actioned in any way. The suite was not fit for purpose.

Expectation

- 4.90 Custody staff are aware of the risk of self-harm from:

- attempted suicide
- drugs ingestion
- medical conditions
- alcohol

and these risks are assessed, monitored and managed appropriately.

Findings

- 4.91 Southwark's immigration detainee population was not generally associated with serious criminogenic activity or substance misuse. Detainees were usually compliant, but distressed. We were told Southwark custody suite did not accept high-risk detainees. Accompanying immigration detention authorities (IS91s) often indicated a PNC check and no known risks. Standard risk-related questions asked when custody records were opened relied on detainees self-reporting. Frequent entries were made after that, but generally focused on where people were or what they were doing, with no evidence of continuing risk assessment.
- 4.92 Detainees had daily free association in the cell corridor and a small television room. There were a number of obvious ligature points in the corridor and exercise yard. The mesh/caging used in the exercise yard did not comply with safer custody doctrine guidance and therefore was not suitable for detainee use. Blind spots in the yard and custody area were not covered by closed-circuit television. There were two ligature shears at the custody desk, a first aid box and defibrillator.
- 4.93 Some, but not all, cells were covered by closed-circuit television. Cells contained a toilet and a solid plinth bed, both designed to offer no ligature points. There was evidence of recent re-sealing around some of these and around spy holes in the wall between the screened toilet

area and corridor. However, cupboards obstructed corridor access to two of the spy holes. Sliding wickets in cell doors were of a good and safe design. Two separate cell corridors allowed men and women or vulnerable detainees to be kept separate subject to occupancy level.

- 4.94 Apart from individual custody records, or reports likely to follow serious incidents such as a death, there was no systematic monitoring of incidents such as threats, bullying or reaction to visitors and no staff observations book that could inform the next shift or continuing risk assessment.

Expectation

- 4.95 Custody staff are aware of any risk of harm to others and this is managed appropriately. Detainees are not placed in cells together unless a risk assessment indicates that it is safe to do so, Risk assessments include whether the detainee has previous convictions for racially aggravated offences.

Findings

- 4.96 Information recorded was usually derived from the PNC or self-reporting, both often revealing nothing. There was no evidence that cells were occupied by more than one person.

Expectation

- 4.97 Holding cells are equipped with call bell systems and their purpose is explained to detainees. They are responded to within a reasonable time.

Findings

- 4.98 All cells had working bells connected to the custody desk. As no detainees were present, it was not possible to check if or how their use was explained, including to non-English speakers. Cells were unlocked for association for varying parts of the day and detainees could approach staff directly.

Expectation

- 4.99 Holding areas, cells, detention rooms are:

- clean
- free from graffiti
- in good decorative order
- of a suitable temperature
- well ventilated
- well lit
- equipped with somewhere to sit
- free of ligature points.

Findings

- 4.100 Cells were unhygienic and unfit for use. They contained a plinth bed, approximately two feet high, and a toilet, but no sink. Some cells appeared to have been painted recently, but there was still graffiti on plinths and they were in need of deep cleaning. Cell toilets were filthy and some still had faeces in them. One seemed to have been leaking. Blood or spit and what appeared to be excrement was visible on some doors and walls. Dust, hair and stains were not cleaned off plinth beds. Daylight permeated small windows at the top of cell walls, supplemented by artificial lighting. Most were adequately ventilated, but cold. The forensic medical examiner's (FME's) room was unhygienic and dirty (see healthcare section).

Expectation

- 4.101 A smoking policy for staff and detainees is enforced that respects the right of individuals to breathe clean air in the custody suite.

Findings

- 4.102 Smoking was not allowed anywhere in the custody suite, but detainees could smoke in the small caged outside exercise area.

Expectation

- 4.103 Detainees are provided with suitable meals that cater for special dietary requirements, and drinks at appropriate intervals.

Findings

- 4.104 There was a stock of sealed microwave meals catering for some diverse needs, but portions were small. A number of yoghurts in the kitchen fridge suggested these were also offered. Visitors often brought in pre-packed sealed food. Detainees had to ask for drinks or get their own water from a sink in the cell corridor during association. There was no evidence of how often hot drinks were supplied, but we did not see large stocks of tea or coffee.

Expectation

- 4.105 Detainees are provided with a mattress, pillow and clean blankets if held overnight.

Findings

- 4.106 Plastic-coated mattresses and pillows were in reasonable condition. Several bags of blankets were stacked in a corridor, but it was not clear if these were clean or dirty. Pillow covers were not available.

Expectation

- 4.107 Detainees are able to use a toilet in privacy, and toilet paper and washing facilities are provided.

Findings

- 4.108 The toilet in each cell was partially screened from the main cell area by a solid half wall. A spy hole allowed observation from the corridor. A few sheets of toilet paper had been left in most cells. In a few cells, advice that occupants could request toilet paper was stencilled on the wall. No cells had sinks or taps. There was a sink and a single small shower in the corridor. Both had an unhygienic bar of soap. A soap dispenser was fitted above the sink, but was empty. We saw no stock of other hygiene items, although one custody record indicated that a female detainee had been given a toothbrush and toothpaste.

Expectation

- 4.109 Detainees whose clothing is taken for forensic examination are provided with suitable alternative clothing before being released or transferred to court.

Findings

- 4.110 Immigration detainees were unlikely to have clothing removed for forensic examination, but were likely to spend some days in detention without a change of clothes unless a visitor could deliver some. The store room contained only a few T-shirts and one pair of plimsolls and there were no obvious signs informing detainees they could request a change of clothing.

Expectation

- 4.111 Detainees who are held for more than 24 hours are able to take a shower and a period of outdoor exercise.

Findings

- 4.112 The records indicated that most detainees were held for longer than 24 hours. They were given daily access to a single shower and a small caged exercise yard containing two fixed benches.

Expectation

- 4.113 Those held in custody for several days are provided with suitable reading material. Visits are also allowed, and changes of clothing, especially underwear are facilitated.

Findings

- 4.114 We saw no reading material provided. A small television room with five chairs contained a stock of videos. Visitors were allowed by appointment every afternoon and the visitor book indicated that a few visited most days. Visitors could bring food, clothing and money for the detainee.

Expectation

- 4.115 Custody suite staff have received fire safety training and evacuation procedures are practised frequently.

Findings

- 4.116 No staff were present and there was no permanent staffing, but none of the staff covering Southwark had received specific fire safety training. There was no evidence of frequent evacuation exercises. Fire extinguishers had been checked in recent months. However, the fact that so few cell keys were available could have delayed evacuation.

Additional findings

- 4.117 The custody suite had been closed for electrical work just before the inspection. No detainees or custody staff were present and no permanent staff were based on site. Officers with varied training and experience were drafted in as necessary on overtime. Lack of continuity and accountability was demonstrated by the dirty and chaotic state of the whole suite. Paper custody records were filed in order, but other documentation was left where it fell. We found two DNA samples alongside food in the kitchen fridge; a detainee file including sealed medical information that had not transferred with the detainee; money and medication (uncontrolled) that had not been returned to transferred detainees; and confidential documents and general rubbish in bags for confidential documents in the storeroom. The storeroom and cupboards contained a jumble of unassociated items, rubbish and dirt. Under present conditions, Southwark custody suite was not fit to hold detainees.
- 4.118 A Metropolitan Police Custody Directorate inspection in January 2008 had drawn attention to the lack of individual responsibility, updated risk assessment, operational guidance or routine checks, but little had been remedied since then and there was no action plan. A brief Southwark custody suite risk assessment dated February 2005 was marked for review May 2005, but we found no updated review. Southwark borough instruction 06 2007, dated 22 March 2007, with a review date of 19 September 2007, highlighted that 'roles and responsibilities have become confused since the provision of custody staff fell within the remit of The Core Response Teams' and 'has led to key responsibilities being neglected'. There was no sign of an updated instruction.

Recommendations

- 4.119 Southwark custody suite should be closed until the fundamental deficiencies identified in this report are remedied.
- 4.120 The custody suite should be subject to continuing and recorded supervision by a designated senior officer.
- 4.121 In consultation with the UK Border Agency, risk assessments of the facility and its occupants should be updated, with corresponding detailed instructions to staff.
- 4.122 Detainees should be subject to continuous risk assessment during their stay and this should be recorded in the custody record.

- 4.123 Potential ligature points should be removed or steps taken to mitigate their risk.
- 4.124 All custody staff should carry personal cell keys and ligature knives secured to their person.
- 4.125 Observation points should be accessible.
- 4.126 Given the prolonged stay of most detainees, the custody suite should devise a central log of incidents and staff observations handover book to inform short- and long-term risk assessment.
- 4.127 The custody suite should be deep cleaned before it is used for detainees.
- 4.128 Cells and all other areas should be cleaned in accordance with the Metropolitan Police Authority operational custody suite cleaning contract. A daily cleaning schedule should be monitored and enforced by a designated officer.
- 4.129 Cells should be kept at a reasonable temperature.
- 4.130 Detainees held for substantial periods should be able to get regular hot drinks.
- 4.131 Every detainee staying overnight should be offered at least two clean blankets and a clean pillowcase and told they can ask for more.
- 4.132 Detainees should routinely be given an adequate amount of toilet paper and told they can request more. Any detainees not given toilet paper following individual risk assessment should be told they can request some sheets as required.
- 4.133 Detainees held for a day or longer should be offered a pack of basic hygiene items and should have access to adequate washing facilities.
- 4.134 A stock of basic clothing, including underwear, should be held for detainees in need of a change or additional clothing. This should include outer clothing for anyone detained without a jacket and due to be removed to an inclement climate. Detainees should be advised of availability.
- 4.135 A stock of reading material should be available to detainees, including newspapers, religious texts and material in languages commonly spoken by detainees.
- 4.136 Custody suite staff should receive fire safety training and evacuation plans should be practised.

Good practice

- 4.137 *All cell doors had sliding wickets, designed to provide good observation and communication without offering ligature points.*

5. Individual rights

Peckham custody suite

- 5.1 Custody sergeants ensured that detainees were properly informed of their rights. Rights and entitlements books were issued in 48 languages. Staff had received no specific training in the supervision of juveniles or immigration detainees. The latter were often held for up to five days without clear advice from the immigration authorities on what was happening to them. The telephone could not be used in private. Interpreters were easily accessible and used regularly.

Expectation

- 5.2 Detention is appropriate, authorised and lasts no longer than is necessary.

Findings

- 5.3 The National Strategy for Police Information Systems (NSPIS) custody system contained authorisation and reasons for initial detention, and subsequent reviews were conducted by an inspector. The reviews seen were conducted on time unless the detainee was not in a fit state to be interviewed, in which case the inspector made a note to this effect. Custody staff expressed concern about how long immigration detainees were held at Peckham. Immigration detainees were not subject to PACE and some were held for many days. One experienced custody sergeant described communication from the local immigration office, Becket House, as generally poor and said that in the past he had released immigration detainees in the absence of adequate communication or indication of when immigration action was to be taken.

Expectation

- 5.4 Detainees, including immigration detainees, are told that they are entitled to have someone concerned for their welfare informed of their whereabouts. Any delay in being able to exercise this entitlement, such as phoning a person concerned for the welfare, is authorised at the level of Inspector or above. They are asked if they wish to see a doctor.

Findings

- 5.5 We observed a number of detainees being booked in by custody staff and all were given comprehensive information. The telephone was opposite the custody desk and could not be used in private.

Expectation

- 5.6 Detainees who do not speak English or who are deaf are provided with interpreters.

Findings

- 5.7 Custody staff had access to a telephone interpreting service, but it was rarely used. We were told that Metropolitan Police Service-approved interpreters were contacted as required and were apparently willing to give free brief telephone consultations, although we did not observe this happening. A translated booklet, Rights and Entitlements, was available from NSPIS in 48 languages. Detainees were issued these booklets during the inspection.

Expectation

- 5.8 There are special arrangements for detained juveniles that cover:
- the limited use of restraints
 - the conduct of any strip search
 - location in unlocked detention rooms close to the custody desk where possible for observation purposes
 - separation from adults at all times including in showers and exercise yard
 - specially trained officers allocated until the appropriate adult arrives
 - whether appropriate adults are indeed appropriate for the task
 - the capacity for the relative, guardian or appropriate adult to remain with the juvenile detainee during waiting periods, in the detention room if necessary.

Findings

- 5.9 Juvenile detainees were held in rooms closest to the custody sergeant's desk. However, there was no other distinct policy to cover their management and no specially trained officers stayed with them pending the arrival of appropriate adults. During the inspection, two detained juveniles were unlocked for a substantial period to make telephone calls.

Expectation

- 5.10 Female detainees are able to be dealt with by female staff, or where this is not possible, hygiene packs for women are routinely provided. Staff are aware that the impact of detention on women is different to the impact on men, and adopt their level of observation and support appropriately. There is a system in place for arranging childcare for single parents who have been detained.

Findings

- 5.11 No female detainees were held during the inspection. The Peckham designated detention officer and some custody staff were women. Hygiene packs were not routinely provided and all detainees had to ask for any toiletries. Staff said childcare arrangements were always dealt with as high priority.

Expectation

- 5.12 Detainees are able to have a solicitor present when interviewed by police officers. Those under the age of 17 or vulnerable adults are not interviewed without a relative, guardian or appropriate adult present. Solicitors and advocates arrive promptly so as

not to unnecessarily prolong the period in custody. Detainees are able to consult with legal representatives in privacy.

Findings

- 5.13 Solicitors and appropriate adults attended as required, but sometimes had to wait for considerable periods at the front desk before being admitted. There could also be delay in getting an appropriate adult out of hours. Solicitors complained about delays in communicating with detainees and custody staff because they often had to ring repeatedly before getting through to the custody suite. These factors wasted valuable time. Forty-five per cent of the ex-Southwark borough detainees held in HMP Brixton said they had waited more than four hours to see a solicitor.

Expectation

- 5.14 Detainees are not interviewed by police officers whilst under the influence of alcohol or drugs, or if medically unfit unless in circumstances provide for under PACE.

Findings

- 5.15 We saw several examples of police waiting for the effect of drink and/or drugs to wear off before interviewing detainees.

Expectation

- 5.16 Suitable legal advice is available for both police detainees and immigration detainees.

Findings

- 5.17 All detainees had access to the duty solicitor scheme, although these advisers, within the criminal defence service, were unlikely to be accredited to provide immigration advice. Detainees we spoke to had legal advice.

Expectation

- 5.18 Detainees are not subject to inhuman or degrading treatment in the context of being interviewed, or in the denial of any services they need. They are allowed a period of 8 hours continuous break from interviewing in a 24 hour period.

Findings

- 5.19 There was no evidence of inappropriate treatment in the course or duration of interviews. However, some basic needs, such as for toilet paper, were not consistently met (see section on treatment and conditions).

Expectation

- 5.20 Detainees are able to read through their interview record, with the help of interpretation if necessary, to comment and correct, and are told that they are not obliged to sign it.

Findings

- 5.21 Interviews were tape-recorded. Custody staff said detainees and solicitors could access interpreters as required.

Expectation

- 5.22 Detainees are not handcuffed in secure areas unless there is a risk of violence to other detainees or staff.

Findings

- 5.23 Detainees were not required to wear handcuffs once they reached the custody suite and been risk-assessed. We were told that it was very rare for restraints to be applied at this stage and that this had been done only when detainees were actively violent.

Expectation

- 5.24 Those charged are produced at court promptly.

Findings

- 5.25 Custody records, local custody focus group meeting minutes and custody staff we spoke to did not indicate that late production at court was an issue.

Expectation

- 5.26 Detainees know how to complain about their care and treatment. They are not discouraged from doing so but are supported in doing so where necessary.

Findings

- 5.27 Most detainees we spoke to did not know how to make a formal complaint and none had made one. No information was routinely provided, although independent custody visitors (ICVs) visited regularly, spoke to detainees and dealt with or advised on some complaints. They experienced the same delay as others in getting entry to the custody suite (see paragraph 5.13).

Expectation

- 5.28 There is an effective system in place for reporting and dealing with racist incidents.

Findings

- 5.29 Custody staff did not know of any distinct racist incident procedure. They said any racial complaint was considered a 'critical incident' and immediately referred to the duty officer.

Expectation

- 5.30 All custody suites hold a copy of the PACE Code of Practice C, and detainees, including immigration detainees, know they are able to consult it. Detainees or their legal representatives are able to obtain a copy of their custody record on release, or at any time within 12 months following their detention.

Findings

- 5.31 Detainees could read a copy of PACE Code C and we observed detainees doing so. We were told that detainees and legal representatives could view their custody records on request.

Expectation

- 5.32 Pre-release risk management is conducted and vulnerable detainees are released safely.

Findings

- 5.33 There was no formal procedure for pre-release preparation, although detainees with serious mental health or substance use problems were more likely to be given assistance (see section on healthcare).

Recommendations

- 5.34 Detainees should be able to make telephone calls in private.
- 5.35 Custody staff should receive further specialist training in the management of juveniles. All policies and procedures should be reviewed to ensure that they take into account the distinct needs of juveniles.
- 5.36 Detainees held for a day or more should be offered a pack of basic hygiene items and women routinely offered sanitary items.
- 5.37 The Metropolitan Police Service should consult with the local authority with a view to improving availability of appropriate adults, particularly out of normal working hours.
- 5.38 The entry of solicitors, appropriate adults and ICVs to the custody suite should be expedited and they should not have to wait at the front desk for long periods.
- 5.39 In addition to being notified of their general right to legal advice, immigration detainees should be given information on how to get independent specialist immigration legal advice. This information should be available in languages commonly spoken by detainees.
- 5.40 Information about how to complain about treatment by police, the UK Border Agency (UKBA) or contractors should be available in custody suites.

Walworth Road custody suite

- 5.41 Custody sergeants ensured that detainees were properly informed of their rights. Interpreters were used, but there were sometimes delays in getting appropriate adults. The distinct needs of juvenile and female detainees were not recognised.

Expectation

- 5.42 Detention is appropriate, authorised and lasts no longer than is necessary.

Findings

- 5.43 Detention was usually authorised before charging by an inspector and after charging by a sergeant. Reviews were carried out at the prescribed times using a computer-generated flagging system.

Expectation

- 5.44 Detainees, including immigration detainees, are told that they are entitled to have someone concerned for their welfare informed of their whereabouts. Any delay in being able to exercise this entitlement, such as phoning a person concerned for the welfare, is authorised at the level of Inspector or above. They are asked if they wish to see a doctor.

Findings

- 5.45 Detainees were routinely given the opportunity to contact someone by telephone. All detainees we saw being admitted were also given the opportunity to see a doctor.

Expectation

- 5.46 Detainees who do not speak English or who are deaf are provided with interpreters.

Findings

- 5.47 Custody sergeants contacted an interpreter when necessary.

Expectation

- 5.48 There are special arrangements for detained juveniles that cover:
- the limited use of restraints
 - the conduct of any strip search
 - location in unlocked detention rooms close to the custody desk where possible for observation purposes
 - separation from adults at all times including in showers and exercise yard
 - specially trained officers allocated until the appropriate adult arrives

- whether appropriate adults are indeed appropriate for the task
- the capacity for the relative, guardian or appropriate adult to remain with the juvenile detainee during waiting periods, in the detention room if necessary.

Findings

- 5.49 Apart from notification to the appropriate adult scheme run by the local authority social services, there were no special arrangements for juveniles. Four cells of the same design as other cells had been designated for use by juveniles, but it was not unusual for adults to be located next to juveniles when the custody suite was busy. Staff had not been trained in this area of work and none of the adult-orientated custody procedures had been modified to cater for the younger age group. There was no evidence that particular care had been taken to ensure that juveniles were bailed wherever possible.

Expectation

- 5.50 Female detainees are able to be dealt with by female staff, or where this is not possible, hygiene packs for women are routinely provided. Staff are aware that the impact of detention on women is different to the impact on men, and adopt their level of observation and support appropriately. There is a system in place for arranging childcare for single parents who have been detained.

Findings

- 5.51 There were no special arrangements for female detainees. A corridor had been designated for their use, but adult men were often located there when the custody suite was busy. We were told that attempts were made to assign a female member of staff to look after female detainees, but this was not always possible. When children needed to be looked after, the custody sergeant contacted other family members or social services. Staff had not been trained in working with female detainees. Hygiene packs were not routinely provided and all detainees had to ask for any toiletries.

Expectation

- 5.52 Detainees are able to have a solicitor present when interviewed by police officers. Those under the age of 17 or vulnerable adults are not interviewed without a relative, guardian or appropriate adult present. Solicitors and advocates arrive promptly so as not to unnecessarily prolong the period in custody. Detainees are able to consult with legal representatives in privacy.

Findings

- 5.53 The custody sergeants scrupulously ensured that detainees were informed of their right to legal advice. Juveniles and vulnerable adults were not interviewed without an appropriate adult present. Custody staff said it was sometimes difficult to access appropriate adults, particularly out of hours. Forty-five per cent of the ex-Southwark borough detainees held in HMP Brixton said they had waited more than four hours to see a solicitor and it was not unusual for legal visitors to wait for long periods at the front desk.

Expectation

- 5.54 Detainees are not interviewed by police officers whilst under the influence of alcohol or drugs, or if medically unfit unless in circumstances provide for under PACE.

Findings

- 5.55 There were several examples of detainees admitted to the custody suite under the influence of alcohol or drugs. In all cases, no interview was carried out until medical advice had been sought.

Expectation

- 5.56 Suitable legal advice is available for both police detainees and immigration detainees.

Findings

- 5.57 Duty solicitors were available to provide legal advice to police detainees. Initial telephone advice was provided through the Criminal Defence Service scheme. It was not clear how immigration detainees could get assistance from specialist immigration solicitors.

Expectation

- 5.58 Detainees are not subject to inhuman or degrading treatment in the context of being interviewed, or in the denial of any services they need. They are allowed a period of 8 hours continuous break from interviewing in a 24 hour period.

Findings

- 5.59 There was a built-in sleep break of eight hours.

Expectation

- 5.60 Detainees are able to read through their interview record, with the help of interpretation if necessary, to comment and correct, and are told that they are not obliged to sign it.

Findings

- 5.61 Police interviews were recorded and interviewees and their representatives could have a copy of the tape.

Expectation

- 5.62 Detainees are not handcuffed in secure areas unless there is a risk of violence to other detainees or staff.

Findings

- 5.63 Detainees were taken into the custody suite in handcuffs, which were normally removed on the authority of the custody sergeant as the formal detention process began. Escorting staff usually verbally reported if a detainee was considered to present any type of security risk. The custody sergeant discussed the situation with the detainee in the van and was usually able to persuade them to enter the suite in a cooperative way.

Expectation

- 5.64 Those charged are produced at court promptly.

Findings

- 5.65 Following receipt of an advance list, escort providers picked up detainees daily at regular times. Detainees who were bailed normally waited up to a week before their cases were dealt with at court. Juveniles were dealt with at the local youth court every Wednesday.

Expectation

- 5.66 Detainees know how to complain about their care and treatment. They are not discouraged from doing so but are supported in doing so where necessary.

Findings

- 5.67 There was no obvious information about a formal complaints system. Staff said that complaints made by detainees were simply dealt with by the duty officer. ICVs visited frequently and assisted with some complaints.

Expectation

- 5.68 There is an effective system in place for reporting and dealing with racist incidents.

Findings

- 5.69 Custody staff did not know of any specific mechanism for dealing with racist complaints. Staff said that detainees wanting to complain about a racist issue were expected to raise the matter initially with the duty officer.

Expectation

- 5.70 All custody suites hold a copy of the PACE Code of Practice C, and detainees, including immigration detainees, know they are able to consult it. Detainees or their legal representatives are able to obtain a copy of their custody record on release, or at any time within 12 months following their detention.

Findings

- 5.71 Custody staff said detainees and their legal representatives could obtain a copy of their custody record on request.

Expectation

- 5.72 Pre-release risk management is conducted and vulnerable detainees are released safely.

Findings

- 5.73 There were no formal pre-release arrangements for vulnerable detainees. We were informed that where a detainee needed support on release, a lift would be organised or contact made with a friend or family member to pick the detainee up.

Recommendations

- 5.74 Custody staff should receive further specialist training in the management of juveniles. All policies and procedures should be reviewed to ensure that they take into account the distinct needs of juveniles.
- 5.75 Custody staff should receive training in working with female detainees. Policies and procedures should be checked to ensure they take into account the distinctive needs of women.
- 5.76 Detainees held for a day or more should be offered a pack of basic hygiene items and women routinely offered sanitary items.
- 5.77 The MPS should consult with the local authority with a view to improving availability of appropriate adults, particularly out of normal working hours.
- 5.78 The entry of solicitors, appropriate adults, and ICVs to the custody suite should be expedited and they should not have to wait at the front desk for long periods.
- 5.79 In addition to being notified of detainees' general right to legal advice, immigration detainees should be given information on how to get independent specialist immigration legal advice. This information should be available in common languages.
- 5.80 Information about how to complain about treatment by police, the UKBA or contractors should be available in custody suites.

Southwark custody suite

- 5.81 Immigration detainees were customarily held for a few days at Southwark custody suite, but without evidence of expeditious review by the UKBA on their custody records. Custody staff

were asked to serve UKBA documents, which they could neither understand nor explain. No information was given to detainees about how to find specialist immigration advice. There was limited access to telephones and no payphone. The regime included periods of free association, fresh air and visits.

Expectation

- 5.82 Detention is appropriate, authorised and lasts no longer than is necessary.

Findings

- 5.83 Detention was authorised by the UKBA for up to seven days and people were often transferred to Southwark from the police station where they were first detained. From 26 recent custody records sampled, the average stay was four days. Two had been detained for seven days before transfer to Heathrow for removal, two for six days before transfer to detention centres and one for six days before being released with reporting conditions. There was little evidence of diligent review to minimise detention in the custody suite. Custody staff conducted reviews, roughly at nine hours, but simply noted that circumstances were unchanged. They pursued the UKBA only as the five-day ceiling approached. None of the 26 custody files sampled recorded an immigration officer visiting. The UKBA faxed various documents to the custody suite, but it was not always clear whether officers gave these to detainees or even knew what to do with them. One two-sentence letter from a London UKBA office informed Southwark police that a detainee's removal directions had been cancelled, 'please rectify accordingly'. The officer promptly rang to ask what to do and was told the chief immigration officer would get back to him the following day. The detainee was not released until the afternoon of the next day.

Expectation

- 5.84 Detainees, including immigration detainees, are told that they are entitled to have someone concerned for their welfare informed of their whereabouts. Any delay in being able to exercise this entitlement, such as phoning a person concerned for the welfare, is authorised at the level of Inspector or above. They are asked if they wish to see a doctor.

Findings

- 5.85 Custody records indicated that people were asked if they wished to contact someone on arrival and this was arranged. There was no payphone and detainees used a telephone at the side of the custody desk, which did not provide privacy. Some custody records indicated that detainees were allowed further telephone calls and supervised use of their own mobiles. The UKBA guidance to other short-term holding facilities allows use of mobiles provided they have no camera or internet facility.

Expectation

- 5.86 Detainees who do not speak English or who are deaf are provided with interpreters.

Findings

- 5.87 There was limited use of interpreters. None of the 26 custody records sampled included evidence that an interpreter had been used, although five noted that the detainee spoke no English. Three had been given the Law Society booklet summarising rights in their own language, in two cases at the last police station. An interpreters' account book recorded five instances in the previous three months. A notice advised staff that they could use a telephone interpreting account funded by the UKBA, although the service provider information was not updated.

Expectation

- 5.88 There are special arrangements for detained juveniles that cover:
- the limited use of restraints
 - the conduct of any strip search
 - location in unlocked detention rooms close to the custody desk where possible for observation purposes
 - separation from adults at all times including in showers and exercise yard
 - specially trained officers allocated until the appropriate adult arrives
 - whether appropriate adults are indeed appropriate for the task
 - the capacity for the relative, guardian or appropriate adult to remain with the juvenile detainee during waiting periods, in the detention room if necessary.

Findings

- 5.89 There was no evidence that juveniles were held as immigration detainees.

Expectation

- 5.90 Female detainees are able to be dealt with by female staff, or where this is not possible, hygiene packs for women are routinely provided. Staff are aware that the impact of detention on women is different to the impact on men, and adopt their level of observation and support appropriately. There is a system in place for arranging childcare for single parents who have been detained.

Findings

- 5.91 Staffing arrangements were ad hoc and it was not possible to determine the normal gender mix. There were no obvious special arrangements for female detainees, who could be detained separately on one corridor if there were enough empty cells, but were given no separate free association. There were no hygiene packs for women in the stores other than a few tampons. No cells contained notices advising women that they could ask for sanitary supplies.

Expectation

- 5.92 Detainees are able to have a solicitor present when interviewed by police officers. Those under the age of 17 or vulnerable adults are not interviewed without a relative,

guardian or appropriate adult present. Solicitors and advocates arrive promptly so as not to unnecessarily prolong the period in custody. Detainees are able to consult with legal representatives in privacy.

Findings

- 5.93 On records checked, people were held solely as immigration detainees and were not subject to police interview.

Expectation

- 5.94 Detainees are not interviewed by police officers whilst under the influence of alcohol or drugs, or if medically unfit unless in circumstances provide for under PACE.

Findings

- 5.95 Detainees were not subject to police interview. See 5.95.

Expectation

- 5.96 Suitable legal advice is available for both police detainees and immigration detainees.

Findings

- 5.97 PACE Code C does not apply in its entirety to immigration detainees. Section 6, detailing rights of access to legal advice, is not stated to apply to immigration detainees. However, the Code does set minimum standards of treatment and prompt access to legal advice is an established norm for all detainees. Access to legal advice at Southwark was unsatisfactory. In six of 26 custody records sampled, the section on legal rights had been crossed through as not applicable and not all indicated that the detainee had been informed of rights and entitlements. One noted that the detainee had wrongly been told that he could get legal advice, but would have to pay for it. All records where detainees had requested legal advice showed that they had been left to arrange it themselves. There was no indication of guidance given on finding suitable legal advice or any obvious written guidance in the custody area. The only relevant notice in the custody area reported access to criminal duty solicitors, accredited to advise on criminal matters, not immigration law. We found only one instance of a legal adviser visiting. Interview rooms were available. In a few cases, telephone calls with solicitors were noted. Although some people were detained for several days, no record noted a bail application. Many immigration detainees were removed direct from the custody suite, possibly after several days of detention without evident means of getting legal advice.

Expectation

- 5.98 Detainees are not subject to inhuman or degrading treatment in the context of being interviewed, or in the denial of any services they need. They are allowed a period of 8 hours continuous break from interviewing in a 24 hour period.

Findings

- 5.99 Detainees were not subject to police interview. See 5.95.

Expectation

- 5.100 Detainees are able to read through their interview record, with the help of interpretation if necessary, to comment and correct, and are told that they are not obliged to sign it.

Findings

- 5.101 Detainees were not subject to police interview. See 5.95.

Expectation

- 5.102 Detainees are not handcuffed in secure areas unless there is a risk of violence to other detainees or staff.

Findings

- 5.103 There was no evidence of use of handcuffs in the custody suite. Some, but not all, detainees arrived in handcuffs, which we were told were removed on arrival and the detainee checked for injuries.

Expectation

- 5.104 Those charged are produced at court promptly.

Findings

- 5.105 Detainees were not subject to police interview. See 5.95.

Expectation

- 5.106 Detainees know how to complain about their care and treatment. They are not discouraged from doing so but are supported in doing so where necessary.

Findings

- 5.107 There was no obvious information about complaint procedures for either the police or the UKBA.

Expectation

- 5.108 There is an effective system in place for reporting and dealing with racist incidents.

Findings

- 5.109 See 5.109.

Expectation

- 5.110 All custody suites hold a copy of the PACE Code of Practice C, and detainees, including immigration detainees, know they are able to consult it. Detainees or their legal representatives are able to obtain a copy of their custody record on release, or at any time within 12 months following their detention.

Findings

- 5.111 We did not see a copy of PACE Code C in the custody suite, although one was available on the premises. (See paragraph 5.99.)

Expectation

- 5.112 Pre-release risk management is conducted and vulnerable detainees are released safely.

Findings

- 5.113 Any information relevant to risk normally accompanied detainees when they were moved, but there was no evidence of continuous risk assessment or management to inform what happened next. Recent departures included a mixture of transfers to other detention centres and to Heathrow for removal. Some detainees were released.

Recommendations

- 5.114 All detainees should be allowed a free telephone call on arrival to let someone know of their whereabouts and have continuing access to a payphone that can be used in private.
- 5.115 A professional telephone interpreting service should be used when detainees who speak no English are received to ensure they understand what is happening to them, can ask questions and are able to contribute to risk assessments. Guidance on use should be provided to all custodial staff.
- 5.116 The custody suite should provide basic information about on-site procedures pictorially or in common languages.
- 5.117 Female custody staff should be on duty when women are detained.
- 5.118 Detainees held for a day or more should be offered a pack of basic hygiene items and women routinely offered sanitary items.

- 5.119 All detainees should be notified of their right to legal advice and given information on how to get independent specialist immigration legal advice. This information should be available in languages commonly spoken by detainees.
- 5.120 Basic information about bail for immigration detainees should be available in a range of languages.
- 5.121 Detainees should be provided with free facilities to communicate with legal advisers.
- 5.122 Information about how to complain about treatment by police, the UKBA or contractors should be available in the custody suite.

6. Healthcare

- 6.1 Detainees appeared to receive a reasonable service from the forensic medical examiners (FMEs) who provided health services to the custody suites in Southwark. However, the clinical rooms were not fit for purpose, there was no safe pharmaceutical stock management and some documentation was below expected standards. There were no clinical governance arrangements and any auditing of the service was impossible due to the lack of systems and processes. Mental health services were provided by Southwark Social Services and met the immediate needs of detainees. Drug services were fully integrated with the policing system and provided rapid and appropriate support.

Expectation

- 6.2 The decency, privacy and dignity of detainees are respected.

Findings

- 6.3 The three FME rooms, one at each custody suite, were not clean or fit for purpose. There were no paper rolls for the examination couches, hand-washing facilities were inadequate, the rooms were untidy and many products, including medications, dressings and sterile equipment, were out of date. None of the clinical rooms was appropriate for taking forensic samples.
- 6.4 At Southwark custody suite, where detainees could be held for several days, not all detainees saw a health services professional unless they requested to do so.

Expectation

- 6.5 Detainees are treated by health care professionals and drug treatment workers in a professional and caring manner that is sensitive to their situation and their diverse needs, including language needs.

Findings

- 6.6 Drug services across the three police stations were provided by the Blenheim Community Drug Project team, which was situated next to Southwark police station. The team was also responsible for drug services in Tower Bridge Magistrates' Court, through which many detainees passed. At least one drug worker was available for consultation between 9am and 10pm on weekdays and between 1pm and 5pm on Saturdays. All other out-of-hours cover was provided by a single point of contact out-of-hours service. The team worked a nine-week rota through all police stations and the magistrates' court. This provided continuity of care and drug workers were able to establish sound professional relationships with their clients, the majority of whom were local. Some trigger offences automatically incurred a drug test at the police station. Detainees whose test proved positive were referred to a drug worker for assessment. Any detainee requesting the support of a drug worker could see one without undue delay. A drug worker carried out a 'sweep' of Peckham and Walworth stations every day, introducing themselves to all detainees and offering support where appropriate. Although the team was not

funded to support detainees admitting alcohol misuse, drug workers did provide some support and were able to advise detainees of local alcohol support services. The team had good access to interpreters through the social services department and police sources.

- 6.7 In terms of health support, FMEs were informed as soon as any health issues were raised by detainees or when custody officers felt that medical intervention was appropriate. There was no delay in contacting FMEs and wherever necessary FMEs were called in to see the detainee, who was examined and any necessary treatment prescribed. We were confident that the medical needs of detainees with substance use needs were fully met.

Expectation

- 6.8 Clinical governance arrangements include the management, training and supervision and accountability of staff.

Findings

- 6.9 There were no clinical governance arrangements.

Expectation

- 6.10 Patients are treated by health care staff who receive on-going training, supervision and support to maintain their professional registration and development. Staff have the appropriate knowledge and skills to meet the particular health care needs of detainees in police custody.

Findings

- 6.11 Contracts for the FMEs were held centrally and each FME was individually contracted. Southwark borough had had a long-standing arrangement of over 30 years with a local GP practice, four of whom formed part of an eight-strong team of FMEs providing services to all three custody suites in Southwark and one in Kennington. MPS staff at Empress House assured us that all the FMEs were registered with the General Medical Council. They provided 24-hour cover by working 12-hour shifts from 5am to 5pm and 5pm to 5am. The doctors were not all approved under section 12 of the Mental Health Act 1983, with special experience in the diagnosis or treatment of mental disorder.

Expectation

- 6.12 All equipment (including resuscitation kit) is regularly checked and maintained and all staff (healthcare and custody staff) understand how to access and use it effectively.

Findings

- 6.13 There was a defibrillator by the custody desk at each site. They were in working order, but there were no documented checks. We could not confirm whether all staff were trained in their use and it was particularly concerning that the FME we spoke to was unaware that any of the custody suites had a defibrillator. First aid kits at each site held only minimal equipment, such as bandages and plasters. There was hand-held suction apparatus in the FME room cupboard

at Peckham and resuscitation face masks in each of the three clinical rooms. There was no oxygen available.

Expectation

- 6.14 Detainees are able to continue to receive any prescribed clinical management for drug dependency, and to receive medication to provide relief for drug and alcohol withdrawal symptoms.

Findings

- 6.15 Detainees could receive prescribed medication once this was verified by the FME. The FME we spoke to said it was extremely rare for registered drug users to be held at the police station, but if they were and their prescribed drug usage was undisputedly verified, then such medication would be prescribed and supplied. Any detainee showing signs of substance use, including drugs and alcohol, was seen and assessed by the FME and, where appropriate, prescribed symptomatic relief. Local pharmacies provided a 24-hour service. Nicotine patches were not routinely provided for smokers.

Expectation

- 6.16 Detainees are offered the services of a drugs or alcohol arrest referral worker where appropriate and referred on to community drugs/alcohol teams or prisons' drugs workers as appropriate.

Findings

- 6.17 Drug services were available. The drug workers had established good working relationships with London-wide and local community drug teams and contacted them whenever one of their clients was held in police custody. Once the detainee was released from custody, the drug workers ensured that they had an appointment with their own drug worker in the community. The team had established links with prison counselling, assessment, referral, advice and throughcare (CARAT) teams and were in regular contact with prisons, particularly Holloway and Brixton. Any detainee remanded to a prison was immediately referred to the prison CARAT team and copies of all case notes were forwarded there. The prison teams were also contacted by the drug worker dealing with the detainee. The system appeared comprehensive and effective.

Expectation

- 6.18 A liaison and/or diversion scheme enables mentally disordered detainees to be identified and diverted into appropriate mental health services, or referred on to prison health services.

Findings

- 6.19 Mental health services were provided by the Southwark Voluntary Appropriate Adult Scheme, which provided cover between 9am and 10pm every day including weekends. Out-of-hours cover was through Southwark Social Services department. Detainees displaying anxiety or distress were referred to the service for assessment. Response times were generally good, but

there were often unacceptable delays in volunteers accessing detainees because of difficulties in gaining admission to the police station. We were told that volunteers often had to wait over 20 minutes, which was unacceptable and could have had serious consequences. For the majority referred to the volunteers, the support given was sufficient. If a detainee was considered in urgent need of more specialised support, the FME was called and could refer the detainee to the South London & Maudsley NHS Foundation Trust (SLAM) mental health team for future management. Detainees remanded to prison custody were referred to prison mental health in-reach services.

Expectation

- 6.20 Police custody is not used as a place of safety for section 136 assessments except where the detainee needs to be controlled for his or her own safety or the safety of others.

Findings

- 6.21 No central records were kept of any detainees held at the custody suites for Section 136⁴ assessments, so it was not possible to determine whether any of the custody suites were used inappropriately for this purpose.

Expectation

- 6.22 Each detainee seen by health care staff has a clinical record containing an up to date assessment and any care plan conforms to professional guidance from the regulatory bodies. Ethnicity of the detainee is also recorded.

Findings

- 6.23 The FMEs used the clinical records on the National Strategy for Police Information Systems (NSPIS) custody system to record minimal information about the detainees they saw and any clinical instructions.⁵ The FMEs also recorded their attendance in a 'book 83', but more than one of these books was in use at each custody suite and some FMEs carried their own version, so an audit of these was impossible.
- 6.24 The FME also made and kept his or her own handwritten notes. The doctor we spoke to did not have any formal arrangements for ensuring that his handwritten notes were held in accordance with Caldicott principles.

Expectation

- 6.25 Any contact with a doctor or other health care professional is also recorded in the custody record, and a record made of any medication provided. The results of any

⁴ Section 136 of the Mental Health Act 1983 enables a police officer to remove someone from a public place to a place of safety, for example to a police station, for the purpose of arranging examination by a doctor and interview by an approved social worker, to arrange necessary treatment and care

⁵ Only individuals who need access to patient identifiable information should have access to it. Action should be taken to ensure that those handling patient identifiable information – clinical and non-clinical staff – are aware of their responsibilities and obligations to respect confidentiality

clinical examination are made available to the detainee and, with detainee consent, his/her lawyer.

Findings

- 6.26 There were examples where the detention log on NSPIS indicated that a detainee had been seen, but there was no corresponding entry in the clinical section of NSPIS. There were also examples of poor record-keeping, including the use of abbreviations, and medications recorded as issued by the doctor without the correct prescription forms being completed.
- 6.27 We were told that the doctor would provide a photocopy of handwritten clinical notes if requested by a solicitor for their client.

Expectation

- 6.28 Information sharing protocols exist with all appropriate agencies to ensure efficient sharing of relevant health and social care information.

Findings

- 6.29 There were no information sharing protocols between the various health and social care agencies.

Expectation

- 6.30 All medications on site are stored safely and securely, and disposed of safely if not consumed. There is safe pharmaceutical stock management and use.

Findings

- 6.31 There was no evidence of safe pharmaceutical stock management or use of medications. The cupboards used to store medications at all three custody suites were not lockable. At Peckham, there were vast quantities of over-the-counter remedies such as paracetamol, ibuprofen and indigestion tablets, some of which were in unlocked cupboards in the clinical room, with more stored in a general store cupboard. Some of the medications at all three custody suites were out of date by several months, but we found indigestion tablets that had expired almost five years previously and GTN spray (used for patients suffering from angina) over two years out of date. There were also loose foils of several different medications in cupboards.
- 6.32 There were no arrangements for the safe disposal of unused medications. At Walworth, there were several boxes of named patient medication and some loose tablets in an envelope dated the previous week. At Peckham, we found two Ritalin tablets, a controlled drug, loose in a plastic box in an unlocked cupboard.

Recommendations

- 6.33 The clinical (forensic medical examination) rooms should be clinically clean and fit for purpose.

- 6.34 Staff involved in the cleaning of FME rooms must be conversant with the Metropolitan Police Authority's (MPA) standard operating procedures for cleaning of FME rooms. Compliance needs to be validated by a designated officer in accordance with volume 4 of the MPA cleaning contract 'to ensure that police operations are not compromised' (volume 5, paragraph 20.20, page 41).
- 6.35 There should be clinical governance arrangements that include the management, training, supervision and accountability of staff.
- 6.36 There should be evidence that healthcare staff receive on-going training, supervision and support to maintain their professional registration and development.
- 6.37 Appropriate resuscitation equipment in a 'grab bag' or similar should be easily accessible by all staff (healthcare and custody), who should understand how to access and use it effectively. There should be documented checks of all resuscitation equipment.
- 6.38 Nicotine patches should be available for detainees held for substantial periods.
- 6.39 All clinical records should be held in accordance with Caldicott guidelines.
- 6.40 All clinical records should be contemporaneous and conform to professional guidance from the relevant regulatory body, such as the General Medical Council.
- 6.41 Information sharing protocols should exist with all appropriate agencies to ensure efficient sharing of relevant health and social care information.
- 6.42 All medications on site should be stored safely and securely and unused medication disposed of safely.
- 6.43 There should be safe pharmaceutical stock management and use.

7. Summary of recommendations

Strategy

To the Metropolitan Police Service

- 7.1 The Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) should establish the extent to which identified weaknesses in custody practices and procedures have been exacerbated by the lack of a permanent custody team and the institution of 12-hour shifts, and take action accordingly. (3.15)
- 7.2 All custody staff should undergo nationally approved custody officer training. (3.16)
- 7.3 The MPS should consult with the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) with the aim of developing an effective bail management system that minimises use of custody. (3.17)
- 7.4 A protocol should be developed governing the access of independent custody visitors (ICVs) to information on National Strategy for Police Information Systems (NSPIS). (3.18)
- 7.5 There should be an effective procedure for following up and monitoring progress on internal inspections. (3.19)

To the UK Border Agency and Metropolitan Police Service

- 7.6 The UK Border Agency (UKBA) should regularly monitor the physical conditions in which detainees are held on its behalf by the Metropolitan Police. (3.20)
- 7.7 There should be clear operating instructions and standards to regulate the use of police cells for immigration detainees set down by the UKBA that incorporates the following:
 - The UKBA should ensure that immigration detainees are held for the shortest possible time in police cells.
 - The UKBA should review detention expeditiously and keep detainees informed of case progress in a language they can understand.
 - Immigration officials should serve and explain to detainees decision documents that have important consequences or engage appeal rights.
 - Police custody officers should communicate daily with the UKBA to ensure speedy case progression. (3.21)

Treatment and conditions: Peckham

- 7.8 Custody staff should receive specialist training in the management of self-harming behaviour. (4.37)

- 7.9 All custody staff should carry personal cell keys and ligature knives secured to their person. (4.38)
- 7.10 Cells and all other areas should be cleaned in accordance with the Metropolitan Police Authority operational custody suite cleaning contract. A daily cleaning schedule should be monitored and enforced by a designated officer. (4.39)
- 7.11 Every detainee staying overnight should be offered at least two clean blankets and a clean pillowcase and told they can ask for more. (4.40)
- 7.12 Detainees should routinely be given an adequate amount of toilet paper and told they can request more. Any detainees not given toilet paper following individual risk assessment should be told they can request some sheets as required. (4.41)
- 7.13 All detainees should have access to washing facilities and told they can request a shower. (4.42)
- 7.14 Detainees should not be given paper suits to wear except for forensic purposes to preserve evidence. A clear policy on when paper suits should be used should be published. (4.43)
- 7.15 Detainees held for a day or longer, or otherwise in need of a change of clothing, should be offered basic clothes including a change of underwear. (4.44)
- 7.16 A stock of reading material should be available to detainees, including newspapers, religious texts and material in languages commonly spoken by detainees. (4.45)
- 7.17 Visits to detainees should be allowed when possible, and should particularly be facilitated when the detainee has been in custody for longer than 24 hours. (4.46)
- 7.18 Custody suite staff should receive fire safety training and evacuation plans should be practised. (4.47)
- 7.19 The waiting area outside the custody suite should be clean and supplied with suitable seating. Steps should be taken to prevent pigeons from colonising the area and the clinical waste bin should be relocated away from waiting detainees. (4.48)

Treatment and conditions: Walworth Road

- 7.20 Custody staff should receive specialist training in the management of self-harm behaviour. (4.76)
- 7.21 All custody staff should carry personal cell keys and ligature knives secured to their person. (4.47)
- 7.22 Detainees should be told how to operate cell call bells. (4.48)
- 7.23 Cells and all other areas should be cleaned in accordance with the Metropolitan Police Authority operational custody suite cleaning contract. A daily cleaning schedule should be monitored and enforced by a designated officer. (4.79)
- 7.24 Every detainee staying overnight should be offered at least two clean blankets and a clean pillowcase and told they can ask for more. (4.80)

- 7.25 Cells should be kept at a reasonable temperature. (4.81)
- 7.26 Detainees should routinely be given an adequate amount of toilet paper and told they can request more. (4.82)
- 7.27 Detainees should not be given paper suits to wear except for forensic purposes to preserve evidence. A clear policy on when paper suits should be used should be published. (4.83)
- 7.28 All detainees should have access to washing facilities and told they can request a shower. (4.84)
- 7.29 A stock of reading material should be available to detainees, including newspapers, religious texts and material in languages commonly spoken by detainees. (4.85)
- 7.30 Detainees held for a day or more, or otherwise in need of a change of clothing, should be offered basic clothes, including a change of underwear. (4.86)
- 7.31 Visits to detainees should be allowed when possible, and should particularly be facilitated when the detainee has been in custody for longer than 24 hours. (4.87)
- 7.32 Custody suite staff should receive fire safety training and evacuation plans should be practised. (4.88)

Treatment and conditions: Southwark

- 7.33 Southwark custody suite should be closed until the fundamental deficiencies identified in this report are remedied. (4.119)
- 7.34 The custody suite should be subject to continuing and recorded supervision by a designated senior officer. (4.120)
- 7.35 In consultation with the UKBA, risk assessments of the facility and its occupants should be updated, with corresponding detailed instructions to staff. (4.121)
- 7.36 Detainees should be subject to continuous risk assessment during their stay and this should be recorded in the custody record. (4.122)
- 7.37 Potential ligature points should be removed or steps taken to mitigate their risk. (4.123)
- 7.38 All custody staff should carry personal cell keys and ligature knives secured to their person. (4.124)
- 7.39 Observation points should be accessible. (4.125)
- 7.40 Given the prolonged stay of most detainees, the custody suite should devise a central log of incidents and staff observations handover book to inform short- and long-term risk assessment. (4.126)
- 7.41 The custody suite should be deep cleaned before it is used for detainees. (4.127)

- 7.42 Cells and all other areas should be cleaned in accordance with the Metropolitan Police Authority operational custody suite cleaning contract. A daily cleaning schedule should be monitored and enforced by a designated officer. (4.128)
- 7.43 Cells should be kept at a reasonable temperature. (4.129)
- 7.44 Detainees held for substantial periods should be able to get regular hot drinks. (4.130)
- 7.45 Every detainee staying overnight should be offered at least two clean blankets and a clean pillowcase and told they can ask for more. (4.131)
- 7.46 Detainees should routinely be given an adequate amount of toilet paper and told they can request more. Any detainees not given toilet paper following individual risk assessment should be told they can request some sheets as required. (4.132)
- 7.47 Detainees held for a day or longer should be offered a pack of basic hygiene items and should have access to adequate washing facilities. (4.133)
- 7.48 A stock of basic clothing, including underwear, should be held for detainees in need of a change or additional clothing. This should include outer clothing for anyone detained without a jacket and due to be removed to an inclement climate. Detainees should be advised of availability. (4.134)
- 7.49 A stock of reading material should be available to detainees, including newspapers, religious texts and material in languages commonly spoken by detainees. (4.135)
- 7.50 Custody suite staff should receive fire safety training and evacuation plans should be practised. (4.136)

Good practice

- 7.51 All cell doors had sliding wickets, designed to provide good observation and communication without offering ligature points. (4.137)

Individual rights: Peckham

- 7.52 Detainees should be able to make telephone calls in private. (5.34)
- 7.53 Custody staff should receive further specialist training in the management of juveniles. All policies and procedures should be reviewed to ensure that they take into account the distinct needs of juveniles. (5.35)
- 7.54 Detainees held for a day or more should be offered a pack of basic hygiene items and women routinely offered sanitary items. (5.36)
- 7.55 The MPS should consult with the local authority with a view to improving availability of appropriate adults, particularly out of normal working hours. (5.37)
- 7.56 The entry of solicitors, appropriate adults and ICVs to the custody suite should be expedited and they should not have to wait at the front desk for long periods. (5.38)

- 7.57 In addition to being notified of their general right to legal advice, immigration detainees should be given information on how to get independent specialist immigration legal advice. This information should be available in languages commonly spoken by detainees. (5.39)
- 7.58 Information about how to complain about treatment by police, the UKBA or contractors should be available in custody suites. (5.40)

Individual rights: Walworth Road

- 7.59 Custody staff should receive further specialist training in the management of juveniles. All policies and procedures should be reviewed to ensure that they take into account the distinct needs of juveniles. (5.74)
- 7.60 Custody staff should receive training in working with female detainees. Policies and procedures should be checked to ensure they take into account the distinctive needs of women. (5.75)
- 7.61 Detainees held for a day or more should be offered a pack of basic hygiene items and women routinely offered sanitary items. (5.76)
- 7.62 The MPS should consult with the local authority with a view to improving availability of appropriate adults, particularly out of normal working hours. (5.77)
- 7.63 The entry of solicitors, appropriate adults, and ICVs to the custody suite should be expedited and they should not have to wait at the front desk for long periods. (5.78)
- 7.64 In addition to being notified of detainees' general right to legal advice, immigration detainees should be given information on how to get independent specialist immigration legal advice. This information should be available in common languages. (5.79)
- 7.65 Information about how to complain about treatment by police, the UKBA or contractors should be available in custody suites. (5.80)

Individual rights: Southwark

- 7.66 All detainees should be allowed a free telephone call on arrival to let someone know of their whereabouts and have continuing access to a payphone that can be used in private. (5.114)
- 7.67 A professional telephone interpreting service should be used when detainees who speak no English are received to ensure they understand what is happening to them, can ask questions and are able to contribute to risk assessments. Guidance on use should be provided to all custodial staff. (5.115)
- 7.68 The custody suite should provide basic information about on-site procedures pictorially or in common languages. (5.116)
- 7.69 Female custody staff should be on duty when women are detained. (5.117)
- 7.70 Detainees held for a day or more should be offered a pack of basic hygiene items and women routinely offered sanitary items. (5.118)

- 7.71 All detainees should be notified of their right to legal advice and given information on how to get independent specialist immigration legal advice. This information should be available in languages commonly spoken by detainees. (5.119)
- 7.72 Basic information about bail for immigration detainees should be available in a range of languages. (5.120)
- 7.73 Detainees should be provided with free facilities to communicate with legal advisers. (5.121)
- 7.74 Information about how to complain about treatment by police, the UKBA or contractors should be available in the custody suite. (5.122)

Healthcare

- 7.75 The clinical (forensic medical examination) rooms should be clinically clean and fit for purpose. (6.33)
- 7.76 Staff involved in the cleaning of forensic medical examiner (FME) rooms must be conversant with the Metropolitan Police Authority's (MPA) standard operating procedures for cleaning of FME rooms. Compliance needs to be validated by a designated officer in accordance with volume 4 of the MPA cleaning contract 'to ensure that police operations are not compromised' (volume 5, paragraph 20.20, page 41). (6.34)
- 7.77 There should be clinical governance arrangements that include the management, training, supervision and accountability of staff. (6.35)
- 7.78 There should be evidence that healthcare staff receive on-going training, supervision and support to maintain their professional registration and development. (6.36)
- 7.79 Appropriate resuscitation equipment in a 'grab bag' or similar should be easily accessible by all staff (healthcare and custody), who should understand how to access and use it effectively. There should be documented checks of all resuscitation equipment. (6.37)
- 7.80 Nicotine patches should be available for detainees held for substantial periods. (6.38)
- 7.81 All clinical records should be held in accordance with Caldicott guidelines. (6.39)
- 7.82 All clinical records should be contemporaneous and conform to professional guidance from the relevant regulatory body, such as the General Medical Council. (6.40)
- 7.83 Information sharing protocols should exist with all appropriate agencies to ensure efficient sharing of relevant health and social care information. (6.41)
- 7.84 All medications on site should be stored safely and securely and unused medication disposed of safely. (6.42)
- 7.85 There should be safe pharmaceutical stock management and use. (6.43)

Appendix I

Inspection team

Anne Owers	-	HM Chief Inspector of Prisons
Hindpal Singh Bhui	-	HMIP team leader
Paddy Craig	-	HMIC inspector
Eileen Bye	-	HMIP inspector
Ian Macfadyen	-	HMIP inspector
Lucy Young	-	HMIP inspector
Elizabeth Tysoe	-	HMIP healthcare inspector
Bridget McEvilly	-	HMIP healthcare inspector
Helen Meckiffe	-	HMIP researcher

With assistance from:

Monica Lloyd	-	HMIP head of thematics
Nick Budden	-	HMIC inspector

Appendix II

Prisoner survey methodology

A voluntary confidential and anonymous survey of the prisoner population, who had been through a police station in the borough of Southwark, was carried out for this inspection. The results of this survey formed part of the evidence-base for the inspection write-up. The proportion of detainees who eventually went to prison was small (less than 10%) compared to the total numbers who had spent time in Southwark police station. However, they were likely to have spent longer periods in police custody and had the opportunity to express themselves freely.

Choosing the sample size

The survey was conducted on 28 April 2008. Two lists of potential prisoners, who had been through Southwark police station, were created, one listing those from the borough of Southwark (i.e. resident in Southwark), the second listing those arriving from Southwark Magistrates' and Crown Courts.

Selecting the sample

In total, 99 prisoners were approached, 50 of whom reported being held in police stations outside Southwark and were therefore excluded from the sample. On the day, the questionnaire was given to 42 detainees. Six prisoners had language difficulties and one could not read or write.

Completion of the questionnaire was voluntary. If a prisoner could not speak or read English or had literacy problems, they were excluded from the survey.

Methodology

Every questionnaire was distributed to each respondent individually. This gave researchers an opportunity to explain the independence of the Inspectorate and the purpose of the questionnaire, as well as to answer questions.

All completed questionnaires were confidential – only members of the Inspectorate saw them. In order to ensure confidentiality, respondents were asked to do one of the following:

- fill out the questionnaire immediately and hand it straight back to a member of the research team
- have their questionnaire ready to hand back to a member of the research team at a specified time
- seal the questionnaire in the envelope provided and leave it in their room for collection

Respondents were not asked to put their names on their questionnaire.

Response rates

In total, 38 (90%) respondents completed and returned their questionnaires, 14 from Peckham and 21 from Walworth Road. Three respondents did not mark the police station of origin. Four participants did not complete a survey. All non-responses or missing responses to individual questions are excluded from the figures presented, which is why the percentages do not always add up to 100. Multiple responses will sometimes add up to more than 100.

Police Custody Survey

Section 1: About You

Total number of surveys completed: 38

Q1 What police station were you last held at?

Q2 What type of detainee were you?

Police detainee	82%
Prison lock-out (i.e. you were in custody in a prison before coming here)	3%
Immigration detainee	3%
I don't know	8%

Q3 How old are you?

16 years or younger	0%	40-49 years	21%
17-21 years	5%	50-59 years	11%
22-29 years	26%	60 years or older	0%
30-39 years	37%		

Q4 Are you:

Male	82%
Female	0%
Transgender/Transsexual	5%

Q5 What is your ethnic origin?

White - British	18%
White - Irish	5%
White - Other	5%
Black or Black British - Caribbean	26%
Black or Black British - African	16%
Black or Black British - Other	0%
Asian or Asian British - Indian	0%
Asian or Asian British - Pakistani	0%
Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi	5%
Asian or Asian British - Other	0%
Mixed Race - White and Black Caribbean	0%
Mixed Race - White and Black African	3%
Mixed Race - White and Asian	3%
Mixed Race - Other	11%
Chinese	0%
Other ethnic group	3%
Please specify:	

Q6 Are you a foreign national (i.e. you do not hold a British passport, or you are not eligible for one)?

Yes	18%
No	71%

Q7 What, if any, would you classify as your religious group?

None	11%
Church of England	32%
Catholic	29%
Protestant	0%
Other Christian denomination	8%
Buddhist	0%
Hindu	0%

	Jewish	0%
	Muslim.....	13%
	Sikh	0%
	Any other religion, please specify	
Q8	How would you describe your sexual orientation?	
	Straight / Heterosexual	79%
	Gay / Lesbian / Homosexual	8%
	Bisexual	0%
	Other (please specify):	
Q9	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	
	Yes.....	18%
	No	71%
	Don't know	5%
Q10	Have you ever been held in police custody before?	
	Yes.....	82%
	No	13%

Section 2: Your experience of this custody suite

If you were a 'prison-lock out' **some** of the following questions may not apply to you.
If a question does not apply to you, please leave it blank.

Q11	How long were you held at the police station?	
	1 hour or less	0%
	More than 1 hour, but less than 6 hours	5%
	More than 6 hours, but less than 12 hours	8%
	More than 12 hours, but less than 24 hours	29%
	More than 24 hours, but less than 48 hours (2 days)	24%
	More than 48 hours (2 days), but less than 72 hours (3 days)	5%
	72 hours (3 days) or more	26%
Q12	Were you given information about your arrest and your entitlements when you arrived there?	
	Yes.....	76%
	No	16%
	Don't know/Can't remember	5%
Q13	Were you told about the Police and Criminal Evidence (PACE) codes of practice (the 'rule book')?	
	Yes.....	61%
	No	24%
	I don't know what this is/I don't remember	13%
Q14	If your clothes were taken away, were you offered different clothing to wear?	
	My clothes were not taken.....	66%
	I was offered a tracksuit to wear.....	5%
	I was offered an evidence suit to wear.....	13%
	I was offered a blanket	3%
Q15	Could you use a toilet when you needed to?	
	Yes.....	76%
	No	18%
	Don't know	3%

Q16	If you have used the toilet there, were these things provided?			
		Yes	No	
	Toilet paper	57%	38%	
	Sanitary protection	11%	34%	
	Other (please specify):			
Q17	Did you share a cell at the police station?			
	Yes.....		3%	
	No		87%	
Q18	How would you rate the condition of your cell:			
		Good	Neither	Bad
	Cleanliness	32%	21%	39%
	Ventilation /Air Quality	16%	21%	47%
	Temperature	13%	23%	49%
	Lighting	54%	10%	23%
Q19	Was there any graffiti in your cell when you arrived?			
	Yes.....		50%	
	No		45%	
Q20	Did staff explain to you the correct use of the cell bell?			
	Yes.....		29%	
	No		66%	
Q21	Were you held overnight?			
	Yes.....		84%	
	No		13%	
Q22	If you were held overnight, which items of clean bedding were you given?			
	Not held overnight		8%	
	Pillow.....		22%	
	Blanket.....		39%	
	Nothing.....		27%	
Q23	Were you offered a shower at the police station?			
	Yes.....		8%	
	No		87%	
Q24	Were you offered any period of outside exercise while there?			
	Yes.....		5%	
	No		92%	
Q25	Were you offered anything to:			
		Yes	No	
	Eat?	74%	24%	
	Drink?	68%	24%	
Q26	Was the food/drink you received suitable for your dietary requirements?			
	I did not have any food or drink.....		13%	
	Yes.....		34%	
	No		45%	
Q27	If you smoke, were you offered anything to help you cope with the smoking ban there?			
	I do not smoke		11%	
	I was allowed to smoke		5%	
	I was not offered anything to cope with not smoking.....		74%	
	I was offered nicotine gum		0%	
	I was offered nicotine patches.....		3%	

	<i>I was offered nicotine lozenges</i>	0%
Q28	Were you offered anything to read?	
	Yes.....	13%
	No	84%
Q29	Was someone informed of your arrest?	
	Yes.....	58%
	No	29%
	<i>I don't know.....</i>	5%
	<i>I didn't want to inform anyone</i>	5%
Q30	Were you offered a free telephone call?	
	Yes.....	74%
	No	21%
Q31	If you were denied a free telephone call, was a reason for this offered?	
	<i>My phone call was not denied.....</i>	47%
	Yes.....	3%
	No	24%
Q32	Did you have any concerns about the following, while you were in police custody:	
		Yes No
	<i>Who was taking care of your children</i>	26% 36%
	<i>Contacting your partner, relative or friend</i>	45% 29%
	<i>Contacting your employer</i>	18% 39%
	<i>Where you were going once released</i>	16% 42%
Q33	Were you interviewed by police officials about your case?	
	Yes.....	82%
	No	16% If No, go to Q35
Q34	Were any of the following people present when you were interviewed?	
		Yes No Not needed
	<i>Solicitor</i>	60% 21% 11%
	<i>Appropriate Adult</i>	11% 18% 26%
	<i>Interpreter</i>	5% 11% 34%
Q35	How long did you have to wait for your solicitor?	
	<i>I did not requested a solicitor</i>	24%
	<i>2 hours or less</i>	18%
	<i>Over 2 hours but less than 4 hours</i>	3%
	<i>4 hours or more</i>	45%
Q36	Were you officially charged?	
	Yes.....	74%
	No	11%
	<i>Don't know</i>	8%
Q37	How long were you in police custody <u>after</u> being charged?	
	<i>I have not been charged yet.....</i>	8%
	<i>1 hour or less</i>	0%
	<i>More than 1 hour, but less than 6 hours</i>	18%
	<i>More than 6 hours, but less than 12 hours</i>	18%
	<i>12 hours or more</i>	50%

Q38 Do you have any other comments about your time in police custody?

Example comments included:

"They called my solicitor to come, but got told to wait a few hours." (Unknown)

"[I had to wait for a solicitor] god knows how long, over a day." (Peckham)

"The police were intimidating and not professional and lacked any skills when dealing with human beings." (Walworth Road)

"Asked for clean clothes which were brought in, but not given. I had the same clothes on for almost 48 hours." (Walworth Road)

"There have been other times when 'Lights were left on'. The officer in charge seemed to have a personal conflict against me, saying he would get me '25 Rothams' then not and getting me to sign a notebook with 'No comment' on it." (Walworth Road)

"...the officer made a point of telling me how badly he wanted to keep me in the station and not give me bail." (Walworth Road)

"The pillow and blanket smelt of piss." (Walworth Road)

"...they need to raise their hygiene standards." (Peckham)

"I was surprised that everything was to the book, I'm used to getting a bashing." (Walworth Road)

Section 3: Safety

Q39 Did you feel safe there?

Yes..... 50%
No 37%

Q40 Had another detainee or a member of staff victimised (insulted or assaulted) you there?

Yes..... 18%
No 71%

Q41 If you have felt victimised, what did the incident involve? (Please tick all that apply)

<i>I have not been victimised.....</i>	<i>21%</i>	<i>Because of your crime.....</i>	<i>9%</i>
<i>Insulting remarks (about you, your family or friends).....</i>	<i>18%</i>	<i>Because of your sexuality.....</i>	<i>2%</i>
<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted) ..</i>	<i>5%</i>	<i>Because you have a disability.....</i>	<i>4%</i>
<i>Sexual abuse.....</i>	<i>0%</i>	<i>Because of your religion/religious beliefs.....</i>	<i>4%</i>
<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i>	<i>2%</i>	<i>Because you are from a different part of the country than others</i>	<i>2%</i>
<i>Drugs</i>	<i>11%</i>		

Please describe: Examples included:

"I was assaulted on the way to the police station. Hit in the face on the van, whilst cuffed behind my back." (Peckham)

"My Cockney accent." (Walworth Road)

"I have a stutter and a drug problem and was abused about it." (Peckham)

Q42	Were you handcuffed or restrained while in the police custody suite?	
	Yes.....	39%
	No	50%
Q43	Were you injured while in police custody, in a way that you feel was not your fault?	
	Yes.....	21%
	No	68%
Q44	Were you told how to make a complaint about your treatment here, if you needed to?	
	Yes.....	11%
	No	82%
Q45	Do you have any other comments about safety in the police custody suite?	
	<i>Examples included:</i>	
	<i>"The food was not properly cooked." (Walworth Road)</i>	
	<i>"I was handcuffed for 3 hours." (Unknown)</i>	
	<i>"Sometimes they put cuff on you so tight your hands bleed." (Unknown)</i>	

Section 4: Healthcare

Q46	When you were in police custody, were you on any medication?	
	Yes.....	50%
	No	45%
Q47	Were you able to continue taking your medication while there?	
	Not taking medication.....	29%
	Yes.....	18%
	No	34%
Q48	Did someone explain your entitlements to see a healthcare professional, if you needed to?	
	Yes.....	45%
	No	42%
	Don't know	8%
Q49	Were you seen by the following healthcare professionals during your time there?	
		Yes No
	Doctor	66% 26%
	Nurse	0% 50%
	Paramedic	0% 50%
	Psychiatrist	0% 47%
Q50	Were you able to see a healthcare professional of your own gender?	
	Yes.....	29%
	No	42%
	Don't know	13%
Q51	Did you have any drug or alcohol problems?	
	Yes.....	55%
	No	34%
Q52	Did you see, or were you offered the chance to see, a drug or alcohol support worker?	
	I didn't have any drug/alcohol problems.....	13%
	Yes.....	42%
	No	37%

- Q53 Were you offered relief or medication for your immediate symptoms?**
I didn't have any drug/alcohol problems..... 21%
 Yes..... 21%
 No 47%
- Q54 Please rate the quality of your healthcare while in police custody:**
- | | <i>I was not seen
by healthcare</i> | Very Good | Good | Neither | Bad | Very Bad |
|-----------------------|---|-----------|------|---------|-----|----------|
| Quality of healthcare | 11% | 0% | 16% | 21% | 24% | 16% |
- Q55 Did you have any specific physical healthcare needs?**
 No 61%
 Yes..... 26%
 Please specify: *Examples included:*
"Symptoms of TB." (Peckham)
*"I had a stomach and liver problem which has been on going for a while."
 (Walworth Road)*
"Sciatica." (Walworth Road)
- Q56 Did you have any specific mental healthcare needs?**
 No 68%
 Yes..... 16%
 Please specify: *Examples included:*
*"I'd prior to being recalled, been in a mental health hospital for 15 years."
 (Walworth Road)*
*"Being paranoid and depressed since coming off drugs, which were
 making me violent." (Walworth Road)*
- Q57 Do you have any other comments about your time in the police custody suite?**
Examples included:
*"It was intimidating and very stressful, as I was held without interview for 48 hours then insulted
 and threatened." (Walworth Road)*
*"They could have done more to help with healthcare and should try and recognise when
 someone needs help with depression and drug addiction." (Walworth Road)*
*"I asked for a shower before I went to court, but I got none. My court clothes were refused and
 told to take them to court, but the court does not accept clothes." (Walworth Road)*
*"The cell should be kept cleaner. Cleaning staff should clean the cell straight after a person
 leaves the cell." (Walworth Road)*
*"The guards seemed more helpful to neighbouring cells, i.e. smoke break, shower, paracetamol,
 drinks. My cell was also next door to reception, so it was noisy. If it was believed that I was to
 harm myself, why didn't I see a doctor?" (Walworth Road)*
"The police at Walworth police station are racist." (Walworth Road)
*"They need to learn that not everybody is the same, but everybody deserves to be treated with
 respect and dignity, regardless of their standing in society....they should not treat addicts with
 less respect..." (Unknown)*
"I wasn't given my medication." (Peckham)

Section 5: Prison Lock-Out Information

If you were a 'prison-lock out' please answer the following questions.

If a question does not apply to you, please leave it blank.

Q58 **Were you told that you would be held in a police station, rather than a prison, before you arrived there?**

Yes..... 16%
No 39%

Q59 **How long did you spend in the escort van before arriving there?**

Less than 1 hour..... 32%
More than 1 hour, but less than 2 hours 8%
More than 2 hours, but less than 3 hours 5%
More than 3 hours, but less than 4 hours 3%
More than 4 hours 3%

Q60 **Were you offered the chance to let family/friends know where you were?**

Yes..... 24%
No 26%

Q61 **Did your property come with you to the police station?**

Yes..... 24%
No 16%
I don't know..... 5%

Q62 **On average, how much time were you able to spend out of your police cell each day?**

I was not able to spend any time out of my police cell..... 39%
Less than 1 hour..... 3%
More than 1 hour, but less than 2 hours 0%
More than 2 hours, but less than 3 hours 0%
More than 3 hours, but less than 4 hours 0%
More than 4 hours 0%

Q63 **Do you have any other comments about being a 'prison lock-out' in the police station?**

Examples included:

"Prisoners are treated with more respect than lock-out prisoners." (Peckham)

*"I was locked out of Brixton prison and sent to HMP Bullingdon. I had no food or drink from the 4/4/08 until 8pm 5/4/08. I was arrested at 13:15 on the 4/4/08 and hadn't eaten since 8:30."
(Walworth Road)*

"The prison system needs to sort out this terrible mess." (Walworth Road)

"It's a nasty way of keeping people locked up all day everyday, no visits, no calls, no fresh air, no proper food..." (Walworth Road)

Thank you for your time.