

12 December 2018

Health & Adult Social Care Select Committee

Housing related support

**A report on the impact of a reduction
in the contracts on West Sussex Housing Authorities**



By Nigel Lynn, CEO Arun District Council with the support of the
District & Borough Strategic Housing Officers Group
November 2018

Recommendations

The Health and Adult Social Care Committee (HASC) meeting of 27 September 2018 agreed to engage with partners as part of the decision making process in relation to Housing Related Support Contracts to be determined on 10 December 2018. Furthermore, at a West Sussex County Council (WSCC) Full Council meeting on 19 October 2018, a decision was made to extend the commissioned contracts until September 2019 while a review is carried out. West Sussex County Council are conducting consultation to the proposals (by 3 December 2018). It was agreed at the West Sussex Leaders Board meeting on 23 November 2018 that the following proposals be put forward by the District and Borough Leaders;

a) An extension of the current commissioned services of up to 12 months be agreed through to March 2020 to provide an opportunity for further collaboration, engagement and assessment of the impacts on the local communities of all the budgetary proposals, including the Local Assistance Network (LAN) budget.

b) The Social Care Authority (WSCC) identify and engage with other stakeholders that could have a positive impact on housing support.

c) A task and finish group will be set up with representatives from the Social Care Authority and each of the Housing Authorities (Districts and Boroughs) to look at how we seek joint efficiencies, remodel provision and identify what alternative funding streams could be made available, including from other agencies. [Resourcing for undertaking the work has been agreed by Districts & Boroughs and Terms of Reference will be agreed shortly].

d) The Social Care Authority considers, with the Housing Authorities, the overlapping geography that occurs to determine any efficiencies across areas of West Sussex, rather than solely Housing Authority boundaries.

e) The Social Care Authority should provide detail of the impact these proposed cuts will have on their own internal budgets, particularly in relation to Adult Social Care and Children's Services statutory obligations, and how they intend to discharge those duties in the absence of supported housing funding to local providers.

f) Housing Authorities also request sight of the risk assessment and equalities impact assessment with regard to the impacts of the proposals on Housing Authorities, other statutory bodies and service users.

1. Summary

1.1 At the West Sussex Leaders and Chief Executive's meeting held on 10 September 2018, all present agreed the following actions in relation to the proposed removal of funding for housing related support contracts:

- All West Sussex Local Authorities to work together to review total spend on homelessness (including police and NHS) and identify savings that can be delivered through collaboration. Work will need to be implemented by April 2019. This work will:
 - Analyse the needs and demand of the client groups currently supported in existing accommodation services

- Provide clarity about which Local Authority is discharging which statutory responsibility and where discretionary spend is currently incurred;
- Identify what monies and funding streams are currently in the wider homelessness and prevention system; and
- Work with local authorities and providers to analyse what efficiencies and savings can be identified in existing provision and what alternative provisions and funding within the whole system there are to shape new models of services reflecting the reduced resources available particularly in relation to the County Council. *Action: Nigel Lynn, as Lead Chief Executive via the Strategic Housing Partnership*

- 1.2 Subsequently, at the West Sussex Leaders Board meeting on 23 November 2018, District and Borough Leaders agreed to the recommendations of this report as their response to the WSCC call for engagement.
- 1.3 There is no doubt that the complete removal of these housing support contracts will have a dramatic negative effect on individuals in our West Sussex communities. There will also be a knock on effect to Housing Authority revenue budgets as well as that of the Social Care Authority, as a result of proposed cuts in services. Strategic housing officers have expressed a willingness to work with the Social Care Authority to fully understand the repercussions and to remodel more efficient commissioned services for the future. The Social Care Authority will want to know when savings can be achieved. There will, therefore, be a need to consider how the Housing Authorities can assist the Social Care Authority with this in a reasonable timeframe.
- 1.4 Whilst there may be a concern (from some Housing Authorities) that working with the Social Care Authority may, inadvertently, shift the problems to the Housing Authorities, it is in all Councils interests to try and maintain housing support, whilst recognising that the system needs to be more efficient.
- 1.5 However, to enable this, additional funding is required, to create capacity within Housing Authorities (2 FTE's to work across West Sussex?). Furthermore, more time is required for a thorough piece of work that will stand the test of time.
- 1.6 Whilst a decision has not been made, it is imperative that the Social Care Authority evaluate and divulge their impact under their statutory duties as well as their risk/EIA assessments, to the Housing Authorities to provide a better insight for the proposed task and finish group.

2. Background

- 2.1 Strategic budget options were published in the West Sussex County Council Forward Plan of Key Decisions on 27 August 2018. The proposals reflect the current financial challenges faced by the Social Care Authority and are part of the budget process for 2019/20. However, an earlier report from the WSCC Executive Director of Children, Adults, Families, Health & Education in April 2018 'Commissioning Supported Housing: Renewal and Extension of existing contracts' considered social care budgets and made proposals to make changes, but to mitigate impacts on those most vulnerable. The report also recognised the Social Care Authority's role in the prevention agenda and reducing costs to Children and Adult Social care services. In this same report, the Social Care Authority make reference to the rationale for

continuing to fund these services because the Social Care Authority understand the value of the preventative services they provide: by helping vulnerable people to remain independent, avoid homelessness and minimise the impact on more intensive, higher cost services. Costs which the Social Care Authority are partly responsible for.

- 2.2 The proposals in the Health and Adult Social Care Committee (HASC) report (27 September 2018) included the review of the Social Care Authority's investment in housing related support contracts and the Local Assistance Network (LAN).
- 2.3 The Social Care Authority commissions a range of housing related support services through contracts with independent sector organisations. These services range from specialist accommodation based schemes for residents who are at risk of homelessness, to 'floating support' for residents living in community settings. Housing related support may be provided either in an accommodation-based setting, such as a hostel, shared houses or refuges or alternatively in a community setting through 'floating support' where residents live independently in their own home.
- 2.4 The current arrangements for funding housing related support reflect an historical legacy of welfare reforms, which involved shifting costs provided by the then Housing Corporation and other government agencies such as, Probation and those contained within the benefit system to local government. Specifically, the Social Care Authority's role was defined by the creation of the then Supporting People Programme in 2003. This programme brought a number of revenue funding streams from various agencies together into a single "pot" to provide support for vulnerable people to help them live independently in the community.
- 2.5 Supporting People funding continued to be provided in this way, with the Social Care Authority acting as 'administering authority', until 2011 when specific funding for this purpose was abolished. The removal of the ring-fenced grant has had a gradually increasing impact across the country, with serious implications for the recipients.
- 2.6 The Social Care Authority currently spends £6.3m p.a. on commissioning housing related support services for people who are vulnerable or at risk of homelessness. Since 2010 £3m savings have already been delivered from this budget. The current overall Social Care Authority breakdown on spend on housing support is provided in the table below:

| Client group | Stakeholders impacted | Spend £m p.a |
|--|--|---------------------|
| Older people | Adult Social Care and NHS | 0.9 |
| West Sussex Homelessness Prevention Partnership | Adult and Children, Housing Authorities | 1.8 |
| Accommodation based services for homeless adults | Social Care Authority, NHS, Police and Housing Authorities | 1.7 |
| Young People (16-25) | Children's Services and Housing Authorities | 1.9 |
| Total Housing Support | | 6.3 |

- 2.7 The Social Care Authority currently spends £0.807m providing discretionary assistance to households in crisis situations through the Local Assistance Network (LAN). The LAN is delivered through a partnership with voluntary sector agencies which provide non cash based assistance, very largely on an 'in kind' basis, to

households facing hardship as a result of a crisis or emergency, including foodbanks. As part of the proposals, the Social Care Authority are also considering whether to agree to the further reduction of LAN funding to a total of £200,000 per annum from April 2019 creating an annual saving of £0.607m.

2.8 The Health and Adult Social Care Committee (HASC) met on 27 September 2018 to consider housing support contracts. The Committee resolved that:

- i. All service users likely to be impacted by these proposals have the opportunity to be consulted
- ii. Members of the Committee have the opportunity to take evidence prior to, and at the next meeting of the Committee, where practical, from different providers, the voluntary sector, service users, local authorities, the NHS and police
- iii. The next meeting of the Committee include the Children & Young People's Services Select Committee and the Chairman of the Corporate Parenting Panel to take into account any cross-cutting issues
- iv. The next meeting of the Committee's Business Planning Group to discuss and finalise the arrangements for the Committee's evidence gathering prior to consideration of any final proposals taking into account the Committee's discussion on 27 September

2.9 The HASC report states that the Social Care Authority has continued to commission services on housing related support services since the demise of the Supporting People (ring-fenced) grant in 2011. Furthermore, these services provide support to vulnerable people whose lives are complex and chaotic. So, whilst the Social Care Authority contributes significant levels of funding to housing related support, the report states that it is the Housing Authorities who own the principal statutory role in preventing and responding to homelessness.

2.10 In accordance with the Housing Act (1996), the Housing Authorities have a statutory responsibility to take applications for assistance from homeless people. The Act requires Housing Authorities to carry out an assessment of homeless people to establish whether a duty is owed to house them. If the household is vulnerable ie. they have a health or social care need or have children (and they have not made themselves homeless intentionally) the Housing Authority has a duty to assist them with housing. In the case of vulnerable people the duty is to work with other service providers (health and social care) to ensure the accommodation is suitable and appropriate to meet their needs. In the case of many vulnerable households this would not be possible without a package of care and/or support.

2.11 In accordance with the Care Act (2014), Social Care Authorities have a statutory duty to assess the care needs of vulnerable people. Often the support provided assists people to remain in their homes and provide an important role in maintaining tenancies and preventing homeless. Without this support, a revolving door of homeless can occur, which is costly for all tiers of local government. In the case of the Social Care Authority, this support has often been provided by the services commissioned from the £6.3m supported housing fund. As referenced earlier, in April 2018 the Social Care Authority recognised that the key value in this work was preventative and helped enable vulnerable people to live independently, thus avoiding dependency on more intensive and high cost services elsewhere in the health and social care sector.

- 2.12 The situation is even more complex in the case of families who have been found to be intentionally homeless. This means the Housing Authorities do not have a duty to assist the family beyond a limited time in temporary accommodation, usually bed and breakfast. Where these families have children, the children could be considered to be 'Children In Need' (Children's Act 1989) and, therefore, the responsibility of children's services i.e. the Social Care Authority, even when their only need is for housing.
- 2.13 In April 2018, the government placed additional responsibilities on the Housing Authorities via the Homelessness Reduction Act, which places a duty to provide assistance to all homeless persons.
- 2.14 The Homelessness Reduction Act (2017) was implemented in April 2018 and is the most significant and comprehensive change to homelessness legislation since the Homeless Persons Act (1977). It sets new duties for local Housing Authorities to provide advice and assistance to all households who are already homeless, or are threatened with homelessness within 56 days (as compared to the previous 28 days), irrespective of their priority need status.
- 2.15 The Homelessness Reduction Act places a new duty on all Councils to undertake an assessment of the housing and support needs with every client who is homeless or threatened with homelessness, and to provide them with a Personalised Housing Plan (PHP) setting out the planned actions that will be undertaken by both the client and the Council to address these issues. The Act identifies statutory roles and responsibilities and the relationship between the Housing Authority and the Social Care Authority.
- 2.16 The early experience of Housing Authorities in reducing homelessness has been broadly positive, with many reporting that the longer 56 day period has allowed them to identify potential homelessness at an earlier stage. This has allowed Housing Authorities to respond proactively with preventative action as opposed to a reactive resolution. However, early indications are also that Housing Authorities are experiencing increased numbers of people presenting themselves as homeless. There are also more people in Temporary Accommodation, and for longer. Although some government funding has been made available (through the New Burdens Fund), this has been woefully inadequate. The New Burdens funding is insufficient to sustain the work required to fully implement the Homelessness Reduction Act, with only one in five districts feeling that the current level of funding is sufficient to ensure that Councils are properly funded to tackle homelessness. This imbalance between need and funding has put a significant impact on local housing teams and their partners.
- 2.17 A survey of District Council Network (DCN) members, demonstrated that over two thirds of District Councils have seen an increase in the visible signs of homelessness in their areas, with just over half of District Councils also reporting an increase in the numbers approaching them for advice.
- 2.18 Whilst demand increases, there remains a lack of affordable and social housing availability, and the costs of Private Rented Sector (PRS) properties are unrealistic for those most at need.
- 2.19 Clearly, there are also implications for the Social Care Authority's budgets. When there are statutory responsibilities, the Social Care Authority will not be able to benefit from the supported housing budget.

2.20 Whilst Housing Authorities are primarily the local 'Housing Authorities' with the lion share of statutory functions, there are statutory responsibilities the Social Care Authority have where the provision of supported housing would enable them to discharge their own duties. Paragraphs 2.11 and 2.12 of this report identify Housing Authority responsibilities. The list below provides an indication of Social Care Authority responsibilities:

- Accommodation duty for 16 and 17 year olds (Southwark ruling)
- Accommodation for care leavers up to the age of 18 and, if in further accommodation, up to the age of 25 (Corporate parenting)
- Young parents' accommodation for 18-25 year olds who are at risk
- Children Act (1989) Section 20, duty to provide a child with somewhere to live because that child doesn't currently have either a home or a safe home
- Children Act (1989) Section 17, duty to provide accommodation to protect a child where there is a safeguarding issue
- Care Act Sections 18 & 19, duty to assess and, as required, meet care and support needs which would include the need for accommodation where this does not form a statutory duty for Housing Authorities under the Housing Act 1996 – e.g. where the person has no recourse to public funds
- Accommodation duty for vulnerable adults with no capacity which would also include adults with learning disabilities
- In cases of bed blocking where specialist accommodation or support needs are preventing discharge, the Adult Social Care service would be responsible for covering the cost of the bed blocking and would therefore be expected to be actively engaged in brokering appropriate move-on accommodation.
- Government Rough Sleeping Strategy – seeking to halve rough sleeping by 2022 and end it by 2027.
- Recent letter to all Leaders from James Brokenshire MP (Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government) requesting that terminally ill homeless people are provided with accommodation. This has resulted in a change to the Homelessness Code of Guidance from 1st November 2018. Many of these are vulnerable adults with costs falling to health and social care in providing palliative care.
- Crime & Disorder Act (Section 17), falls to both the Social Care Authority and Housing Authorities and a duty to reduce crime and antisocial behaviour and re-offending,
- Domestic violence- Women's refuges and domestic abuse
- Substance misuse (alcohol & drugs)
- Public health requirements and avoidance of non-elective care (A&E)
- Maintaining independence living at home and reducing pressure on expensive residential services/care settings
- West Sussex Plan (2017-2022) – best start in life for children and young people, a strong, safe and sustainable place for communities and a council that works for communities
- Human rights Article 8

2.21 It will be important, moving forward, to fully understand all Authority statutory responsibilities, so that we are clear where the accountability and expenditure actually resides for the future. This assessment will help us all to identify both gaps in services to clients and inefficiencies in the overall system. As a result of the Homelessness

Reduction Act (2017), Housing Authorities are required to produce updated strategies to reduce homelessness. Understanding the whole picture more fully will help Housing Authorities with this piece of work. A countywide strategy, with individual Housing Authority parts, would be useful and this could be achieved within the next 12 months. The task and finish group, incorporating housing strategy officers, should be tasked with creating a strategy for dealing with homelessness across the whole county.

3. **Current spend**

3.1 The Social Care Authority spend on supported housing contracts (floating and/or accommodation based) broken down by Housing Authority:

| | Young people | Prevention | Older adults | Total spend |
|---|---------------------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------------|
| Adur and Worthing | £639,275 | £975,052 | £178,482 | £1,792,809 |
| Arun | £114,169 | £493,848 | £301,115 | £909,132 |
| Chichester | £67,525 | £441,565 | £113,728 | £622,818 |
| Crawley | £335,377 | £525,742 | £92,750 | £953,869 |
| Horsham | £280,172 | £268,417 | £151,662 | £700,251 |
| Mid Sussex | £36,118 | £294,051 | £133,379 | £463,548 |
| Total spend by service | *£1,472,636 | £2,998,675 | £971,116 | £5,442,427 |
| Youth Homelessness Prevention Team Social Care Authority employees | | | | £170,000 |
| Floating preventative support – countywide demand led | | | | £574,673 |
| Current underspend | | | | £140,000 |
| TOTAL | | | | £6,327,100 |

3.2 The Housing Authorities use a combination of revenue funding (grants), Discretionary Housing Payments, New Burdens Funding, Flexible Homelessness Support Grant and Rough Sleeping initiatives funding. They provide in the region of £3.12m pa to support people in their homes and to prevent and relieve homelessness.

3.3 All of the current Housing Authority funding streams are fully committed and the Housing Authorities are spending considerable extra sums of money from their General Revenue Funds to meet statutory duties, both to prevent homelessness and specifically to relieve homelessness by placing individuals and families in temporary accommodation. In 2017/18, the temporary accommodation spend across Housing Authorities and the Social Care Authority was in the region of £5.6m.

3.4 Commissioned housing related support services:

| | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| Commissioned Housing Related | | | £ |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|

| Support Services | | | |
|-------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------|
| | Safe in Sussex | Women's Refuge* | 99,514 |
| Hostels & refuges | Bognor Housing Trust | Bognor Hostel | 105,811 |
| | Crawley Open House | Direct Access | 262,075 |
| | Stone Pillow | Chichester & Arun service | 190,735 |
| | Worthing Churches | Homelessness service | 269,000 |
| | Home Group | Ex Offender short stay | 240,043 |
| | CGL | MAPP/ high risk offenders | 283,293 |
| Older People | Worthing Homes | Floating Support | 120,000 |
| | Crawley Homes | Floating Support | 71,000 |
| | Guild Care | Dolphin Court | 10,000 |
| | Hanover | Extra Care Housing | 30,000 |
| | Peabody, South East | Here to Help | 587,518 |
| | Places for People | Leaholme - extra care | 15,600 |
| | Saxon Weald | Floating Support | 57,000 |
| | Saxon Weald | Extra Care Housing | 80,000 |
| Homelessness Prevention | Southdown | Countywide Prevention Partnership | 1,420,000 |
| | Peabody South East | Mid Sussex Resettlement | 215,000 |
| | Sanctuary | Arun Resettlement | 180,000 |
| Young People | Life housing | Young Parents | |
| | Sanctuary | Youth homelessness | 23,685 |
| | Sanctuary | Supported Housing | 292,360 |
| | Southdown | Myplace - Care Leavers | 125,000 |
| | Home Group | High support/Mental Health | 205,913 |
| | YMCA Downslink | Foyers & Youth homelessness | 883,152 |
| | | | 5,766,699 |

Note: This list may not be exhaustive and does not include the physical number of houses provided by Housing Authorities and Registered Social Landlords (RSL's).

3.5 **Annex A** to this report provides detailed responses from all West Sussex Housing Authority Strategic Housing Officers. A detailed analysis of these responses by the task and finish group would help provide a better understanding of how clients are

financially supported by various agencies and authorities. This report attempts to assimilate these various responses and focus in on a pragmatic and collaborative way forward.

- 3.6 What is clear from the comments from the Strategic Housing Officers Group is how, in real terms, external revenue funding has reduced for Housing Authorities to support their housing functions because the 'New Burdens' funding has proved to be inadequate for the additional duties, and the growing additional demand. Whilst the Flexible Homelessness Support grant has technically left no Housing Authority worse off, even with New Burdens funding, the budget is insufficient and has increased Housing Authority costs. This has occurred at a time when there are significant increases in demand. This increase in demand is more acute in deprived areas of West Sussex than any part of West Sussex and is the result of a number of factors including:
- a. Welfare Reform;
 - b. Changes in taxation rules (Landlords);
 - c. Impact of low incomes vs high land/property values;
 - d. Competition in the rental market; and
 - e. The Homelessness Reduction Act
- 3.7 For information, the two most frequently cited reasons as to why people have found themselves homeless across West Sussex is firstly, parent(s) no longer willing to accommodate them (parental evictions) and the loss of their Assured Shorthold tenancy.
- 3.8 **Annex B** provides an overview of the Homelessness Reduction Act (2018) and the Government's Rough Sleeping Strategy (August 2018).

4. Impact

- 4.1 The Strategic Housing Officers Group met on 22 October 2018 to discuss the impact of the Social Care Authority budget proposals. Housing Officers have stated that the reduction in services would present a huge gap in capacity for Housing Authorities in terms of their ability to provide housing and support to the most vulnerable in our communities. Officers also agreed that the loss of the LAN would also have a significant impact. Shortly after this meeting, an email from WSCC's Commissioning Manager confirmed that "the LAN is likely to be reduced to £200k next year" (25 October 2018).
- 4.2 Housing Officers do not believe that using the Flexible Homeless Support Grant and the New Burdens Funding is an option to cover funding gaps, given the funding is already committed.
- 4.3 However, Strategic Housing Officers do believe there is the potential to ease savings out of existing contracts without an impact on the end user. They suggest that some services could be improved dramatically as the current commissioned services are poorly specified and inconsistent across the County. They suggest that some services are not measured or managed in any effective way. Officers have raised this on a number of occasions with the Social Care Authority's team and they are frustrated that an opportunity appears to have been lost to improve and streamline contracts with

minimal impact on clients. Strategic Housing Officers also felt that there was a lack of transparency around how the services are being managed. For example, providers are often cross-subsidising their services between different Housing Authorities in order to manage their cashflow and their contracts. A more transparent approach to how the contracts are being managed might help in terms of understanding the needs and ensuring value for money and efficiencies.

- 4.4 Housing Officers also indicated that they were not aware of whether the commissioned housing providers were taking advantage of Enhanced Housing Benefit or Intensive Housing Management Support which would dramatically improve their income streams. It was felt that this was something that should be discussed with the countywide Housing Benefits Officer Group.
- 4.5 Any reductions in the levels of supported housing for Housing Authority clients would have an impact on these individuals, their families, and the Councils' ability to discharge their duties. In addition to the Social Care Authority discharging their statutory duties to children and vulnerable adults, failure to provide such supported accommodation and to rely upon temporary and emergency accommodation not only places a significant financial burden on councils, but the reality is that there are very few suitable local options for such placements. Poorer outcomes, particularly for families and children in temporary accommodation, has been well documented and evidenced nationally.
- 4.6 The proposed savings through cuts to front-line preventative services could be counterproductive. The WSCC April 2018 report recognises this. While they will help to achieve short-term savings targets, the long term impact of a reduced service may be more costly. Besides the impact on individuals, the savings generated need to be considered alongside the prevention of crime, anti-social behaviour, insolvency and hospitalisation against the benefit of addressing immediate budgetary concerns.
- 4.7 Housing Authorities do have some financial capacity to support capital projects that expand the provision for those in need of housing, but do not have the capacity to increase revenue spend given the significant financial pressures they too are being placed under. It is worth noting that those areas where housing is most difficult (often through deprivation) will be impacted more by the Social Care Authority's proposals, creating greater injustice to those most in need.
- 4.8 On 5 October 2018, WSCC promoted "Your Voice – the Peoples Panel", inviting key stakeholders to have their say. The consultation will close on 3 December 2018. This report could be by Districts and Boroughs as a response to this consultation.

5. Overall evaluation of the analysis

- 5.1 The analysis demonstrates some key points:
 - There is a lack of transparency relating to outcomes from the data, as well as a lack of clarity about the effectiveness of how current contracts have been managed.
 - There is a need to understand accountability and expenditure across the whole County area. This would help us better understand the provider relationships and where there might be duplication, overlap or inefficiencies.

- A complete review of the contracts and commissioning is needed in order to take forward a plan to commission services for the future in a more efficient way.
- Housing Authorities have a significant number of placements of people who do not originate from their areas and this places additional burdens on Councils that have seen the highest rise in rough sleeping and a sharp increase in homelessness presentations over the last two years.
- Beyond the financial burden, (detailed below) the impact of these commissioned housing support services ceasing to exist would be:
 - Increased rough sleeping
 - Worse long term outcomes for individuals and families
 - Increased number of hospital admissions
 - Increased care act assessments
 - Increased risk to the public (loss of offender specific services)
 - Increased number of temporary accommodation placements outside of the area
 - Loss of government funding (MHCLG grant)

5.2 The key issues for all Housing Authorities is the additional pressures on teams and budgets to accommodate people with complex health and social care needs in Temporary Accommodation earlier, and for longer. The onus is therefore placed upon all Councils to undertake as many activities as possible to prevent homelessness were possible, and enable individuals and families to maintain tenancies, and to source and sustain affordable accommodation.

5.3 Should the budget proposals be agreed, Housing Authorities are unaware how the Social Care Authority will manage their responsibilities they have in meeting their obligations under the Children Act and Care Act responsibilities. It is essential that we do not move vulnerable people between Housing Authorities and the Social Care Authority. We should collectively attempt to collaborate so that our most vulnerable residents have seamless housing support.

5.4 The task and finish group (proposed) provides an opportunity to look at how the preventative elements of the support services are commissioned by the Social Care Authority. However, if alongside this, services that provide accommodation are significantly affected, then the capacity of the system to be able to prevent and provide support is likely to be exhausted. There is, therefore, a need to take a whole system approach to reviewing how all councils commission, manage and deliver services for vulnerable people.

5.5 It is important that Housing Authorities and the Social Care Authority recognise the importance of prevention. In many respects it is irrelevant whether housing related support grants are discretionary as they have the ability to save millions for local authorities. Cutting the housing support grant in its entirety will put more pressure on other services and cost all councils considerably more. Councils should prioritise independent living in their commissioning strategies, and recognise the importance of preventative support services in relation to this agenda.

5.6 A further consideration is the impacts for commissioners:

- Adults and Children's social care commissioners - there are a variety of health and social care contracts that are due to expire in March 2019 and have not been recommissioned. What will be the impact of that combined with the

withdrawal of supported housing funding? What is the link to Better Care Funding?

- CCG commissioning - The Social Care Authority may not commission some services. How will this link to homelessness and residential care?
- PCC commissioners – housing officers are keen to understand the landscape and this could be included in future discussion. This will directly affect outreach work with the street community
- The Social Care Authority - commissioners for drugs and alcohol services - what will be the impact on these services?
- National Probation Service and Criminal Justice Board - how is offender support commissioned and how can we align resources going forward.

5.7 There may be further operational impacts to other 'systems'. For example:

- Occupational Therapy – The Social Care Authority and Hospitals?
- Primary Care – GPs?
- Western Hospitals Trust - A&E & hospital Admissions & discharge
- Sussex Partnership Foundation Trust = mental health providers - concerns re discharge to the street
- Social care - adults and children?
- Hospital Trusts - A&E in particular - will the loss of supported accommodation lead to increased hospital admissions? Direct health service providers should be asked eg practice managers and GPs, health visitors, Occupational Therapists likewise (OTs) etc. as they will be able to provide case studies and a view on the impact of supported housing and what the lack of it would do to their caseloads
- Police?
- Probation?

5.8 There is also an opportunity to work with Health and Wellbeing Boards as they have responsibility for preventative housing support services and shape the health agenda. The need for housing related support should also be included in the local Joint Strategic Needs Assessment.

6. Proposals

The following provides background information to the six recommendations for this report.

- a) An extension of the current commissioned services of up to 12 months need to be agreed through to March 2020 to provide an opportunity for further collaboration, engagement and assessment of the impacts on local communities. Our review confirms that all of our Strategic Housing Officers expressed a concern over the timeframe, even with the 6 month reprieve proposed. They felt it would be impossible to come to a conclusion within 6 months. There are 18 providers delivering 22 contracts within the proposed £6.3m cut and more time will be needed to engage and consider matters fully. The impact of the LAN reduction should be included because it is considered an essential component of supporting people in the community.
- b) The Social Care Authority should also identify and engage with other stakeholders that could have a positive impact on housing support (e.g. PCC, CCG). It is important that they also explore the opportunity of other potential funders to provide ongoing revenue support, for example the CGL Ex-offenders service. It may also be appropriate to approach other specialist agencies to see what their position would be in terms of providing ongoing revenue funding.

- c) A task and finish group will be set up with a representative from the Social Care Authority and each of the Housing Authorities to look at how we can collaborate more, seek joint efficiencies, remodel provision and identify what alternative funding streams could be made available, including from other agencies. The group could also consider how the remodelling would be carried out. There has been a suggestion that commissioning and delivering services should come back to the Housing Authorities, perhaps with a jointly funded post, hosted by one of the Housing Authorities to provide an overview. However, the current workload of Housing Officers might delay progress on this. Therefore, a better proposal would be to fund consultants to work with housing officers and the Social Care Authority staff to completely remodel the service. Furthermore, the group should commit to working collectively with our Housing Authorities Revenue and Benefit teams to offset any reductions to our clients. Clear Terms of Reference should be developed quickly to ensure the group identify all the various strands of supported housing provision and produce recommendations as quickly as possible.
- d) The Social Care Authority should also consider the overlapping boundary issues that occur to determine any efficiencies across areas of West Sussex, rather than solely Housing Authority geographical boundaries.
- e) The Social Care Authority should provide detail of the impact these cuts will have on their own internal budgets, particularly in relation to Adult Social Care and Children's Services statutory obligations and how they intend to discharge these duties in the absence of supported housing funding to local providers.
- f) Housing Authorities also request sight of the risk assessment and equalities impact assessment with regard to the impacts of the proposals on Housing Authorities, other statutory bodies and service users.

7. Annexes

- Annex A – Financial details from:
 - Adur and Worthing Councils
 - Arun District Council
 - Chichester District Council
 - Crawley Borough Council
 - Horsham District Council
 - Mid Sussex District Council
 - Annex B – Briefing notes:
 - Homelessness Reduction Act 2017
 - Rough Sleeping Strategy briefing
-

Adur and Worthing Councils

Table 1: Impact Assessment of Reduction of Funding for Supported Accommodation

Notes

- Financial assumptions: all costs of TA are based on an average cost of £50 per night per person and are shown both as Gross and Net after HB - assuming all HB/rental is collected and returned. HB is calculated at 90% of LHA
- It is a given that the costs to individuals and families of having supported accommodation removed and replaced by unsuitable Temporary accommodation are immense, long lasting and to a great degree unmeasurable

| | Service Type | Units | Contract Value & (Cost to A&W of TA) | Statutory ? (WSCC to complete) Yes/No | If withdrawn, alternative delivery for statutory duties (WSCC to complete) | D&B narrative – consequences or risks of withdrawal |
|---------------------------|--|-------|--|--|--|--|
| Young People 16-25 | | | | | | |
| Home Group - Phoenix | Supported accommodation for young people with complex needs. | 15 | £205,913 Net cost of TA (£200, 750) | | | <p>Mental Health provision for young people</p> <p>On arrival into service 56% under 18 receiving service from MH. 21% with probation. 34% were either rough sleeping or sofa surfing when arrived in service.</p> <p>Added value: 5 move on flats with 8 occupants.</p> <p>Impact: Minimum 14YP in immediate need of TA; estimated total per annum 23. Given the complexity of cases = high risk of TA eviction and rough sleeping.</p> <p>Additional resource would therefore be needed to case manage these young people in TA if this was the outcome</p> <p>TA Cost: £419,740 per annum (gross - 23</p> |

| | | | | | |
|--|---|----|--|--|---|
| | | | | | households for 1yr) - average |
| YMCA - Worthing Foyer and Roland House | Supported accommodation for homeless young people with support needs (includes rent element for 2 quick access beds for 16/17 year olds | 33 | £231,485 Net cost of TA (£441, 650) | | <p>26 units in main hostel. 7 move on.</p> <p>33% of income stream from WSCC. 5% own funding stream. 62% rental income.</p> <p>90% residents Adur/Worthing connection. 41% careleavers. 35% will require care act assessment with potential eligible needs if accommodation ends. 80% have substance misuse; 23% receiving mental health treatment; 42% have diagnosed MH and untreated. 19% with probation.</p> <p>Added Value: In house education + 23 Empty Homes units (+12 in pipeline: move on for project and accommodation for suitable prevention / hless cases)</p> <p>Impact: 90%= 30 in immediate need of TA; estimated total per annum - 53. (with a third potentially needing Care Act assessment and support).</p> <p>Complexity of cases = high risk of TA eviction and rough sleeping. Affordability for move on into PRS will be an issue</p> <p>While YMCA may remodel as general needs, it is unlikely to be financially viable as given the age of the client group they would only be eligible for single room rate HB</p> <p>TA Cost: £967,250 per annum (gross)</p> |

| | | | | | | |
|-----------|--|----|---|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | |
| Sanctuary | Supported accommodation for homeless young people with support des rent element for 1 quick access bed for 16/17 year olds | 25 | £213,570 (Net cost of TA £334, 581) | | | <p>17 shared units. 8 self contained.</p> <p>84% residents Adur/Worthing connection. 24% care leavers. 24% will require care act assessment with potential eligible needs if accommodation ends. 16% history of rough sleeping. 32% substance misuse issues.</p> <p>Impact: 84% = 21 in need of TA estimated total per annum 40.</p> <p>TA Cost: £730,000 per annum (gross)</p> <p>25 single beds per year would be needed to replace this provision:</p> <p>Note - Complexity of cases = high risk of TA eviction and rough sleeping. Affordability for move on into PRS will be an issue</p> |

| | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|----|-------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Prevention of Homelessness | | | | | | |
| Southdown ILS | Accommodation with floating support for vulnerable working age adults | 63 | £144,233 Impact Net TA | | | All residents have either rough slept or have been homeless and received a service from AWC and/or Single Person 'Pathway' provider. |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|----|---|--|--|---|
| | | | (£281, 050) | | | <p>Impact: Estimate 33% - 21 eligible for TA TA Cost: £383,000 per annum (gross)</p> <p>77% rough sleeping when accommodation ends.</p> |
| Southdown co-located workers | Floating support service dealing with homeless prevention (2 workers) | | £79,949 | | | <p>Approx 50 cases at any one time that Housing Support Advisors would need to work with.</p> <p>Key risk that those with higher support needs would not receive level of support needed.</p> <p>Impact would be additional work for housing teams and an increase in intentionally homeless households.</p> |
| Safe in Sussex | Womens' Domestic Violence Refuge | 6 | £45,776 Net cost of TA £87, 510 | | | <p>Impact: AWC 6 households in TA as will have fled area of Local Connection. estimated total per annum - 16,</p> <p>TA Cost: £292,000 (gross)</p> |
| Turning Tides (Worthing Churches Homeless Project) | Supported hostel type accommodation for homeless people | 67 | £271,685 Cost of TA (through-put £548, 710) | | | <p>In total WSCC fund 67 beds (53 high support) across the Turning Tides portfolio - with an annual throughput of 191.</p> <p>For Adur & W there are three key projects that would be affected</p> <p>Byron and Manor Road (28 units)</p> <p>Lyndhurst Road (39 units - data based on 24units as not received full data set)</p> <p>Combined Impact of 100% loss of WSCC</p> |

| | | | | | | |
|------------------------|---|----|----------|----------------------------|--|--|
| | | | | | | <p>funding</p> <p>Turning Tides have modelled a loss of 100% of funding that would result in Manor Road and Byron Closing and Lyndhurst Road becoming a medium support need accommodation only.</p> <p>The funding would have to operate with reduced staffing levels which will result in less support and possibly increase ASB and more street homelessness.</p> <p>Reduced staff may impact on the schemes ability to work with more chaotic residents.</p> <p>Financial impact of loss of 29 supported beds and increases in rough sleeping and other needs we assume an annual case load of 41 for the Councils</p> <p>Cost of TA (gross) = £747,761</p> |
| Life | Supported accommodation for young parents | 5 | £38,980 | Impact on TA (£61, 716) | | <p>AWC would have housing responsibility for all if homeless - Social Services will need to provide support for all as parents with support needs</p> <p>Impact: 5 households in TA. Estimated total per annum:9</p> <p>TA Cost: £164,250 per annum (gross)</p> |
| Home Group - Offenders | Supported hostel type accommodation for chaotic younger offenders | 15 | £240,043 | Impact TA Cost (£200, 748) | | <p>Currently none of these cases impact AWC. %split of local connection unknown.</p> <p>Impact: Assuming 85% with local connection: AWC 13 in TA (If risks permit). Estimated total</p> |

| | | | | | | |
|--------------------|--|------------|--|--|--|---|
| | | | | | | 44 per annum in TA. TA Cost: £803,000 per annum (gross) |
| CGL Offender House | Supported accommodation for High Risk Offenders. | 10 | £94,489 Impact TA net costs (£133, 832) | | | Impact: AWC 10 rough sleepers as likely too high risk for TA. 32 per annum. Net TA Cost x 10 x 1 yr =£133,832.40 |
| | | 239 | £1,566,123 | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|--|------------------------------------|---------------|----------|--|--|--|
| Older People | | | | | | |
| Saxon Weald - Highdown Court Extra Care Housing Scheme | supported accommodation | 54 | £13,231 | | | 54 one and two-bedroom apartments for rent and shared ownership. Over 60s who need support with day-to-day living. Likely to need Care Act Assessments to establish eligible care needs. Impact: It is difficult to place a financial cost on this and effectively there would be mixed outcomes that would in all likelihood fall on the landlord, the NHS and WSCC. WSCC would need to provide care support to enable them to live independently or care placement if they cannot do so with care support. |
| Peabody - Here to Help | tenure neutral floating support | not specified | £35,251 | | | Report 62 households per annum supported. Impact: see above |
| Worthing Homes - housing for | floating support to social housing | not specified | £120,000 | | | Support 270 tenants supported per annum |

| | | | | | |
|--|----------------------------|------------|-------------------|--|--|
| older people | properties | | | | Impact: as above for Saxon Weald |
| Guild Care: Dolphin Court "Extra Care Light" housing scheme | supported accommodation | 32 | £10,000 | | Sheltered Housing Scheme 31 Studio Units. Supported to maintain independence - daily living tasks - cleaning and personal care. If support withdrawn - likely to need Care Act Assessments to establish eligible care needs. Impact: See above |
| | | 86 | £178,482 | | |
| | | 325 | £1,744,605 | | |

Table 2: Financial Summary

| Impact of complete withdrawal of funding | | | | |
|---|----------------|-----------------|------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Organisation | County support | Number of units | Likely annual caseload | EA / TA equivalent costs per year |
| Home Group - Phoenix | 205,913 | 15 | 23 | 307,810 |
| YMCA - Worthing Foyer and Roland House | 231,485 | 33 | 53 | 709,310 |
| Sanctuary | 213,570 | 25 | 21 | 281,050 |
| Southdown ILS | 144,233 | 63 | 21 | 281,050 |
| Southdown co-located workers | 79,949 | | | 0 |
| Safe in Sussex | 45,776 | 6 | 6 | 87,510 |
| Turning Tides | 271,685 | 67 | 41 | 548,710 |
| Life | 38,980 | 5 | 9 | 120,450 |

| | | | | |
|--|-----------|----|-----|-----------|
| Home Group - Offenders | 240,043 | 15 | 44 | 588,860 |
| CGL Offender House | 94,489 | 10 | 32 | 428,260 |
| Saxon Weald - Highdown Court Extra Care Housing Scheme | 13,231 | 54 | 0 | 0 |
| Peabody - Here to Help | 35,251 | | 0 | 0 |
| Worthing Homes - housing for older people | 120,000 | | 0 | 0 |
| Guild Care: Dolphin Court "Extra Care Light" housing scheme | 10,000 | 32 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | |
| | 1,744,605 | | 250 | 3,353,010 |
| Cost of administering caseload (8 additional members of staff) | | | | 332,000 |
| Total cost | | | | 3,685,010 |

Table 3: Financial Resources Available and Committed - Adur & Worthing Councils

| Adur District Council | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|---------------|----------------------|---|
| Financial resources available | | | | |
| Budget | 2018/19 Budget Level (Annual or one off grant) | Source | Spend / Usage | Notes |
| Discretionary Housing Payment | 130,002 | DWP | 130,002 | Can only be used to top-up housing benefit payments for existing claimants. Adur spends close to the overall allocation each year. |
| Additional Burdens Funding | 27,216 | MHCLG | 34,000 | The additional burdens funding was given for the introduction of the Homeless Reduction Act. In Adur and Worthing the cost of the additional staff was £125,000 across the two Councils and consequently, the Council chose to top-up the budget from general resources. Since the introduction of the act the Councils have seen a further rise in the number of cases costing an additional £370,000 per |

| | | | | |
|--|---------|--------------|---------|--|
| | | | | year, of which £100,000 is attributable to Adur. |
| Flexible Homeless Support Grant | 206,019 | MHCLG | 206,019 | <p>Flexible Housing support grant replaces payments made via the housing benefit system. Councils used to receive £60.00 per week per claimant.</p> <p>As a result of this change, overall income for the service does not increase with the level of demand on the service.</p> <p>In 2018/19 there is additional income of £52,480, (which is all contributing to costs associated with TA)</p> <p>In 2019/20 the grant will reduce to £138,739 at which point the Councils will be receiving at least £14,000 less than the amount received via the old HB system.</p> <p>We expect this funding stream to be rolled into RSG / retained business rates in 2020/21. This funding contributes towards the cost of temporary and emergency accommodation together with rental income.</p> |
| Other MHCLG grant(s) | | | | |
| None | | | | |
| New Homes Bonus | 202,440 | MHCLG | 202,440 | New Homes Bonus is used to part-fund the net cost of the general fund and so is not available for any other purpose. The overall amount of NHB will reduce down in 2019/20 to £115,908. |
| Other (please list) | | | | |

| | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---------|------------------------------|---------|--|
| Rental payments from tenants | 312,000 | Tenants / HB payments | 647,981 | <p>Rents from Adur Homes are ring fenced into the Housing Revenue Account and can only be used for to fund management, maintenance and major improvements of the housing stock and to support the borrowing costs that exist in terms of the existing level of housing debt.</p> <p>TA rents are set by government at a maximum of 90% of January 2011 LHA Rates. The average cost of temporary accommodation is in the region of £350 per week for a household with only £109 recoverable from Housing Benefit. Adur Council uses all of its Flexible Homelessness Support Grant to fund the net shortfall in temporary accommodation cost. The project shortfall next financial year will be met from the General Fund</p> |
|-------------------------------------|---------|------------------------------|---------|--|

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| <u>Worthing Borough Council</u> | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|

| Financial resources available | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|---------------|----------------------|--|
| Budget | Budget Level (Annual or one off grant) | Source | Spend / Usage | Notes |
| Discretionary Housing Payment | 228,477 | DWP | 228,477 | Can only be used to top-up housing benefit payments for existing claimants. Worthing spend close to the allocation each year. |
| Additional Burdens Funding | 44,440 | MHCLG | 91,000 | <p>The additional burdens funding was given for the introduction of the Homeless Reduction Act.</p> <p>In Adur and Worthing the cost of the additional staff was £125,000 and consequently, the Council chose to top-up the budget from general resources.</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|-----------|------------------------------|-----------|---|
| | | | | Since the introduction of the act the Councils have seen a further rise in the number of cases costing an additional £370,000 per year , of which £270,000 is attributable to Worthing. |
| Flexible Homeless Support Grant | 137,743 | MHCLG | 137,743 | Flexible Housing support grant replaces payments made via the housing benefit system. Councils used to receive £60.00 per week per claimant. As a result of this change, overall income for the service fell. In 2018/19 the shortfall is estimated to be £177,000. In 2019/20 the grant will increase to £151,922 at which point the shortfall is estimated to be £163,000. |
| Other MHCLG grant(s) | | | | |
| Rough Sleeping Initiative | 271,094 | MHCLG | 271,094 | Bid based grant allocation which can only be used for the purpose awarded. A provisional allocation of £340,000 for 2019/20 has been made, however whether this is received is based on a) progress to implement the current bid and outcomes b) ability to deliver sustainable outcomes to reduce rough sleeping. Should the changes to supported accommodation commissioning go ahead as indicated, these fund are at risk. |
| New Homes Bonus | 1,220,868 | MHCLG | 1,220,868 | New Homes Bonus is used to part-fund the net cost of the general fund and so is not available for any other purpose. This will reduce to £1,045,082 in 2019/20. |
| Other (please list) | | | | |
| Rental income | 913,000 | Tenants / HB payments | 1,834,257 | Worthing Council does not have a Housing Revenue Account as it owns no residential housing stock. TA rents are set by government at a maximum of 90% of January 2011 LHA Rates as above. |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|

Table 3: Additional funds to support the prevention of homelessness

| Grant funding/commission services Adur & Worthing Councils | | |
|---|---|---|
| Provider | Level of funding (Annual or one off) | Project / Usage |
| Adur Homes Sheltered Housing Support | | Tenants pay as part of their service charge |
| Going Local - Wellbeing Housing Advice Team | £40,000 (One off) | Provides housing advice through the Going Local social prescribing project at 4 GP Surgeries & to IPEH clients. |
| Citizen Advice | £163,653 | Annual contract co-commissioned with WSCC provides advice and guidance on Housing and related matters |
| Infrastructure Support Service (Community Works) | £77,040 | Annual contract co-commissioned with WSCC supports the third sector organisations in Adur & Worthing |
| Guild Care Social Isolation | £33,990 | Supporting people to stay independent |
| Community Transport Grants | £50,000 | Supporting people to stay independent |

Homeless Prevention and Assessment – Financial resources available and grant funding awards made to local providers

Arun District Council

| | Service Type | Units | Value | Statutory? (WSCC to complete) Yes/No | If withdrawn, alternative delivery for statutory duties (WSCC to complete) | D&B narrative – consequences or risks of withdrawal |
|-----------------------------------|--|--------------|--------------|---|---|---|
| Young People 16-25 | | | | | | |
| Sanctuary | Supported accommodation for homeless young people with support needs (includes rent element for 1 quick access bed for 16/17 year olds | 11 | £102,474 | | | Loss of low/medium level supported accommodation for young people who need short term supported accommodation (up to 2 years) in which to learn how to live independently. This is a valuable resource for placing young people who we would otherwise have a duty to provide TA under the homelessness legislation. Not all those accommodated in Sanctuary are considered to have a Priority Need under the homelessness legislation so ADC would not have a duty to place all those that Sanctuary currently accommodates. The project also provides a quick access bed for homeless 16/17 year old. |
| Prevention of Homelessness | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|--|----|----------|--|--|--|
| Sanctuary | Supported accommodation for vulnerable working age adults | 26 | £180,018 | | | Loss of supported accommodation for vulnerable adults, including those with mental health issues. This is a valuable resource intended to provide residents, some with complex needs, with accommodation for up to 2 years with a view to enabling them to manage their tenancies independently. The loss of this service will result in increased homelessness and use of TA at a cost to the council and increased reluctance for social landlords to accept nominations of adults with more challenging support needs. |
| Bognor Housing Trust | Supported hostel type accommodation for homeless people | 25 | £105,811 | | | As above |
| Stone Pillow | Supported hostel type accommodation for homeless people | 16 | £50,000 | | | As above |
| Life | Supported accommodation for young parents | 4 | £31,184 | | | The service accepts referrals from the Housing Needs Team and other agencies. The loss of this service will result in increased homelessness and use of TA at a cost to the council |
| Southdown co-located worker | Floating support service dealing with homeless prevention (1 worker) | 1 | £32,412 | | | Without this service, homelessness prevention work will fall and result in increasing TA costs to the Council & also to WSCC as they would ultimately have to pick up those Intentionally Homeless (IH) families and possibly IH |

| | | | | | | |
|--|---|---------------|-----------------|--|--|---|
| | | | | | | vulnerable adults. |
| CGL Offender Houses | Supported accommodation for high risk offenders | 10 | £94,489 | | | Impact on Arun Council Homes, TA and Arun homelessness service. Has there been any dialogue with the Probation service? |
| | | | | | | |
| | | 92 | £596,388 | | | |
| Older People | | | | | | |
| Saxon Weald - Abbotswood Extra Care Housing Scheme | supported accommodation | 62 | £13,231 | | | The removal of the subsidy for Extra Care Landlords will affect the delivery of this type of accommodation in the district. Saxon Weald (Abbotswood) has a contract that funds the support provided by the scheme manager equating to £13,231 pa. The provider may be able to mitigate the potential loss of this funding via enhanced housing management charges being added to the rent account and by levying a small charge to residents to assist to meet support costs. |
| Peabody - Here to Help | tenure neutral floating support | not specified | £287,884 | | | The impact of withdrawing the cross tenure floating support service will have more serious impacts across the County. This service provides valuable assistance to older people who may otherwise be without support, be isolated and need assistance with a range of |

| | | | | | | |
|----------------|--|------------|-----------------|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | housing related needs. |
| Safe in Sussex | DA resettlement service. Has accommodation for female victims of domestic abuse and a drop in facility for advice. | | | | | Any cut in funding will have a devastating impact on critical services which are already stretched. District and boroughs do not have the facilities, expertise nor funding to replicate these services. The withdrawal of this service would have an adverse impact of WSCC as children are often affected. |
| Homegroup | Working with victims of domestic abuse to support, advise and secure alternative accommodation, or remain in current accommodation with legal remedies in place. DV MARAC may be affected by this. | | | | | Low level floating support helps prevent referrals to higher level crisis facilities such as refuges. The provision of this service has a hugely positive impact on the individuals as well as decreasing costs for districts / boroughs and WSCC as children are often affected. |
| | | 62 | £301,115 | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | 154 | £897,503 | | | |

Arun District Council

| Financial resources available | | | |
|-------------------------------|---|--------|---|
| Budget | Budget Level (Annual or one off grant) | Source | Spend / Usage |
| Discretionary Housing Payment | £319,720 | DWP | Spent and committed £210,000 to date on |

| | | | |
|---------------------------------|----------|-------|---|
| | | | Homelessness Prevention and covering the Spare Room subsidy |
| Additional Burdens Funding | £65,000 | MHCLG | |
| Flexible Homeless Support Grant | £350,289 | MHCLG | |
| Other MHCLG grant(s) | | | |
| New Homes Bonus | | | |
| Other (please list) | | | |

| Grant funding provided by Arun District Council | | |
|--|---|---|
| Provider | Level of funding (Annual or one off) | Project / Usage |
| Stonepillow | £10,000 | To provide funding for rent and utilities at the supported hostel |
| SWEP | £15,000 | Emergency winter accommodation provision |
| | | |
| | | |

Homeless Prevention and Assessment – Financial resources available and grant funding awards made to local providers

Chichester District Council

| | Service Type | Units | Value | Statutory? (WSCC to complete) Yes/No | If withdrawn, alternative delivery for statutory duties (WSCC to complete) | D&B narrative – consequences or risks of withdrawal |
|-------------------------------|--|--------------|--------------|---|---|---|
| Young People 16-25 | | | | | | |
| Southdown - Myplace | Accommodation with floating support for care leavers and complex homeless young people | 18 | £67,525 | | | <p>Housing related support aims to help vulnerable young people sustain or achieve independence in their home and this support is aimed at care leavers and young people. Savings in this area could result in higher long term costs as a result of increasing homelessness due to arrears, increased debt, inability to stay in education or employment, dependency on statutory services and the closure of specialist affordable housing. These resulting costs will impact on not only CDC but WSCC, the NHS and the voluntary sector.</p> <p>There would be increased pressure on the CDC Housing service and temporary accommodation. However impacts would be not only on the Housing service, but on the whole community due to increased rough sleeping, ASB, offending.</p> <p>Part of this relating to Care Leavers could be a statutory responsibility for WSCC.</p> |

| Prevention of Homelessness | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|----|----------|--|--|--|
| Stone Pillow | Supported hostel type accommodation for homeless people | 47 | £140,735 | | | <p>StonePillow provide a very specialised support service. If this funding was withdrawn and the hostel was forced to close we would see increased rough sleeping in the District. This has economic and social impacts on the whole community. If the hostel were to close rough sleepers may tip into the care or healthcare system.</p> <p>There would be increased pressure on the CDC Housing service and temporary accommodation.</p> <p>If funding is reduced StonePillow may be forced to reduce staffing levels at the hostel. This would mean they would be unable to accept the highest need cases as there would not be sufficient supervision. This would result in clients with complex needs, including those with mental and physical health problems being forced to sleep rough.</p> |
| Southdown ILS | Accommodation with floating support for vulnerable working age adults | 50 | £144,233 | | | <p>Housing related support aims to help vulnerable people sustain or achieve independence in their home. Savings in this area could result in higher long term costs as a result of increasing homelessness due to arrears, increased debt, inability to stay in education or employment, dependency on statutory services and the closure of specialist affordable housing. These resulting costs will impact on not only CDC but WSCC, the NHS and the voluntary sector. Impacts would be not only on the Housing service due to increased homelessness, but on</p> |

| | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|---|------------|-----------------|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | <p>the whole community due to increased rough sleeping, ASB, offending.</p> <p>For the individual the risk is that they would be unable to sustain their tenancy. They may tip over into the care or healthcare systems.</p> |
| Southdown co-located worker | Floating support service dealing with homeless prevention (2 workers) | 2 | £79,949 | | | <p>CDC has two co-located workers, and our Housing team makes referrals. The service aims to prevent homelessness for two groups: families with children who are at risk of being found intentionally homeless & single adults at risk of rough sleeping. This would be a very direct loss to CDC of 2FTE.</p> <p>For the individual and families the risk is as above.</p> <p>There would be increased pressure on the CDC Housing service and temporary accommodation.</p> |
| CGL Offender Houses | Supported accommodation for high risk offenders | 6 | £56,699 | | | Should this funding be withdrawn the Probation service would have to access housing for high risk offenders in the private rented sector. They would remain unsupervised and this could result in re-offending and anti social behaviour, debt and potentially homelessness. |
| | | 121 | £489,141 | | | |
| Older People | | | | | | |
| Places for People – Leaholme ECH | supported accommodation | 40 | £15,600 | | | Withdrawal of this funding could mean older vulnerable people not having help at hand to support them to live independently. This would be particularly concerning for those with health |

| | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------------|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | conditions. If this support is not available residents could tip into the care system. |
| Hanover – Lapwing Court ECH | Supported accommodation | 28 | £10,000 | | | As above. |
| Peabody - Here to Help | tenure neutral floating support | 140 | £88,128 | | | This is floating support to help people to stay in their homes. If this support were not available that is a large number of older clients who may be struggling with debt, arrears on their rent or mortgage or other housing related issues. They may be living in cold or damp conditions, or be in need of an adaptation and unable to access the assistance they need. The impact of this is that the individual may be unable to stay at home safely. |
| | | | | | | |
| | | 68 | £113,728 | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | 189 | £602,869 | | | |

Chichester District Council

| Financial resources available | | | |
|---------------------------------|---|--------|---|
| Budget | Budget Level (Annual or one off grant) | Source | Spend / Usage |
| Discretionary Housing Payment | £202k | DWP | Ringfenced for discretionary housing payments. |
| Additional Burdens Funding | £46k for 18/19 ongoing new burdens funding for Homelessness reduction act | MHCLG | This funding is a reflection of the additional burdens put on LA's to deliver the Homelessness Reduction Act. It has proved to be insufficient to cover the cost of the additional staff needed. It has been spent on Housing Options and Housing Welfare staff to prevent homelessness. |
| Flexible Homeless Support Grant | £147k for 18/19 there is currently no indication of how long this grant will continue | MHCLG | This funding is to compensate LA's for the loss of the Temporary Accommodation Management Fee. <u>Most LA's will have lost an equivalent amount through a reduction in benefit subsidy so it is not additional funding.</u> In fact CDC did not lose an equivalent amount and the balance has been spent on additional staff to assist with the introduction of the Homelessness Reduction Act and to replace a Southdowns floating support worker that was withdrawn by WSCC two years ago in a previous round of cuts. |
| Other MHCLG grant(s) | | | |
| New Homes Bonus | £2.314m for 18/19. This is not guaranteed funding and is likely to be withdrawn. | | Reserved for community use and affordable housing. |
| Other (please list) | | | |

| Grant funding provided by Chichester District Council | | |
|---|---|---|
| Provider | Level of funding (Annual or one off) | Project / Usage |
| StonePillow | £27k – 3 year funding agreement | Grant awarded towards the Old Glassworks Day Centre, now known as "The Hub". The two main aims of the service are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> to provide crisis support and intervention (clothes, food, warmth, access to health care etc.) to provide tailored support and stop the cycle of homelessness, reconnect individuals to their place of origin and secure longer term accommodation |

Housing support in CDC area

Below is a table with the CDC element of the housing support that is being considered for budget cuts with a short explanation of the services provided (some further detail is still awaited from WSCC). In addition to these there are services we refer into and some countywide services listed below.

| | | |
|---|-------|---|
| Southdown – MyPlace Throughput 28 | £68k | Relates to young people. Accommodation with floating support for care leavers (10 units) and young people at risk with complex needs (18 units). RPs will allocate units of accommodation to clients on the basis of this support being in place. <u>Part of this is statutory in relation to Care Leavers so WSCC should retain some of this budget.</u> |
| StonePillow Throughput 237 | £140k | This funding supports StonePillow in taking homeless clients into the hostel (11 units), and hospital discharge (5 units). StonePillow also provide “move on” accommodation as a pathway for moving people from the hostel into more permanent accommodation, and the Glasshouse hub which provides facilities, shelter and support for rough sleepers and other vulnerable clients (which CDC part fund). |
| Southdown – ILS (independent living scheme) Throughput 57 | £144k | Accommodation with floating support for vulnerable working age adults. ILS schemes predominantly provide support for people with mental health issues or learning disabilities. |
| Southdown co-located | £80k | CDC has two co-located workers, and our Housing team makes referrals. The service aims to prevent |

| | | |
|---|------|---|
| workers Throughput 96 | | homelessness for two groups: families with children who are at risk of being found intentionally homeless & single adults at risk of rough sleeping. This would be a very direct loss to the team of 2FTE. |
| CGL (Change Grow Live) Offender house Throughput 19 | £57k | Service is for high risk offenders who are homeless when released from prison. This funding pays for supervision and monitoring of residents at an HMO. Referrals are via the Probation Service. |
| Places for people - Leaholme (Extra Care) Units 40 | £16k | Extra Care schemes are funded by HB & personal care budgets. This support is for people who don't reach the threshold to be eligible for care but may have some support needs, e.g low level mental health issues. This funding is a contribution towards the salary of the scheme manager. |

| | | |
|---|------|--|
| Hanover - Lapwing Court (Extra Care) Units 28 | £10k | As above. |
| Peabody - Here to help Throughput 140 | £88k | "Here to help" supports older people who face housing related risk, for example, an older person living in a caravan with health problems could be at risk of tipping into the care system. Clients may be owner occupiers or in the PRS. Referrals are via Social Care Teams. Without this service people could end up either in social care or homeless so it is seen as high value. |

Total £603k

In addition to these organisations we also access (by referral) some other organisations on the list:

| | | |
|----------------|--|---|
| Safe in Sussex | | Referrals on a regular basis. Domestic violence refuge. |
|----------------|--|---|

| | | |
|----------------------|--|---|
| Sanctuary | | Referrals on a regular basis. Youth homelessness. |
| Bognor housing trust | | Rare referrals. Hostel. |
| Crawley open house | | Rare referrals. Direct access (Need more information on this) |
| Worthing churches | | Rare referrals. Homelessness service. |
| Home Group | | Rare referrals. Ex Offender short stay. |
| Life Housing | | Rare referrals. Young parents. |
| YMCA | | Rare referrals. Foyers and youth homelessness. |

Other WSCC county-wide services provided by SouthDowns include those below – no indication of a D&B split has been received:

| | | |
|--|-------|---|
| Hospital discharge work Throughput 345 (WS) | £213k | Acute settings and general needs hospital discharge work. Workers identify housing needs of clients in acute mental health units and offer support to prevent homelessness. 4FTE + manager |
| Money management outreach worker & financial inclusion officer | £145k | 3FTE + manager |
| Management of Supported Housing, co-located staff and admin | £227k | 8FTE – I understand these are SouthDowns admin staff so no service delivery impacts. |

Homeless Prevention and Assessment – Financial resources available and grant funding awards made to local providers

Crawley Borough Council

| | Service Type | Units | Value | D&B narrative – consequences or risks of withdrawal |
|---|---|--------------|--------------|--|
| Young People 16-25 | | | | |
| YMCA – Crawley Foyer | Supported accommodation for homeless young people (includes rent element for 2 quick access beds for 16/17 year olds) | 38 | £237,725 | Loss of a key plank in the housing pathway supporting vulnerable young people. Increase in repeat homelessness and rough sleeping with associated social, health and welfare issues and increased costs to other statutory and acute servicesIncreased costs to WSCC in accommodating care leavers |
| YMCA – Ewhurst Road and other dispersed accommodation | Accommodation with floating support for homeless young people | 36 | £97,652 | Increased and repeat homelessness due to failure to sustain tenancies |
| | | | | |
| Prevention of Homelessness | | | | |
| Crawley Open House | Supported hostel type accommodation for homeless people | 24 | £262,075 | Increase in homelessness/rough sleeping and health, welfare and social issues associated with street homelessness |

| | | | | |
|-----------------------------|---|----|---------|---|
| | | | | with additional financial burdens falling on other acute/statutory services. Non-compliance with expectations set out in Government's Rough Sleepers strategy for targeted prevention enabled by all parts of Government coming together. Likelihood of levering in additional Government funding to improve existing and develop new services declines |
| Southdown ILS | Accommodation with floating support for vulnerable working age adults | 38 | £86,702 | Increased numbers in crisis and failing tenancy sustainment resulting in increased levels of homelessness. |
| Southdown co-located worker | Floating support service dealing with homeless prevention (2 workers) | 2 | £77,789 | Loss of the short term intensive support required to prevent homelessness. Rise in homelessness across all client groups. Loss of a key tool in promoting social inclusion and stable communities through tenancy sustainment |
| Life | Supported accommodation for young parents | 6 | £46,776 | Young parents not enabled to develop parenting and life skills. Impact on health and well-being of children and future educational attainment |

| | | | | |
|--|---|---------------|-----------------|--|
| | | | | |
| | | 142 | £808,719 | |
| Older People | | | | |
| Crawley Homes – housing for older people | Floating support to social housing properties | Not specified | £71,000 | Increased demand for acute higher cost services. Increased hospital admissions and bed blocking. |
| Hanover Housing – Lanehurst Gardens ECH | Supported accommodation | 33 | £10,000 | Closure of extra-care facilities will increase residential care placements and costs to WSCC |
| Peabody - Here to Help | tenure neutral floating support | not specified | £11,750 | Limited take-up in Crawley |
| | | | | |
| | | 33 | £92,750 | |
| | | | | |
| | | 175 | £901,469 | |

Crawley Borough Council

| Financial resources available | | | |
|-------------------------------|---|--------|---|
| Budget | Budget Level (Annual or one off grant) | Source | Spend / Usage |
| Discretionary Housing Payment | £336,760 | DWP | Allocated in accordance with the statutorily defined criteria |
| Additional Burdens Funding | £50,326 | MHCLG | Allocation fully spent on homelessness prevention measures |

| | | | |
|---------------------------------|------------|-------|--|
| Flexible Homeless Support Grant | £516,024 | MHCLG | Used to fund x3FTE staff plus x1 temporary part-time post to resource additional demand generated by the HR Act, homelessness prevention payments and contracts for floating support, CAB debt advice and subsidising PSL arrangements |
| Other MHCLG grant(s) | | | |
| New Homes Bonus | £1,467,303 | MCHLG | Mainstreamed and fully utilised to support General Fund services |
| Other (please list) | £25,873 | DWP | Universal Credit digital and personal support – paid to the CAB |

| Grant funding provided by Crawley Borough Council | | |
|--|---|---|
| Provider | Level of funding (Annual or one off) | Project / Usage |
| Crawley Open House | £75,000 | Outreach homelessness support and day centre provision |
| North & South West Sussex Relate | 25,200 | Counselling |
| Home Start Crawley | £17,728 | Support for young parents & children, troubled families |
| Surrey & Sussex Rape Crisis | £5,000 | |

| | | |
|-------------------------------|--------|-----------------------------------|
| West Sussex Mediation Service | £3,000 | Sustainable communities/tenancies |
|-------------------------------|--------|-----------------------------------|

Homeless Prevention and Assessment – Financial resources available and grant funding awards made to local providers

Horsham District Council

| | Service Type | Units | Value | D&B narrative – consequences or risks of withdrawal |
|--|---|--------------|--------------|---|
| Young People 16-25 | | | | |
| YMCA – Horsham Y Centre and dispersed properties | Supported accommodation for homeless young people (includes rent element for 2 quick access beds for 16/17 year olds) | 51 | £280,172 | Substantial risk. Dependent upon the YMCA response and how the service will be structured without this level of funding. Reduction in provision would lead to increased homeless approaches to HDC and an increase in the length of stay young people have in homeless accommodation due to the lack of alternative accommodation options. |
| Prevention of Homelessness | | | | |
| Southdown ILS | Accommodation with floating support for vulnerable working age adults | 44 | £86,702 | Withdrawal will increase costs to HDC as households remain in emergency homeless accommodation longer whilst alternatives are identified. Without ILS accommodation there is a risk that we refuse applications for assistance from households we consider to be unable to progress a homeless application. These households may then need increased input from mental health services, |

| | | | | |
|---------------------------------|---|------------|-----------------|--|
| | | | | adult social care etc |
| Southdown co-located worker | Floating support service dealing with homeless prevention (2 workers) | 2 | £70,226 | Will lead to an increase in homelessness. In Horsham the co-located staff support registered providers eviction cases to prevent eviction, attend court and monitor cases that would otherwise become intentionally homeless and the responsibility of WSCC. |
| CGL Offender House | Supported accommodation for high risk offenders | 4 | £37,790 | Impact unlikely to be significant as a majority of placements to CGL accommodation are without a local connection to the district. This type of accommodation needs to be provided but could it be funded by probation services? |
| Safe in Sussex | Women's domestic violence refuge | 7 | £53,738 | Similar to above, this type of accommodation needs to exist but we don't access the Horsham refuge for households that approach us as fleeing DV. |
| | | 106 | £528,628 | |
| Older People | | | | |
| Saxon Weald – Highwood Mill ECH | Supported accommodation | 105 | £27,074 | As below. |
| Saxon Weald – Leggyfield ECH | Supported accommodation | 57 | £13,231 | |
| Saxon Weald – Osmund Court ECH | Supported accommodation | 40 | £13,231 | |

| | | | | |
|--|---|---------------|-----------------|---|
| Peabody - Here to Help | tenure neutral floating support | Not specified | £41,126 | Not used in the Horsham District. |
| Saxon Weald – housing for older people | Floating support to social housing properties | Not specified | £57,000 | Challenging to estimate but service prevents a number of older residents from needing to approach our services at crisis point for money/debt advice, emergency moves etc. We may need to expand funding in areas such as financial advice if we experienced an increase in demand. |
| | | | | |
| | | 202 | £151,662 | |
| | | | | |
| | | 308 | £680,290 | |

Horsham District Council

| Financial resources available | | | |
|---------------------------------|---|--------|---|
| Budget | Budget Level (Annual or one off grant) | Source | Spend / Usage |
| Discretionary Housing Payment | £155k (2018/19) amount changes but annual award | DWP | Allocated by HB team for crisis intervention |
| Additional Burdens Funding | £99k over three years (2017 – 2020) | MHCLG | Allocated to mitigate the additional responsibilities placed upon LA's as a result of the Homeless Reduction Act (HRA). HDC has added to this funding to restructure the homeless advice team which included three new staff. |
| Flexible Homeless Support Grant | £473k over four years (2016 – 2020) | MHCLG | This funding essentially replaced the temporary accommodation management fee LA's could previously claim through HB. As such it is not <u>new</u> funding. This funding was used |

| | | | |
|----------------------|---|--|--|
| | | | historically to create our private lettings service and sustains its presence. It also supported the restructured service to mitigate the impact of the HRA. |
| Other MHCLG grant(s) | | | |
| New Homes Bonus | £4.827m 2018/19 This is not guaranteed funding and is likely to be withdrawn. | | Used to strengthen the Council's ability to generate income from appropriate investments in order to receive income to support future service delivery and secure the delivery of infrastructure to serve the needs of the district's residents. This funding is not linked the housing department or ring fenced in any way for the delivery of housing service functions. |
| Other (please list) | | | |

| Grant funding provided by Horsham District Council | | |
|---|---|--|
| Provider | Level of funding (Annual or one off) | Project / Usage |
| Worthing Churches Homeless Project / Turning Tides | £8000 – Per year for two years | Support rough sleeper engagement and HDC homeless work – funds 12 hours a week |
| Worthing Churches Homeless Project / Turning Tides | £22,000 – annually | Funding secured through MHCLG bid – Horsham proportion |
| Citizens Advice Bureau | Confidential | CAB financial advisor operating from HDC offices to support households at risk of becoming homeless due to financial issues. |
| | | |

Mid Sussex District Council

Homeless Prevention and Assessment – Financial resources available and grant funding awards made to local providers

| | Service Type | Units | Value | D&B narrative – consequences or risks of withdrawal |
|--|---|--------------|--------------|--|
| Young People 16-25 | | | | |
| YMCA – Acorn House, Mill Road and dispersed properties | Supported accommodation for homeless young people | 13 | £36,118 | <p>Loss of low/medium level supported accommodation for young people who need short term supported accommodation (up to 2 years) in which to learn how to live independently. This can be a valuable resource for placing young people who we would otherwise have a duty to provide TA under the homelessness legislation. However the YMCA does not meet the need of those with higher levels of support needs. If funding for the YMCA across the county is lost, MSDC would lose access to quick access beds for homeless 16 & 17 year olds who we may then have duty to accommodate under the homelessness legislation if they are deemed not to be a child in need.</p> <p>The establishment of the West Sussex services for YP follows the Southwark judgement ref 16 and 17 year old designated as Child in Need and the responsibility of LAs (WSCC) to accommodate. The arrangements made post this judgement ensured such young people were not bounced backwards and forwards between authorities. It is critical that there is no return to that situation.</p> |
| | | | | |
| Prevention of Homelessness | | | | |
| Peabody Resettlement Service | Supported accommodation for vulnerable working age adults | 34 | £215,096 | Loss of supported accommodation for vulnerable adults, including those with mental health issues. This is a valuable resource intended to provide residents, some with complex needs, with accommodation for up to 2 years with a view to enabling them to manage their tenancies independently. |

| | | | | |
|--|--|---------------|-----------------|--|
| | | | | Without this we may find that we will have an increase in levels of rough sleeping and also in the number to whom we will have a duty to provide TA. The loss of this service will result in increased homelessness and use of TA at a cost to the council and increased reluctance for social landlords to accept nominations of adults with more challenging support needs. |
| Southdown co-located worker | Floating support service dealing with homeless prevention (1 worker) | 1 | £39,974 | Without this service, homelessness prevention work will fall and result in increasing TA costs to the Council & also to WSCC as they would ultimately have to pick up those IH families and IH vulnerable adults. |
| Life House | Supported accommodation for young parents | 5 | £38,980 | The loss of this service will result in increased homelessness and use of TA at a cost to the council. Higher level of intervention likely from WSCC if service not available and Childrens' services have a high level of involvement with the residents of the LIFE house. |
| | | 52 | £330,168 | |
| Older People | | | | |
| Hanover Housing – Arthur Bliss House ECH | Supported accommodation | 24 | £10,000 | The removal of the subsidy for Extra Care Landlords will affect the delivery of this type of accommodation in the district. Hanover Housing have a contract that funds the support provided by the scheme manager equating to £10,000 per annum. the provider may be able to mitigate the potential loss of this funding via enhanced housing management charges being added to the rent account and by levying a small charge to residents to assist to meet support costs. |
| Peabody - Here to Help | tenure neutral floating support | Not specified | £123,379 | The impact of withdrawing the cross tenure floating support service will have serious implications within Mid Sussex. This service provides valuable assistance to older people who may otherwise be without support, be isolated and need assistance with a range of housing related needs. |
| | | | | |

| | | | | |
|--|--|-----------|-----------------|--|
| | | 24 | £133,379 | |
| | | | | |
| | | 76 | £463,547 | |

Overall the impact of these proposals however, if these households had to be accommodated in emergency TA, the gross cost is likely to be £930k pa.

Mid Sussex District Council

| Financial resources available | | | |
|--|---|---------------------|--|
| Budget | Budget Level (Annual or one off grant) | Source | Spend / Usage |
| Discretionary Housing Payment | 2918-2019 £169,935 with potential top up from MSDC | Central Gov funding | Spend to make up shortfall in HB when gap. This all assists with homelessness prevention. |
| Additional Burdens Funding | New Burdens total 2017-2020 £82,666 | | Spend on various initiatives including staffing and commissioning services |
| Flexible Homeless Support Grant | Total 2017-2020 £695,833 | | Spend on various initiatives including staffing and commissioning services |
| Other MHCLG grant(s) | | | |
| New Homes Bonus | | | |
| Other (please list) MSDC Rent in Advance and Deposit Guarantee Scheme | 2918-2019 £8000 Deposit Guarantee | MSDC | The Rent in Advance and Deposit Guarantee Scheme are in place to assist households to |

| | | | |
|--|-------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|
| | £17,000 Rent in Advance | | access the private rented sector. |
|--|-------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|

| Grant funding provided by Mid Sussex District Council | | |
|--|---|---|
| Provider | Level of funding (Annual or one off) | Project / Usage |
| Worthing Churches | Funding from WSCC & ESCC rough sleeping bid. For 2018-2019 £20,902. Future funding uncertain. Further joint bid to MHCLG planned for 2019-2020 or potentially MSDC funding from FHSG | Work with Rough Sleepers to provide advice and assistance to enable such clients to improve their housing circumstances and secure accommodation. |
| CAB - Homeless Prevention & Money Advice Service | £31,740 funded through FHSG | Dedicated service to prevent homelessness through provision of debt & money advice <i>Referrals for this service come from HNT. Aims to minimise risk of clients losing their homes due to debt or budgeting issues.</i> |

Briefing October 2018

Homelessness Reduction Act 2017 – came into force on 3 April 2018

National trends which led to the introduction of the Homelessness Act are:

- Increase in homelessness presentations over the last 3 years
- Increase in use of and length of stay in temporary accommodation
- Increase in households applying to join the Housing Register
- Affordability issues – Local Housing Allowance Rate not keeping pace with private rented sector rents
- Housing Associations introducing stricter allocations criteria – affordability checks

In summary the new Act places a number of obligations on Councils as follows:

- New legal obligations on English councils to provide meaningful help to all eligible households irrespective of priority need, to support people to remain in their current homes (where suitable)
- Extended definition of threatened with homelessness to within 56 days up from previous 28 days
- Assess and agree meaningful support by means of a personal homelessness plan if someone is homeless or threatened with Homelessness within 56 days, regardless of priority need status so long as they are eligible
- Take reasonable steps to help someone avoid homelessness – the new prevention duty
- Take reasonable steps to help to secure accommodation for homeless for at least six months - the new relief duty
- An expectation that applicants should cooperate with efforts to assist them
- New duty on public services to notify a local authority if they come into contact with someone they think may be homeless or at risk of becoming homeless

Some of the measures being adopted by Arun District Council are:

- Personalised approach as opposed to process led
- Continue to focus on Homelessness Prevention Work
- Partnership working with Housing Associations/Private Rent Sector to maximise available social housing
- Joint working with community services that provide housing support such as housing advice/ money advice

Background

Main measures introduced by the Act are set out below – giving a bit more detail and background to the overall new duties above:

1. Definition of a person threatened with homelessness moves from likely to be made homeless in 28 days to 56 days. Also includes a duty if they present with a valid section 21 notice that expires in 56 days (Section 21 notice used by landlords to evict tenants and gain possession of a property where tenants have not violated the terms of the tenancy agreement)
2. Duty to provide advisory services – extends the general duty to provide advice and information free of charge, about preventing homelessness to any person in their local authority area. This should include advice and information on preventing homelessness, securing accommodation when homeless, the rights of homeless people or those threatened with homelessness, the help that is available from the local authority or others and how to access that help. It also requires advice services to be designed with certain vulnerable groups in mind. This includes care leavers, victims of domestic abuse, people released from prison or youth detention accommodation, former members of the armed forces, people leaving hospital and those suffering from a mental illness or impairment.
3. Duty to assess all eligible applicants' cases and agree a personalised homelessness plan – regardless of priority need, where an eligible applicant is at risk of homelessness. Eg non-priority need households most likely to be single people or couples without children - to be assessed and provided with more meaningful assistance if they are threatened with homelessness
4. The prevention duty – Local authorities must take reasonable steps to prevent homelessness for any individual regardless of priority need, either assisting them to stay in current accommodation or helping them to find a new place to live. This works alongside the 56 day timing set out above helping applicants to avoid homelessness. Applicants have a right to request a review of a decision to end this duty (after 56 days)
5. The relief duty – local authorities must take 'reasonable steps' to help homeless eligible applicants to secure accommodation for at least 6 months, unless they are referred to another local authority as they have not local connection to the authority they have applied to. This duty would continue for 56 days. Applicants have a right to request a review of a decision to end this duty (after 56 days). This help could be for example a rent deposit or debt advice.
6. Duties to help secure accommodation - interacts with the prevention and relief duties to give flexibility to assist by providing support and advice to households who would then be responsible or securing their own accommodation.

7. Deliberate and unreasonable refusal to co-operate – sets out the actions an authority can take if an applicant who or homeless or threatened with homelessness, deliberately or unreasonably refuses to take the steps set out in their personalised plan. It sets out the procedures is an applicant who is homeless refuses, at the relief stage, a final offer of accommodation and clarifies that local authorities no longer owe the main homelessness duty to those who fail to co-operate. The overall focus being on prevention and greater parity of treatment for all households approaching homelessness.
8. Local connection of a care leaver – makes it easier for a care leaver to show that they have a local connection with both the area of the LA responsible for them and the area in which they lived whilst in care if they were there for a continuous period of at least 2 years.
9. Reviews – an applicant can request a review of their authority’s homelessness decisions, so they apply to a number of the decisions that a LA might make
10. Duty of a public authority to ‘refer’ – where such an authority (to be set out in regulations) considers that somebody they are working with is or may be threatened with homelessness they must refer that persons details (with their permission) to a local housing authority.
11. Codes of practice – the Secretary of State will be able to produce mandatory codes of practice dealing with LA functions in relation to homelessness or homelessness prevention, including how they exercise and monitor their functions under 7 and staff training. It will also allow future codes to apply narrowly to specific councils. A code of practice must be approved by both Houses of Parliament before being issued.
12. Suitability of private rented accommodation – LAs must ensure that certain standards and suitability requirements are met for vulnerable households in the private rented sector.

Briefing October 2018

Rough Sleeping Strategy – prevention, intervention, recovery – published 13 August 2018

Summary:

The Rough Sleeping Strategy sets out the Government's strategy for halving rough sleeping by 2022 and ending it by 2027. The intention is that it will refresh the strategy on an annual basis. Complex and wide ranging set of initiatives – need to look at the whole system

Explicit links with Homelessness Reduction with a renewed focus on local homelessness strategies, targeted prevention enabled by all parts of Government coming together, new welfare reform measures and a step change in the supply of secure and affordable housing is critical + increase in good quality supported housing, particularly for vulnerable people. Central and local government to work hand in hand with charities and business to prevent rough sleeping. Social Housing Green paper will be published

£100 million investment over next two years, but concerns about how much of this is new funding rather than being prioritised from existing budgets

Focus throughout the Strategy is understanding the issues that lead to rough sleeping and being able to address them before people are forced to sleep on the streets.

Three areas:

- **Prevention** – Provision of timely support before someone becomes homeless including timely support to tackle mental health and substance misuse + helping those leaving prison to find sustainable accommodation. Support to rough sleepers to find work and live independently. Focus on performance and evidence and stronger accountability. But cross departmental effort to monitor the impact of actions should lead to more joined up approach, although joint planning not formalised. New health provision for rough sleepers. Wider work to reform the private rented sector
- **Intervention** – a number of initiatives and additional funding. Key link to homelessness actions – swift targeted support to help people already in crisis. New 'rapid rehousing response' to rough sleeping. Funding new navigators to guide rough sleepers through support systems.
- **Recovery** – support to people to find a new home and rebuild their lives. Focus on support to move into sustainable accommodation – essential to recovery from rough sleeping.

Actions/initiatives in the Strategy:

PREVENTION

- Working with LAs to update their local homelessness strategies by winter 2019 which will be re-badged as homelessness and rough sleeper strategies
- Convening local agencies to improve accountability for ending rough sleeping
- Health and Wellbeing Boards to feed into the development of local strategies
- Ensure Adult Safeguarding Reviews are conducted when a person who sleeps rough dies or is seriously harmed
- Work with the LGA to develop by summer 2019 a package of sector led support for LAs
- Undertake research into workforce challenges and opportunities in Housing Options Teams
- Better data – working towards an integrated outcomes framework for homelessness and rough sleeping services including inclusion of housing status in NHS data
- Request NICE guidance to support prevention work, integrated care and recovery across the NHS
- Fund research to inform improved hospital discharge services
- Support to prisoners who have been identified as being at risk of rough sleeping on discharge (£3 million over 2 years)
- Support to female offenders with multiple and complex needs
- Develop a quantitative predictive model of homelessness and rough sleeping which can be used to assess the impact of government policy and interventions
- Gather evidence around affordability in the private rented sector
- Develop policy options for post 2020 when the current Local Housing Allowance freeze ends

INTERVENTION

- The Rough Sleeping initiative will receive up to £45 million for 2019/20. Work will extend from the 83 LAs with the highest level to other LAs who demonstrate commitment to tackling rough sleeping.
- New funding to support people sleeping rough to access local services
- £17 million of new funding for a new Somewhere Safe to Stay pilot in 15 locations around the country
- In partnership with LAs and other providers a review of hostels commencing in Spring 2019
- Government work with the sector to deliver new training to the hostel workforce
- £5 million to help local areas develop support for non-UK nationals who sleep rough

- A rough sleeping support team providing targeted case work to support and resolve the immigration status of non-UK nationals
- £2 million in health funding to enable access to health and support services

RECOVERY

- From autumn 2018, there will be an evaluation of the Housing First pilots in Liverpool, Manchester and the West Midlands, informing wider roll-out.
- The government will explore an exemption from the Shared Accommodation Rate for the three government-backed Housing First pilots
- £50 million of the government's recent £100 million Move-On Fund will shortly become available to areas outside England, with the launch of a prospectus by Homes England. Bids will be for both the capital funding to build homes and the funding to provide tenancy sustainment support
- £135 million from dormant accounts - the majority being spent on housing for vulnerable people, and the rest on new models of community funding.
- A new Supported Lettings Fund of up to £19 million, which will fund flexible support and tenancy sustainment in homes provided exclusively for people who sleep rough.
- A review of housing-related support services commencing in September 2018
- The £20 million Private Sector Access Fund, which was announced in the 2017 budget, will be focused on supporting schemes that help single homeless people and families
- A new fund to support the set-up of local lettings agencies, to provide homes and advice for people who are homeless or at risk of homelessness
- £1.2 million of outcomes payments for the Rough Sleeping Social Impact Bond programme
- A new programme of work involving Jobcentres: a work coach homelessness expert to act as a single point of contact in every Jobcentre