

---

# **Homelessness Review Strategy and Delivery Proposals Consultation Feedback**

**March 2013**

Assistant City Mayor: Councillor Andy Connelly  
Lead director: Ann Branson

---

<b>Index:</b>	<b>Page No.</b>
Petitions	3 - 5
Consultation events and workshops	5 – 6
Individual and provider responses	6 - 8
On line survey responses	8 – 12
Postal questionnaire responses	12 – 13
Feedback on delivery proposals	13 - 14
Feedback on strategy	14 – 22
Feedback on families/teenage parents	22 – 27
Feedback on commissioning proposals	27 - 29
Feedback on day centres	29 – 32
Feedback on using private sector	32 – 35
Feedback on Band 5	35 - 36
Feedback on eligibility criteria	36 – 39
Feedback on ex-offenders	39 – 41
Feedback on rough sleepers	41 – 43
Feedback on single access point and Housing Options	43 – 44
Feedback on employment and training	44 - 45
Feedback on BME issues	45 – 47
Feedback on young people	47 – 49
Feedback on single people	49 – 51
Feedback on move-on	51 – 53
Feedback on floating support	53 – 54
Appendix 1: Profile of people attending client event	
Appendix 2: Response from 13 VCS groups	
Appendix 3: Profile of respondents to the on line questionnaire	
Appendix 4: Profile of Respondents to Postal Questionnaire	

# Homelessness Review & Proposals Consultation

## 1. Introduction

This report summarises the findings of the Homelessness Review, draft Strategy and delivery proposals consultation.

The purpose of the consultation was to obtain the views of stakeholders, clients and interested parties on the findings of Leicester's Homelessness Review and the Draft Homelessness Strategy. The Strategy outlines the Council's planned approach to preventing and addressing homelessness within Leicester City. It also sets out the Council's proposed strategic priorities and what we need to do to achieve these priorities.

There has been strong interest in the consultation from a range of stakeholders including service users, local residents and local homelessness providers. We have received a range of feedback on the proposals with detailed feedback from voluntary and faith groups and homelessness service providers. There has also been a specific action group – the Streetlife Action Group – formed by homeless people to campaign against the proposals.

## 2. Consultation period

This report relates to consultation undertaken in the period from 16<sup>th</sup> November 2012 to 18<sup>th</sup> February 2013.

## 3. Consultation methods

A range of consultation methods were used including a questionnaire available on-line via the Council's website accompanied by supporting documentation, a postal questionnaire, client and service providers' focus groups.

In this report we have summarised feedback received via:

- Petitions (section 4)
- Consultation events / workshops (section 5)
- Individual responses (section 6)
- Questionnaire available on-line (section 7)
- Postal questionnaire (section 8)

## 4. Petitions

A number of petitions were received about the draft Homelessness Strategy and delivery proposals, including an e-petition, petitions relating to services for persons from black and ethnic minority backgrounds and a petition from the Streetlife Action Group. The petitions received have reached the 1,500 signature threshold to trigger a debate at a meeting of the full Council.

The e-petition signatories had to 'tick' box to say they either live, work or study in the City, it does say they have to give the address in the City of where they work or study, so those that gave addresses outside of the City were discounted. Those identifying themselves as City Council employees were also counted separately in view of the restrictions on

lobbying members about employment issues. In total there were 2,537 signatures of which 1,432 were verified, 155 had no fixed abode or address of a hostel, 932 had an incomplete address or had an address outside the city and 18 were city council employees.

#### **4.1 E-petition**

An e-petition and a paper version of the petition ran from 10/01/2013 to 14/02/2013 and had 704 signatures of which 442 were verified, 7 had no fixed abode or address of a hostel, 204 had an incomplete address or had an address outside the city and 1 was a city council employee.

The petition was *"We the undersigned petition the council to do everything it can to prevent homelessness in the City and in particular to maintain:*

- *It's support for all the local charities that help homeless people in Leicester*
- *The number of available bed-spaces for homeless people in Leicester*
- *The existing budget for services for homeless people"*

#### **4.2 Petitions about provision for black and minority ethnic groups**

There was a petition about homeless provision for black and minority ethnic groups, including a response from the Baps Swaminaryan Temple. In total there were 135 signatures of which 129 were verified and 6 had an incomplete address or had an address outside the city.

The petition was *"We the undersigned are concerned:*

- *The LCC proposed homeless pathway makes no provision for culturally specific or BME services in city which prides itself in being so diverse*
- *The pathway shows no consideration of the needs of the 49% of Leicester's population which are BME*
- *There is no consideration of the challenges and issues which are different for BME groups and communities and therefore need specialist services*

*We request that consideration be given for specialist service to be included within the new pathway. This is for almost the majority in the City. We kindly request that we have:*

- *Culturally specific hostel and homeless such as floating support services in our city which prides itself in being so diverse*
- *Safe and secure services that respect the needs of the women and men from the various BME communities*
- *These services can respond to wider communities as well the BME communities too when needed*
- *Services that are sited among the BME community so the shops, places of worship and community belonging are there*
- *Staff that understand the journey and problems we have experienced and also look like and not judge us*
- *Staff who believe us and talk to us with respect and care*

There was another petition relating to homeless provision for black and minority ethnic groups from the Leicester Sikh Alliance. In total there were 305 signatures of which 258 were verified and 47 had an incomplete address or had an address outside the city.

The petition was *"We the undersigned are concerned that new Leicester City Council Homelessness Services Review 2013 has proposed a reduction from 22 units to zero for*

*the black and minority ethnic community and therefore not meeting and addressing their needs of the diverse community of Leicester.”*

There was also a petition against the closure of Foundation Housing Association hostels (who provide accommodation from BME communities) from Foundation Housing, which a total of 19 people signed.

#### **4.3 Petition organised by the Streetlife Action Group**

The Streetlife Action Group are a group of homeless, vulnerably housed and formerly homeless people this had 1,111 signatures of which 464 were verified, 148 had no fixed abode or address of a hostel, 497 had an incomplete address or had an address outside the city and 2 were city council employees.

Their petition was “to keep homeless daycentre and homeless hostels open”.

#### **4.4 Petition organised by HITS Home Trust**

HITS Home Trust organised a petition which had 132 signatures of which 71 were verified and 61 had an incomplete address or had an address outside the city.

The petition was “We the undersigned petition the council to do everything it can to prevent homelessness in the City and in particular to maintain:

- It’s support for all the local charities that help homeless people in Leicester
- The number of available bed-spaces for homeless people in Leicester
- The existing budget for services for homeless people”

#### **4.5 Petition to Save Kirton Lodge**

ASRA Housing Association organised a petition which had 200 signatures of which 68 were verified, 117 had an incomplete address or had an address outside the city and 15 were city council employees.

The petition was “Leicester City Council’s Homelessness review has placed Kirton Lodge under threat of losing funding. This could result in this service being closed to the vulnerable women and children who may require this safe and supported accommodation in the future. We would like to obtain a thousand signatures by the end of January 2013 in order to challenge this, so please support us by signing below.”

### **5. Consultation Events / Workshops**

The project team visited and in some cases arranged the following events to answer questions and encourage responses to the consultation:

<b>Event</b>	<b>Date Held</b>
Housing Advice and Support Board	10/12/12
Former Supporting People Providers Forum	10/12/12
New Arrivals Strategy Group	13/12/12
Adult Social Care & Housing Scrutiny Commission	10/01/13 & 16/01/13
Safer Leicester Partnership	15/01/13
Aylestone Ward Meeting	22/01/13
Meeting with Home Group	22/01/13

Action Homeless Consultation Event	25 <sup>th</sup> /01/13
Private Rented Sector Landlords	04/02/13
Social Welfare Advice Partnership	24/01/13
Existing and former client event ( Hansom Hall)	06/02/13
Meeting with Leicestershire Police	08/02/13
Homelessness Strategy Reference Group	11/02/13
Meeting with Foundation Housing Association	13/02/13
Meeting with Domestic Violence Coordinator	15/02/13
Voluntary & Charity Sector Strategy Group	15/02/13
Health Scrutiny	26/02/13

## 5.1 Client consultation event responses

Existing and former clients of homeless services were invited to a client consultation event. The 94 individuals attending the event were asked for their feedback on a range of proposals. Attendants showed their support for the proposals by a show of hands.

Responses to proposals / issues (focused on phase 1 proposals)

Proposal	Support %	Do not support %	Some Reasons Given for not supporting this proposal
Discharging the homelessness duty using the private rented sector	5	95	- Insecure - Too expensive - No support
Reducing hostel spaces for young people	0	100	- Insufficient bed spaces now - Cause more crime and prostitution - Will increase rough sleeping - Where will homeless people get support?
Reducing spaces for singles	0	100	- Too big a drop - Single people are vulnerable - No adequate alternatives
Reducing hostel spaces for families (proposal includes 10 spaces for teenage parents)	0	100	- Children will end up in Social Services care - Insufficient places now - Families should be a priority
Reduce spaces for ex-offenders	10	90	- Will cause reoffending / more crime - Need more help - No adequate alternatives
Maintain the Outreach Team	100	0	
Keep the Wet Day Centre	34	66	- Not run well - Staff are rude
Removing funding to other Day Centres	0	100	- People rely on services provided - Important for rehabilitation and social interactions - Vital support
Reducing specialist BME provision	0	100	- Meets peoples cultural needs - Provides safe environment
Increasing floating support	16	84	- Depends on their effectiveness

A profile of people attending the 'Have your say on homeless services' client event is shown at appendix 1.

## **6. Individual Responses**

A number of detailed responses were received regarding the homelessness consultation not via the consultation questionnaires from a range of providers and individuals, including a report from a group of homeless service providers in the City.

### **6.1 Report from homelessness services providers in the City**

In response to the issuing of the draft homelessness strategy for consultation we received a detailed response from a group of 13 voluntary and faith group homelessness services providers in the City. They have undertaken a detailed review of the strategy, including the aligned delivery proposals and equality impact assessments. A copy of the full report is shown at appendix 2.

The report stated that:

- The sector feels it has not been sufficiently consulted or involved in helping to prepare the draft strategy and delivery proposals
- The draft strategy has been developed too quickly to meet budgetary requirements. They endorse the comments of the Cabinet Lead for Housing who said the budget should be service needs led and managed to respond to the aims and objectives set out within the strategy
- They want to work with the council to agree a managed process for cost reduction
- The draft strategy insufficiently acknowledges the vital role played by the voluntary and faith sector in homelessness services in Leicester city
- The draft strategy to be strengthened through the development of an improved commitment to aspirational, innovative and quality assured services underpinned by much stronger and more transparent arrangements for overseeing the delivery of the strategy
- There are a number of areas for further development, including aspects of content, structure, process, service review, governance, consultation and engagement.

### **6.2 Feedback responses from organisations / groups / individuals**

Individual feedback, often very detailed, about the homelessness review and proposals were also received from the following organisations / groups, local MP's and individuals:

- Adullum Homes
- East Midlands Housing Association
- Health Visitor Homeless Families
- Inclusion Healthcare
- Park Lodge
- Leicestershire Constabulary
- UNISON
- Foundation Housing Association
- Private sector landlord
- Shelter Housing Aid and Research Project (SHARP)
- Leicestershire and Rutland Probation Trust
- NHS Homeless Mental Health Service
- Leicestershire Cares
- Housing Related Support Provider Forum
- HITS Homes Trust
- Kirton Lodge
- Safer Leicester Partnership
- 'Homeless Not Worthless' Campaign responses about use of YASC

- LCC Hostels staff members
- Leicester YMCA
- Service user of Foundation Housing
- Feedback from the Rough Sleeping Task Force
- Young People's Team, Leicestershire Partnership NHS Trust
- Feedback from budget consultation that related to homelessness services
- Number of individuals
- Local MPs
- Leicester City of Sanctuary
- Leicester Quaker Housing Association
- Leicestershire Cares
- New Arrivals Strategy Group
- Welfare Reform Project

Feedback about the draft Homelessness Strategy and the phase 1 proposals has been extracted and reported on in section 9 of this report. The feedback received was very detailed and the main points have been highlighted in this report. Full copies of the responses received are available on request.

## 7. On-line Survey

A total of 112 responses to the questionnaire available on-line were received. A summary of some of the questions asked are shown below:

Closed Questions	% Yes	% No	% Don't Know	% No answer
Do you support the proposed 6 priorities?	78.6	15.2	6.3	0.0
Do you support the proposal to make use of private rented accommodation?	36.6	53.6	9.8	0.0
Do you agree with the proposed eligibility criteria?	50.9	40.2	8.0	0.9
Do you agreed with the proposal to reduce hostel provision and to change the way homeless services are delivered?	18.8	67.0	14.3	0.0
Do you agree with the proposal to introduce No Second Night Out in Leicester?	79.5	11.6	8.9	0.0
Do you agree with the proposal to increase the supply of shared and supported housing and to explore the provision of specialist long term accommodation?	70.5	21.4	5.4	2.7
Do you support our proposal to remove Band 5 from the Allocations Policy?	45.5	19.6	26.8	8.0
Do you agree with the draft delivery proposals?	17.0	64.3	17.9	0.9

Where respondents did not support the proposals they were asked to give their reasons. General comments are shown below. A summary of responses relating directly to the strategy and the phase one delivery proposals are shown later in the report. Although of course the general comments made also impact upon the wider draft strategy. A copy of all comments made is available on request.

A profile of respondents replying to the questionnaire available on-line is shown at appendix 3.

Open Questions	General responses
If you answered no (to agreeing to reduce hostel provision) please tell us why	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There will be a shortage of appropriate alternative accommodation with appropriate support / enough to be available in real time – mentioned by 3 respondents</li> <li>• Limited access to supported accommodation – mentioned by 2 respondents</li> </ul>



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Too long to wait for alternative accommodation</li> <li>• Negative impact on society (crime) and burden on other services</li> <li>• Hostels needed because of high rate of homelessness – mentioned by 5 respondents</li> <li>• Proposals will lead to repeat homelessness (can't sustain tenancies)</li> <li>• It's not realistic to say you can prevent people from becoming homeless / hostel provision is always needed</li> <li>• The mentally ill should be in hospital not hostel</li> <li>• Depends what wrap around support is offered</li> <li>• Need more preventative measures</li> <li>• More information on how this will be executed</li> <li>• Reducing hostel accommodation will move the problem to the streets – mentioned by 4 respondents</li> <li>• There needs to be sufficient emergency hostel provision in place</li> <li>• Need to ensure the alternatives are in place before reducing hostels – mentioned by 3 respondents</li> <li>• You can't limit how long someone stays in a hostel, particularly if they have complex issues</li> <li>• Not enough info here to make a qualified decision</li> <li>• Proposals will lead to an increase in homelessness – mentioned by 4 respondents</li> <li>• What alternatives are there when beds are not available</li> <li>• Reduced hostel spaces puts people at risk of death and serious harm</li> <li>• Shouldn't close hostels as they are oversubscribed / not enough places – mentioned by 3 respondents</li> <li>• Prevention should be allowed to work first before reducing bed spaces – mentioned by 3 respondents</li> <li>• Current prevention methods are not adequate</li> <li>• Hostels need to give people time to find appropriate alternatives, particularly those with complex needs – mentioned by 6 respondents</li> <li>• The council should invest its money into services for people who have other problems (learning disabled / those with physical disabilities)</li> <li>• These proposals need to be piloted first</li> <li>• Hostel provision is preventative, it helps people sustain a tenancy in the future</li> <li>• Fewer hostel spaces will mean people remaining in unsatisfactory / abusive situations / poor condition</li> <li>• This statement is too general it is necessary to consider the needs of each client group. Some people may benefit from a shorter stay in a hostel for other this would have an adverse effect resulting in repeat homelessness – mentioned by 5 respondents</li> <li>• The reduction in hostel units far too high. Additionally the VCS provided beds tend to be more successful with better outcomes than LCC and removing them will have a devastating effect on many people</li> </ul>
<p>If you answered no (to agreeing to the draft delivery proposals) please tell us why</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Generally not sufficient to meet need (particularly in the light of welfare reform / recession) – mentioned by 4 respondents</li> <li>• Hostels / supported housing reduction is too much,</li> </ul>

	<p>too fast. The services should be protected / increased – mentioned by 8 respondents</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Insufficient evidence in the review / strategy to support these proposals</li> <li>• Insufficient consideration of how these proposals will impact on other services / society – mentioned by 4 respondents</li> <li>• Street workers have not been considered</li> <li>• Will lead to repeat homelessness when person reaches 25</li> <li>• Problems with inappropriate referrals to voluntary organisations needs to be addressed</li> <li>• Pathways for signposting to relevant agencies need to be set up before service reductions</li> <li>• Will lead to more homelessness</li> <li>• Not enough information on services that were previously funding to be able to compare</li> <li>• Cause unemployment through staff cut backs</li> <li>• Lack of emergency accommodation for high risk / high support homeless – mentioned by 2 respondents</li> <li>• More detail needed on those with mental health issues – mentioned by 2 respondents</li> <li>• Allow preventative measures to work first</li> <li>• Too negative view of the voluntary sector</li> <li>• Proposals will lead to an increase in homelessness – mentioned by 4 respondents</li> <li>• One emergency hostel won't allow for wet and dry provision</li> <li>• Proposals misleading (e.g. putting shared and supported accommodation together)</li> <li>• Too much reliance on LCC to provide</li> </ul>
<p>Do you have comments about the proposal being fair, equitable and help ensure that limited resources are targeted at those most in need and least able to meet those needs in other ways?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unfair to those in need of hostel spaces, need to provide alternative accommodation first / review effectiveness of existing hostels – mentioned by 5 respondents</li> <li>• No, not fair, open to challenge – mentioned by 6 respondents</li> <li>• These changes will negatively impact on social cohesion</li> <li>• Will negatively impact on those with mental health issues – mentioned by 2 respondents</li> <li>• Savings could be found elsewhere</li> <li>• Unfair on those who experience domestic violence – mentioned by 3 respondents</li> <li>• Unfair on those in need because of the pace of the change</li> <li>• Council should be challenging the right of the government to make these cuts – mentioned by 3 respondents</li> <li>• Not fair on vulnerable people (may lead to isolation) – mentioned by 7 respondents</li> <li>• A social impact assessment needs to be carried out</li> <li>• Unfair on those under threat from welfare reforms</li> <li>• An exercise in cost cutting over need – mentioned by 5 respondents</li> <li>• Proposals go part of the way to meeting need but need more detail</li> <li>• Unfair on the hidden homeless such as sofa-surfers as their needs are not taken into account</li> <li>• There will be insufficient provision for those with</li> </ul>

	<p>high support needs – losing support and skilled staff</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unfair on dual diagnosis clients, doesn't give them sufficient regard</li> <li>• How will these proposals be monitored and evaluated?</li> <li>• Unfair on those with multiple needs as support seems to be geared to specific needs only</li> <li>• Which group would be aimed at the most? Accommodation for offenders, or pregnant women or families etc.</li> <li>• Should look at needs of services users before cutting services</li> </ul>
<p>Are you concerned that the proposals might have a negative impact on any particular group of people?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Those who require supported accommodation</li> <li>• Vulnerable people – mentioned by 7 respondents</li> <li>• People with learning difficulties – mentioned by 4 respondents</li> <li>• Mental health problems – mentioned by 10 respondents</li> <li>• People with physical health problems – mentioned by 4 respondents</li> <li>• The homeless – mentioned by 2 respondents</li> <li>• Those with alcohol / substance abuse issues – mentioned by 2 respondents</li> <li>• Sexuality</li> <li>• Gender – mentioned by 6 respondents</li> <li>• The disabled – mentioned by 2 respondents</li> <li>• The elderly</li> <li>• Religious groups – mentioned by 3 respondents</li> <li>• Domestic violence victims – mentioned by 2 respondents</li> <li>• Sex workers</li> <li>• Those with complex needs</li> <li>• Local residents</li> <li>• All people need support – mentioned by 2 respondents</li> </ul>
<p>Do you have any other comments about the Review, draft Strategy or delivery proposals?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to see the results of these kinds of changes in other parts of the country before making changes</li> <li>• The proposal are not sustainable, will lead to an increase in homelessness / withdraw the strategy – mentioned by 2 respondents</li> <li>• LCC needs to work in partnership with voluntary sector, community and related professionals – mentioned by 2 respondents</li> <li>• More work needs to be done explaining use of external providers and making sure they can do the work</li> <li>• Need to look at prevention e.g. job creation</li> <li>• Homelessness will increase in the near future so homelessness provision should increase not decrease – mentioned by 2 respondents</li> <li>• Support workers are crucial to making this succeed</li> <li>• Proposals will lead to negative unintended impacts on wider society / service providers e.g. increased crime / higher costs for other services – mentioned by 5 respondents</li> <li>• Hostels should not be closed – mentioned by 2 respondents</li> <li>• Closure of hostels may result in increased rough sleeping</li> <li>• Service users need to be made aware of changes</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vulnerable women need to be protected in this review</li> <li>• Hostel staff need to be consulted not just managers as they have the real experience of working with homeless people</li> <li>• Consultation is a forgone conclusion</li> <li>• Dual diagnosis is not included</li> <li>• Are rumours that the YMCA centre is closing and 200 beds in the City are shutting down true?</li> <li>• Cuts far too deep into hostel provision far too quickly</li> </ul>
--	---

## 8. Postal Questionnaire

A total of 110 responses to the postal questionnaire were received. These are mainly from clients who are currently homeless or have been homeless in the past. A summary of some of the questions asked are shown below:

Question	% Yes	% No
Do you support the proposed 6 priorities?	74.3	25.7
Do you support the proposal to make use of private rented accommodation?	77.8	22.2
Do you agree with the proposed eligibility criteria?	68.6	31.4
Do you agree with the proposal to reduce hostel provision and to change the way homeless services are delivered?	34.6	65.4
Do you agree with the proposal to introduce No Second Night Out in Leicester?	78.3	21.7
Do you agree with the proposal to increase the supply of shared and supported housing and to explore the provision of specialist long term accommodation?	78.5	21.5
Do you agree with the draft delivery proposals?	46.4	53.6

Where respondents did not support the proposals they were asked to give their reasons. General comments are shown below. A summary of responses relating to the strategy and the phase one delivery proposals are shown later in the report. Although of course the general comments made also impact upon the wider draft strategy. A copy of all comments made is available on request.

A profile of respondents replying to the postal questionnaire is shown at appendix 4.

Open Questions	General responses
If you answered no (to not support these priorities) please tell us why	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Health and care services need to be somewhere people can access them</li> <li>• More affordable housing need / build more homes – mentioned by 2 respondents</li> <li>• What about those with no local connection / from abroad? – mentioned by 3 respondents</li> <li>• Need more information on these priorities to make a decision</li> </ul>
If you answered no (to not agreeing there is too much hostel provision) please tell us why	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hostels are full / there is not enough hostel accommodation – mentioned by 23 respondents</li> <li>• Hostel closures will lead to more homelessness – mentioned by 7 respondents</li> <li>• Hostels are needed – mentioned by 21 respondents</li> <li>• These proposals won't have as much impact on homelessness prevention as intended</li> <li>• Vulnerable will die on the streets</li> <li>• Need prevention in place / working before closing bed spaces – mentioned by 3 respondents</li> <li>• Can't prevent people from being homeless so don't</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>reduce bed spaces – mentioned by 2 respondents</li> <li>• Alternatives will mean vulnerable / troubled mixing with inappropriate others</li> <li>• Crime will increase</li> </ul>
If you answered no (to no agreeing with the draft delivery proposals) please tell us why	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not enough bed spaces / more needed – mentioned by 34 respondents</li> <li>• More support workers needed – mentioned by 4 respondents</li> <li>• More support for street drinkers needed</li> <li>• A permanent solution for homelessness is needed</li> <li>• Proposals need to be adequately funded</li> <li>• Need to target support at those it will benefit the most</li> <li>• Need some provision for the elderly</li> <li>• All homeless should be helped not just these categories</li> <li>• Welfare reforms will need more to be spent</li> <li>• Wrong priorities</li> </ul>
Are you concerned that these plans might have a negative impact on some people in the community? If so, who?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Everyone – mentioned by 6 respondents</li> <li>• Homeless people / or those who might become homeless – mentioned by 21 respondents</li> <li>• Families – mentioned by 4 respondents</li> <li>• Street drinkers – mentioned by 2 respondents</li> <li>• Long-term unemployed</li> <li>• The community – mentioned by 4 respondents</li> <li>• Those who slip through the net of these proposal – mentioned by 2 respondents</li> <li>• Couples who need to be able to share a room in a hostel</li> <li>• Those in need</li> <li>• Older people – mentioned by 3 respondents</li> <li>• Disabled</li> <li>• Vulnerable people – mentioned by 2 respondents</li> <li>• Substance abusers – mentioned by 2 respondents</li> <li>• Those affect by this review</li> <li>• Tax payers</li> <li>• Those on waiting lists</li> </ul>
Do you have any other comments you wish to make?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need more time for consultation / too much paperwork</li> <li>• Help all homeless</li> <li>• Don't make these changes / disagree with cuts – mentioned by 2 respondents</li> <li>• Keep hostels open / more bed spaces needed – mentioned by 10 respondents</li> <li>• Let volunteer helps hostels / services viable</li> <li>• Older people need help too</li> <li>• No one should be homeless today</li> <li>• Look at individual's circumstances</li> <li>• Protect the vulnerable</li> <li>• Affordability needs to be addressed</li> </ul>

## 9. Summary of Feedback on the Strategy and Proposed Phase One Delivery Proposals

Below is a summary of feedback regarding the draft strategy and the proposed delivery proposals at phase one. Where closed questions were asked these have been shown and also open responses given relating to each proposal.

Through the online and postal questionnaire respondents were asked whether they agreed with all the draft delivery proposals.

Closed question results relating to the draft delivery proposals:

% Yes	% No	Feedback from
46.4	53.6	Postal Questionnaire
17.0	64.3	Online Questionnaire

Generally there was not support for the draft delivery proposals from the postal and online questionnaire respondents.

## 9.1 Feedback relating to the draft Strategy

Feedback on the draft strategy was identified from all the forms of consultation and open feedback received is shown below. There was also a specific question asked on the postal and online questionnaires about whether there was support for the six proposed priorities.

Closed question results relating to support for the proposed six priorities:

% Yes	% No	Feedback from
74.3	25.7	Postal Questionnaire
78.6	15.2	Online Questionnaire

Generally the headline strategic priorities were supported however the detail of the strategy and the delivery proposals were not universally supported. For example proposal 2.4 states we will reduce hostel provision... and this was generally not supported.

Closed question results relating to support for reducing hostel provision and changing the way homeless services are delivered

% Yes	% No	Feedback from
34.6	65.4	Postal Questionnaire
18.8	67.0	Online Questionnaire

There were many concerns raised including concerns that the proposed strategy would not reduce homelessness, work with the voluntary and community sector could be better reflected and an implementation / transition plan was required. The homeless service providers also felt that the draft strategy required for further development, including aspects of content, structure, process, service review, governance, consultation and engagement.

Open feedback relating to the draft Homeless Strategy

Feedback	Feedback from
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do not support reduction in bed-spaces available and wish to maintain existing services</li> <li>Keep homeless daycentre and homeless hostels open</li> </ul>	Petitions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need for women only spaces in hostel provision</li> <li>Impact of change in definition of domestic violence (now including 16 to 24 year olds) not considered</li> <li>Often people who have experienced domestic violence have found it hard to access current generic services</li> <li>Lack of rationale on the number of units / bed-spaces proposed</li> </ul>	Consultation events

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns about lack of single sex hostel provision</li> <li>• Feel impact of hostel closures will be higher crime rates and an increase in health problems</li> <li>• Impact of Action Homeless's bid for transitional funds to be considered</li> <li>• Needs to be development of work regarding placements for rough sleepers and the revolving door projects</li> <li>• Not a full picture that acknowledges that community / faith services will see more people accessing their services and also the impact of welfare reforms</li> <li>• Consultation with clients too late in the process</li> <li>• EIA does not reference the loss of 200 bed spaces, nor does it reference the proposals and it makes no mention of the resulting effects on other public services i.e. increased use of A&amp;E, Crisis teams, Police etc.</li> <li>• Reference Group does not support the proposals as they do not reflect the findings of the Review, that the proposals will be expensive and not deliver the vision particularly in respect to No Second Night Out</li> <li>• Feel like decisions already made and lack of transparency</li> <li>• Cuts to homelessness are disproportionate 52% compared to 36% for the Council as a whole</li> <li>• No implementation plan for no second night out or SAR</li> <li>• No second night out (NSNO) needs to be the cross-cutting theme across the strategy</li> <li>• Require implementation / transitional arrangements</li> <li>• Role of Well-Being centres as whether homeless people could access services at these centres?</li> <li>• Homeless people need to be at the centre of the approach</li> <li>• Concern about the speed of implementation</li> <li>• Difficult to break the cycle of homelessness due to complex needs / dependencies</li> <li>• Youth Offending Team have concerns about the difficulties for 16-18 year olds to access accommodation will be worse with proposed cuts to units and impact of welfare reform</li> <li>• Fear impacts on the City's heritage through damage to empty buildings</li> <li>• Work with VCS not reflected in the strategy</li> <li>• Statistics VCS provided not included</li> <li>• Move-on not clearly defined</li> <li>• Draft strategy and delivery proposals do not draw on findings of review</li> <li>• Some 'back to the drawing board' work needed on the first principles and overall shape of the strategy and the delivery</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Redraft vision statement</li> <li>• A statement of core values should replace the draft strategies principles</li> <li>• Strategy should have a clearly defined series of outcomes linked to key performance indicators providing a framework to measure strategy implementation</li> <li>• The Equality Impact Assessment requires considerable further development if the strategy is not to be left open to challenge. In particular the necessity of culturally sensitive provision within the city; provision for those that are dependent children within the homelessness services system; and young people aged 16-18 years old in hostels under licence</li> <li>• Require a transition plan</li> <li>• Strategy requires a statement that recognises the important role the voluntary and faith sector plays in the delivery of homeless services within the city</li> <li>• Develop a case management system (pathway) so that services</li> </ul>	Individual Responses

<p>users can be supported and tracked on their journey to independent living</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop a service user involvement strategy</li> <li>• Develop a quality standard that can be applied across all homelessness services</li> <li>• Review staff training across the sector</li> <li>• Ensure the draft strategy does not stand in isolation and links with other local strategies and can be supported by them</li> <li>• Stimulate the supply of good quality homes from the private, public and social sector</li> <li>• Establish a multi-partner Homelessness Strategy Group embedded within the city's Local Strategic Partnership structure</li> <li>• Secure a commitment from Leicester City Council to review aspects of the draft strategy that might hinder the delivery of the no second night out proposals, especially the allocations policy which we perceive is a barrier to accessing move on accommodation for those meeting the no second night out criteria</li> <li>• Homelessness should be deemed as a priority in Leicester and addressed as such. Homelessness services should be available to all, including those who are deemed to be statutorily homeless and those that are not but have real and genuine needs</li> <li>• Impossible to quantify the net detriment to public services resulting from homelessness, but the additional costs placed on agencies such as social services, the Police, youth offending services and the health sector will almost certainly outweigh the cost of adequate homelessness provision many times over</li> <li>• Homelessness services should be deemed a priority in a time of unprecedented economic and social turbulence</li> <li>• Homelessness services should be recognised for the benefits they bring within housing and beyond and preventing and responding to homelessness, and therefore not subjected to the level of funding cut proposed</li> <li>• Propose addition of a seventh principle</li> <li>• Explore the establishment of a specialist hostel for drinkers who have not yet accepted their need to change</li> <li>• How can reducing service to those with least e.g. the homeless be equitable</li> <li>• Concerns proposals would have a negative impact on the poor and needy of the City</li> <li>• Concern homelessness levels second highest in the Country and improvement to services are required not making more cuts</li> <li>• Cuts likely to result in increased crime, unemployment, rough sleeping and the removal of a safety net</li> <li>• Currently insufficient places and the council has a gatekeeping policy preventing all but the most vulnerable single people from entering their hostels</li> <li>• Proposal will make a bad situation worse and extend crisis to families as well as single people</li> <li>• Council has had responsibility for preventing homelessness since 2006 and it has made no difference to the numbers of homeless people in Leicester or the availability of hostel accommodation</li> <li>• Concern proposals will have a negative outcomes in terms of community safety which will require funding from other budgets</li> <li>• Homelessness and rough sleeping have increased dramatically through the recession and will increase further due to these cuts</li> <li>• The Council has been underestimating the number of homeless individual in Leicester for years</li> <li>• Cuts to service for homeless people may impact on their lifespan, health, wellbeing, finances and social integration</li> <li>• Do we have enough accommodation available daily for the homeless?</li> </ul>	
---	--



- Homelessness review is unrealistic. Whilst prevention is better than cure, this must inevitable involve greater expenditure
- Homeless and elderly are far more important (arts are largely non-essential)
- Homelessness service proposal will lead to increased need
- No details about the successful work that EMHA does across its three schemes and no real acknowledgement of the teenage parents' services
- Homelessness strategic priorities contain no reference to diverse cultural
- Foundation hostels classed as generic rather than specialist in the Homelessness Review. Two hostels are BME specific and floating support is culturally sensitive
- Benefits of services and high satisfaction levels of service users omitted in the findings
- Strategy should be agreed amongst all stakeholders before providers are allocated to implement the strategy The priority relating to diversity and cultural need from the VCS vision in not replicated in the draft homelessness strategy
- Consultation undertaken with service users and service have not been transferred to the draft strategy
- Service users would prefer to have accommodation that is culturally appropriate rather than that was less than ideal in terms of infrastructure (e.g. sharing / en-suite)
- Maintain resources to keep specialist BME homelessness provision and culturally sensitive tenancy support services
- Concern about how consultation took place and future consultation took place and future exercises should take into account accessibility for all of our communities
- Opportunity to work together to develop an excellent offer to homeless people to homeless people in our city, develop a cost efficient delivery plan and ensure diversity is at the heart of that and is responsive to the needs of our diverse communities adequately
- Lack of acknowledgement that the needs of homeless families require a multiagency approach and does not consider the needs of children
- The strategy is likely to result in further exclusion of families, add to the population of transient families in Leicester and their needs not being identified
- Disturbing that in the strategy's discussion of partner agencies CAMHS rapid access service and the specialist homeless health visiting service are not mentioned
- What sanctions will be used is clients do not actively engage in 'their road to independent living'?
- Principles of the strategy are commendable but the delivery proposals make the objectives hard to deliver
- Documents suggest existing support services deal with single issues however HMHS address multiple issues
- Strategy does no address how LCC intend to apply the 'psychologically informed environments'
- Concern about Dawn Centre staff offering mental health support and is not equivalent to mental health interventions. Concern this could put staff and the mental health of service users at risk
- Difficult to understand the role and value of MDT being implicitly questioned in the review and strategy
- No mention of the increase in cost to health, social care, police and criminal justice purses of the changes in LCC homelessness provision
- Fear increased homeless population without matched provision of emergency accommodation will result in:

- - fatalities through mental and physical health emergencies - increase in instances of domestic abuse and people experiencing domestic abuse
- - increase in problematic drug and alcohol use
- - increase in anti-social behaviour and crime
- Leading to more frequent and expensive admissions to mental health hospital, physical health hospital and prison.
- Could the hospital discharge policy adopted for physical health be replicated for mental health?
- Moving away from a crisis and rescue model in the proposed ways will not reduce crisis happening, it may actually have the opposite effect as individuals and families have difficulty accessing appropriate services
- Benefits of personalised support following service user no matter where they are accommodated
- Concern regarding implications of the proposals in their current format will be counterproductive to strategic priority 5
- If hostels are closed and people placed in shared housing where will the HMHS / LPT engage and assess people safely? Also difficulty for crisis teams / CMHT's
- If hostels / day centres close who will undertake an initial screening process and referral for HMHS's?
- Emergency access to hostel beds will be reduced / restricted for individuals in mental health crisis which is essential in the prevention of suicide
- Potentially the number of people rough sleeping and sofa surfing will increase which will impact upon health services, police and probation. Many people not offered temporary accommodation have been forced into "social crisis" and present inappropriately to health services.
- Potential increase in inappropriate referrals to LPT drug and alcohol services (see priority 5.6)
- Can priorities 5.4 & 5.5 also be applied to LPT?
- Hospital discharges will be affected (physical and mental health) with reduced capacity to accept admission to the one remaining single persons hostel
- Open statement "LCC want to focus resources away from addressing homeless after it happens, to prevent it from happening at all" fails to recognise that not all homelessness is preventable
- People will only get a single service offer and once the LA have discharged their duty any repeat episodes will increasingly likely to be viewed as "intentional" and hence no further duty to provide housing / support
- EIA makes no mention or reference to any predicted increase in demand on other public services as a direct result of cuts in hostel provision (health, police, prison services etc)
- "people with low level mental health needs" what is low level?
- Concern about level of cuts that are disproportionate to the level of DCLG suggested cuts to housing related support of 12% per annum
- Substantive role providers play in the City's homelessness services are not reflected in the draft strategy and providers not part of the delivery process model and information provided by VCS members at steering group meetings omitted from this document
- Draft strategy focusing very much on Leicester City Council's figures and statutory homelessness have to look at reasonable solutions for all homelessness
- Concern about the lack of provision of housing and supported living services for those affected by mental health difficulties

- Housing relating support as well as value for money (for every £1 spent a further £2.11 is saved elsewhere on the public purse) has social value
- Pleased regarding emphasis on preventing homelessness. Increasing floating support to those most at risk of becoming homeless is a good model as long as the target population can be identified and the support is consistent over an appropriate period of time
- Overwhelming concern that transition period may be too short and that services will close before replacement services and pathways are in place and tested and concern could lead to an increase in rough sleeping
- Concern about the cuts to homeless services in Leicester
- How will the council accurately record figures on homelessness if it is removing services that play a vital role in recording this client base?
- Investments such as Victoria park investment and creation of jubilee square should not been done at the expense of not running YASC
- Has a risk assessment been carried out for the potential impact of the removal of beds and the withdrawal of services? Also have the physical and mental health implications of these cuts been considered?
- Concern about the cuts to third sector provision for homeless people
- Lack of recognition of the role and the achievements of the Outreach team in the Homelessness Review
- Fear about impact of hostels closures along with changes to universal credit and HB changes and time given to work with service users to change culture from dependence on hostels
- Hostel closures and cutting family support services would in the long run be more costly to the City than the proposed short term savings
- Reconfigure Loughborough Road Hostel to supported housing
- Shared housing staff be able to offer support like Duty Officers currently do
- Service users prefer specialised accommodation set within the community on a small scale like supported housing but with 24 hr support
- Needs of people leaving prison should be considered
- Positive change for service users can only be achieved with the right model of accommodation with the appropriate level of support available
- Reflects some of the learning of the Rough Sleeping Task Force but it contains other provisions that could well act against the successes
- Focus should be on support services that reach people wherever they happen to be living
- Changes will increase the number of unsupported homeless people in Leicester
- Concern over what will happen to existing service users
- How was figure of 65 emergency bed places in the city remaining arrived at and how did this consider the needs of different groups?
- New Arrivals Strategy Group support the 6 priorities however the gypsy and traveller accommodation site provision should have been considered as a priority activity for Leicester
- NASG agree with the closure of temporary accommodation as long it is accompanied with a proper assessment of the needs of homeless people and is matched by an increase in long term housing provision
- NASG agree to the draft delivery proposals

- Does not consider the needs of the gypsy and traveller community as there is no mention of site provision
- Could include explicit link to the UK Border Agency and recommendation which aim to gather information about the issue of hidden homelessness in Leicester and to use this information to alleviate the issue in Leicester
- No clear evidence of how the council has assessed or priorities needed
- On-site support by implication is regarded as wasteful and ineffective which we do not believe. More than one approach to meeting needs is required
- Lack of impact assessment on how changes proposed with affect crime and disorder in the City
- Vital that a further review of the strategy be conducted before implementation commences to take into account crime and disorder and a structured and detailed assessment be made of the potential impacts
- Lack of governance structure by way of performance framework and outcomes to measure success and how it will review delivery if it fails to meets these outcomes and homelessness increases in the city
- No mention of how this strategy will dovetail or has been shaped with neighbouring authorities and their strategic aims in this area
- No clear pathway from homelessness to independent living which shows how the proposals with be achieved
- Risk of moving too quickly (from emergency hostel provision) will result in increased street homelessness particularly for vulnerable individuals and difficulties in supervising offenders released from prison who may resort to offending to fulfil their basic needs
- Agreed with proposed priorities set out in the strategy and the emphasis on prevention
- Concern about the huge reduction in the number of hostel bed spaces and do not see how this will be matched by an increase in the supply of alternative accommodation
- Concerns funding cuts will mean the loss of good well managed accommodation for example potentially Action Homeless or HITS Homes Trust
- Need for hostel and supported accommodation is likely to increase rather than decrease over the next few years. There is already a shortage of accommodation at hostels across the City
- Strategy depends on more alternative accommodation being provided with current conditions does not explain how this is to be achieved
- Not clear how the Council will make greater use of the existing stock in the City and how people will move from homelessness to temporary accommodation and then into independent or semi-independent accommodation
- Pursue measures to increase the amount of alternative provision before reducing the number of hostel spaces
- Savings can be made but not attempted in the way suggested by the Strategy and Delivery proposals
- Welfare reform could mean greater numbers of people who could be homeless
- Work undertaking would benefit from being communicated more widely
- Hostel closures will place undue pressure on other under-resourced services in the area such as STAR and Housing Options
- Strategies aimed at prevention will be insufficient to cope with the numbers involved unless there is considerable financial investment
- Risk to vulnerable citizens are tangible and substantial

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential for authority to see more cases as homeless from out of areas and opportunity for other authorities to place out of area in the private sector</li> <li>• In cases where their current accommodation is unaffordable it will not be reasonable for them to continue to occupy their accommodation. This is likely to result in more cases presenting as homeless</li> <li>• Positive work of Family Support Service is not mentioned</li> <li>• No reference to the Child Mental Health service of LPT</li> <li>• Priority 5 in ensuring access to health services is exclusive to adults without any reference to children the same applies to priority 6</li> <li>• EIA does not consider full impact on children and the impact of the Family Support Service and the Corner Club</li> <li>• Lack of details on specific children's issues hinders an informed decision on the future model of service provision to meet homeless children's needs in Leicester</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will be a wider impact of changes (to society (crime etc) and other services (health and police etc)) and higher cost to public purse – mentioned by 10 respondents</li> <li>• Needs of teenage mothers not addressed</li> <li>• It's not possible to achieve these priorities in the light of the cuts being made – mentioned by 7 respondents</li> <li>• Needs to be more positive (remove terms like 'aspire' and 'where possible') – mentioned by 3 respondents</li> <li>• Nothing about the intentionally homeless and those with no links to Leicester</li> <li>• Need to address hidden homeless such as those in hospital</li> <li>• Doesn't address need for specialist services</li> <li>• Support the proposals but not the delivery method of the Homelessness Strategy</li> <li>• Intervention needed to support people before they become homeless. Advice is not a strong enough prevention method – mentioned by 2 respondents</li> <li>• Need for hostel accommodation between Dawn Centre / Border House and floating support</li> <li>• Not enough supported housing projects – mentioned by 2 respondents</li> <li>• All too vague</li> <li>• Appropriate accommodation not defined</li> <li>• Nothing on asylum seekers</li> <li>• Broader issues relating to housing, population growth, immigration have not been addressed</li> <li>• Won't be able to access care services as these are being cut</li> <li>• More emphasis needed on homeless immediate needs rather than training</li> <li>• Won't be able to achieve priority 5 if closing day services</li> <li>• Priority 2 is a weak aim</li> <li>• List of priorities doesn't cover everyone / not inclusive</li> <li>• The proposals are not sustainable, will lead to an increase in homelessness, withdraw the strategy – mentioned by 2 respondents</li> <li>• Need a clear transition plan / detail of how this proposal will be carried out – mentioned by 2 respondents</li> <li>• Transition needs to be properly resourced with proper infrastructure / adequate length of time – mentioned by 3 respondents</li> <li>• No transition plan / information (particularly with regard to the reduction in bed spaces – mentioned by 2 respondents</li> <li>• Transition period needed to see how the changes go / current transition is too short – mentioned by 2 respondents</li> </ul>	<p>Online questionnaire</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implementation plan needs to be made public</li> <li>• The homelessness strategy is a very good / well thought out and significant piece of work – mentioned by 2 respondents</li> <li>• Pleased to see a preventative approach in the strategy</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More needed than advice as this will not prevent homelessness – mentioned by 4 respondents</li> <li>• Keep more hostel space – mentioned by 2 respondents</li> <li>• More support needed</li> <li>• Support will not prevent homelessness</li> <li>• These principles won't work – mentioned by 2 respondents</li> <li>• Should provide homeless with accommodation</li> <li>• Bed spaces not available when needed</li> <li>• Priorities unachievable with cutbacks</li> <li>• Supported housing should not be cut</li> </ul>	Postal questionnaire

## 9.2 Feedback on families / teenage parents

Feedback relating to proposals affecting families including teenage parents were identified through all the forms of consultation and open feedback received is shown below.

The proposals affecting families included our proposal to reduce the number of temporary accommodation bed-spaces available for families and to retain Border House but without specialist Family Support Services including the Corner Club.

Clients and former clients were asked specifically for their feedback regarding reducing bed spaces for families (including 10 spaces for teenage parents) at the client consultation event.

Closed question about support for the proposal to reduce bed spaces for families

% Yes	% No	Feedback from
0.0	100.0	Client event

There was general concern about reducing the number of bed spaces available for families and the impact this could have in children and the impact of not having specialist family support services available at Border House.

Feedback received about families / teenage parents

Feedback	Feedback from
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern about reduction in units for families as allow time for child protection plans to be prepared for court and independent accommodation with floating support would provide the same level of support in safeguarding cases which could lead to more children being taken into care</li> <li>• Family Support Service helped keep children safe and was highly valued by Children's services</li> <li>• Children will end up in Social Services care</li> <li>• Insufficient places now</li> <li>• Families should be a priority</li> <li>• Why keep Border House and not a voluntary provider?</li> <li>• Such a big cut in family provision is disproportionate</li> <li>• Reference group believe the Corner Club is dated and expensive</li> <li>• More people and children will become homeless because of less spaces</li> <li>• Children will end up in Social Services care</li> <li>• Families will then need support if they are being housed in the</li> </ul>	Consultation Events

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>private rented sector and these tenancies will cost more</li> <li>Families and teenage pregnant parents should be priority</li> <li>Need for spaces already exceeds provision of spaces</li> <li>Not enough support / beds to meet the Council's human rights obligations</li> <li>Not feasible without adequate alternatives</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Would like evidence on how numbers of units for families has been arrived at</li> <li>What alternative provision will be accessible to families</li> <li>The withdrawal of specialist family support will also have a negative impact</li> <li>Reduction in units is likely to have significant negative implications for families especially those with more than one child</li> <li>Do not reduce family accommodation. Border House is disgusting. It is mixed sex, does not have separate flats and has people with drug and alcohol issues</li> <li>Support provided is excellent and court would expect parole to the Bethany project</li> <li>Bethany court has lots of services to help vulnerable parents with their children. Allowed me to get children out of foster care because of the support provided</li> <li>I was getting now help before I moved here</li> <li>The Bethany project has supported me in getting my son back and provided support with bills and debt</li> <li>I wouldn't feel safe in a council hostel and I wouldn't be allowed to see my son in a council hostel</li> <li>Provides great support for young ladies with or without children</li> <li>Adullam Homes Bethany Project concern that their services being cut whilst Border House and Dawn Centre (Council run services) are being kept. Not right provision for vulnerable service users</li> <li>Concern proposals could have a negative impact on refugees or those who have recently settled in Leicester</li> <li>How has the need for 10 units been identified as we currently provide 29 units for teenage parents and in 2011/12 supported 78 service users</li> <li>Accommodation for supported housing clients funded by capital grants which will not be replicated in the future</li> <li>EMHA services for teenage parents costs the local authority £160,274 according to research this save the local authority approximately £338,178 of expenditure from other sources such as hospital admission, crisis services etc.</li> <li>Services provided for teenage parents by EMHA offer an existing housing pathway with each tenant that includes appropriate accommodation and support</li> <li>Families are likely to be moved from one area to another – this is likely to result in missed appointments for children attending services – resulting in discharges and frequent loss of contact with services. This could result in repeated referrals for children and families and possible duplication of services</li> <li>Take up of immunisations are likely to be affected as children who are placed in temporary accommodation are likely to have difficulty accessing their previous GP</li> <li>Sexual health services are currently available at all of the family hostels</li> <li>Adults resident in hostels can gain access to specialist mental health provision through referrals from support staff</li> <li>Access to primary care services is likely to be further hindered. It has been repeatedly demonstrated that adults accessing mainstream services do not have their needs fully assessed</li> <li>NICE guidance states that children and families with complex multiple needs should have access to specialist services – it is not</li> </ul>	<p>Individual Responses</p>

<p>clear how this will be achieved</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Further work required by Leicestershire Partnership Trust needs to be completed to identify an assessment process for families</li> <li>• A central base needs to be established in the city where families can access services they are already in contact with</li> <li>• Loss of support staff will further reduce access for school age children to services (e.g. rapid access to children’s mental health services and child behaviour services)</li> <li>• Support staff act as an advocate and support families accessing school places</li> <li>• Loss of a crèche facility from Border House will have a huge impact on Childrens’ wellbeing particularly for the under 5’s</li> <li>• This service is not available to families in the wider community as there are currently no section 17 children in need placements for the under 2’s (under s.17.1(a) of the Children Act 1989, local authorities have a duty to ‘safeguard and promote the welfare of children within their area who are in need’)</li> <li>• Prevent targeted support being made easily available and 2012 survey demonstrated families going through homelessness did not access Sure Start</li> <li>• Family support service at Border house provides a valuable service in identifying mental health problems and referral</li> <li>• Homeless families with no support are at increased risk of having children placed in care</li> <li>• How will Border House staff support families whose children are undergoing child protection procedures without the Family Support Service? Without the support children may be more at risk of children being placed in care and higher risk of mental health problems</li> <li>• Not appropriate or acceptable to carry out mental health assessments and interventions with parents when children are present. Concern that closing Family Support and Corner Club services children will be placed at risk and parents will not be able to attend appointments</li> <li>• Family Support Service at Border House provides a valuable service in identifying mental illness and the facility at the Corner Club make assessment possible</li> <li>• Homeless families without family support services are at increased risk of having children placed in care, at higher risk of mental health problems and repeat homelessness</li> <li>• How has the need for 10 units for teenage parents been identified?</li> <li>• Provision of family accommodation should be tendered on the open market. Variety of providers would mean a wider and more diverse delivery model of support throughout the city and the risk would be spread across providers</li> <li>• Scaling down of beds at Border House provides a resource for those most chaotic and in the greatest need</li> <li>• Allocation of 10 beds for young families recognises the specific needs of this highly vulnerable population</li> <li>• Concern that Kirton Lodge will close and support and help for mothers and children will be lost</li> <li>• 16% of current budget is directed towards families yet these make up the large majority of the cases that are statutory homeless</li> <li>• Homelessness review disproportionately penalises homeless families</li> <li>• Majority of referrals to Kirton Lodge are from the City’s social workers who have safeguarding and child protection concerns</li> <li>• If only statutory homeless are referred by Housing Options to Kirton Lodge believe this will place greater responsibility on children’s services with more Looked After Children cases</li> <li>• Social return study showed for every £1 invested in Kirton Lodge</li> </ul>	
---	--



<p>there was a return of £6.82. Probable alternative to Kirton Lodge is a mother living in a single person hostel and the children place in care</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support provided by Kirton Lodge helps clients move on to independence and no longer rely on statutory interventions</li> <li>• Do not believe that Kirton Lodge should be decommissioned. A social return on investment study in 2011/12 found that for every £1 spent of Kirton Lodge the following social return was delivered: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- £6.82 of social return</li> <li>- £5.19 direct savings to LCC Social Services Division</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Places families at risk in the private rented sector and in hostels with part time staff. Without Kirton Lodge risk of a serious case review. Decommissioning Kirton Lodge would create more costs than it would save.</li> <li>• Support provided keeps families together and minimising the amount of children that are removed from their families</li> <li>• High demand for units at Kirton Lodge</li> <li>• Valued by health and social workers</li> <li>• It 'at risk' families could not be placed in Kirton Lodge then vulnerable women are more likely to return to dangerous environments where further harm and abuse could happen. Incidents occur that that will have high costs for social services, health services and the Police</li> <li>• Bridlespur woman's project unit (8 bed spaces) should be retained to work with female sex workers</li> <li>• Children will suffer if this service is cut. Also Social care &amp; Health benefit from the training that student social worker receives and experience regarding child protection issues</li> <li>• Benefits for both children and parents</li> <li>• Teenage parents are a concern because hostels are not seen to be an appropriate housing environment especially for those aged 16 and 17</li> <li>• High level of need of homeless children</li> <li>• Family Support Team help ensure access to mainstream services</li> <li>• Initial reasons on child and family homelessness do not include major reason of domestic violence</li> <li>• Important to present number of child in statistics to help convey the extent of their vulnerability and risk</li> <li>• Proportionate cost of the family support service appears very low for the high impact it has</li> <li>• No rationale is provided on proposal to remove Family Support Services including the Corner Club</li> <li>• Family Support Service service model may require adjustment in its type of provision e.g. by widening the target group from one hostel</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Needs of children and parents, particularly if forced down the route of homelessness not addressed – mentioned by 6 respondents</li> <li>• Needs of teenage mothers / parents not addressed – mentioned by 3 respondents</li> <li>• Placing vulnerable families and their children into the private rented sector will only mask the underlying problems associated with homeless families – mentioned by 5 respondents</li> <li>• Issues of child protection can be managed by empowering homeless families by supporting them to work together to address their specific issues and as such in the longer term help these families to stay tighter and maintain the family home i.e. not become homeless – mentioned by 5 respondents</li> <li>• Eligibility criteria with teenage parents need to be broader – mentioned by 3 respondents</li> <li>• Believe the removal of hostel accommodation will result in more</li> </ul>	<p>Online Questionnaire</p>

<p>children being removed and as such becoming a statutory responsibility (looked after children) therefore more costly provision will be required – mentioned by 5 respondents</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduced supported accommodation for Bethany means the districts will have limited access to this type of supported provision</li> <li>• Reducing support services to families in hostel accommodation creates safeguarding issues for children. Parents need support – mentioned by 2 respondents</li> <li>• Protect Bethany as it provides a safe environment for non-smoking families</li> <li>• Supported housing like GAP is a high need. More places needed with support not less</li> <li>• Hostels provide support for teenage mothers which enable them to move on</li> <li>• Shared housing could lead to a safeguarding issues for families with children</li> <li>• Must ensure a smoke free environment particularly for children</li> <li>• Experience shows that some families will require longer term supported accommodation in order to ensure their support needs are fully met and they are supported to learn and practice the skills and engage and maintain positive family relationships. Thus preventing the revolving door syndrome. However simply increasing the supply of supported housing alone is insufficient. Along with more supported housing it is necessary to ensure adequate funding to achieve lifelong changes towards positive outcomes.</li> <li>• Rapid reduction in supported accommodation may place vulnerable children at risk</li> <li>• Safeguarding issues (children) with reduction to supported housing</li> <li>• Families will suffer as there aren't the properties / support available</li> <li>• Teenage parents need more spaces / units with support as never lived alone before and don't have any skills. More money / funding is needed to keep teenage parent services – mentioned by 5 respondents</li> <li>• 60 beds are not enough for families and teenage parents. There will be more homeless people and single mums and babies on the road</li> <li>• Not fair on families / vulnerable families; particularly the lack of hostel space. Not enough consideration</li> <li>• Unfair on children and families without appropriate support workers safeguarding issues will not be addressed</li> <li>• EIA misses the needs of children whose parents require hostel support</li> <li>• The EIA, the draft Strategy and the delivery proposals fail to address the impact on children within families. Sufficient regard has not been given to the clients or their children at Kirton Lodge and similar services</li> <li>• There's nothing on teenage parents</li> <li>• It isn't fair because not all teenage pregnancies are planned. Need support and guidance to get our lives back on track</li> <li>• Children's Services feel that these proposals do not reflect the Council's safeguarding responsibilities and will lead to pressure on Children's services through increased referrals</li> <li>• Border House provides an important resource for those most in need</li> <li>• Don't remove the under 5's play space in Border House</li> <li>• Vulnerable mothers need to be protected in this review</li> <li>• Kirton Lodge should not be decommissioned as part of the Council's Review – mentioned by 5 respondents</li> </ul>	
---	--

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Safeguarding issues for children – mentioned by 2 respondents</li> <li>• Does not help families</li> <li>• Will negatively affect children</li> <li>• More support workers needed (including families)</li> <li>• Foundation hostels important – mentioned by 4 respondents</li> <li>• Bethany valuable – mentioned by 2 respondents</li> <li>• People need support to get children back and this may take time</li> </ul>	Postal Questionnaire
---	----------------------

### 9.3 Feedback on commissioning proposals

Feedback relating to the commissioning proposals were identified from all the forms of consultation and open feedback received is shown below. There were no specific questions asked in relation to this question.

Of the open ending responses related to these proposals there were general concerns about the reduction in budget, how the balance of in-house services to external providers was established and whether services could be developed through partnership working rather than taking a procurement route.

#### Feedback about commissioning proposals

Feedback	Feedback from
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern about council taking a procurement route and not partnership working</li> <li>• Why are so many internal service being retained whilst cutting the voluntary sector</li> <li>• Why is the 30% General Funded STAR service not being tendered?</li> <li>• Evidence based contributions to help develop specifications</li> <li>• Is commissioning required as current providers are discreet and stable?</li> <li>• Need for an effective pathway</li> <li>• Council service are very expensive, particularly the Dawn Centre. Why keep Council services when these are not necessarily the most effective services?</li> <li>• Best outcomes do not come from LCC provision</li> <li>• How will issues regarding voids be dealt with if providers do not receive enough referrals?</li> <li>• The independence of the voluntary sector undermined by having to offer services to anyone referred to them by the Council and not to anyone not referred to them. Better to include clear performance targets in respect of service delivery under contracts</li> </ul>	Consultation Events
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that budgetary reduction is achieved through a managed process of cost reduction, based on evidence of need, across all services. The voluntary and faith sector will play its part in this as it did in 2012/13</li> <li>• Leicester City Council should justify why its own services will continue to be delivered in-house and why the voluntary and faith sectors service should be commissioned</li> <li>• Leicester City Council should agree contract conditions, such as referral criteria and allocations, through negotiation with voluntary and community sector providers</li> <li>• How did the City Council arrive at its decision not to put the Dawn Centre service out for tender?</li> <li>• Would like to understand what balance of in-house and commissioning is proposed from move-on accommodation and how this figure was arrived at</li> <li>• What balance of in-house and commissioning is proposed for floating support and how was the figure arrived at?</li> </ul>	Individual Responses

- Would like further information on the rationale for tendering some parts of the service, but not others
- Believe the amount of funding allocated for Homelessness Services is insufficient to meet current and medium term needs and to fulfil the various delivery proposals set out within the draft strategy. Undertaking a procurement exercise to commission for services might also add significantly to the cost of delivering the proposed services
- Hope council will act on the resolution proposed as the Adult Social Care and Housing Scrutiny Committee and return £1m to the budget available for homelessness services
- Scrutiny Commission also moved that the Homelessness Strategy be introduced by way of negotiation with the first sector rather than by competitive tendering
- Genuine concerns about the imbalance proposed within the draft strategy between those services that the City Council will retain in house and those that will be externally commissioned and as a result will impact on the voluntary, community and faith sector
- Might want to examine Community Right to Challenge options concerning commissioning if not satisfied by the answer provided by the City Council
- To deliver quality services providers need longevity during the planning process i.e. surety of continued revenue funding
- Decisions on future services based on more transparency and intelligence led solutions rather than ones that could be perceived as retaining services and job security for LCC services and staff. Removing the VCS provision will have a disproportionate effect on BME groups due to the number of staff within the protected characteristics
- Serious consideration needs to be given to procurement options need to embrace localism through local services for local people
- If cuts result in a large reduction in funding for HITS Homes Trust risk that the project will have to close and cease its work with young people
- Accept the Council has to make savings, suggest 33% cut for the project
- Housing Act 1996 section 180 allows the council to give assistance by way of grant or loan to 'voluntary organisations concerned with homelessness or matters relating to homelessness'.
- Council needs to become a more creative and better informed commissioner of services for homeless people including rethinking the governance of its commissioning role
- Need clear definition of the performance that is expected of service providers and greater accountability for performance
- Necessary for the Council to separate its homelessness policy and implementation roles from its in-house provision to homeless people so there is scope for appropriate challenge to its own services
- Element of YASC funding comes from the homeless grant and no current plans by the CLG to remove this
- If proposal is to discontinue funding to day centres formal notice should be given as soon as practicable
- Concerned about the prospect of the provision for homeless people being provided by private sector. Services currently delivered through local third sector providers who are best placed to support this client group
- Withdrawal of funding may put HITS Home Trust at risk of closure resulting in the loss of 46 bed places a year
- Council should work with existing providers and related organisations to see if they can make savings while at the same time maintaining for the time being a similar amount of

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>accommodation</li> <li>• Link into commissioning processes underway / just completed for domestic violence and substance misuse agenda to ensure better integration of provision and in some instances provide financial efficiencies</li> <li>• Will the City Council recognise that the VCS have been responsible for bringing in a substantial amount of funding and honour the principles of both capital improvement and service delivery underpinning contracts</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hostels should not be cut but reviewed to work more effectively</li> <li>• Need to ensure the alternatives are in place before reducing hostels</li> <li>• Look at drawing in investment through joint strategic needs assessments e.g. landlords pay a contribution to floating support</li> <li>• Look at improving work to minimise duplication and share resources. More effective working</li> <li>• This needs to be adequately resourced</li> <li>• The Council should invest its money into services for people who have other problems (learning &amp; physical disabilities)</li> <li>• VCS provided beds tend to be more successful with better outcomes than LCC and removing them will have a devastating effect on many people</li> <li>• It's cheaper to maintain current hostels that increase the supply of shared and supported housing</li> <li>• A lot of services will be provided by LCC. The City is in danger of losing some if its most effective provision by not tendering out all of the potential new services that result from the review</li> <li>• Funding is available and should be used to increase provision</li> <li>• Services in the voluntary sector more effective and should be used instead of LCC services – mentioned by 2 respondents</li> <li>• Pathways for signposting to relevant agencies need to be set up before services reductions</li> <li>• The cuts being made by LCC are greater (disproportionate) than the government cuts to homeless</li> <li>• Need more information on current needs and funding and predicted / future needs to make an informed decision – mentioned by 3 respondents</li> <li>• A range of providers is needed across the city to link (young people) to the community not one large provider (YMCA)</li> <li>• Too much reliance on LCC to provide. All needs to be offered up to competition. Strategy makes a huge assumption that LCC is the most effective provider</li> <li>• An exercise in cost cutting over need</li> <li>• Changes could be vulnerable to organisations working to achieve performance standards rather than meeting needs</li> <li>• Look at the needs of service users before cutting services</li> <li>• Will the increase in floating support lead to use of costly agency staff?</li> </ul>	Online Questionnaire
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need prevention in place / working before closing bed-spaces</li> <li>• Hostels could be run more efficiently to save money and spaces</li> <li>• A more effective use of funds will mean they can stay open</li> <li>• Proposals need to be adequately funded</li> </ul>	Postal Questionnaire

#### 9.4 Feedback relating to day centres

Feedback relating to proposals affecting day centres were identified from all the forms of consultation and open feedback received is shown below. The postal questionnaire (open question) and the client event (at Hansom Hall) specifically asked for feedback on the proposal to reduce funding for day centres and other support services.

The proposals included continuing to support the wet day centre and ending funding to other day centres. At the client consultation event Clients and former clients were asked specifically for their feedback regarding maintain the wet day centre and removing funding for the other day centres

#### Closed question about support for the proposals to keep the wet day centre

% Yes	% No	Feedback from
34.0	66.0	Client event

#### Closed question about support for the proposals to remove funding to other day centres

% Yes	% No	Feedback from
0.0	100.0	Client event

There was general concern about closing the day centres currently available.

#### Feedback relating to day centres

Feedback	Feedback from
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Day centre services will be lost before any transition made. They are need to help with this process</li> <li>YASC / Outreach help clients access mental health / health services. How will they access these in the future?</li> <li>Look at the models from Liverpool</li> <li>Why maintain funding to the Anchor Centre without an evaluation of all Day Centres?</li> <li>Day centres played a pivotal role in reducing rough sleeping</li> <li>If Day Centres close only Housing Options for advice</li> <li>Safer Leicester Partnership approve the proposal to keep funding for the Anchor Centre</li> <li>The Wet Day Centre is not run as well as it should be. Staff are rude</li> <li>People rely on these kind of services</li> <li>Keep the Centre Project open</li> <li>Keep all centres open and have more information at offices</li> <li>Centre Project needs more help as they help people with retraining and help LGBT people</li> <li>Not feasible without adequate alternatives</li> <li>Not enough day centre support as it is</li> <li>How will people access support</li> <li>Day centres offer vital support</li> <li>Makes the problem worse</li> <li>Day centres are a very important part of rehabilitation and have a social aspect</li> <li>YASC provides a lot of support and 2 to 3 hundred people use it every week</li> <li>Concern about the Network project, we need a drop in centre to support people with mental health issues, training, LGBT support needs</li> </ul>	Consultation Events
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review day centre services within the city before decisions are taken to close existing ones</li> <li>Support continuing a wet day centre however believe it should be supported via socials services or health and wellbeing related budget</li> <li>Funds to keep wet day centre open should not come from the homeless budget</li> <li>Most hidden homeless people go to day centres for support and safety. What happens when all day centres close?</li> </ul>	Individual Responses

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very concerned about the cessation of funding to YASC and do not recognise the picture painted of YASC in the strategy.</li> <li>• Joint working with YASC crucial to their mental health drop-in and if YASC is closed team contact could be reduced by 45% and engagement with seriously mentally ill people would be restricted</li> <li>• Concern Anchor Centre becomes only place to go in the day time and might potentially encourage inappropriate use of this resource and might risk people increasing alcohol use in order to access this service</li> <li>• If YASC closes LPT's community mental health teams, Assertive Outreach and Crisis teams will also be unable to meet or engage with service-users who are rough sleeping or vulnerably housed</li> <li>• Potentially 45% of the Homeless Mental Health Service contacts will be affected / reduced and engagement with seriously mentally ill people will be restricted if the YASC day centre is closed</li> <li>• Where will rough sleepers be assessed by HMHS's if no day centre?</li> <li>• Potentially forces inappropriate use of wet day centre if no other dry day centre is available (see priority 5.8)</li> <li>• Positive service user feedback from 19 rough sleepers, homeless people with no local connection, refugees who used YASC. Allowed services to obtain food, access to telephone to access other agencies, advice on benefits, warmth, help to fill in forms, access accommodation, access to furniture, access to clothing, and referral to other agencies, access to washing, social benefits, point for mail to be delivered, advice about training</li> <li>• Closure of YASC may result in compromised access to Inclusion Healthcare's health suite however opportunity for a review of this area</li> <li>• Day centres must be recognised as priority. The "Well Being" centre model serving a local community could be explored</li> <li>• Fear that closure of YASC will have widespread implications for homeless people, put added pressure on scarce healthcare, increase visible homeless within the City and also increase hidden homelessness</li> <li>• YASC provides vital services and provides a support network</li> <li>• Continuation of the day centre services albeit on a scaled down approach</li> <li>• YASC has provided a core service to homeless and vulnerably housed individuals for a number of years which includes the provision of a mental health access worker, education and meaningful occupation classes, provision of emergency food parcels, clothing and toiletries in addition to advice, information and signposting for vulnerable clients</li> <li>• Closure of YASC will impact on the aims of the strategy ("anyone who is homeless will be able to access appropriate care services to meet their health and wellbeing needs"). The only available day centre is the Anchor Centre does not cater for a wider client group. There are no proposals which state how this gap will be filled if at all. Fear that this could lead to an increase in street drinking which will impact on a number of partners. Has funding for the Anchor Centre been discussed with the Police and Crime commissioner?</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Principle 5 (accessing appropriate care services) can't work if you're closing day services</li> <li>• Keep Y Advice &amp; Support Centre – at present homeless people can access many of the services / support / advice in one central area there. This is a central hub for a lot of people to access services on a regular basis in an environment where they feel comfortable and where they know they will get support from experienced staff</li> <li>• More support needed for day centres not cuts (include broader</li> </ul>	Online Questionnaire

<p>than street drinkers, important for mental health) – mentioned by 11 respondents</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Why is Anchor being support when others are being closed?</li> <li>• If YASC goes there is no contact point for rough sleepers / tenants that need new services – mentioned by 2 respondents</li> <li>• Support retention of a wet centre</li> <li>• These changes will negatively impact on social cohesion (e.g. lack of day centres)</li> <li>• Changes will negatively impact on those with mental health issues (e.g. lack of day centres) – mentioned by 2 respondents</li> <li>• Not fair, more help for day centres such as more trusts</li> <li>• Not fair on day centre / drop in centre users (no alternative suggested) – mentioned by 4 respondents</li> <li>• Closure of YASC drop in centre may compromise access to healthcare at the Dawn Centre</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More needs to be spent on support services</li> <li>• Support for homeless is important to get them back into permanent accommodation – mentioned by 2 respondents</li> <li>• Disagree with proposal/keep them – mentioned by 13 respondents</li> <li>• Support service deal with immediate crisis and refer/signpost people to most appropriate service. If they are lost where will people get help – mentioned by 8 respondents</li> <li>• Use volunteers to make them viable</li> <li>• Provide a venue for agencies to meet assess clients</li> <li>• Victimising the vulnerable by closing/vulnerable need them – mentioned by 7 respondents</li> <li>• Rough sleepers, need access to services such as showers, food healthcare, advice – mentioned by 4 respondents</li> <li>• Safe environment where people can build relationships and avoid isolation</li> <li>• No alternatives available</li> <li>• Elderly people need them – mentioned by 2 respondents</li> <li>• A more effective use of funds will mean they can stay open</li> <li>• Negative issues attached to homelessness will increase - crime, addiction etc)</li> <li>• Alternatives need to be in place first (prevention/support) before you do this</li> <li>• Important support for those from other countries – mentioned by 2 respondents</li> <li>• Important to prevent isolation for the vulnerable</li> <li>• Will negatively affect children</li> <li>• Helps people learn to help themselves</li> <li>• Support centre for drinkers will cause more problems bringing them all together – mentioned by 2 respondents</li> </ul>	Postal Questionnaire

## 9.5 Feedback about discharging of homelessness duty in the private sector

Feedback relating to proposals for Leicester City Council to discharge their homelessness duty in the private sector was consulted on through all the forms of consultation and open feedback received is shown below.

Closed question results relating to support for the proposal to discharge duty by using the private rented sector:

% Yes	% No	Feedback from
77.8	22.2	Postal Questionnaire
36.6	53.6	Online Questionnaire
5.0	95.0	Client event



There is mixed support for this proposal. The concerns raised related to the instability of private rented accommodation, being able to access this type of accommodation and how support would be offered to clients placed in private rented accommodation.

### Feedback relating to discharging duty by using the private rented sector

Feedback	Feedback from
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern about getting enough private rented sector properties</li> <li>• Some experience of cases where private landlords did not want to take on cases of people fleeing domestic violence</li> <li>• Fears about security of tenure, rogue landlords, lack of money for deposits and affordability</li> <li>• Concern about the proposal to discharge into the private sector. Schemes are already in place and these will close due to funding reductions, this contradicts this proposal</li> <li>• Landlords are worried about the risks</li> <li>• Risks need to be managed and offset</li> <li>• Need help to manage the tenancy</li> <li>• Some tenants will require more support / training before tenancy begins</li> <li>• Communication with Council needs to be improved</li> <li>• Need intelligent placement of tenants</li> <li>• Too much responsibility put on landlords</li> <li>• Need to tackle rogue landlords</li> <li>• Landlords want to sell their property which leads to homelessness</li> <li>• Too expensive</li> <li>• Clients needing support may end up in a failed tenancy</li> <li>• The number of council properties should be increased</li> <li>• Only if they are regulated properly by the council</li> <li>• Makes the problem worse</li> <li>• Landlords are not observing the deposit schemes</li> </ul>	<p>Consultation Events</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The private sector will not necessarily provide safe, supportive, preventative solutions</li> <li>• Certain areas where private rented accommodation is available will have more families placed there. Homeless families commonly have complex needs this is likely to result in local services becoming rapidly overstretched</li> <li>• Needs will not be addressed and access to specialist support will deny children access</li> <li>• What about needs of larger families who have been evicted from the private sector for rent arrears?</li> <li>• Is the greater use of private sector really appropriate? Instability of private tenancies result in frequent disruptive moves for children and families and disrupts a child's education and friendships</li> <li>• Difficulty in offering mental health services in 'shared housing' with floating support as limited staff support, lack of confidential space and contact with individuals is difficult.</li> <li>• Concerns about how mental health services and other visiting support services will engage and assess people safely</li> <li>• Can private sector offer an equivalent service to social landlords of the sake of the wellbeing of tenants who may well have complex support needs</li> <li>• Loss of private rented accommodation is stated to be the second highest reason for homelessness despite Housing Options working with landlords to avoid evictions</li> <li>• What is the Council's strategy if private landlords are not prepared to offer shared housing (impact on young people)?</li> <li>• How will LCC increase the supply of private landlords without dropping the threshold of quality?</li> <li>• Concern about high reliance on private landlords, as no direct</li> </ul>	<p>Individual Responses</p>

<p>payments and short term tenancies. Not a sustainable solution as exacerbates insecurity and therefore risk of repeat homelessness</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern that alternative accommodation sourced in the private sector is decent and appropriate to meet needs</li> <li>• Support proposal to use private rented properties although New Arrivals Strategy Group would also like to see temporary stopping places for caravans</li> <li>• No scoping exercise to assess the availability and appropriateness of this private sector stock</li> <li>• Revolving doors project only supports those in Local Authority accommodation, will this be extended to those placed in private accommodation?</li> <li>• Will the changes in the benefit system meet the rates charged by the private sector?</li> <li>• Concern about the increased use of multi-occupancy private rented accommodation</li> <li>• No plan or structure around where private sector housing may be located as inappropriate placement within communities in the city may increase tensions and affect cohesion</li> <li>• Need to work in partnership with the private sector</li> <li>• Difficulty in timely contact with Council officers</li> <li>• Would like to see guaranteed rent / direct payments</li> <li>• Longer tenancies would be beneficial and would consider discounts for longer tenancies with good tenants</li> <li>• Agree better use could be made of the private rented sector but it will difficult. Many landlords are reluctant to let to formerly homeless people</li> <li>• Private landlords would like to see some sort of scheme for 'passported tenants' and leasing schemes</li> <li>• Important to tackle primary causes of homeless such as domestic violence and family breakdown which family support services support to help ensure families can sustain tenancies in the private rented sector</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increasing the use of private rented accommodation and the lack of secure tenancies in the private rented sector may increase homelessness – mentioned by 2 respondents</li> <li>• Concern about rogue landlords and poor quality private rented housing – mentioned by 2 respondents</li> <li>• Look at external providers to address homelessness rather than LCC</li> <li>• More needed on the potential supply of private rented housing</li> <li>• Reliance of the private sector will be problematic, particularly 6 month tenancies</li> <li>• Some not capable of sustaining a tenancy/not suitable for vulnerable tenants/special needs tenants – mentioned by 20 respondents</li> <li>• Should consider using RSL props too</li> <li>• Poor condition inappropriate properties – mentioned by 13 respondents</li> <li>• Rogue landlords - mentioned by 12 respondents</li> <li>• Need to ensure it is affordable – mentioned by 13 respondents</li> <li>• Landlords won't take people on benefits/asb/substance abuse/not enough available – mentioned by 14 respondents</li> <li>• Insecure accommodation /needs to be made secure with guarantees for tenants/regulation needed - will lead to repeat homelessness – mentioned by 12 respondents</li> <li>• Can't get deposit/access/make use of rent guarantee scheme – mentioned by 4 respondents</li> <li>• Can't replace hostel accommodation as this is dedicated to people's (support) needs – mentioned by 5 respondents</li> <li>• Need a long-term strategy for sustainable housing</li> </ul>	<p>Online Questionnaire</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Placing vulnerable families and their children into the private rented sector will only mask the underlying problems associated with homeless families – mentioned by 5 respondents</li> <li>• List of private landlords made available is not up to date</li> <li>• Bad experience in the past with private letting</li> <li>• Private rented is not an appropriate / affordable alternative – mentioned by 2 respondents</li> <li>• Quality of external providers in question (private sector), ability to sustain tenancies, too much reliance on private sector – mentioned by 5 respondents</li> <li>• Private sector rents need to be reduced to make the sector more useable</li> <li>• You can't depend on private / alternative investment for provision – mentioned by 2 respondents</li> <li>• Not fair on vulnerable people (may lead to isolation (need a contact point) / threatened by move to private sector) – mentioned by 7 respondents</li> <li>• Controls needs to be put in place on private landlords – rents / condition of housing – mentioned by 2 respondents</li> <li>• Too much dependence on private landlord provision</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of rent regulation</li> <li>• Lack of supply – mentioned by 3 respondents</li> <li>• Hostel accommodation better suited to people's needs</li> <li>• Affordability - can't get deposit</li> <li>• Affordability – rent – mentioned by 10 respondents</li> <li>• Rogue landlords</li> <li>• Won't take those on benefits – mentioned by 2 respondents</li> <li>• Decent accommodation/standard – mentioned by 3 respondents</li> <li>• May have a negative impact on hostels</li> <li>• Need life/budgeting skills for this to work (support in supported housing would prepare people) – mentioned by 2 respondents</li> <li>• Safeguarding issues for children – mentioned by 2 respondents</li> <li>• Safeguarding - vulnerable people/Vulnerable will suffer – mentioned by 3 respondents</li> <li>• Issue of people sharing who have problems</li> <li>• Lack of security/stability – mentioned by 6 respondents</li> <li>• People won't be able to sustain tenancy – mentioned by 2 respondents</li> <li>• Quick move on is good</li> <li>• Should be available to everyone</li> <li>• Build more homes instead</li> <li>• Private rents are not affordable</li> </ul>	Postal Questionnaire

## 9.6 Feedback on proposal to remove Band 5 from the Allocation Scheme

Feedback relating to the proposal to remove band 5 from the allocation scheme was identified from all the forms of consultation and open feedback is shown below.

Closed question results relating to support for the proposal to remove band 5:

% Yes	% No	Feedback from
45.5	19.6	Online Questionnaire

A greater number of respondents to the online questionnaire supported the proposal to remove band 5 from the allocation scheme however there are the following concerns. That the proposal could exclude vulnerable people and concern that people who had housing need (but not priority) would not be able to access support / advice.

## Feedback received about this proposal

Feedback	Feedback from
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No specific feedback</li> </ul>	Consultation Events
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New Arrivals Strategy Group support removal of band 5 but would like to see additional reference made to gypsy and traveller site provision</li> </ul>	Individual Responses
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Housing register should be open to everyone/equal opportunities – mentioned by 7 respondents</li> <li>Need to be on HomeChoice to access rent deposit schemes</li> <li>Not clear if previous band 5s that move band 4 will just sit there with no more chance of getting accommodation</li> <li>Not clear enough - will previous band 5 applicants now have Housing register closed to them</li> <li>Need to be on the list to make it easier to update your circumstances which may move you into higher band</li> <li>Make all temp/supported accommodation Band 5 until the accommodation notifies housing they're ready for permanent accommodation, then move to Band 2, prevents people abusing the hostel system to queue jump (see full answer)</li> <li>What will happen to those old band 5 who can't get on the Housing Register - will they get any support? - particularly those who are vulnerable, young male homeless, asylum seekers, etc.</li> <li>This will affect the Local Connection 12 months rule.</li> <li>Need band 5 as part of evidence base of those who have housing need, but don't have statutory housing need.</li> <li>Don't know enough about band 5 / system – mentioned by 3 respondents</li> <li>Will lead to more homelessness – mentioned by 2 respondents</li> <li>Closes band 5 people off from all social housing</li> <li>Need to look at increasing move-on accommodation and the stock of affordable housing – mentioned by 2 respondents</li> <li>Private rented is not an appropriate/affordable alternative – mentioned by 2 respondents</li> <li>May end up excluding vulnerable people (rough sleepers / migrants) – mentioned by 5 respondents</li> <li>Existing changes are already causing problems with move-on.</li> <li>I feel that the banding system is unfair and does not priorities people needs or situations</li> <li>There doesn't seem to be anything being offered to those people as an alternative. More work needs to be done on this to ensure a significant number of people are not left without good advice, information and support as they are on the list most often for valid reasons.</li> <li>Proposal not fair on those in the lower housing register bands who still have needs but can't get access to housing – mentioned by 2 respondents</li> </ul>	Online Questionnaire
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No specific feedback</li> </ul>	Postal Questionnaire

### 9.7 Feedback on proposed eligibility criteria

Feedback relating to the proposed eligibility criteria were identified from all the forms of consultation and open feedback is shown below. In the on-line and postal questionnaire respondents were asked specifically if they agreed with the proposed eligibility criteria.

Closed question results relating to support on the proposed eligibility criteria:

% Yes	% No	Feedback from
50.9	40.2	Online Questionnaire
68.6	31.4	Postal Questionnaire

The proposed eligibility criteria were generally supported (in response to the online and postal questionnaires) however there were concerns about what would happen to people not considered eligible for accommodation, that the eligibility criteria needed to be broader to consider categories such as young people, single homeless and victims of domestic abuse and that more information was required about the terms used in the eligibility criteria e.g. who is considered a 'vulnerable adult'.

#### Feedback received about the proposed eligibility criteria

Feedback	Feedback from
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is the purpose of the eligibility pilot and how will this be reported?</li> <li>• What will be the provision for vulnerable people who do not meet the local connection criteria and other people who did not meet the eligibility criteria</li> <li>• Definitions of the population 'at risk' of homelessness (single and families separately)</li> <li>• Police are concerned about what is a high risk offender (prolific offenders could be as high risk as sex offenders)</li> <li>• Concern about eligibility criteria / those in priority in relation to the low number of positive approvals for singles</li> </ul>	<p>Consultation Events</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strongly disagree to restrict hostel places to only those who meet the extremely narrow criteria for statutory homelessness and the victims of domestic abuse</li> <li>• Number of children entering temporary accommodation in Leicester city with safeguarding concerns has demonstrated a steady increase over the past 3 years. Moving families into short term temporary accommodation is likely to result in issues remaining hidden for longer leaving children at risk of increased abuse</li> <li>• Current temporary accommodation in hostels allows a certain amount of close supervision that would not be available in the wider community. This would cease and may result in more children being placed in foster care</li> <li>• What assessments will be made of the needs of families being placed in temporary private rented accommodated and how will they be enabled to access services?</li> <li>• How will the minimum accommodation standard be monitored and enforced?</li> <li>• Fewer hostels may become more difficult for LPT to discharge people from acute wards leading to increased problems with bed blocking. LPT may have to discharge homeless people who are no longer in need of acute care to the streets or Housing Options which risks further traumatisation</li> <li>• Restrictions on access to temporary accommodation dependent on having to be engaged with treatment programmes forces people who are not yet ready to engage in treatment resulting in waste of resources and jeopardising compliance</li> <li>• Term 'vulnerable adult' to be more clearly defined</li> <li>• LPT staff need clarify about inclusion and exclusion criteria in order to ensure patients are identified, advised and placed appropriately</li> <li>• More clarity about the changes in eligibility criteria for people with 'low level' mental health problems</li> <li>• Concern that people will only get a single service offer and once the LA has discharged duty and any repeat episodes will increasingly likely to viewed as intentional</li> <li>• Already been implemented despite consultation process still being under review</li> <li>• Major implication on those people with substance use issues as</li> </ul>	<p>Individual Responses</p>

<p>access to hostels has been restricted to those in “active treatment”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Vulnerable” adult requires further definition</li> <li>• Mental health services require clear guidelines on temporary accommodation eligibility thresholds</li> <li>• Don’t people with sexuality / gender identity issues meet higher eligibility criteria?</li> <li>• “priority need” is this a higher threshold than other local authorities? Need more clarification and clarify</li> <li>• How will the needs of singled people who do not meet vulnerable and priority criteria be met?</li> <li>• Must not be a requirement that those who have a drug or alcohol issues should already be engaged with health / specialist services prior to placement</li> <li>• What are classed as low level mental health problems?</li> <li>• What are classed as low level drug and alcohol problems?</li> <li>• New Arrivals Strategy Group do not agree with eligibility criteria as does not capture asylum seekers or new arrivals who are marginalised and socially excluded. Also without site provision gypsies and travellers do not have access to basic essential services and although not roofless they are illegally parked and subject to constant evictions. They should be eligible for emergency and temporary accommodation in the form of a legal place to station their caravans</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Criteria needs to be broader - alcohol abuse – mentioned by 2 respondents</li> <li>• Criteria needs to be broader - domestic violence – mentioned by 6 respondents</li> <li>• Criteria needs to be broader - ex offenders</li> <li>• Criteria needs to be broader - young people – mentioned by 9 respondents</li> <li>• Criteria needs to be broader - those who have never been homeless before</li> <li>• Criteria needs to be broader - mental health – mentioned by 3 respondents</li> <li>• Criteria needs to be broader - physical health</li> <li>• Criteria needs to be broader - asylum seekers/failed asylum seekers – mentioned by 3 respondents</li> <li>• Criteria needs to be broader - teenage parents – mentioned by 3 respondents</li> <li>• Criteria needs to be broader - ex-services</li> <li>• Need to prioritise older people – mentioned by 2 respondents</li> <li>• Needs to say how needs are going to be assessed and by who – mentioned by 3 respondents</li> <li>• Needs a definition of vulnerable adult – mentioned by 4 respondents</li> <li>• Eligibility should be extended to everyone who is homeless</li> <li>• Will have a negative impact on drug and alcohol programmes, forcing people onto them and putting them under strain</li> <li>• The info on each service group is too general</li> <li>• Appropriate support needs to be put in place for those in need</li> <li>• Won't address the demand for limited hostel spaces</li> <li>• Need to look at prevention – mentioned by 2 respondents</li> <li>• There is a need for specialist providers for specific client groups</li> <li>• Need more clarity for these eligibility criteria – mentioned by 2 respondents</li> <li>• Can't have set eligibility criteria as anyone can become homeless</li> <li>• There's no mention of rough sleepers with undiagnosed issues, such as mental health</li> <li>• This will place pressure on other services as people now need to clients needing to receive treatment to meet these criteria</li> </ul>	<p>Online Questionnaire</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What will happen to those who are vulnerable but don't meet the criteria?</li> <li>• How are eligibility criteria applied? Needs to be made clear</li> <li>• There needs to be a weighting to ensure that those in most need helped first (e.g. children) - if there's limited help</li> <li>• Not clear if this list of eligibility criteria is in order of priority</li> <li>• I/We believe this statement is too general; it is necessary to consider the each needs of client group. Whilst we accept some people would benefit from shorter stay in a hostel, for other clients groups this would have adverse effect resulting in repeat homelessness. We believe the removal of hostel accommodation will result in more children being removed and as such becoming a statutory responsibility (Looked After Children), therefore more costly provision will be required – mentioned by 5 individuals</li> <li>• There's no mention of care leavers</li> <li>• I wouldn't like to live next to a high risk offender</li> <li>• Should be specialist places available for people who take drugs and alcohol</li> <li>• Not just LCC tenants that find themselves in an emergency Tenants of other tenures should also be considered</li> <li>• Concerns about single people who do not meet the vulnerability criteria</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Everyone in need should get help – mentioned by 7 respondents</li> <li>• Does not help single homeless – mentioned by 5 respondents</li> <li>• Does not help single men – mentioned by 2 respondents</li> <li>• Does not help teenagers/young people – mentioned by 6 respondents</li> <li>• Does not help ex-offenders</li> <li>• Does not help vulnerable adults/victims of abuse/those with support needs – mentioned by 4 respondents</li> <li>• Does not help senior citizens</li> <li>• Does not help families</li> <li>• Does not help victims of harassment</li> <li>• Should consider gender/sexual discrimination</li> <li>• Don't agree with groups prioritised – mentioned by 3 respondents</li> <li>• Who gets priority?</li> <li>• People need help before being able to share (ex-offenders, drug users) – mentioned by 3 respondents</li> <li>• Shouldn't support ex-offenders – mentioned by 2 respondents</li> <li>• What about those in need who don't fit the criteria?</li> <li>• Private rents are not affordable</li> <li>• Repeat homeless cases should not be given priority above first time homeless</li> <li>• Prioritise those most likely to maintain a tenancy (e.g. not drug users)</li> <li>• Use a different entry criteria to fill all bed spaces</li> </ul>	Postal Questionnaire

## 9.8 Feedback on proposals for ex-offenders

Feedback relating to the proposals for ex-offenders were identified from all the forms of consultation and open feedback is shown below. Clients and former clients were asked specifically for their feedback regarding reducing bed spaces for ex-offenders at the client consultation event.

Closed question results relating to reducing bed spaces for ex-offenders:

% Yes	% No	Feedback from
10.0	90.0	Client Event

The proposals for ex-offenders include provision of 30 specialist bed-spaces of accommodation for city people leaving prison on licence, special provision for high risk offenders (MAPPA) and access to other temporary accommodation for young offenders and those who left prison within the last year under the new proposed eligibility criteria (for those with a connection to Leicester City).

At the client event there was not support for this proposal and the feedback showed there were concerns about the support available / integrated for ex-offenders, especially high risk offenders.

#### Feedback received about proposals for ex-offenders

Feedback	Feedback from
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Imprisonment a key driver to homelessness</li> <li>• Statutory agencies need to know where offenders are</li> <li>• Floating support needs to be able to meet the needs of complex cases</li> <li>• Danger beds will become blocked if offenders in higher risk accommodation cannot move on to lower risk accommodation</li> <li>• Offenders need support to remain in tenancies / maintain hostel places</li> <li>• Housing key element of addressing behaviour</li> <li>• Will specialist hostel for ex-offenders (Stonham) still use their pathway?</li> <li>• Will cause ex-offenders to reoffend / more crime</li> <li>• When people come out of prison they need more help</li> <li>• Not feasible without adequate alternatives</li> <li>• Not enough support / beds to meet the Council's human rights obligations</li> <li>• Make the problem worse</li> </ul>	<p>Consultation Events</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would like evidence of how number of units for ex-offenders has been arrived at</li> <li>• Would like to see the service configured to provide short-term, intensive support linked to specialist support for rehabilitation</li> <li>• Loughborough Road Hostel (c21 bedspaces) utilised to work with low level ex-offenders who will not be subject to parole service monitoring</li> <li>• Concern about reducing bed spaces, move-on and commission from private external providers available for ex-offenders. Concerns that it may put the public at risk</li> <li>• The Probation Trust is keen to be involved in initiatives to work closely with housing options and support providers to sustain tenancies and ensure more joined up services</li> <li>• Continued need for specialist floating support for high risk offenders</li> <li>• Consider co-commissioning with County authorities for offender accommodation provision</li> <li>• Crucial there is sufficient bed space for high risk and repeat offenders and provision integrates with statutory services that provide support for issues such as mental health and substance misuse</li> </ul>	<p>Individual Responses</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to look at specific needs of vulnerable groups e.g. ex-offenders when proposing to increase the supply of shared and supported housing and exploring the provision of specialist long-term accommodation</li> <li>• Proposals not fair on ex-offenders</li> <li>• Concern that the proposals will have a negative impact on ex-offender – mentioned by 4 respondents</li> </ul>	<p>Online Questionnaire</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Eligibility criteria does not help ex-offender – mentioned by 1 respondents</li> </ul>	<p>Postal Questionnaire</p>



<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• People need help before being able to share (ex-offenders / drug users) – mentioned by 3 respondents</li> <li>• Shouldn't support ex-offenders – mentioned by 2 respondents</li> <li>• More support workers needed (including ex-offenders) – mentioned by 4 respondents</li> <li>• Spaces for ex-offenders, people may offend to get a place</li> </ul>	
---	--

**9.9 Feedback on rough sleepers**

Feedback relating to proposals relating to rough sleepers were identified from all the forms of consultation and open feedback is shown below. The proposals relating to rough sleepers include maintaining the current Outreach Team and adopting the principles of No Second Night Out.

Clients and former clients were asked specifically for their feedback regarding keeping the Outreach Team.

Closed question results relating to keeping the outreach team:

% Yes	% No	Feedback from
100.0	0.0	Client Event

Postal and online respondents were asked if they agreed with the policy to introduce 'No Second Night Out' in Leicester.

Closed question results relating to introducing No Second Night Out:

% Yes	% No	Feedback from
79.5	11.6	Online Questionnaire
78.3	21.7	Postal Questionnaire

There was unanimous support for maintaining the Outreach Team at the client event and also the proposal for No Second Night Out was supported however there were concerns about how this would work with the reduction in bed spaces. A number of respondents said that Leicester City Council should aim to have a policy where no-one spends a single night out rough sleeping.

**Feedback about proposals for rough sleepers**

Feedback	Feedback from
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposals will be expensive and not deliver the vision particularly in respect to No Second Night Out</li> <li>• No implementation plan for no second night out or SAR</li> <li>• No second night out (NSNO) needs to be the cross-cutting theme across the strategy</li> <li>• Need to allocate prevention money to help fund no recourse clients</li> <li>• Outreach team must have access to direct beds</li> <li>• NSNO needs to cross-cutting theme across the strategy</li> <li>• Safer Leicester Partnership praised the work undertaken by the Outreach Team</li> </ul>	Consultation Events
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Likelihood of increased rough sleeping as a result of the reduction of resources available which is likely to add to the workload of the Dawn Centre team and increase demand over and above the six dormitory beds proposed</li> <li>• Concern about LCC reverting to institutional style 'dorm' accommodation which people find undignified and unsafe</li> </ul>	Individual Responses

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Where will female rough sleepers be referred since mixed sex dorms carry risks to health and wellbeing</li> <li>• How will extra 'emergency cold weather camp beds' be made available with less hostel provision</li> <li>• How will no second night out be implemented with significantly reduced emergency hostel bed provision</li> <li>• Where will provision be for extra emergency cold weather beds?</li> <li>• Consider making current part-time temporary outreach post permanent to help with additional work demands and proposed changes</li> <li>• Impact on no second night out given that YASC will play a significant role in achieving its outcomes</li> <li>• New Arrivals Strategy Group agree with proposal to introduce no second night out policy</li> <li>• SHARP Trustee Board agree with the no second night out proposal</li> <li>• Believe delivery proposal will see an increase in the number of people sleeping rough</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More detail needed on no second night out policy – what about existing rough sleepers? What happens if on street for more than one night? etc – mentioned by 3 respondents</li> <li>• Should be a 'no first night out policy' – mentioned by 2 respondents</li> <li>• Will these targets mitigate against effective help e.g. if someone has passed a second night out rough sleeping will they be ignored because it affects performance?</li> <li>• Will the NSNO policy lead to empty beds if beds are held to meet this target?</li> <li>• There's no mention of rough sleepers with undiagnosed issues such as mental health in the eligibility criteria</li> <li>• Even one night rough sleeping not acceptable – mentioned by 7 respondents</li> <li>• NSNO can't work because of current/upcoming new benefit changes – mentioned by 2 respondents</li> <li>• NSNO not resourced/infrastructure to make it work/the proposed cuts mitigate against this proposal (particularly hostel closures) – mentioned by 11 respondents</li> <li>• Maybe used to victimise rough sleepers/what about the right to sleep rough – mentioned by 2 respondents</li> <li>• Not enough detail on emergency/required provision to make NSNO work – mentioned by 2 respondents</li> <li>• Will there be exceptions - e.g. refugees?</li> <li>• Can't work with changing migration - when Bulgaria and Romania join EU</li> <li>• What provision for existing rough sleepers – mentioned by 2 respondents</li> <li>• NSNO policy focuses on single adults - what about families? What about immigrants?</li> <li>• Not realistic e.g. time it takes to sort accommodation out – mentioned by 2 respondents</li> <li>• Will rough sleepers have the choice to sleep out?</li> <li>• No rough sleeping at night, but what happens during the day if day centres close?</li> <li>• More work needs to be done on why people sleep rough</li> <li>• Outreach workers can't deal with the problem of temporary accommodation which could become long-term without appropriate accommodation</li> <li>• More hostel provision needed for single rough sleepers</li> </ul>	Online Questionnaire
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unfair more than one night out loses hostel bed</li> <li>• No-one should sleep rough at all – mentioned by 6 respondents</li> <li>• Second night out policy won't work (queue jumping / disruptive</li> </ul>	Postal Questionnaire

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>people in hostels) – mentioned by 3 respondents</li> <li>• Rough sleepers need access to services such as showers, food, healthcare and advice – mentioned by 4 respondents</li> <li>• No one should be on the streets for even one night – mentioned by 11 respondents</li> <li>• Can't achieve NSNO by closing hostels – mentioned by 5 respondents</li> <li>• Need a wider definition of rough sleeping to include sofa surfing</li> <li>• NSNO not achievable</li> <li>• NSNO for new rough sleepers not repeat homeless</li> <li>• I'm in a hostel and have a right to spend two nights out with friends and family</li> <li>• How will NSNO be enforced?</li> </ul>	
--	--

## 9.10 Feedback about proposals for provision of housing advice and determination of homelessness decisions

Feedback relating to proposals for the provision of housing advice and determination of homelessness decisions were identified from all the forms of consultation and open feedback is shown below.

The delivery proposals include continuing to fund advice, assistance and prevention activities through the Housing Options Service, increase funding to further develop the private rented sector and develop a full Single Access and Referral Service.

Consultees were not asked a specific question about these proposals however of the feedback received there were concerns about the single access and referral service being located in Housing Options and the assessments undertaken.

Feedback received about proposals for provision of housing advice and determination of homelessness decision, including developing of a single access and referral service:

Feedback	Feedback from
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern Housing Options does not work for single people</li> <li>• Children's Services supportive of SAR. 16/17 year olds would be assessed by children's services first</li> <li>• Cannot be used as a gate keeping service as this only increases rough sleeping</li> <li>• Needs to be built on the premise of the most appropriate service is provided to the person when they most need it</li> <li>• Referrals need to be made from several sources</li> <li>• Nottingham is the best example</li> <li>• The Mayor should look into Phoenix House</li> <li>• I have lived here all my life and statutory duty is being overlooked</li> </ul>	Consultation Events
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Establish an assessment and referral process for single homeless people separate from the Housing Options Centre that recognises the particular needs of that group</li> <li>• Housing Options and SAR need to be improved to meet customer need and to provide a more effective service. Models from elsewhere that might be considered</li> <li>• Lack of autonomy within our services thus making projects harder to manage and places vulnerable people at greater risk. Rental loss on voids places the viability of a project into question. Inappropriate referrals may lead to bad debt for service users and additional legal costs on increased eviction, hence placing the viability of the project into question</li> <li>• Proposed that SAR is separated out from Housing Options and managed as a standalone facility; would like to see this facility placed out to tender</li> </ul>	Individual Responses

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This service does not currently notify the health service of families being placed in accommodation across the city however under NICE guidance (social and emotional wellbeing) it is recommended that directors of public health and children's services should ensure that the social and emotional health of the under 5's is assessed. How will the local authority ensure that systems are put in place to notify family and young people's health services?</li> <li>• There needs to be a robust information sharing policy to ensure families are notified to appropriate health care services</li> <li>• If the Council is not able to make appropriate referrals within a limited time period should allow HITS to fill the vacancy</li> <li>• Require some negotiation between the Council and smaller voluntary organisations over the details of this single access point</li> <li>• Young people experiencing difficulties may prefer to speak to others rather than Housing Options</li> <li>• No referrals made by Housing Options since SAR has been in operation</li> <li>• Who will provide initial screening process where support needs are identified and raised (as this is currently done on placement in temporary accommodation). Seriously mentally ill people may lack capacity or insight to understand the benefits to them of raising the fact that they have "an illness" or require support with SAR staff and will often avoid or deny identification of such.</li> <li>• Risk of not identifying "vulnerabilities" at SAR if individuals do not have a local connection</li> <li>• Since SAR has been operated by Housing Options not received any referrals to HMHS</li> <li>• Seriously mentally ill people often lack capacity or insight to understand the benefits of identifying to SAR that they have "an illness" or require support and will often avoid or deny identification of such, how ill these people be identified and signposted and placed in temporary accommodation?</li> <li>• Concern about the role of Housing Options as a single point of access been ignored. No value for money process involved which could enable efficiencies</li> <li>• Unclear where people can present for support and advice other than Housing Options and unclear if SAR will be equipped to manage</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will people be taken down the homelessness route just so they can access advice?</li> <li>• List of private landlords made available is not up to date</li> <li>• Problems with inappropriate referrals to voluntary organisations needs to be addressed</li> <li>• Pathways for signposting to relevant agencies need to be set up before service reductions</li> <li>• Independent providers would be better placed to provide single access point</li> <li>• Gate keeping concerns over single access and referral point</li> <li>• Misgivings over Housing Options Centre effectiveness</li> <li>• Will single access referral be adequately resourced to manage the demands that will be placed on it</li> </ul>	Online Questionnaire
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More needed than advice, this will not prevent homelessness</li> <li>• Housing Options Centre needs to perform better</li> </ul>	Postal Questionnaire

### 9.11 Feedback on proposals to continue to support employment, training and education opportunities

Feedback relating to proposals to continue to support employment, education and training opportunities for homeless people were identified from all the forms of consultation and

open feedback is shown below. There were no specific questions asked in relation to this question.

Of the open ending responses related to these proposals there was feedback from the housing providers that they supported this proposal but would like to discuss this in more detail to develop an appropriate service.

Feedback about proposals to support employment, training and education opportunities:

Feedback	Feedback from
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No specific feedback</li> </ul>	Consultation Events
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Believe this is an adequate proposal but would welcome the opportunity to discuss in more detail with the City Council about how an appropriate service could be developed</li> <li>Selected as UK delivery partner in a European digital literacy project called DLit 2.0. with four target groups domestic violence, homelessness, BME and older people. Will help customers resolve life issues such as benefit claims</li> <li>Concern no longer to be procured from the VCS but through organisations delivering the Work Programme does not recognise the intense one to one support that Leicestershire Cares provides</li> </ul>	Individual Responses
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need to look at support to get homeless people into work / training / education</li> <li>Need to look at helping homeless people sustain employment</li> </ul>	Online Questionnaire
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need life / budgeting skills for people to be able to sustain a private rented tenancy (support in supported housing would prepare people)</li> <li>Day centres / support services help people learn to help themselves</li> <li>Can't work with high unemployment</li> </ul>	Postal Questionnaire

## 9.12 Feedback relating to Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) individuals / Asylum Seekers and Refugees

Feedback relating provision for BME individuals, asylum seekers and refugees were identified from all the forms of consultation and the open feedback is shown below.

Clients and former clients were asked specifically for their feedback regarding have no specialist BME hostel provision at the client consultation event.

Closed question results relating to having no specialist provision for BME groups:

% Yes	% No	Feedback from
0.0	100.0	Client Event

Concerns were raised about having no specialist BME provision and the strategy not addressing how it would meet the culturally diverse needs required in Leicester.

Feedback received relating to provision for BME individuals, asylum seekers and refugees:

Feedback	Feedback from
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Believe there should be specialist homeless provision for black and minority ethnic groups</li> </ul>	Petitions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern about scale of reductions and what will happen to redundant buildings</li> <li>What happens when you have people that cannot be placed</li> </ul>	Consultation events

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• together and only the Dawn Centre is available?</li> <li>• EIA not taken account of all the issues raised about BME groups and other equality strands</li> <li>• Concern about racism, ignorance and religious hatred from other residents if no specialist provision available</li> <li>• Lack of reference to asylum seekers in review</li> <li>• Issues for BME groups not addressed in the proposals</li> <li>• BME getting no funding</li> <li>• Should stay open so people of same cultures live and understand each other</li> <li>• BME hostel is the only hostel to meet cultural needs and provide a safe environment</li> <li>• Services for BME clients are not clear in the proposals</li> <li>• We have not been asked about BME service reductions</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are still needs of young black persons</li> <li>• A collaborative cross sector approach to mainstreaming diversity over the next few years</li> <li>• Culturally specialist providers can do generic but generic providers cannot always do specialist</li> <li>• Can meet the needs of their customers, staff are non-judgemental and can empathise with concerns and worries</li> <li>• Gender specific services are the cornerstone of successful intervention from homelessness to independence</li> <li>• Seen cuts of 25% already whilst DCLG have suggested cuts of 12%</li> <li>• Service users experiencing Leicester City Council or other hostels have not had their identity or needs have not been acknowledged or met</li> <li>• Current female service users would tolerate their housing crisis than seek help if Dawn Centre or Border House were options</li> <li>• Foundation Housing concerned that the proposed pathway to refer those at need to the Dawn Centre or Border House would not be suitable for a young BME woman with sensitive issues such as forced marriage. They are worried that the Dawn Centre is used for emergency cases and there would not be the correct support and advice available for the group they cater for</li> <li>• Issue of homelessness and asylum should be considered as a separate section. Number of homeless and destitute asylum seekers is on the increase and charities and faith groups are struggling to meet the demand for even basic provision</li> <li>• Important to recognised than when asylum applications are turned down many are forced onto the streets</li> <li>• Strategy does not address how it will meet the needs of a culturally diverse city which has seen an increase in rough sleepers from Eastern Europe</li> <li>• Strategy does not address how it will seek to support and tailor delivery to black people linked to asylum and migration in Leicester</li> <li>• In support of service received from Foundation Housing and benefits it provides in costs saving, impact on individuals and benefits for communities</li> </ul>	Individual Responses
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hostels offer a unique supportive environment meeting a range of needs that cannot be replicated by alternative forms of accommodation / support (particularly the vulnerable with needs / BME, religion etc) needs to be protected / increased – mentioned by 12 respondents</li> <li>• Nothing on asylum seekers – mentioned by 2 respondents</li> <li>• Doesn't address need for specialist services</li> <li>• Nowhere is it stated that a homeless person will be able to stay in secure, safe and culturally sensitive temporary accommodation</li> <li>• List of priorities doesn't cover everyone / not inclusive</li> </ul>	Online questionnaire

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To have no BME sensitive provision will cause problems for many and will mean people from their communities could be become more isolated with services less accessible than before. With 49% BME population no BME provision is a mistake</li> <li>• Asylum seekers need more consideration / those affected by the immigration system – mentioned by 2 respondents</li> <li>• Proposals will impact on minority groups</li> <li>• Proposals will impact on those in BME group, particularly those with needs – mentioned by 2 respondents</li> <li>• Proposals unfair on asylum seekers / migrants / refugees as no mention of them – mentioned by 3 respondents</li> <li>• Proposals will have a negative impact on non-British homeless / refugees – mentioned by 5 respondents</li> <li>• Proposals with have a negative impact on BME groups – mentioned by 8 respondents</li> <li>• Need to address the needs of asylum seekers / non-British homeless – mentioned by 4 respondents</li> <li>• No specialist services for BME communities is a weakness and doesn't seem appropriate for Leicester</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BME hostel spaces needed</li> <li>• Specialist hostels (for BME groups / single sex hostels) are needed for those who are vulnerable and would be isolated in mixed provision – mentioned by 4 respondents</li> <li>• Need BME provision – mentioned by 2 respondents</li> <li>• BME hostels needed – mentioned by 2 respondents</li> <li>• Foundation hostels important – mentioned by 4 respondents</li> <li>• Bethany valuable – mentioned by 2 respondents</li> <li>• Cultural needs have to be addressed</li> </ul>	Postal questionnaire

## 10. Summary of Feedback on the Strategy and Proposed Phase Two Delivery Proposals

Below is a summary of feedback regarding the draft strategy and the proposed delivery proposals at phase two. Where closed questions were asked these have been shown and also open responses given relating to each proposal.

### 10.1 Feedback on proposals relating to young people (16-24 year olds)

Feedback on proposals relating to young people was identified from all the consultation and open feedback is shown below.

The delivery proposals relating to young people concerned reducing the number of units commission and these would be cluster flats with shared facilities or self-contained flats and that accommodation based support should focus on improving positive move on outcomes.

Clients and former clients were asked specifically for their feedback regarding reducing hostel spaces for young people at the client consultation event.

% Yes	% No	Feedback from
0.0	100.0	Client Event

The proposal to reduce hostel spaces for young people was not supported by people at the client event. There were concerns raised in the open ended responses about the reduction in units for young people and the impacts this would have.

Feedback relating to young people

Feedback	Feedback from
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Children's Services would prefer a number of dispersed project for young people</li> <li>• Services at YMCA had not accepted people with complex needs and had evicted / excluded people with complex needs very quickly</li> <li>• Concern about the level of reduction in units as there is an increase in children coming into care</li> <li>• Impact of change in definition of domestic violence, now including 16 to 24 year olds</li> <li>• Youth Offending Team have concerns about the difficulties for 16-18 year olds to access accommodation as the situation will be worse with proposed cuts to units and the impact of welfare reform</li> <li>• Need more units for young people</li> <li>• Reducing spaces will increase crime / prostitution / drugs</li> <li>• Reducing spaces will add to the numbers of rough sleepers</li> <li>• Where will homeless people get support?</li> <li>• Makes young people vulnerable and potentially facing life threatening situations</li> <li>• Some young people need help and support to live on their own</li> <li>• Not feasible without adequate alternatives</li> <li>• Not enough support / beds to meet the Council's human rights obligations</li> </ul>	<p>Consultation Events</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review how homelessness and housing services are provided for young people in the city</li> <li>• Would like evidence on how number of units for young people has been arrived at as demand is higher than the present number of units currently available</li> <li>• As a minimum at least 74 young people per annum will have their life chances considerably reduced and not be supported effectively to help them turn their lives around</li> <li>• For many young people sustaining their own tenancies is not viable until after a period of intensive support within a hostel or supported housing setting</li> <li>• Reduction in units is likely to have significant negative implications for young people in the target group and potentially lead to the closure of some VCS providers</li> <li>• Direct access to hostels give vulnerable young people access to housing before they are placed in a crisis</li> <li>• Only provider to offer 16 &amp; 17 year olds the opportunity of holding an Assured Shorthold Tenancy and also chosen because do not feel they will manage in shared accommodation</li> <li>• Reducing temporary accommodation for young people will potentially place more young people at risk</li> <li>• Concern that reduction in places for temporary accommodation could have a disproportionate impact on young service users</li> <li>• Little to say about the needs of young homeless people aged 16-25</li> <li>• Units for young people aged 16-25 are to be reduced by more than half is disproportionate and takes no evident account of need</li> <li>• How will minimum accommodation standards for young people be developed?</li> <li>• Young people should also be offered support that directly address on of the key social problems they face – loneliness (some support required not possible in cluster flats / self-contained accommodation)</li> <li>• Young people need more than one approach to meeting their needs and believe that cluster flats with floating support will not be sufficient</li> <li>• Strategy creates a false polarity between what it refers to as crisis</li> </ul>	<p>Individual Responses</p>



<p>and rescue on one hand and enablement on the other. It is feasible to do both</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Restriction on housing benefits for the under 35s so they can only afford shared accommodation is a concern as the private sector is finding it difficult to accommodate people and those with complex needs find shared accommodation difficult to manage</li> <li>• Concern about proposal to significantly reduce the bed space available and how this will be managed</li> <li>• Currently two thirds of current residents at The Y would not be owed a statutory duty as they do not have care leave or young offender status where does the Council think were these young people will be housed?</li> <li>• What will the relationship between the Council and the VCS in meeting the needs of single homeless?</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to consider hostels for young people who have been excluded for bad behaviour</li> <li>• LCC plan to address disadvantage to young homeless as a result of these changes</li> <li>• Where will support for young women come from if Bethany closes</li> <li>• Need to consider care leavers</li> <li>• Proposed eligibility criteria needs to be broader for young people</li> <li>• Proposed eligibility criteria doesn't not mention care leavers</li> <li>• More quality hostel provision for young people needed</li> <li>• Vulnerable people could be at risk from sharing e.g. young people – safeguarding issues</li> <li>• What will happen to those on the old band 5 who can't get on the Housing Register will they get any support? Particularly young male homeless</li> <li>• Number of units for single people should be higher</li> <li>• A range of providers is needed across the City to link young people to community not one large provider (YMCA)</li> <li>• Doesn't consider young people released from custody / banned from properties</li> <li>• Proposals not fair on young people in need may put them at greater risk if they can't access support the way the Homelessness Strategy treats them / not enough consideration</li> <li>• Not fair on young people leaving the care system</li> <li>• Consider proposals might have a negative impact on young people – mentioned by 7 respondents</li> <li>• Consider proposals might have a negative impact on care leavers</li> </ul>	Online Questionnaire
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Eligibility criteria does not help teenagers / young people</li> <li>• More support workers needed including young people</li> <li>• Young people should be with their families or in the care system</li> <li>• Less spaces are needed for young people</li> <li>• More spaces are needed for young people – mentioned by 2 respondents</li> <li>• Concern that the proposal might have a negative impact on young people – mentioned by 5 respondents</li> </ul>	Postal Questionnaire

## 10.2 Feedback on proposals relating to single people

Feedback on the proposals relating to single people were identified from all the forms of consultation and open feedback is shown below.

The delivery proposals for single people relating to reducing the number of units available and these would be single rooms with shared facilities and catering and the focus of the service would be to provide support and to refer people to 'move on' accommodation and independent tenancies as appropriate.

Clients and former clients were asked specifically for their feedback regarding reducing bed spaces for singles at the client consultation event.

Closed question results relating to reducing hostel places for single people:

% Yes	% No	Feedback from
0.0	100.0	Client Event

There was not support for reducing hostel places for single people from the client event and there was concern expressed about the reductions in bed spaces and single people not being eligible for accommodation in the open ended responses.

#### Feedback received about this proposal

Feedback	Feedback from
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fears about cultural needs not being met and racism and having to mix with people who drink / take drugs or were offenders at the Dawn Centre</li> <li>• Concern about the low levels of singles that receive positive decisions</li> <li>• Would be a risk of homeless people turning to crime</li> <li>• Rough sleepers still need somewhere to go</li> <li>• It is too big a drop</li> <li>• Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual &amp; Transgender people need more support</li> <li>• Not feasible without adequate alternatives</li> <li>• Single people need more help</li> <li>• Single people are equally as vulnerable as families and in need of more support especially when they have mental health issues</li> <li>• Not enough support / beds to meet the Council's human rights obligations</li> <li>• Makes the problem worse</li> </ul>	Consultation Events
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Establish an assessment and referral process for single homeless people separate from the Housing Options Centre that recognises the particular needs of that group</li> <li>• Would like evidence on how the number of units for single people has been arrived at</li> <li>• Currently many more people in this category currently in hostels. The proposal relies heavily on the target group moving into move-on accommodation, primarily the private rented sector without any evidence that there is capacity and access</li> <li>• How do proposals meet the needs of single homeless people which the council has no statutory duty?</li> <li>• Repeat single homelessness is seen as a failure of the hostels / system rather than a reflection on the failings of general society. There is a need for a "safety net" of hostel accommodation</li> <li>• More males will be affected by closures of hostels for single people</li> </ul>	Individual Responses
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposal to increase the supply and shared and supported housing and to explore the provision of specialist long-term accommodation is missing single homeless</li> <li>• Number of units for single people should be higher – mentioned by 2 respondents</li> <li>• Figures of 45 for single homeless too low – mentioned by 2 respondents</li> <li>• There is a need for a hostel for single women – mentioned by 2 respondents</li> <li>• More hostel provision needed for single rough sleepers – mentioned by 2 respondents</li> <li>• Proposals might have a negative impact on single homeless</li> <li>• Concerns about single people who do not meet the vulnerability</li> </ul>	Online Questionnaire

criteria	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More need for single homeless</li> <li>• Eligibility criteria does not help single homeless – mentioned by 5 respondents</li> <li>• Eligibility criteria does not help single men – mentioned by 2 respondents</li> <li>• More support workers need including single people</li> <li>• Less spaces for single people</li> <li>• Mores spaces for single people</li> <li>• Concern that the proposals might impact on single people – mentioned by 2 respondents</li> </ul>	Postal Questionnaire

### 10.3 Feedback on proposals relating to move-on accommodation

Feedback relating to move-on accommodation were identified from all the forms of consultation and open feedback is shown below.

The proposals relating to move-on were to increase the number of units of shared and supported accommodation.

The online and postal questionnaire specifically asked whether they agreed with the proposal to increase the supply of shared and supported housing and to explore the provision of specialist long-term accommodation.

Closed question results relating to move-on accommodation:

% Yes	% No	Feedback from
70.5	21.4	Online Questionnaire
78.5	21.5	Postal Questionnaire

There is general support for the proposal to increase the number of units of shared and supported accommodation from the postal and online questionnaires. There were some concerns raised about sharing being suitable for all clients and requests for further clarification / definition about move-on.

Feedback relating to move-on accommodation

Feedback	Feedback from
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Move on not clearly defined in the delivery plan (need to drop the word hostel except for Border House and Dawn Centre)</li> </ul>	Consultation Events
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support proposals for move on accommodation but can see no evidence of detail about how it is to be achieved</li> <li>• Require the Council to accommodate our tenants so there is no bed blocking, could be considered being an 'exceptional circumstance' and gain higher priority on the housing register. New policy could mean providers are in a position where they cannot move people on</li> <li>• Young people do not have the financial means to access private housing to move-on</li> <li>• New Arrivals Strategy Group agree with the proposals relating to move-on accommodation</li> </ul>	Individual Responses
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Make sure appropriate move-on accommodation is in place</li> <li>• Appropriate accommodation not defined</li> <li>• Move on accommodation not defined</li> <li>• Don't believe everyone will be able to 'move on' to appropriate accommodation</li> <li>• Hostels provide support for teenage mother which enable them to move on</li> </ul>	Online Questionnaire

- Some can't share accommodation because of compatibility issues – mentioned by 7 respondents
- Vulnerable people could be at risk from sharing (e.g. young people and negative peer groups/families with children - safe guarding issues) – mentioned by 6 respondents
- Need more detail on the impact on local neighbourhoods
- Can't close hostels and move to 'move-on' - hostels needed to direct people to 'move-on' and prepare them for living in a less supported environment – mentioned by 2 respondents
- Needs to look at the specific needs of vulnerable groups - e.g. ex-offenders
- Can't use existing properties for move-on, need dedicated accommodation
- Need to consider how you will assist people to live in this environment
- Self-contained accommodation is better as it gets resident used to managing their own tenancy (including self-contained supported) – mentioned by 2 respondents
- The numbers of move-on accommodation units is insufficient and will have negative social and service related impacts if not properly resourced
- Not suitable for those with complex needs who need on-site support – mentioned by 2 respondents
- It's cheaper to maintain current hostels
- Need more detail on the previous record of move-on accommodation when used elsewhere
- What about those who fall through the gap (e.g. have needs but not enough to qualify for specialist long-term accommodation) – mentioned by 2 respondents
- How will you socialise people so that they can function in long-term accommodation?
- Don't agree with the 6 month limit on staying in accommodation - some needs are greater
- There needs to be a home building programme / need more stock – mentioned by 2 respondents
- Must ensure a smoke free environment , particularly vulnerable adults with ill health and children
- Pilot this first
- Will staff receive adequate training to identify needs and to engage client group
- Strategy contradicts itself - focuses on the need for this type of provision, but needs to reduce numbers already provided
- This work is missing single homeless
- We/I believe that for some clients it is necessary to have access to longer term supported housing option. Therefore, we agree with proposal to increase supported housing supply. Experience shows that some families will require longer term supported accommodation in order to ensure their support needs are fully met and they are supported to learn and practice the skills to engage and maintain positive family relationships. Thus, preventing the revolving door syndrome. However, simply increasing the supply of supported housing alone is insufficient. Along with more supported housing it is necessary to ensure adequate funding to achieve lifelong changes towards positive outcomes – mentioned by 5 respondents
- Yes in the main, but the strategy seems to suggest a lot of those services will be the in home by LCC. The city is in danger of losing some of its most effective provision by not tendering out all of the potential new services that result from the review
- Make all temporary / support accommodation band 5 until the accommodation notifies housing they are ready for permanent

<p>accommodation then move to band 2, prevents people abusing the hostel system / queue jumping</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to look at increasing move-on accommodation and the stock of affordable housing</li> <li>• Existing changes are already causing problems with move-on</li> <li>• Not enough detail on role of 42 temporary move-on beds</li> <li>• Proposal are misleading e.g. putting shared and supported accommodation together</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quick move on is good</li> <li>• Support for homeless people is important to get them back into permanent accommodation – mentioned by 2 respondents</li> <li>• Too little move-on accommodation available</li> <li>• Doesn't cover everyone who is/may become homeless</li> <li>• Sharing will be difficult for those with issues/lack of sharing skills/risk to vulnerable people – mentioned by 5 respondents</li> <li>• Cultural / religious /gender problems of sharing – mentioned by 3 respondents</li> <li>• Keep hostels / more hostels needed for this to work – mentioned by 3 respondents</li> <li>• Build more homes</li> <li>• The complex needs requirement may mean some who need this miss out</li> <li>• More support needed – mentioned by 4 respondents</li> <li>• No need to provide new accommodation facilities already there in existing buildings</li> <li>• No sharing - accommodation should be for individuals and have support available</li> <li>• People should have their own homes</li> </ul>	Postal Questionnaire

#### 10.4 Feedback on proposals relating to floating support

Feedback relating to floating support was identified from all the forms of consultation and open feedback is shown below.

The proposal regarding floating support was to increase the units of floating support with a focus on providing more specialist support.

Clients and former clients were asked specifically for their feedback regarding increasing floating support with a focus on specialist support at the client consultation event.

Closed question results relating to increasing floating support:

% Yes	% No	Feedback from
16.0	84.0	Client Event

There was not support for increasing floating support at the client event. There was also concern raised in the open ended feedback about floating support being able to meet the needs of some clients and that the support they needed should be provided in a hostel environment.

Feedback relating to floating support

Feedback	Feedback from
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Why is the 30% General Funding STAR service not being tendered?</li> <li>• Not everyone needs help and if they do, go find it</li> <li>• Floating groups are just excuse to delay tactics</li> <li>• It will depend on their effectiveness</li> </ul>	Consultation Events

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase in provision is to be welcomed</li> <li>• Offering mental health services to people in shared housing who have floating support is difficult as limited staff support, lack of confidential space and arrangements can be difficult to maintain</li> <li>• Risk to floating support worker becoming a taxi-service or PA to the person using services</li> <li>• Floating support cannot take the place of the intensive support currently provided in hostels</li> <li>• Being accommodated in a hostel should not rule out floating support. Benefits of the Revolving Door team is that personalised support follows the service user no matter where they are accommodated</li> <li>• Concern about floating support must be appropriate from clients experiencing homelessness. Does need to include specialist support for multi-need homelessness, mental health, substance abuse etc. Hope the whole sum of 395 units will be tendered in the open market not just the extra 79 therefore ensuring the best service provision procured competitively for quality and price</li> <li>• Floating support not work with residents whose needs are multiple and complex and have barely any independent level skills. They are often a high risk to themselves, each other, staff and members of the public</li> <li>• Floating support may well jeopardise safeguarding</li> <li>• Police have concerns that dedicated support on site which deals with unacceptable behaviour, including ASB by the service users will dramatically reduce becoming floating support and thus potential for a rise of ASB within communities</li> </ul>	Individual Responses
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a need for hostel accommodation between Dawn Centre/ Border House and floating support</li> <li>• Floating support needs to be increased</li> <li>• Hostels meet needs floating support can't</li> <li>• Look at drawing in investment through joint strategic needs assessments e.g. landlords pay a contribution to floating support</li> <li>• Need more detail on the available floating support – mentioned by 2 respondents</li> <li>• Floating support can't replicate the intensive support of hostels that some need</li> <li>• Will the increase in floating support lead to use of costly agency staff</li> <li>• 70% STAR Team / 30% Supporting People needs to be changed to a single service as this is confusing</li> <li>• Needs a better balance between accommodation providers and floating support (with more emphasis on floating support)</li> </ul>	Online Questionnaire
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need more floating support – mentioned by 5 respondents</li> <li>• STAR great – mentioned by 4 respondents</li> </ul>	Postal Questionnaire

## Profile of people attending the 'Have your say on homeless services' client event

### Profile of attendees

Hostel %	Supported Housing %	Floating Support %	Ex-Homeless %	No Accommodation %	Total no of Responses
58	12	12	13	5	84

### Length of time using homeless services

Less than 3 months %	3 – 6 months %	6 – 12 months %	12 – 18 months %	2 years or more %	Receiving support in own house %	No 'Local Connection' %	Total Responses
14	12	18	6	23	8	18	77

**A Response to Leicester City Council's Draft  
Homelessness Strategy and Delivery Proposals by  
Voluntary and Faith group Homelessness Service  
providers in Leicester city**

**February 2013**

**ISB Eat'n'Meet**



# 1 Background to the Report

1.1 In response to Leicester City Council issuing its Draft Homelessness Strategy for consultation in late 2012, a group of voluntary and faith group homelessness service providers has undertaken a detailed review of the strategy, including the aligned delivery proposals and equality impact assessments. This report builds on previous work undertaken by the voluntary and community sector in the lead up to the 2011 Homelessness Summit which articulated a new vision for homeless services in Leicester. Our response includes views obtained from thirteen service providers, including council funded and non council funded projects and some services run by homeless people.

1.2 The views and recommendations set out in the report are based on consensus and all organisations consulted have agreed to them being submitted to Leicester City Council. Details of those organisations consulted and a brief summary of the services they provide is included as an appendix to the report.

## 2 Executive Summary

2.1 The voluntary and faith sectors have for some considerable time provided important and high quality homelessness services within Leicester city and as a result of their innovation and creativity have levered in significant additional resources to address the needs of homeless service users. Much of the sector's work is carried out by highly skilled and motivated volunteers. The sector has always striven to work as a partner with Leicester City Council and other statutory agencies. Furthermore, the sector welcomed and contributed to the City Council's Homeless Review and actively participated in the Homelessness Summits held during 2011/12.

2.2 Beyond involvement in the strategic review process, the sector feels it has not been sufficiently consulted or involved in helping to prepare the Draft Strategy and Delivery Proposals now under consideration. Given the impact these will have on the lives of its services users, this is unfortunate and a lost opportunity for partnership development and collaboration between the local authority and the sector.

2.3 Having recognised within the Homelessness Review some excellent scoping work and a strong analysis of key issues affecting homeless people and the services provided for them, we feel this initial platform has not been built upon within the Draft Strategy, this is

because it has been developed too quickly to meet budgetary requirements. We endorse the comments of the Cabinet lead for housing at the Adult Social Care and Housing Scrutiny Commission on 15<sup>th</sup> January 2013, where he said that the budget should be service needs led and managed to respond to the aims and objectives set out within the strategy.

2.4 The voluntary and faith sector understands Leicester City Council's position regarding its need to manage budget reductions; indeed it has worked constructively with the Council to achieve budget cuts of 15% during the 2012/13 financial year. Our intention in submitting this detailed appraisal is to invite Leicester City Council to immediately engage with the voluntary and faith sector to strengthen the Draft Strategy with the aim of agreeing one that will drive the development and delivery of homelessness services within the city for the foreseeable future. We also want to work with the Council to agree a managed process for cost reduction. Proposals made within the Draft Strategy run the risk of the city losing committed and successful housing providers that are trusted by the homelessness community.

2.5 We believe the Draft Strategy insufficiently acknowledges the vital role played by the voluntary and faith sector in the development and delivery of homelessness services in Leicester city. If homelessness services are to be maintained and improved in an ever tightening economic climate, an effective partnership arrangement is required between the local authority, the voluntary and faith sectors and the private sector.

The vision for 3 | Page

this is not made within the Draft Strategy; in fact we feel that the capacity to work in partnership across the city will be greatly weakened with potentially harmful effects on those service users we all want to serve. Overall, the authors of this response believe that the Draft Strategy can be strengthened through the development of an improved commitment to aspirational, innovative and quality assured services underpinned by much stronger and more transparent arrangements for overseeing the delivery of the strategy.

2.6 In responding to the Draft Strategy and Delivery Proposals we suggest a number of areas for further development, including aspects of content, structure, process, service review, governance, consultation and engagement. These are designed to assist with the development of a robust and comprehensive strategy capable of improving quality standards and creating opportunities for service growth and innovation.

### 3 Recommendations

We strongly recommend the following in respect of the Draft Strategy and Delivery Proposals:

#### 3.1 Content and Structure

The Draft Strategy should include:

- a) A redrafted vision statement – we have proposed a new version which is more aspirational (4.2.1.a)
- b) A statement of core values which should replace the Draft Strategy’s principles (4.2.1.b)
- c) A clearly defined series of outcomes linked to key performance indicators providing a framework to measure strategy implementation (4.2.1.c).
- d) An Equality Impact Assessment which requires considerable further development if the strategy is not to be left open to challenge (4.2.2). This is particularly in respect of:

- i. The necessity of culturally sensitive provision within the city;
- ii. Provision for those that are dependent children within the homelessness services system;
- iii. Young people aged 16 – 18 years old in hostels under licence.

e) A transition plan that explains how a drastic reduction in service provision would be achieved, whilst minimising the impact on service users (4.2.1.d), and is underpinned by an evaluation of the capacity of the private rented sector to meet the demand created by decommissioning hostel bed spaces.

f) A statement that recognises the important role the voluntary and faith sector plays in the delivery of homeless services within the city (2.5).

#### 3.2 Process

Leicester City Council works with the voluntary and faith sector to develop:

- a) A case management system (pathway) so that service users can be supported and tracked on their journey to independent living. This should be linked to an effective data capture and monitoring procedure (e.g. CS+) and mapped against other pathways that are under development (e.g. drugs and alcohol misuse) (4.2.3.b).
- b) A service user involvement strategy to enable the voice of homeless people and those affected by the strategy to be heard and responded to (4.2.3.a).
- c) A quality standard that can be applied across all homelessness services (4.4).

### 3.3 Service review and development

Leicester City Council works with the voluntary and faith sector to:

- a) Review Day Centre services within the city before decisions are taken to close existing ones. Day centres are a key component of preventative services and provide valuable support for homeless people or those who are vulnerably housed, including offering access to online services (4.6).
- b) Review how homelessness and housing services are provided for young people in the city and how other services can be encouraged to help young people sustain independent living (4.8).
- c) Review staff training across the sector to support the development of a model of empowerment and cultural change (4.4).
- d) Ensure the Draft Strategy does not stand in isolation and links with other local strategies and can be supported by them (e.g. economic action plan, children and young people, youth offending, think family and appropriate health and social strategies) (4.3).
- e) Stimulate the supply of good quality homes from the private, public and social sector, building on established models of good practice (4.4).
- f) Establish an assessment and referral process for single homeless people, separate from the Housing Options Centre (HOC) that recognises the particular needs of that group (4.4).

### 3.4 Governance, Consultation and Engagement

Leicester City Council works with the voluntary and faith sector to:

- a) Ensure that budgetary reduction is achieved through a managed process of cost reduction, based on evidence of need, across all services. The voluntary and faith sector will play its part in this, as it did in 2012/13 (4.9).
- b) Leicester City Council should justify why its own services will continue to be delivered in-house and why the voluntary and faith sector's service should be commissioned (4.8).
- c) Establish a multi-partner Homelessness Strategy Group (HSG) embedded within the city's Local Strategic Partnership structure. An HSG will have overarching responsibility for monitoring the delivery of the strategy, fostering

the development of cross sector partnerships and identifying new funding opportunities to support service development. The HSG will be chaired by an independent person with an interest in tackling homelessness in the city (4.7).

d) Secure a commitment from Leicester City Council to review aspects of the Draft Strategy that might hinder the delivery of the No Second Night Out (NSNO) proposal, especially the allocations policy which we perceive is a barrier to accessing move on accommodation for those meeting the NSNO criteria (4.6).

e) Leicester City Council should agree contract conditions, such as referral criteria and allocations, through negotiation with voluntary and community sector providers, in recognition of the value added to contracts by an independent VCS that retains the capacity to innovate. 5 | Page

## 4 Analysis of the Draft Homelessness Strategy

### 4.1 National and local context for strategy

We understand that the drivers behind the development of the Homelessness Strategy and delivery proposals are the result of Leicester City Council's 2008-13 strategy coming to an ending, national policy reform and the downward pressure on the Council's budget as a result of government spending cuts. We acknowledge that the City Council is under pressure to reduce costs across all areas of its budget. However, we contend that homelessness should be deemed a priority in Leicester and addressed as such. Homelessness services should be available to all, including those who are deemed to be statutorily homeless and those that are not but have real and genuine needs.

While we understand the Council has a legal duty to prioritise those who are deemed to be statutorily homeless, the impact on anyone who becomes homeless will be significant with the potential for long term personal and social repercussions, all of which will need to be addressed by other public services. It is impossible to quantify the net detriment to public services resulting from homelessness, but the additional costs placed on agencies such as social services, the Police, youth offending services and the health sector will almost certainly outweigh the cost of adequate homelessness provision many times over. Research by Homeless Link has estimated a £2.11 payback for every £1.00 invested in housing-related support.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> [www.homeless.org.uk/value\\_of\\_the\\_sector](http://www.homeless.org.uk/value_of_the_sector)

The onset of welfare reform, the growth in Leicester's population, especially its diversity brought about by new immigration, the high levels of unemployment in the city and a reduction in the supply of affordable housing, all point to homelessness increasing in the

short to medium term. This point was well made in the Homelessness review: *"It can be difficult to predict future need, but the current social-economic and demographic context suggests there will be further difficulties for many households trying to access good quality affordable housing, which may lead to increased homelessness."*<sup>2</sup>

<sup>2</sup> Leicester City Council, Homelessness Review (2012) p17

<sup>3</sup> Leicester City Council, Child Poverty Commission Review Report (January 2013)

All homelessness related trends appear to be upwards. Again, the Homeless Review listed several key indicators all highlighting a worsening of the situation for people at risk of homelessness or those moving into homelessness. For the years 2010/11 and 2011/12 these included:

- 13.5% increase in people accessing housing options;
- 14% increase in total Homeless Declarations;
- Day centres and drop in services for food, clothing and furniture experiencing more people accessing their services.

Factor in that in 2011 Leicester had the second highest number of rough sleepers outside of London, and there is a case to argue that homelessness services should be deemed a priority in a time of unprecedented economic and social turbulence resulting from legislative changes and welfare reform. The country has seen a 31% increase in rough sleeping over the past two years and Leicester's success in reversing this trend in 2012 demonstrates the value and impact of its homelessness services.

The increase in levels of child poverty and the current economic pressures on families, for example, as cited in the Leicester Child Poverty Commission review, highlight the increasing levels of disadvantage being faced within the city's more deprived communities.<sup>3</sup> 6 | Page

Taking this argument to its logical conclusion, we propose that homelessness services should be recognised for the benefits they bring within housing and beyond by preventing and responding to homelessness, and therefore not subjected to the level of funding cut proposed. This latter view was endorsed by the Adult Social Care and Housing Scrutiny Commission at its meeting on the 15<sup>th</sup> January 2013, when it moved *“That the Commission believes that it is not possible to deliver the Homelessness Strategy within the Budget imposed and asks the Executive and Council to remove the savings identified and increase the Budget by £1 million to help ensure that the Homelessness Strategy can be delivered.”*<sup>4</sup> It is also relevant to note that the 2010 comprehensive spending review reduced revenue funding for Supporting People from central to local government by only 3% between 2010/11 and 2014/15.

<sup>4</sup> Draft minutes of the Adult Health and Social Care Scrutiny Commission (15<sup>th</sup> January 2013)

#### **4.2 Structure of the Draft Strategy**

We believe that the Draft Strategy could be improved and strengthened by:

##### 4.2.1 Strategic framework

a) The Vision statement should be placed at the front of the document. It should be aspirational, engaging and a call to action across the whole city to end homelessness. It should propose the development and delivery of high quality services capable of eradicating homelessness. The present vision statement as drafted is too passive and inward looking, it reads as an objective and is insufficiently visionary to capture the attention of an audience other than existing providers and the council. We believe the Homelessness Strategy should seek to engage with a much wider audience than Leicester City

Council and those organisations who currently deliver “homelessness services”; it should be the tool that drives a wider campaign to address homelessness and to draw in additional

resources to focus on the issue. The Homelessness Strategy needs to have city wide ownership and should reach out to everyone from local philanthropists, private companies, the education sector, the wider voluntary, community and faith sector and all public agencies to help tackle the issue.

We propose the following statement:

***‘Leicester is committed to ending the blight of homelessness in all forms and for all people. Our vision is for a city where everyone has access to high quality, safe and affordable accommodation with appropriate support for those who need it. Only when everyone in our city is housed in this way will we truly flourish and prosper. We call on every agency and individual in the city to help eradicate homelessness forever.’***

b) The Draft Strategy contains no clearly defined outcomes (outcomes are the changes that occur as a result of the work carried out). The success of any strategy can only be measured by the achievement of its outcomes over time. As it stands, the Draft Strategy is largely comprised of a series of priorities with management and delivery actions. A set of key outcomes should be developed, linked to key performance indicators that are capable of being measured in order to quantify progress towards the overarching Vision.

7 | Page

Without agreed outcomes and KPIs how do we know if the strategy is succeeding?

c) Principles and Strategic Priorities – the Draft Strategy proposes a set of ‘Principles’ and ‘Priorities’, however, these are essentially the same. We have commented on the proposed Principles and Strategic Priorities as they are stated, although we suggest that the Principles might be rewritten to include reference to a set of core values that sit behind the Draft Strategy. These might include a commitment to fairness; addressing issues of equality and diversity; a focus on the needs of the ‘whole person’ and how homeless people can be helped across a wide range of issues to promote recovery, stability and economic independence; transparency in the way services are developed and delivered; a commitment to working in partnership across all sectors and striving to achieve a quality assured service and a focus on working with local providers to the benefit of the wider local community to secure economic and other social benefits. The Strategic Priorities would then set out the high level aspirations underpinned by a range of key activities.

d) The Draft Strategy needs to develop a coherent rationale linking the Strategic Priorities through and into delivery proposals. To compound this structural fault, there is no description of a transition plan to underpin the proposed delivery schedule.

#### 4.2.2 Equality and diversity

The 2011 Census results demonstrated that Leicester’s non-white population now stands at 49% of the population. This is an increase of 10% since 2001 and projections suggest that the city will have a majority non-white population by 2015. Leicester has an excellent track record in delivering community integration and cohesion which is due to the diversity of its providers. This would be at risk if we default to largely statutory provision without an assessment of the potential impact on community cohesion.

The Draft Strategy fails to draw on the Equality Impact Assessments (EIA) to suggest how it will address the needs of Leicester’s diverse community. The EIA states that “we know people from black backgrounds are disproportionately over represented in current homelessness services. We anticipate that the profiles of people using homelessness services will not change.” (p8) And again “we propose to build in the need for culturally sensitive services within the specifications for the procurement of all services” (p12). The EIA suggests that the strategy will have a negative impact on all those people that have protected characteristics (Equality Act 2010) but that this will be mitigated by service development improvements. Based on the proposed budget reductions and subsequent decrease in service delivery, we think this is an unrealistic assumption.

The analysis in the EIA is not reflected in the Draft Strategy or the delivery proposals. There is no acknowledgment of the need for culturally sensitive or appropriate services for communities within the city that require non-mainstream support, particularly those from black and minority ethnic backgrounds. We believe this remains a critical consideration in Leicester where different groups of people have very different needs and cannot be

addressed through a 'one size fits all' approach.

A further key issue that is not addressed within the EIA or the Draft Strategy and the Delivery Proposals is the impact on children within families.

#### 4.2.3 Service users

a) There is no reference in the Draft Strategy to how service users have helped shape the priorities and Delivery Proposals. The strategy has failed to interpret any data gathered during the Homelessness review to demonstrate how the identified needs of service users will be improved as a result of the proposals contained within it. While we note the service user consultation meeting that took place on the 6<sup>th</sup> February, we firmly believe that the starting point for the design of any client centred services should be the service users themselves. Examples of how the voluntary and faith sector undertake service user consultation include Action Homeless' Café Vision Event to secure input into its 2013/18 strategic plan and ASRA's consultation with parents and children using activity sessions as a means of engagement.

b) No clear pathway for end service users is proposed within the strategy. We believe the development of a progression pathway from rough sleeping or homelessness to independent living should be established to provide a routeway through the various service offers (i.e. 'stages of support') that are desirable and available. This is a critical component within the strategy and will help to manage service users more effectively at different stages of their journey towards independence. In addition, we should like to see the introduction of an improved case management system for individuals supported by homelessness service delivery providers. We understand that Leicester City Council has developed an effective management tool (CS+) that is used for a number of training and education programmes and this could be adapted for use within homelessness services. This approach would not only assist with tracking individual progress, but enable all service providers to share information about individuals and to monitor their progress within the pathway towards independent living. This approach will ensure the introduction of improved data management including the ability to quantify and measure achievement against agreed KPIs. The need for a pathway is proposed within the Draft Strategy which suggests that it will appear at Appendix B and C, but these are absent from the published document.

#### 4.3 Absence of links to other key strategies and programmes

The Draft Homelessness Strategy as it stands appears to have been developed in almost total isolation from other key policy and practice areas in which the City Council and its Voluntary, Community and Faith partners have a clear and linked interest (albeit we note consultation with Youth Offending and Children's Services referred to in the delivery proposals). Treating homelessness simply as a 'housing' issue surely fails the wider needs of service users who use homelessness services and significantly reduces the cross-sectoral opportunities that could be delivered through partnerships with, for example, health, education, economic regeneration and other 9 | Page

service areas. We draw attention to the requirements of the Public Services (Social Value) Act 2012 for public bodies to take into account the wider economic, social and environmental impact of services during procurement, which supports this cross-sectoral view.

The absence of strategic linkages within the Draft Strategy is a fundamental weakness and if it persists will significantly minimize longer term opportunities for joint work, innovation and resource acquisition. This aspect of the Draft Strategy requires urgent consideration and development.

#### **4.4 Views on evidence drawn from the 'Homelessness Review conclusions'**

The Draft Strategy draws on a number of statements or outcomes from the Homelessness Review, and these provide the context for the principles and priorities set out later in the document. We believe that some of these statements can be contested or are unclear and we have the following comments to make of each:

*Rough Sleepers - It is clear that a more planned and sustainable approach is required, in the form of the 'No Second Night Out' principles, implemented in other areas across the country.*

This is accepted and we agree that No Second Night Out should be a continuing focus of effort. The proposals behind the NSNO project have been led by the voluntary and community sector and Homeless Link and this deserves recognition.

*Hostel provision and access - there appears to be an over-provision of generic singles accommodation, however it is difficult to establish exact need levels as there are many direct access hostels across the city. .... we need to ensure the most vulnerable and entrenched people are not being excluded from services and use bed spaces as efficiently as possible.*

Leicester undoubtedly has a relatively high level of hostel accommodation for singles when compared to other cities. But it is not all generic. One provider, for example, has run its own homelessness pathway for over twenty years, enabling single homeless people to move from generic crisis accommodation to their own tenancies via, if necessary, specialist supported accommodation focusing on substance misuse, mental health and learning difficulties. Direct access does not prevent provider organisations from analysing need levels across their services and many do so very effectively indeed using Outcomes Star. However, a high level of access to this type of provision is facilitated through Housing Options. The use of the term "appears to be" suggests that the City Council does not have the full data at its disposal and estimates of service provision have been used. We believe that "exact needs" should be identified before a strategic or delivery response to this issue can be formulated. This demonstrates there is insufficient coordinated data capture and utilisation across the different hostels in the city. For example, there appears to be little reference to the data collected during Supporting People to inform strategic priorities. Addressing this issue would enable us to better understand need levels among the entire cohort of single people accessing hostel accommodation and more importantly ensure the voice of the customer is taken into account through satisfaction levels at various services.

We propose that the council develops a progression pathway in consultation with the VCS, using shared case management systems such as CS+. This will enable data collection to establish levels of need and make an informed assessment of generic accommodation services and access for the most vulnerable and entrenched people. The development of an agreed progression pathway can also be used to assist with the establishment of agreed quality standards across all types of provision. We would like to explore how this can be achieved with the aim of driving up the quality of services in the statutory, voluntary and private sectors. 10 | Page



Currently VCS service providers use QAF, although we should like to explore which other standards might be used. *Move on accommodation - there is a lack of appropriate move-on accommodation across the city, although this situation is sometimes eased through the use of private sector rented accommodation. There is also a lack of affordable social housing.*

Our view is this is a complex and multi-faceted issue. Some single people may have remained in hostel accommodation for too long and the two year 'operating window' created by Supporting People funding has clearly influenced how some services have been delivered. There is also insufficient move on accommodation in the city for families. The 'Leicester Requirement' has compounded this issue. But it is too simplistic to argue that this is at the heart of any move on problems in the city. We believe there are a range of factors that play into this situation: poor move on outcomes are equally about low professional aspirations for homeless people, insufficient skilled care and support to enable people to deal with the causes of homelessness, a lack of opportunity for service users to regain their confidence, learn new skills and make a successful transition to sustainable employment, and because of issues associated with the criminal justice system. It is also about rent arrears and difficulties in accessing decent affordable housing. However, for those accommodation projects which support under 18s the situation is largely unavoidable given that Leicester City Council has a policy of not offering any form of tenancy to 16 and 17 year olds.

Furthermore, the figures presented within the Draft Strategy do not disaggregate City Council and Voluntary Sector outcomes. Our general view is that the Voluntary Sector has better move on rates than the Council and this can be evidenced from data collated during the Supporting People period.

To address this issue, we suggest the feasibility of establishing an ethical support fund to stimulate the development of homes for rent should be considered. We suggest reviewing a number of approaches (e.g. Plymouth Homes for Let) to design a service enabling Leicester to lever in social investment linked to the achievement of positive outcomes (e.g. sustainable tenancies, job outcomes) with the aim of increasing the range and type of accommodation provided by the public, voluntary and private sectors. Linked to this proposal would be the creation of an ethical lettings agency capable of brokering tenant and landlord relationships. This work might link with the proposed DCLG Single Homelessness and Prevention Funding.

*Repeat Homelessness - the development of the Revolving Door Project has helped to identify barriers to move-on and has worked on a one to one basis with the most entrenched homeless people. However, resources only enable the service to work with 50 cases at one time, and the lessons learnt from this project need to be embedded across all homelessness services to reduce repeat homelessness in the future.*

The feedback from service users about the Revolving Door Project has been positive with the one to one support offered by Revolving Door Workers (alongside the co-working efforts of hostel staff) being credited as making a difference to their ability to move on from hostel accommodation. However, we understand this specific service is only available to those in council hostels. It is also worth noting that a 'Revolving Door' type service (i.e. intensive one to one support) is provided to a good standard by many voluntary providers who also report success with delivery and positive feedback from service users through project based monitoring exercises (e.g. data collected from Supporting People). In order to ensure equitable provision across the city, a quality standard for this type of provision needs to be developed and enabled for all providers. 11 | Page 12 | Page

*the community. However, we must also recognise that there will always be a small number of people who will never be able to live completely independently and we will need to develop sustainable options for them.*

The voluntary and faith sector is very aware of this 'culture' but has actively sought to challenge it and address it for some time. Some providers have identified this as fundamental to their service development function and have planned to tackle it accordingly. For example, one provider highlighted the issue within its own strategic plan, and aims to develop services which help prevent homelessness before people reach crisis point, whether that is a tenancy breakdown or being released from prison without stable accommodation.

Generally, we agree there is a need to achieve a culture shift in homeless services which sees service users being empowered to access the services and opportunities they need to leave homelessness behind and make a success of their futures. For many service users, such a culture shift is the missing ingredient in their support package no matter whether they receive it in hostels or via floating support services. We should not assume that because support is floating, it is automatically more enabling or empowering than support received in hostels. What is required across homelessness services in general are well trained staff that have a range of specific skills relating to health and wellbeing, psychology and practical support skills who can deliver the support required to ensure people achieve sustainable independence as quickly as possible. As it stands there is little provision in the plan to support this deliverable. We propose a review of the training available to all staff in homelessness services to assess how this can be improved.

We also suggest that involving service users in developing the Homelessness Strategy is one way of setting the tone for this culture shift among both service users and providers. We therefore wish to see the development of a client engagement or involvement plan within the strategy and progressing this to a scrutiny role where the customers hold providers to account. Many organisations have customer led governance and scrutiny structures.

We welcome the recognition that some people will require longer term support and that specialist options are required. For many single homeless people with multiple needs who are hard to reach, day centres currently play a key role in prevention because they are easily accessible and people seek support where they feel comfortable and not necessarily where they live. We propose that the existing impact of day centre provision is assessed in relation to developing sustainable support to people with multiple needs.

Generally, we would agree with this statement, but we contend the proposed delivery plan does not demonstrate how it will deliver on this principle.

*The Housing Options Service - issues have been raised about the need to further improve customer care, the Phoenix House reception area, and the difficulties in training staff to deal with all the complexities that service users face.*

Phoenix House has a very poor reputation amongst service users and the City Council should be applauded in recognizing this and committing to do something to change the situation (we make suggestions elsewhere in this report about how that should be done).

The service users of VCS providers and homeless people more generally have frequently used words such as 'degrading', 'dehumanising' and 'a lack of understanding' to describe their customer experience of the Housing Options Service.

There is equally no doubt that working in Housing Options is a challenging environment, especially given the number and range of people presenting for advice, and that Housing Options delivers some exceptional results for people which often goes unsung. However, if Housing Options is to be the public face of access and referral for 13 | Page

homeless service users then we have to ensure that the people and communication skills of advisers is up to the task of knowledgeably and sensitively helping vulnerable people deal with difficult situations in their lives.

We make the case elsewhere that the Housing Options service should be tendered and that single homeless people should have a separate service to support them.

*Governance and Performance Management - one of the roles of the Housing Support and Advice Programme Board (HASP) is to oversee the implementation of the Homelessness Strategy and Delivery Plan. There is evidence that this does not work as effectively as it could. It is better than it was but needs to be more coordinated and robust. Our partners, and key stakeholders, also need to play a more active role in monitoring the Homelessness Strategy.*

We agree that governance and performance management are key issues in relation to the delivery of a high quality homelessness service. We make detailed proposals about governance in the report and have already raised concerns about the lack of a performance management framework (outcomes and key performance indicators) within the Draft Strategy.

*Partnership Working - partnership working between the Council and the Voluntary, Community and Faith Sectors has been improving....this new way of working, where all providers are valued, must be built upon.*

We agree with this statement and make recommendations about partnership being fundamental to the development and delivery of a Homelessness Strategy later in this report. However, the Draft Strategy does not build on the foundations developed to date.

#### **4.5 Principles**

Notwithstanding our earlier comment that the Principles and Strategic Priorities are essentially the same statements, we have a number of minor comments about the proposed principles, (although we do think they should be Strategic Priorities only!). We do, however, propose the addition of a seventh Principle (i.e. a Strategic Priority).

*1. Anyone at risk of homelessness is given advice and support to prevent this, whenever possible.*

We think that the term 'wherever possible' runs the risk of being used to deny someone advice and support based on a lack of resources. This principle should be unconditional; advice and 'appropriate' support should be made available to all that need it and to a defined standard.

*2. When someone is homeless today, we aspire to assist them into appropriate accommodation, with support, and we will ensure that services are tailored to address their individual needs.*

We support this principle, but we would like to see 'aspire' replaced by 'will' which gives a guarantee of support and is unconditional.

*3. We will implement 'No Second Night Out' to ensure that new rough sleepers will not sleep out for more than one night.*

We agree fully with this principle and will continue to lead and support this initiative.

*4. Anyone who is homeless will be able to 'move-on' into appropriate accommodation.*

We think that it might be useful to define 'homeless' in this principle. Do you mean 'homeless' in its plain English version or Statutorily Homeless only? This principle suggests an absolute guarantee of accommodation for those who are homeless.

We are pleased this has been included.

*5. Anyone who is homeless will be able to access appropriate care services to meet their health and well-being needs.* 14 | Page

We propose that 'anyone at risk' of becoming homeless should be added as a client group within this principle, including families.

*6. There are opportunities to access training, education, employment and enterprise initiatives.*

While we support the idea behind this statement, as it is written we do not believe that it constitutes a principle, it merely makes a statement about the availability of a type of service. Furthermore, we feel that the delivery proposals set out to achieve it are inadequate. We will not achieve our aspirations for move on and independent living unless we find more ways to promote economic well being among service users.

We propose that this principle reads "We will ensure that homeless people or those at risk of homelessness have access to the highest quality training, education, employment and enterprise support to help them develop new skills to help them achieve economic independence and a sustainable life style."

We would like to see a seventh principle added that seeks to address those who are vulnerable and homeless or at risk of homelessness but who are not statutory homeless. "We will meet the needs of those who are vulnerable but are not regarded as statutory homeless."

#### **4.6 New strategic priorities**

In general terms we are supportive of most of the Strategic Priorities, however, the 'shopping list' approach to how these will be developed and implemented is at times confusing as the list often contains a combination of policy, management and delivery proposals and fails to present a sense of a clearly defined, outcomes driven process. While we understand that perhaps some of the detail required to provide a better understanding of what is proposed will appear in the delivery plan, we think the Strategic Priorities should be underpinned with a clear set of objectives within a number of different categories, including national policy review; examination of good practice; partnership development; service management; services and activity; implementation arrangements; customer impact.

*1. Anyone, at risk of homelessness, is given advice and support to prevent this, whenever possible.*

We agree that this should be a Strategic Priority, the actions are realistic and feasible but they are limited and require clarity of definition. Homeless prevention involves getting into communities to help families and individuals most at risk. There is a network of VCS organisations (not all homelessness focused) in the city that could help us get targeted advice and support into communities. The strategy needs to at least state that Leicester City Council will work with the VCS to get housing advice and homeless prevention work out into our communities, especially those most affected by poverty and disadvantage.

Furthermore, the City Council's Housing Options service at Phoenix House is a gate-keeping function to determine eligibility and thus limits spend. It often refuses advice and support to those who are not "Statutory Homeless" which means that it is a very limited service for many homeless people. The City Council should take the opportunity to see the potential for this service to be its best prevention measure. Eligibility criteria are currently applied in a way that excludes people by focusing on the criteria for statutory homelessness. For everyone to be advised and supported in the way envisaged by this statement, there needs to be a flexible and positive approach to assessing an individual's needs that focuses more on offering the appropriate advice and support to prevent or end that person's homelessness. 15 | Page

*2. When someone is homeless today, we aspire to assist them into appropriate accommodation, with support. We will ensure that services are tailored to address their individual needs.*

At present we do not have the confidence that a Council-run Single Access Referral Point (SARP) based at Housing Options will enable us to realise this objective. There is also a lack of clarity over how the required increase in PRS accommodation availability is to be achieved. There appears to be reduced scope for VCS innovation as Leicester City Council operates “command and control” over its funded services and concern that the Council will insist which service users service providers should take. There is an inadequate explanation of what, if any, support pathway will be in place to help people transition as effectively as possible from crisis to independent living and, without a strategy for day centre provision; we think this proposal is even more unrealistic. If the commitment is to Statutory Homeless people only, it further limits its impact.

If a diverse range of projects in existence at present were to close or are required to reduce staffing levels, we doubt the proposed increased usage of the private sector will offset the accommodation required. However much they are induced, private landlords are not social landlords and are not qualified or monitored to provide support to vulnerable people. Impending welfare reform may also be a deterrent for private landlords to participate in move on accommodation. They are in the business for profit and any barrier would not be an inducement to their involvement in this area of provision.

In order to manage the transition to accommodation pathways that include a higher number of PRS units, we propose that the Council carries out an audit of current move on needs within services and maps this against current provision. This can be done in partnership with the VCS, for example using Homeless Link’s free Move On Planning Protocol tools.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>6</sup> [www.homeless.org.uk/mopp](http://www.homeless.org.uk/mopp)

*3. We will implement ‘No Second Night Out’ (NSNO) to ensure that new rough sleepers will not sleep out for more than one night*

We are supportive of this delivery strand but now that the VCS has successfully led the bid for funding to roll out NSNO in Leicester there has to be a synthesizing of the strategy and the NSNO project, which has the following delivery aims: a) Launch No Second Night Out in Leicester improving prevention, first night response and providing support so people do not return to the street; b) Work with county districts to build a coordinated approach to rough sleeping; c) Pilot an Intensive Floating Support approach to help rough sleepers find and maintain tenancies and ensure they do not return to the street; d) Create an empathetic response to EU migrant rough sleeping; e) focusing on employment, housing, health, and appropriate supported reconnection in partnership with key local agencies; f) Build partnerships between the VCS and LA improving assessment and allocation systems and influencing the strategic approach to homelessness; g) Provide a new programme of well being activities and support for volunteering, training and employment; h) Improve support provided for local support staff to improve knowledge of substance abuse, mental health and specialist barriers.

This is an area where there is a genuine opportunity for collaborative working between the VCS and the City Council. The Homelessness Strategy has the potential to catalyse that partnership and a commitment through NSNO to create a sustainable and effective response to rough sleeping. This work should in the first instance reflect on the learning achieved during last summer's Rough Sleepers' Task Force work, which essentially cleared the streets of rough sleepers during a 12 week pilot. 16 | Page

However, there is a risk that implementation of NSNO will be undermined by the proposed cuts. Factors such as the proposed reduction in bed spaces and the introduction of Universal Credit and welfare benefit reforms (whereby rent and service charges are paid direct to the claimant) create a high risk that more people will sleep rough, as private landlords are less likely to accept benefit claimants, those who have a poor housing history or those who may have medical needs as a consequence of facing hardship.

#### *4. Anyone, who is homeless, will be able to 'move-on' into appropriate accommodation*

Clearly this proposal is admirable and should be supported; however, there is a range of constraints and concerning facets to it.

Generally, we believe there is a lack of availability of "appropriate accommodation" so the assurance cannot be provided as an absolute guarantee. For example, Adullam has extensive waiting lists as does ASRA at Kirton Lodge. It should also be re-appraised in light of the varying needs of our diverse communities which mean that a 'one size fits all' approach is unlikely to work.

Applying pressure to hostels to speed up move on could result in more tenancy breakdowns if people 'move on' before they are ready and increase the 'revolving door'. We believe the emphasis should be on prompt but sustainable move on where the needs of the customer are paramount. For example, service users who have debt or are banned from housing, by the very nature of their problems, cannot necessarily resolve these issues in shared accommodation with little support - they need to build up trusting and strong relationships with professionals and have regular access to help.

It is our view that the proposals to scale up the availability of PRS accommodation within the levels and time frames required are not realistic. Where PRS is achieved, we believe that tenants are less likely to receive floating support.

We have specific concerns about paragraph 4.2 regarding the autonomy of providers and 4.7 where the priority appears to be those moving into Council accommodation. Improved co-ordination as in 4.2 is laudable but is no substitute for a sufficiency of move on

accommodation. We suggest that the proposal at 4.5 would be better undertaken by a non-landlord agency. We welcome opportunities to engage and support the proposal set out at 4.10, 4.11 and 4.13. In summary, we have concerns that this proposal is driven by short term cost cutting. Three areas have underperformed in the past and two of them are not being reviewed (Floating Support and HOC) which have been major contributors to past failures. The third area is hostels but some have improved considerably in the past 2 years if their QAF scores are examined (Foundation Housing has scored at Level B) and could be models for others.

#### *5. Anyone, who is homeless, will be able to access appropriate care services to meet their health and well-being needs.*

We believe this proposal needs clearer integration with other strategies in order to succeed. It is simply insufficient to state that we welcome the continued presence of partner organisations. The strategy needs to proactively commit to working outside the homelessness 'silo', for example to actively engage with the CCG agenda, if we are to ensure access to appropriate care services. Specialist floating support services for drugs and alcohol are great but proposals for this group need to be aligned with the wider commissioning agenda currently being taken forward by the Drug and Alcohol Action Team. It is not just about hostel staff raising expectations ... it is about a whole system approach to encouraging opportunity and aspiration for people affected by the issues

| Page

- something that generally the strategy fails to deliver on.

The role a general day centre can play in maintaining the well-being of homeless individuals is severely under-estimated; YASC has provided a non-judgmental open access facility where people can socialise and have human contact and support where otherwise they may not. It has been a key infrastructure service within the homelessness sector underpinning and directly supporting work carried out by the outreach team, revolving door, LPT Community Mental Health Team and the Street Drinking Team. Hostels can have strict visiting / behaviour criteria (including refusing access to those severely inebriated thus leaving them outside). Day centre staff often spot declining well-being due to the consistent contact with individuals and can alert other support agencies. The proposal to close day centres other than the wet day centre will therefore impact on the ability to achieve this proposal. Many homeless people, or those in temporary accommodation, struggle financially and turn to Community and Faith Day Centres and Drop-in Services for food, clothing and furniture. They also receive support to help overcome their feelings of social isolation and loneliness from these services. However, the delivery proposals are to stop funding day centres which many people use for support. Furthermore, there is no reference to 5.7 in the delivery proposals (i.e. floating support for alcohol and substance misusers).

*6. There are opportunities to access training, education, employment and enterprise initiatives.*

This proposal is critical to enable service users to secure economic independence and a route out of homelessness, and recent reports show that central government initiatives are not meeting the needs of homeless people.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>7</sup> <http://homeless.org.uk/news/work-programme-not-working-homeless-people>

However, as stated, we feel the Council's proposal is lacking in ambition and resources to the extent that the only work in this area will continue to be done by STRIDE, Action Homeless, Leicestershire Cares, The Y, Foundation Housing and a few others. We believe this element of the strategy is one that requires considerably more discussion, not least about what can be provided by non-housing service providers for our service users and some innovative, longer term solutions. This should involve colleagues within the City Council's Economic Regeneration team and other VCS providers.

As it stands there is no suggestion of any additional resource, therefore a development proposal is required that might attract new income. There is considerable innovation across the UK that could be reviewed, for example the recent establishment of the Recovery College for homeless people in London is one example of good practice.<sup>8</sup> More locally, the Foundation Housing project in partnership with NIACE focusing on digital literacy is a good example of innovation targeted at BME, homeless and domestic violence service users.

<sup>8</sup> [http://www.mungos.org/press\\_office/1528\\_new-college-for-people-recovering-from-homelessness](http://www.mungos.org/press_office/1528_new-college-for-people-recovering-from-homelessness)  
Homeless Link can provide a valuable resource to this area of work. How different ethnic groups should be supported within this proposal, especially those with no or poor English speaking skills, should also be a key consideration.

4.7 Partnership working, governance and implementation of the Homelessness Strategy  
Our overarching comment concerning the section about partnership is that the Homelessness Strategy needs to be a citywide strategy involving all sectors and not simply a Leicester City Council management tool. A commitment to real partnership is about a commitment to equality, of sharing ideas and joint governance, of promoting innovation and

18 | Page

ensuring quality services as well as having an overview regarding the achievement of outcomes.

There have been some good examples of partnership working within the housing and homelessness service sector, however, we believe the time is right to elevate the Homelessness Strategy to one that is owned and governed by a much wider partnership, one that is capable of driving forward effective governance, real change and creating the opportunity for additional resources coming into the sector.

We therefore propose the establishment of a Homelessness Board comprising of one third public sector, one third voluntary, community and faith sector and one third private sector and independent representation and chaired by an independent person unconnected with any of the member bodies. The precise terms of reference for the Homelessness Board should be discussed within the context of the Draft Strategy consultation.

However, if the strategy is only about how the City Council's money is spent then governance can really be limited to Leicester City Council with involvement from 'paid' providers and service users. Even within this limited context, we believe that the VCS and Faith sector has an integral role to play and if the strategy is further developed into a true multi-agency document then homelessness organisations will have a central role to play in its governance. The principles underpinning this position should be that a partnership approach is capable of recognising all contributions on an equal footing for both funded and unfunded groups, especially faith groups who contribute significantly in managing homelessness. On reflection, we feel that HASP has been very poor at these roles in the past. It has often acted as a platform for the City Council to make announcements rather than a process for governing and managing performance. This situation most definitely requires improvement

irrespective of the agreed governance arrangements going forward.

#### 4.8 Delivery proposals

A central criticism of the Draft Strategy is that it fails to develop a coherent rationale linking the Strategic Priorities through and into delivery proposals. To compound this structural fault, there is no description whatsoever of a transition plan to underpin the proposed delivery schedule.

We acknowledge reference is made within the Draft Strategy to an implementation plan, but this should at least be available to see in outline form in order to understand how the Strategy proposes to manage new arrangements that will be in place by, we assume, as early as October 2013 (the date issued to providers for a contract extension).

We suggest the Strategy should demonstrate how the proposed change management process will work and should give consideration to the impacts on current service users within homelessness settings. At the very least, a transition plan is required supported by a full risk assessment.

A specific comment about each of the delivery proposals follows.

Young people (aged 16-24): 65 units of accommodation reduced from 139. This service will be commissioned.

We understand this proposal is being made because young people within the target group do not fall within the Council's statutory obligations as set out within the proposed allocations policy. This proposal amounts to a greater than 50% reduction in the spaces available to young people in this category. We should like to see evidence of how this figure has been arrived at, not least as a result of the calculation resulting from the "potential impact of welfare reforms". 19 | Page



Our general view is current demand is higher than the present number of units currently available. A reduction will mean young people in the target group will be forced to return home (if they are able) to indifferent circumstances, sofa surf or live on the streets. It is unlikely that many young people in this situation will receive appropriate support. Based on the proposed cuts to support units for young people, this means that as a minimum, at least 74 young people per annum will have their life chances considerably reduced and not be supported effectively to help them turn their lives around. Demand for this type of accommodation by young people is constant and high; during the period January to December 2012, The Y accommodated 465 young people with 93.6% moved on in a planned and positive way. Hits Home Trust received 289 referrals during the same period, two thirds of who achieved positive outcomes through access to education and apprenticeship schemes.

While in an ideal world, young people should be supported / receive Housing Related Support Services in their own tenancies to manage their finances, learn how to budget and maintain their tenancy, be encouraged and supported to access and maintain attendance in a course of education and training, for many this situation is not viable until after a period of intensive support within a hostel or supported housing setting. Few will be enabled to have access to private rented accommodation, for example. We generally view this proposal as an unhelpful one that is likely to have significant negative implications for young people in the target group and potentially lead to the closure of some VCS providers. The lack of any alternative arrangements or proposals to manage the effects of the downsizing is also a concern. Our

We understand this proposal is being made because of an estimate of the number of ex-offenders the City Council will be required to 20 | Page

view is that demand will increase and we do not share the viewpoints expressed by Children's Services or YOS about the numbers that require support. This is essentially a cost cutting proposal.

Families: 60 units (including ten specifically for teenage parents) reduced from 139. This service will be delivered via Border House but without specialist Family Support Services.

We understand this proposal is being made because of an estimate of the number of families that the City Council will be required to provide support for under its statutory obligations. The proposal amounts to a 54% cut in the number of units available, yet 90% of statutory homeless are families and this figure is rising. Kirton Lodge provides 19 self contained flats and currently has a waiting list of 20 more families in need. We should like to see evidence of how this figure has been arrived at.

We believe the demand for family accommodation will continue at its present rate for some time and we are not convinced of the extent of accommodation that can be provided by the private rented sector in the meantime. What alternative provision will be accessible to families?

The withdrawal of specialist family support will also have a negative impact and mitigate against the rationale behind the proposal of wanting to focus on 'prevention'. How precisely will this aspect of the service be delivered?

We generally view this proposal as an unhelpful one that is likely to have significant negative implications for families, especially those with more than one child. This is essentially a cost cutting proposal.

Ex-offenders: 30 units reduced from 46 provided by the VCS. This service will be commissioned

provide support for under its statutory obligations. The proposal represents a 33% cut in the provision available. We should like to see evidence of how this figure has been arrived at. We understand the probability of re-offending is higher if appropriate accommodation is not provided.

We would like to see this service configured to provide short term, intensive support linked to specialist support for rehabilitation although we recognize there will be pressure on other types of support if quicker move on rates are achieved for this cohort.

Single People: 45 units reduced from 129 by the VCS. The Dawn Centre will be retained as an assessment centre and provide 6 long term units and 10 emergency beds.

We understand this proposal is being made because of an estimate of the number of single people the City Council will be required to provide support for under its statutory obligations. The proposal represents a 66% cut in the provision available. We would like to see evidence of how this figure has been arrived at. While some bed space reductions are inevitable, the lack of evidence of any proposed preventative or alternative provision gives us no confidence the proposal can be delivered without detriment to the target group.

There are currently many more people in this category currently in hostels. The proposal relies heavily on the target group moving into move-on accommodation, primarily PRS, without any evidence that there is capacity and access, that this is appropriate to their needs or that processes exist to make sure that homeless people do not 'fail' the expectations of the new system.

We understand the rationale behind the Dawn Centre becoming an assessment centre, the reduction in the number of council beds is a more problematic proposal. With the benefit changes that are about to come into effect the financial impact to the council should housing

benefit payments not be secured have serious implications and increase the risk of people becoming homeless.

Further, we would like further information about how the City Council arrived at its decision not to put the Dawn Centre service out for tender.

Move On Accommodation: 155 units with a focus on medium to high level support needs increased from 133 units provided by the VCS. This service will be retained in house with some external commissioning.

We understand this proposal is being made because of an estimate of the number of move-on units required resulting from the City Council's new allocations criteria. The proposal represents a 15% increase against current provision which is to be welcomed. We would like to understand what balance of in-house and commissioning is proposed and how this figure is arrived at. On balance we support this delivery proposal, but can see no evidence of detail about how it is to be achieved. Most single homeless people do not have medium or high level needs and will find it difficult to get move on accommodation. They will also be impacted by the proposed reduction in hostel provision for single people. Additional move on accommodation is also required for families. Floating support: 395 units with a focus on providing specialist support increased from 316 units delivered in-house and via the VCS. This service will be retained in house with some external commissioning.

We understand the rationale behind this proposal based on the need for additional support as more people move into their own tenancies. The proposal represents a 20% increase against current provision which is to be welcomed. We would like to understand what balance of in-house and commissioning is proposed and how this figure is arrived at. We

21 | Page

understand 70% of the STAR team is funded from the Housing Revenue Account, and therefore expect the remaining 30% will be commissioned.

No evidence is presented in the Draft Strategy that the City Council is best placed to provide Floating Support. We would like to know if this service has been evaluated and, if so, what were the results. We would also like further information on the rationale for tendering some parts of the service, but not others.

Rough Sleepers: maintain current staff team of three at the Dawn Centre

We understand the rationale behind this proposal and wish to support it. However, we have suggested there may be the likelihood of increased rough sleeping as a result of the reduction in resources available. This is likely to add to the workload of the Dawn Centre team and increase demand over and above the six dormitory beds proposed.

Wet day centre: continue to support a wet day centre

We understand the rationale behind this proposal and wish to support it. However, we believe that it should be supported via social services or health and wellbeing related budget. We should also like to raise the possibility of exploring the establishment of a specialist hostels for drinkers who have not yet accepted their need to change (such a hostel exists in Derby).

Housing, advice and determination of homelessness decisions: continue to fund Housing Options Service in-house.

We understand the proposal is to retain the Housing Options Service with a Single Access Referral Point for those at risk of homelessness and those who are homeless contained within it and that both will continue to be delivered in-house by Leicester City Council.

We have made a number of comments previously about the HOC and the SARP. To

restate them here, both need to be improved to meet customer need and to provide a more effective service. Models from elsewhere that might be considered include the Nottingham Gateway which includes a Multi-disciplinary team with seconded staff members from VCS organisations.

From a voluntary and faith group provider perspective, the need to rely on the HOS / SAR for referrals means that we have a lack of autonomy within our services thus making projects harder to manage and places vulnerable people at greater risk. Rental loss on voids places the viability of a project into question. Inappropriate referrals may lead to bad debt for service users and additional legal costs on increased eviction, hence placing the viability of the project into question. However, reviewing the Single Access Referral Point so that it draws on the combined expertise of the Council and VCS to assess the needs of homeless people and respond to their housing needs quickly can be an effective mechanism for managing a homelessness pathway that supports people through appropriate accommodation and support as they progress to independence (as well as enabling a planned return to higher support should their circumstances change).

We would like to propose that SARP is separated out from the HOC and managed as a standalone facility. We would like to see this facility placed out to tender.

Employment, education and training: continuation of support for employment, education and training opportunities for homeless people.

We understand the proposal is to continue to support employment, education and training opportunities for homeless people and those services will be commissioned from external providers. 22 | Page

We have made a number of comments about this area of activity which we believe is an inadequate proposal, but would welcome the opportunity to discuss in more detail with the City Council about how an appropriate service could be developed.

#### **4.9 Managing budget reductions and procurement**

We understand the City Council is under pressure to reduce its budget for Homelessness Services in light of its overall target reductions across the authority as a whole for 2013/14 and 2014/15.

The impact on the funded voluntary and community sector and faith groups resulting from the proposed cuts will be significant. We will not pretend this is not a difficult decision that the City Council has to take, however, neither is it an easy time for service providers and their service users.

We believe that the amount of funding allocated for Homelessness Services is insufficient to meet current and medium term needs and to fulfill the various delivery proposals set out within the Draft Strategy. Undertaking a procurement exercise to commission for services might also add significantly to the cost of delivering the proposed services.

The scale of the budget is an issue that was referred to at the Adult Social Care and Housing Scrutiny Committee on the 15<sup>th</sup> January, and we have referenced the resolution moved by the Commission earlier in this report. We sincerely hope the City Council will act on this resolution and return £1m to the budget available for homelessness services.

The Scrutiny Commission also moved that the Homelessness Strategy be introduced by way of negotiation with the First Sector, rather than by competitive tendering. We also hope this resolution will be acted on by the Council. While we have few qualms about tendering for services as healthy competition is to be welcomed, we are keen to ensure that those local providers who have invested years of their time and their own resources to meet the needs of homeless people and their communities should be valued and prioritised over and above out of city agencies that may wish to provide some of the proposed services. The local knowledge, social value and sheer good will that accrue as a result of local providers delivering homelessness services should not be under-estimated. Neither

should the potential loss of civic engagement and accountability that arises when local groups take action to try to resolve local problems.

To achieve this we propose that, should tendering be the Council's preferred option, it is done with reference to the provisions of the Public Services (Social Value) Act 2012 whereby "public bodies...are required to consider how the services they commission and procure might improve the economic, social and environmental well-being of the area".<sup>9</sup> This approach will enable the Council to take into account the added value offered by services that are an established part of the community, as well as joining up strategic aims so that, for example, homelessness commissioning relates to economic development.

<sup>9</sup>  
[http://www.socialenterprise.org.uk/uploads/files/2012/03/public\\_services\\_act\\_2012\\_a\\_brief\\_guide\\_web\\_version\\_final.pdf](http://www.socialenterprise.org.uk/uploads/files/2012/03/public_services_act_2012_a_brief_guide_web_version_final.pdf)

We have genuine concerns about the imbalance proposed within the Draft Strategy between those services that the City Council will retain in house and those that will be externally commissioned and as a result will impact on the voluntary, community and faith sector. We would like to understand the rationale behind this. Homeless Link has advised us that we might want to examine our Community Right to Challenge options concerning this issue were we not to be satisfied by the answer provided by the City Council. 23 | Page

Ultimately we should like to discuss with the City Council how the proposed budget reductions might be managed with minimal impact on voluntary and faith group providers.

## **5. Concluding remarks**

5.1 Voluntary and faith groups in Leicester have sought to provide consistent and high quality services for homeless people over many years and are seen by their service users as trusted and effective providers. We understand that the ongoing reduction in public spending is having a major impact on service provision across all areas of local authority provision. However, we strongly believe that tackling homelessness is a core priority for the city as a whole and requires an effective strategy supported by all sectors to make this happen. As it stands, we think the proposed Draft Homelessness Strategy and Delivery proposals requires more work to align partners behind a coordinated and fit for purpose plan.

5.2 We formally invite Leicester City Council to respond to this submission. We would welcome ongoing discussions related to each of our recommendations but especially those concerning the management process for finalizing the Homelessness Strategy, managed cost reduction and the development of a transition plan prior to its enactment.

5.3 We wish to continue to work in partnership with Leicester City Council and look forward to a formal response from the authority and meetings with Elected Members and Senior Council staff to discuss our concerns and to develop an agreed process for both strategy development and cost reduction management.

## **Appendix - Voluntary and faith group homelessness service profiles**

### **Action Homeless**

[www.actionhomeless.org.uk](http://www.actionhomeless.org.uk)

Established in 1973.

Action Homeless is dedicated to tackling the causes and consequences of homelessness. It provides supported accommodation and resettlement services which seek to enable people who are homeless to rebuild their lives. It also undertakes preventative work in the community to stop homelessness from occurring, especially amongst groups of people who are particularly at risk. Target groups include: vulnerable men aged 18 and above, women fleeing domestic violence or who have vulnerable children and vulnerable adults living in the community. The charity assists up to 300-350 people per year and has 100 people living within its projects at any onetime; it supports over 30 people in the community.

Currently City Council funded.

### **Adullam Homes HA Ltd**

[www.adullam.org.uk](http://www.adullam.org.uk)

Established in 1972.

Adullam works with the most vulnerable people in society and offers hope and dignity through quality housing and support to a wide range of client groups, including male 'ex-offenders' over 25 (usually hailing from Leicestershire, typically referred by Probation & Forensic Mental Health, the majority will be sex-offenders). It provides 14 single rooms and offers stays for up to 2 years. Staff support is provided 24/7 and there is a keyworker for each resident. Adullam is a 'half-way house' to resettlement. In 2012, it supported 28 service users and achieved 9 successful move-ons.

Currently City Council funded.

### **ASRA**

[www.asra.org.uk](http://www.asra.org.uk)

Established in 2002.

asra Housing Group is one of the UK's leading housing and regeneration providers. As a not for profit organisation it strives to be the affordable housing provider of first choice. Locally, asra provides temporary accommodation for homeless women aged 16 and above and children with medium to high support needs. It manages 19 self contained flats and has 69 bed spaces plus cots for babies if required.

Currently City Council funded.

### **The Bridge Homelessness to Hope**

[www.bridgeleicester.org](http://www.bridgeleicester.org)

Established in 2008

The Bridge (Homelessness to Hope) is a small, registered charity run entirely by volunteers. It provides food, warmth, shelter and companionship to homeless and needy people in Leicester. It offers support for the homeless and vulnerably housed. The Bridge currently provides a drop in centre every Thursday evening and Sunday afternoon at the Salvation Army Leicester Central Corps in Kildare Street. Every week throughout the year, it issues 300 meals to needy people, emergency clothes and bedding and offers practical help to those on the streets. The Bridge supports approximately 60-70 people each day.

Non City Council funded. 25 | Page

## **Catch22 Leicestershire**

[www.catch-22.org.uk](http://www.catch-22.org.uk)

Rainer and Crime Concern merged to form Catch22 in 2008.

Catch 22 helps those it works with to steer clear of crime or substance misuse, do the best they can in school or college and develop skills for work, live independently on leaving care or custody, gain new skills and confidence as parents, and play a full part in their community. In Leicester, the charity provides a floating Support Service for Refugees; 16 + Supported Accommodation; Crime Prevention Programme (JYIP) in Saffron and in New Parks. The current floating support offer is provided across 55 units.

Currently City Council funded.

## **The Centre Project**

[www.centreproject.org](http://www.centreproject.org)

Established 1996

The Centre Project provides a holistic service offer which promotes social inclusion and enhances the quality of life for men, women and children from a health and wellbeing perspective. It currently offers generic floating support for vulnerably housed and those at risk of becoming homeless, seeking to help reduce isolation through drop-in sessions, sign posting, practical support, meaningful activities, counselling, pastoral care, advocacy, befriending and emotional support.

Services users are 80% men and 20% women, mainly aged between 22-55 with multiple needs such as mental health problems, learning difficulties, a history of homelessness, unemployment and family breakdown. The project attracts 295 regular services users, making 7500 visits to the Centre per annum.

Currently City Council funded.

## **Foundation Housing**

[www.foundationhousing.co.uk](http://www.foundationhousing.co.uk)

Established in 1989

Foundation is part of the East Midlands Housing Group one of the biggest social housing providers in the East Midlands. Foundation is registered as a specialist housing association since 1989. It owns and manages general needs housing of over 800 homes in the City as well as a range of culturally specific and generalist support services. These include homeless, domestic violence, mental health and older persons' services. Fully utilised services would support up to 322 people at any time in short, medium or long term provision either as accommodation based or floating support.

Currently City Council funded.

## **Hits Homes Trust Limited**

[www.hitshomestrust.co.uk](http://www.hitshomestrust.co.uk)

Established in 1981

Hits Homes Trust provides supported housing to young people aged between 16 and 25 years old. It manages 23 self contained flats let on an assured short hold basis to vulnerable single homeless people. It provides supportive housing in areas of finances, housing management, welfare benefits and health, education, employment and a communal service to promote confidence and self esteem. Service users are largely care leavers, or have been referred from the criminal justice system. Tenants are also come from families facing a wide range of problems.

Currently City Council funded. 26 | Page

## **ISB Eat'n'Meet**

[www.isb.org.uk/eatnmeet](http://www.isb.org.uk/eatnmeet)

Established in 2010

Eat'n'Meet provides a Saturday Drop in service for anyone over the age of 16 who is homeless in the broadest definition of the term. It caters for on average 60 people per week.

Not City Council funded.

## **Leicester Quaker Housing Association - Leicester Holme Project**

Established in 1994

The Leicester Holme Project supports individuals in accessing independent accommodation. It also provides a limited resettlement support program usually for the first 18 weeks from leaving. It offers a 14 bed supported housing scheme with accommodation and support aimed at homeless men aged 25 and over. It provides support for 14 residents at home at any one time and on average 60 residents a year.

Currently City Council funded

## **Leicestershire Cares**

[www.leicestershirecares.co.uk](http://www.leicestershirecares.co.uk)

Established in 2000

Leicestershire Cares offers Individualised support on the next steps towards employment, training, or education through mentored work placements. Its service users are the homeless and might also be hostel residents, in shared or supported housing or sofa surfing. They may also be newly housed tenants in need of support to maintain their tenancy. The project supports 80 people per annum.

Currently City Council funded.

## **Park Lodge Project**

[www.parklodgeproject.org](http://www.parklodgeproject.org)

Established in 1972

Park Lodge Project provides supported accommodation for 24 young homeless people between the ages of 16 and 25. It offers a safe and supportive environment for all residents. It enables service users to develop the appropriate skills required for independence; it also helps each resident move successfully into their own flat or other accommodation. Park Lodge provides 25 bed spaces with one emergency bed and managed 295 referrals last year, housing 65 young people.

Currently City Council funded.

## **Shelter Housing Aid & Research Project (SHARP)**

[www.leicestershelter.org](http://www.leicestershelter.org).

Established in 1974

SHARP is a specialist housing advice service that also offers floating support to anyone that needs it but is targeted towards people at risk of offending, people making use of drug treatment services, and former rough sleepers. Last year it provided advice to 538 new clients. The project currently has 42 units of floating support service paid for by Leicester City Council. These units are for people at risk of offending. In addition, funded from its own resources (as part of the rough sleepers task force initiative) 6 units for ex-rough sleepers.

Currently City Council funded. 27 | Page



## **The Y**

[www.leicesterymca.co.uk](http://www.leicesterymca.co.uk)

Established in 1883

The Y provides high quality supported accommodation. The project offers housing-related support and both its supported accommodation centres are staffed 24 hours a day. It seeks to address challenging behaviour through the use of an innovative Support Intervention Process and rewards progress via an internal pathway with the aim of moving service users into a self-contained flats or shared houses. The project works with single homeless young people aged 16-25, with a specific focus on care leavers and young offenders. The Y manages 91 units of accommodation across 4 sites. Last year a total of 465 young people were supported within The Y's housing provision and 93.6% of these progressed into their own tenancies or into planned alternative accommodation. Currently City Council funded.

### Profile of respondents replying to the questionnaire available on-line

Connection to Leicester / Homelessness Provision (respondents were asked to tick all that applied)

Leicester resident	66	58.9%
Leicester business	6	5.4%
Voluntary, Community or Faith Organisation	14	12.5%
Leicester City Council member of staff	8	7.1%
Someone who is currently homeless	3	2.7%
Someone who has been homeless in the past	11	9.8%
Other	20	17.9%
Not answered	7	6.3%

#### Household composition

Single person without children	31	27.7%
Single person with children	7	6.3%
Couple without children	17	15.2%
Couple with children	32	28.6%
Other	15	13.4%
Not answered	10	8.9%

#### Gender

Male	40	35.7%
Female	61	54.5%
Prefer not to say	3	2.7%
Not answered	8	7.1%

#### Ethnic Group

White	82	73.2%
Dual / Multiple Heritage	2	1.8%
Asian / Asian British	11	9.8%
Black / African / Caribbean / Black British	10	8.9%
Other ethnic group	1	0.9%
Prefer not to say	5	4.5%
Not answered	1	0.9%

### Religion

No religion	32	28.6%
Buddhist	0	0.0%
Christianity	37	33.0%
Hindu	1	0.9%
Jain	0	0.0%
Jewish	0	0.0%
Muslim	4	3.6%
Sikh	0	0.0%
Prefer not to say	9	8.0%
Other	3	2.7%
Not answered	26	23.2%

### Disability

Yes	16	14.3%
No	78	69.6%
Prefer not to say	8	7.1%
Not answered	10	8.9%

### Age

Under 16	1	0.9%
16-24	18	16.1%
25-34	17	15.2%
35-44	20	17.9%
45-54	22	19.6%
55-64	9	8.0%
65-84	5	4.5%
85+	0	0.0%
Prefer not to say	12	10.7%
Not answered	8	7.1%

### Sexual Orientation

Heterosexual or straight	62	55.4%
Gay or lesbian	0	0.0%
Bisexual	1	0.9%
Not sure	0	0.0%
Prefer not to say	17	15.2%
Not answered	32	28.6%

### Pregnancy and maternity

Yes	3	2.7%
No	62	55.4%
Prefer not to say	11	9.8%
Not answered	36	32.1%

### Profile of respondents replying to the postal questionnaire

Connection to Leicester / Homelessness Provision (respondents were asked to tick all that applied)

Leicester resident	74	67.3%
Someone who is currently homeless	31	28.2%
Someone who has been homeless in the past	38	34.5%
Someone who lives / has lived in a hostel	75	68.2%
Someone who lives / has lived in shared / supported housing	32	29.1%
Someone who receives floating support	30	27.3%
Other	8	7.3%

### Household composition

Single person without children	83	75.5%
Single person with children	20	18.2%
Couple without children	1	0.9%
Couple with children	3	2.7%
Not answered	3	2.7%

### Gender

Male	51	46.4%
Female	54	49.1%
Prefer not to say	2	1.8%
Not answered	3	2.7%

### Ethnic Group

White	64	58.2%
Dual / Multiple Heritage	13	11.8%
Asian / Asian British	10	9.1%
Black / African / Caribbean / Black British	20	18.2%
Other ethnic group	0	0.0%
Prefer not to say	1	0.9%
Not answered	2	1.8%

### Disability

Yes	24	21.8%
No	78	70.9%
Not answered	8	7.3%

### Age

Under 16	0	0.0%
16-24	39	35.5%
25-34	19	17.3%
35-44	19	17.3%
45-54	21	19.1%
55-64	3	2.7%
65-84	3	2.7%
85+	0	0.0%
Prefer not to say	2	1.8%
Not answered	4	3.6%

### Sexual Orientation

Heterosexual or straight	66	60.0%
Gay or lesbian	1	0.9%
Bisexual	2	1.8%
Not sure	0	0.0%
Prefer not to say	0	0.0%
Not answered	41	37.3%