

## Appendix A: Homelessness Strategy Consultation Findings

### 1. Summary

1.1 A full consultation exercise was completed which included:

- An online consultation exercise for a 4-week period that ran from 14<sup>th</sup> November to 11<sup>th</sup> December (paper copies of the consultation were available at local libraries across the city and supplied to homelessness service organisations that requested these) (appendix 1: Full responses to the consultation exercise)
- Individual meetings with existing housing-division contracted homelessness service providers that may be affected if the proposals are accepted and agreed
- A meeting of the Homelessness Reference Group on 28<sup>th</sup> November 2017 which is made up of statutory and voluntary sector organisations that work or are involved with homelessness services (appendix 2: summary feedback from this group)
- Homelessness, prevention and support staff were briefed on the consultation and encouraged to participate in the consultation and through the Homelessness Reference Group an offer was extended for a council officer to visit service user groups and brief service users / answer questions
- Other responses to the consultation exercise were also received that were not in the format of the online questionnaire so have been collated separately. This includes feedback from 37 service users who attended Action Homeless's Client Conference (see appendix 3: other consultation responses)
- Presenting the draft review, strategy & proposals and feedback from the consultation to Housing Scrutiny Commission on 15<sup>th</sup> January 2018 (appendix 4: feedback from Housing Scrutiny Commission).

1.2 There were 74 responses to the consultation questionnaire. This included:

- 28 (37.8%) from members of the public
- 15 (20.3%) from service users / service user group
- 22 (29.7%) from providers (or employees) of a homeless service
- 9 (12.2%) from other organisation / landlord (or their employees)

1.3 All the proposals made were generally well received. The detailed feedback received was informative and will help inform development of future plans.

### 2. Overview of consultation exercise feedback

2.1 Proposal 1: Extend prevention support for singles and improve advice and information to all especially on-line (total responses 72)

Do you support proposal 1?

Response	Number	%
Yes	35	48.6
No	8	11.1
Partially	29	40.3

### Summary comments (54 responses):

- Homelessness prevention information should not just be available on-line. Many people will still require face to face assistance.
- Need to consider how to engage with those with multiple and complex needs and those with learning difficulties and people facing language barriers.
- Undertake preventative work in secondary schools as part of PHSE program. Young people need information about how to look after their wellbeing and social networks.
- Need multi-agency working and active referrals not just sign-posting
- Need drop-in centres; not just Dawn Centre as this is a barrier to some people.
- Housing prevention advice needs to be available and accessible. There are barriers to accessing the housing options service and can be seen as a gate keeping service. Need viable housing options for people to access.
- Information required about where can find a private rented let / advice about getting bonds & deposits / hub for local landlords

### Response

Part of this proposal related to improving information on-line, we are not proposing that face-to-face / telephone support will not be available. As part of the work to implement the Homelessness Reduction Act customer access to housing options is being re-modelled to improve the customer experience and the level of support provided. A growth bid to support this improvement is currently being considered as part of the budget process.

### 2.2 Proposal 2: Amended eligibility criteria that for non-statutory groups prioritises support to those with the 'highest' support needs (total responses 71)

Do you support proposal 2?

Response	Number	%
Yes	36	50.7
No	6	8.5
Partially	29	40.8

### Summary comments (50 responses):

- How will needs be assessed / who will assess these? People may not be confident in explaining their needs. Often needs are understood after working with individuals over time.
- If family, requires a family assessment. Are they qualified to assess the needs of children? Assessing physical / mental health will be difficult.
- Less vulnerable quickly become more vulnerable on the streets they need to be kept off the street
- Need a multi-agency approach to help people with drugs, drink, abuse or other problems as part of the package
- 30 points to high for category F, should be 20

- Substance use weighting should be equal whether on a programme or not
- Lack of accommodation to meet required need
- Category F is a barrier to people in need of support
- If this assessment happens at the end of each day will put undue pressure on accommodation providers
- Scoring people is unpleasant. Everyone should be helped.
- Suggest former young offenders should be grouped with former care leavers
- Not sure category F will prioritise needs accurately
- Big difference in weighting between higher needs and lower health & wellbeing needs
- Should also consider an individual's personal resilience
- Service users should also be directed to other support services required (not just accommodation-based support)
- Strongly support the principle that specialist offender accommodation should be reserved for those with a recent offending history. "Within 1 year of leaving a custodial sentence" seems an appropriate threshold for entering such services. We expect that this definition includes those leaving custody who have been recalled to custody under an initial sentence (and who arguable therefore "left a custodial sentence" over a year ago).
- Should not be too rigid with category F. Suggest management discretion to ensure can take a personalised approach where necessary
- Places should be available to anybody who need it regardless of local connection, not just for certain people with specific criteria

### Response

Following the detailed responses received we will look to amend the proposed eligibility criteria category F regarding prioritisation. This proposal relates to the eligibility criteria for temporary accommodation. We will be introducing personalised housing plans which will help identify other needs and support services available that can provide wider assistance.

- 2.3 Proposal 3: Transition over the life of the strategy to reduce by half temporary accommodation by increased relief of homelessness through arranging settled private /social lettings. Ensuring all temporary accommodation offered for families is self-contained (total responses 67)

Do you support proposal 3?

Response	Number	%
Yes	42	62.7
No	6	9.0
Partially	19	28.4

Summary comments (40 responses):

- Very dangerous to rely on the private sector in light of universal credit and the difficulties currently on sourcing suitable private rented sector properties

- Families need more support / services
- Agree accommodation should be self-contained
- Families in temporary accommodation need consistent face-to-face support
- 24/7 support provides security and is needed
- Private landlords need to know how they can help
- Need appropriate accommodation for young people who are pregnant
- All families presenting as homelessness should be offered support (not only for those in temporary accommodation)
- Could the current site be split to provide accommodation for single homelessness females
- Families should not be in temporary accommodation
- Family accommodation should be available at different locations in the city
- There are some families who do require additional support who are not catered for
- Support needs of families are often only identified after working with families in temporary accommodation and some support only available in temporary accommodation
- Should provide Wi-Fi in hostels

#### Response

There was strong support around ensuring temporary accommodation provided for families is self-contained. There was general support around working to arrange settled accommodation however there was concern about whether there are enough settled accommodation options when required and ensuring that this is carefully managed so families do not end up in bed & breakfast accommodation.

#### 2.4 Proposal 4: No change to numbers of specialist temporary accommodation units for offenders (total responses 71)

Do you support proposal 4?

Response	Number	%
Yes	48	67.6
No	11	15.5
Partially	12	16.9

Summary comments (32 responses):

- This should be increased
- Need more effective work to prevent homelessness on release from prison; planned release and move on plans
- Require floating support / need capacity to deliver this
- Urge against any further future reduction
- Increase in 'high risk' individuals where it is not appropriate to place in temporary accommodation, need appropriate placements for these individuals

#### Response

Maintaining specialist temporary accommodation for offenders was mainly seen as positive. We will also work with local prisons / probation / community rehabilitation service and others to improve homelessness prevention. Including ensuring there are agreed pathways to reduce occasions where individuals, who are homeless, are seen by housing options on their day of release from prison.

- 2.5 Proposal 5: Joint work with Children’s services to undertake analysis of the range and volume of supported accommodation required. Explore options for developing shared / semi-supported settled accommodation for young people (total responses 71)

Do you support proposal 5?

Response	Number	%
Yes	43	60.6
No	10	14.1
Partially	18	25.4

Summary comments (38 responses):

- Young people leaving care need early engagement about future accommodation wishes (at least a year in advance)
- Not enough information about future plans
- Need more accommodation and more providers
- Accommodation should be less institutional and more homely
- Important for housing and children’s services to work together
- Consider tiered funding based on support needs
- Would welcome shared accommodation for young people, both with 24-hour support and less frequent contact
- The existing expected ‘length of stay’ may not allow time to establish good relationships and assess needs and deliver appropriate support to ensure successful move-on
- Need more awareness of support services available / support to tackle underlying low resilience
- Homeless mental health services only available to those homeless / in temporary accommodation so if individuals allocated tenancies they might not be able to access these services

Summary views of how the council could develop more settled accommodation for young people (29 responses)?

- Action Homeless would like to work with the Authority to develop new models of accommodation, including adapting its’ existing units and developing more units through RTB
- Fund rent shortfalls with DHP where HB is in payment and they are looking for or have gained employment
- Prevention much earlier on, teaching life skills to vulnerable young people
- The council’s role should be an ‘enabler’ rather than developing the ideas itself per se
- Shared accommodation is a reasonable approach, but regular and ongoing practical support is important

## Response

Joint working and having a wide-range of accommodation options was generally considered a positive step. We are continuing our work with Children's services to develop options on how this can be delivered and will review the feedback of this consultation exercise as part of this exercise.

- 2.6 Proposal 6: Over the life of the strategy increase the range of housing solutions. Move from offering temporary solutions by increasing the numbers of settled solutions available to relieve homelessness. Work in partnership with other homeless agencies who offer support, especially where the council cannot (total responses 68)

Do you support proposal 6?

Response	Number	%
Yes	47	69.1
No	2	2.9
Partially	19	27.9

Summary comments (39 responses):

- Good to have options to provide temporary, urgent accommodation even for those people who are difficult or pose risks
- It is necessary for professionals to have information on how to access temporary accommodation services out of hours. For example, Emergency Duty Team (Adults Social Care), emergency services, hospitals who cover out of hours and weekends
- Keep services in-house
- Contract out all services
- 'Crash pad' needs to be a separate provider (not the council) / work with charities
- Need to be more accommodation / more providers
- Need minimum standards for crash pads
- Lack of social / private rented accommodation in Leicester so how will this be delivered?
- Housing allocation needs to be reviewed; at point of referral have a registered housing application, have 'auto-bidding process that starts immediately at entry to temporary accommodation, once under offer request proofs
- To reduce institutionalism, need to provide settled accommodation as quickly as possible and to reduce the need for staying in long-term hostel provision
- Cheaper/more affordable temporary accommodation is required.
- Struggle to repay former tenants arrears when residents are paying high rents in temporary accommodation
- Requirement for non- catered projects / smaller supported accommodation providing intensive support
- To engage with vulnerable people, you need people who can show empathy and build relationships. This cannot be supported if staff are being permanently rotated

- The principles of Housing First need to be adhered to in terms of support being flexible and available as long as it needed
- Also consider developing a range of housing options that include shared and self-contained housing
- Consider joint commissioning of services with CCG and Adult Care to look at more specialist services that focus on supporting those with the most complex needs
- Crime and disorder considerations should be fully thought through (in partnership with the Police) before firm decisions are made regarding significant developments. We would urge that significant clustering is avoided
- The strategy and this proposal suggest that Leicester City Council has no responsibilities to those that have no recourse to public funds which is not correct
- There is a definite need for casual emergency “night by night” shelter beds to facilitate engagement with “rough sleepers” with aim of promoting positive health and wellbeing
- There is a danger that people’s needs will be missed if placed directly in secure tenancies
- Voluntary sector and health professionals and adult services work together to supply services in places and ways that engage with beneficiaries
- A greater diversity of accommodation i.e. Emmaus type working communities, wet house, a year-round emergency shelter for short term stays
- Trained volunteers to provide one to one support
- Use the Dawn Centre as an assessment centre
- Could joint work with NHS, Police and LCC to joint fund accommodation / support services as will help all parties as some rough sleepers will feign injury to get a bed in hospital or commit a crime to get a bed in prison

Summary views of how the council could develop more settled accommodation for single people (32 responses)?

- Release land for charities and work together to build more accommodation
- Bring empty homes back into occupation
- Action Homeless would like to work with the Authority to develop new models of accommodation, including adapting its’ existing units and developing more units through RTB
- Could consider clusters of pre-manufactured housing units for 20/ 30 individual residents creating a largely self-supported community
- Could the council (or a related organisation) lease quality private sector properties on a long-term basis?
- Look at innovative schemes like containers and flat pack
- Use RTB schemes to acquire more existing stock and convert into use for homeless people
- Reconfigure existing homeless accommodation to support Housing First services

### Response

With increasing levels of homelessness and high levels of rough sleeping in the city general feedback felt that more accommodation options are required. There was support for the concept of 'crash pads' but not this term and many felt that this accommodation would best it was at different locations. The detailed feedback will be considered in the next-step of developing a high-level plan on how we can work with partners across the city to deliver a range of housing solutions.

- 2.7 Proposal 7: Have available 75 units of contracted housing related support and a coaching / mentoring service for individuals with a low resilience to prevent homelessness (total responses 69)

Do you support proposal 7?

Response	Number	%
Yes	40	58.0
No	6	8.7
Partially	23	33.3

Summary comments (43 responses):

- Why is this underutilised is there an issue with referrals?
- People do not know about this service
- Support needs to be readily available e.g. drop-in centres. Centre project provides this kind of support already.
- Useful for public to explain what kind of support is available
- Mentoring can achieve when individuals do not want a support worker
- People need timely support and for a long or as short as required
- STAR work should be done by housing officers
- More floating support services available to LCC tenants when this is the most secure tenancy?!
- Don't think numbers should be cut – this is a preventative service and saves the council money in the long run
- Should be more support available as predict more use of private rented accommodation
- Access to continuing support from a trusted mentor at time of transition and stress can make a big difference
- Support needs to focus on health & wellbeing as well as tenancy sustainment, also gap in effective resettlement support
- Decisions to 'close' cases should be discussed with the service user

### Response

There were concerns raised about the timeliness of referrals from the council's single, access and referral service to the current contracted housing related support service. There are currently no delays or backlog of referrals. Considering the consultation feedback, we propose to maintain the current number of commissioning units. Preventing homelessness from occurring is the best outcome for individuals and is the most effective for public services therefore we will continue to monitor the number / trends of referrals, however

we must also make best use of public resources and if this is underutilised we will look to reduce the number of units procured.

2.8 Proposal 8: Bring together teams to improve services for rough sleepers and move towards a ‘transitions’ service model (total responses 67)

Do you support proposal 8?

Response	Number	%
Yes	41	61.2
No	5	7.5
Partially	21	31.3

Summary comments (37 responses):

- Support this as long as this is not a reduction in service
- Services should be available 24/7
- Needs to be supported by access to year round emergency access accommodation
- Outreach need an adapted van where they can engage with services users off the street
- Skills sets of both teams are specialised so shouldn’t bring teams together or these could be lost
- Look at linking up dynamic psychological interventions with other health partners and a more assertive approach to tackle those who engage in behaviours that put themselves and others at risk
- Could have multi-disciplinary outreach team with social worker / nurse to provide holistic service
- No outreach in county which could direct rough sleepers to appropriate services in their district (could contribute to individuals coming to city). Have a city & county outreach service.

Response

There was concern that this proposal could lead to a reduction in service and losing specialism / skills of both teams. More details options will be considered on how this could be implemented taking into account the feedback received.

2.9 Proposal 9: Continue existing part funding of day centre. Tailored, structured support provided by ‘transitions’ services. Undertake an analysis of day services available to homeless people and those at risk of homelessness following changes to other homelessness services (total responses 66)

Do you support proposal 9?

Response	Number	%
Yes	46	67.6
No	5	7.4
Partially	17	25

Summary comments (40 responses):

- The Bridge Homelessness to Hope can offer a route to those whose don’t engage with other services

- Provide more funding to existing day centres so opening times/ days can be extended
- The Centre project is the only 'day' centre available (others open in the morning or evening) or are not open access
- Is appropriate and engaging support available for all? Needs of specific groups e.g. space for non-custodial parents to take their children
- The Centre project provides a wide range of essential support
- Outreach / Revolving Door services use day centres interview rooms
- Should be a review of day services. Need clear aims and objectives of services and services that do not support and enable individuals to maintain their chaotic street sleeping or street activity
- The multi-agency services at the Dawn Centre (accommodation, day centre and health functions) work well and are nationally recognised and should be acknowledged
- Day centres should offer more meaningful activities e.g. use kitchens for training
- Need coordinator role that looks at all services and works to ensure there is no duplication

#### Response

Service users value the support they receive at the existing 'day' centres across the city. There was general support to undertake a citywide analysis of 'day' services available. Any recommendations resulting from would be discussed with the council's executive and housing scrutiny commission.

#### 2.10 Views on approach to deal with potential increasing demand for services (37 responses)

- Prepare for likely future increases by increasing amount of property the council has access to
- Needs to be responsive to changing demand; by taking action
- Needs to be some in depth local research into the impact of NPS on the increase in homelessness
- Do more work with private landlords working with DWP/JCP
- You know homelessness is increasing but the council will not fund services you hope charities will step in
- Favour bias to prevention
- The local authority needs to provide employment to those most in need
- The National Homelessness Property Fund (partnership between Resonance & NACRO) could be very well placed to provide guaranteed LHA-rate rental homes for the Council as well as making savings by removing the need to supplement (often expensive) TA costs
- Could have digital inclusion officers with welfare / housing knowledge based at libraries across the city
- The homelessness strategy should be driven by need not budgetary pressures (and need is increasing)
- Need to tackle shortage of affordable housing in the city

#### Response

We will need to closely monitor levels of homelessness in the city and those requiring accommodation and support. We believe it is the right approach to invest in effective preventative services rather than responding to the crisis of homelessness once it has occurred.

### Views on the draft homelessness strategy

2.11 Do you think the homelessness strategy covers all the issues effecting homeless people in the city? (total responses 69)

Response	Number	%
Yes	27	39.1
No	27	39.1
Partially	15	21.7

Summary comments (36 responses):

- Underrepresentation of services or means of making aware of services for single non-drug dependant. Alcoholic, ex-offender men and women
- How can shelters justify high charges for accommodation
- The strategy should acknowledge those with needs (MH / LD) who struggle to navigate the system
- Rough sleepers foremost need food, clothes and sleeping bags
- There are no proposals relating to 24 hour toilet facilities, drug rehabilitation support and services, anti-social behaviour associated with homelessness and reduction in police harassment over rough sleepers
- More research into the effect that new psychoactive substances are having on the increase in homelessness
- Not involved private sector landlords
- The government needs to provide funding
- There are more issues
- The strategy needs to consider whether the proposed actions are fostering awareness and encouraging unity
- We are forgetting there are a high number of PFA and EU nationals on the streets of Leicester and those with no local connection
- No-one has mentioned children and the effects it has on them
- Does not care unless it has a duty
- Mental health is a low priority. Focus for those who are not online.
- Homelessness is going to increase with UC and the strategy does not propose enough services
- Needs to be emphasis on training and employment
- More funding needed
- Only briefly mentions domestic / sexual abuse
- Areas not included in this strategy include; transport, ongoing relationships with other services such as mental health or debt advice and relief, prevention of first time homelessness, support and activities for refuges and asylum seekers, those without a statutory right to services.
- It would be helpful to set out ways in which the strategy and its component proposals will be evaluated as they evolve, and again, how the various partners can contribute to this process

- Channel shift will be another barrier. Support will be required which is why floating support is required
- More information about partnership work identifying in particular how agencies can support people with mental ill health and substance misuse issues
- Include reference to psychologically informed environments (PIE) in particular for supported accommodation and day centres to ensure reviews look at this / explicit commitment to continue to implement PIE guidelines
- The strategy is mostly based in providing but should be based in avoiding
- There should be more opportunities for service users to get involved and influence decisions
- Covers the problems but without the correct funding it will fail
- Recognise health services (mental and physical) for homelessness people and a commitment from LCC to continue improving access to support
- Roles of non-commissioned temporary accommodation projects in Leicester is not adequately acknowledged

#### Response

The proposed strategy provides a summary of main issues relating to homelessness whilst the homelessness review provides an in-depth look at issues affecting homeless people in the city. We will review all the feedback received to add to this in-line with the purpose of this document.

#### 2.12 Do you agree with the strategy's key aims? (total responses 66)

Response	Number	%
Yes	47	71.2
No	1	1.5
Partially	18	27.3

#### Summary comments (20 responses):

- Issue is whether the proposals will be followed through and fit for purpose
- Add in the service aims to regulate success through robust and transparent monitoring which will result in changes to any section of the strategy not performing in line with the agree performance targets
- Don't believe you will end rough sleeping by 2020 / set a realistic and attainable target and the means of delivering the improvement through this strategy
- Engagement should appear within the objectives e.g. to maximise engagement by the way in which and places in which are provided
- Needs to be a further aim that looks at employment and training
- Agree with the aims but not the methods
- The first aim should refer to the services that are needed to prevent homelessness
- Services closed down / restricted during last council cuts

#### Response

There was broad agreement for the strategy's key aims however there were some concerns about how these would be delivered.

2.13 Do you agree with the actions outlined in the action plan? (total responses 66)

Response	Number	%
Yes	28	37.8
No	8	10.8
Partially	30	40.5

Summary comments (27 responses):

- Many people do not want to stay in the Dawn Centre but this is the only option out of hours. This should be looked at
- None of it
- Most of the proposals as long as they are carried out in the correct and proper way
- Makes no difference the council will do what they do, they always do
- Not enough information the judge on
- Don't change services / stop the cuts
- Family Support Service would be an excellent partner with Think Family; P3 needs to be promoted and made more accessible, needs to be encouragement of use of STAR from a wider range of referring agencies, NASS route to accommodation seems disconnected, why are people being put in tenancies with nil income and no furniture
- Supportive of all actions but believe there needs to be stronger actions in relation to domestic violence, substance misuse and mental health

Response

The comments received will be reviewed and where appropriate actions will be added / amended.

2.14 Do you think that any of the proposed actions in the strategy / changes to future services could have an adverse impact on any people with protected characteristics (46 responses)?

- Some people clearly have need for priority e.g. pregnant women which may make others feel less valued
- Anywhere reductions are made could have an adverse impact
- People with complex needs
- Rough sleepers and not sure proposals are right for young people
- More flexibility to mitigate against adverse impacts
- Not funding day centres would affect vulnerable and disabled people
- Lone parents especially female lone parents and their children
- Yes on all groups
- Children haven't been mentioned enough
- Many people will slip through the net due to having undiagnosed needs and disabilities and it will lead to more people in the streets not receiving support. This is more reason to include mental health assessment into the housing options registration

- The 'F' criteria mention in your strategy implies an exclusionary approach. The most vulnerable are the first to be affected
- This strategy does not recognise pregnant young women's needs
- Yes the heartless assumption that homelessness can be prevented by an app
- Equality impact assessments should ensure there is no adverse impact
- Online strategies can mean older people and people where English is not their first language are excluded
- The council needs to consider its approach to those who have no recourse to public funds

### Response

Feedback received will be added to the equality impact assessment.

2.15 Do you feel we could do anything more to ensure discrimination does not take place (36 responses)?

- Not really, unless you set a time limit, such as 4 weeks to help everybody who comes for help, but that is probably not achievable
- Consider the support that people require to access services
- Build in service user evaluation and impact monitoring
- Poverty is the greatest discriminator of all
- Not specify ages in the F test for 30 points, why should 30-55 not get points when over 55 gets 10 points
- Communication for all (specifically public) and training for staff utilising service users stories
- Take into account sexism and racism
- Keep the centre project open and fund them more
- Ensure we do not inadvertently discriminate by imposing our own belief / judgement systems on people as much as possible (e.g. substance use weighting referenced earlier)
- Tackle perceptions of homelessness, including among business owners
- The strategy should ensure that people whom English is not their first language are not inhibited from accessing services by language barriers
- Constant impact assessment
- Vulnerable people struggle to be heard, we need to provide an environment where they are valued and happy to communicate, not where their shortfalls are highlighted
- Review outcomes regularly and monitor groups at prevention stage to ensure they are not more likely to fail
- Keep / create services that can tackle discrimination by contacting the service user personally
- The council needs to consider their approach to those that have no recourse to public funds

## Appendix 1: Full responses received as part of the consultation exercise

### Proposal 1 comments

To ensure that housing options staff are up skills so they can provide accurate advice. Also training regarding interviewing and communication skills.
How will people living on the streets know how to access this?
I work with people with mental health problems and there needs to be greater support to ensure that people are able to claim their rights/bid for properties/provide the ID required. There are people who have rights to accom but struggle to navigate the system.
This also needs to prioritise EEAs and new arrivals.
Housing Options needs to become a real homelessness prevention service instead of merely being a gatekeeping service with the aim of keeping people out. They have been required to undertake this role for years and to report on the number of homelessness cases prevented, so this should already be happening.
I partially agree with this, as long as vulnerable people are still given the face to face contact they need. I am aware of the channel shift agenda that the council has, as well as the new Channel Shift Director they have recruited. I hope this obsession with diverting people online to save money, is not pushed upon people, for this proposal.
Although an app would be helpful, it will not solve everything. It will only be an initial point of information, or contain useful next steps which will require an element of face to face contact. An online provision cannot replace human involvement.
WOW a homelessness prevention app - brilliant for those homeless people that firstly have a mobile phone and more importantly have a smartphone
Self-help information will be made available online. As part of the Homelessness Prevention Trailblazer bid a homelessness prevention app is being developed
in what way will this be accessible considering the average profile for a person at risk of homelessness - ridiculously middle class response
I have doubts to how successful a Homelessness prevention app will be with people who are perhaps experiencing DV, MH issues, drug & alcohol issues etc., the reason being is that I suspect that the person who is in the homeless situation, they may find it degrading to go onto an app and perhaps not get the response they hoped for. I believe that people in these situations would ideally prefer face-to-face contact to look at how to resolve their homelessness, a drop-in-centre or 24-hour helpline that could give advice.
In terms of prevention it needs to be recognised that according to a report to The Deputy Mayor there are 800-12000 people in The City with multiple and complex needs. They are economically and socially excluded and often perceived as not engaging. The challenge is to offer services in places and in ways that they trust and they feel are sympathetic to their needs. The services need to engage with them. If this happens then those without hope or purpose will be more likely to take advantage of opportunities offered to them, to create real homes and so avoid repeat homelessness and move to more fulfilling lives. Adult services, mental health services, addiction services all need to be involved from one centre, unfortunately nit YASC as perceived as being part of The Dawn Centre which is a major obstacle/ put off for many
Homeless people do not have access to the internet.
56 days (2months) is a long time for anyone to be homeless.
also needs to have more face to face support especially for people who do not have

access to online services. Day services can help with this.
You spend has much Time and false
Flag resources.. Trying to get good
People Out of Their Homes.
Yes providing it doesn't stop people who need help with a place to stay getting some where to live. Its a good idea to try to reduce homelessness at the start. Maybe some counselling sessions could help people in the beginning
I do not like the idea of people who want a stable safe home to be homeless. But I do not like the idea of people who are not ready to be re-homed particularly in unsuitable accommodation to be forced to move on. I'm sorry poverty is what we are living with. We need to see it. As long as only vagrant laws are being broken they should be left alone if they choose to live on the street. People need to be reminded of what current policies including council cut backs are doing to human beings.
We need to make sure they have food warm clothing hot drinks and the ability to seek shelter if they wish.
Hiding it under the carpet isn't the way look at America.
shared accommodation
I believe 5m in funding is not enough to support the proposal. Being able to talk and prepare a plan with a housing benefits officer before becoming homeless is a great idea, as long as the resources is there to support this.
How are homeless people supposed to access that? Maybe if there was a 24/7 access point, like a display in town but not everyone is literate so we still need face to face support.
Support should be provided more through other means such as one to one interactions and day centres and drop in centres rather than just the internet.
Information should not just be provided through the internet and should be provided through different means such as drop in centres
prefer face to face as it helps me to understand the information as i do not have access to the internet. i would go to the centre project and get face to face advice and support.
Information should be put in the papers, radio and drop in centres because not everyone can access the information online.
some people do not have access to the internet, some people need face to face as some things are more complecated
not many people are computer literate its where to look it would have to made easier.
face to face is some people feel imbarressed hence why they may prefer online as they may feel a burden.
Self help for this client group is challenging. They are in crisis usually and cant think straight so an app is not only a weak solution but one which fails to acknowledge the circumstance of the individual. Don't get me wrong apps have their place but not here.
Too much on line emphasis which does not fit the capabilities of this group.
As part of the prevention aims, we would like to see some work in Secondary schools as part of a PHSE program which could be delivered through a current provider.

The LCC website needs to have more information about what is available. Some of the information available on One Roof, for example, could be provided on the council website. Especially places to eat and where to go to find a bed for the night. Lots of this knowledge is only available word of mouth or if you know the right agencies to ask, which many people facing homelessness for the first time won;t know. The council would probably be the first place most people would ask, so it needs to be really straight forward.

Also, though, it needs to be in printed format and available in a leaflet / booklet from customer services and from all main advice and support charities.

I have seen a booklet about Advice Services and have been searching for it since, but can't find where it is stocked - surely this is something that should be available in the LCC customer service centre too?

not everyone can get on the internet

i prefer face to face as i have a disabillity myself and other people

There is need to have other sources of information and support, not only on-line. For many people they need assistance to find the right support as well as access to the internet and telephone facilities.

People should be able to get face to face support if the need it.

The only way now to obtain temp accommodation is through housing options. Most are turned away. As "no duty" most can not even get past customer services to even see an housing options officer. Phone lines go in a loop it's very different to even speak to an officer .

Self help online is useless for vulnerable people, disabled, poor and elderly who do not have access or cannot afford internet.

The homelessness prevention app should complement existing services, not replace any of them. It is not clear from the description above whether the app may constitute part of a reduction in one-to-one support. I'm concerned that some people may not be attuned to or incentivised by this technology, as external pressures may weigh upon them more heavily. If people do not manage to engage with this sort of technology, will the same blame culture be heaped upon them as we see in the current welfare system implemented by the Department of Work and Pensions, rife with sanctions? Will the app be understandable by all, i.e. people with some forms of Dyslexia or people facing language barriers? There is no replacement for face to face assistance.

I completely agree prevention is a good step to intervene on. But I think that 56 days is far too long, particularly in the winter. If this is about preventing homelessness we need to move much faster than this. I think the app idea is useless, I dont often see homeless people with smart phones and the access to simple things like charging (even if the phone didnt have a sim to pay for a contract) and wifi is not as simple as we may think.

We welcome the additional access to information proposed, but feel this will also need to be delivered in person. While recognising the benefits that the application of new technologies can bring, we do not think the introduction of on-line advice and information and a new app is an effective substitute for face-to-face guidance.

We note that personalised housing plans may stretch current staffing at Housing Options.

Overall, we think that prevention is important, and more could be done under this category. Suggestions from Park Lodge Project include:

- Working more closely with all organisations interested in reducing homelessness in Leicester. We wonder if additional training for project staff will be necessary to draw out relevant information and history from clients. We would be happy to work alongside, and even to contribute staff or joint-fund where we are looking for the same services we would expect to have input as the quality and character of services provided.
- Sharing a pathway plan so that clients do not need to repeat their stories to multiple agencies.
- We find that we house a number of young people who have been told that they do not meet the eligibility for support at Housing Options, but who certainly seem statutorily homeless and in need of support when we investigate further. Catching these people before family breakdown would be ideal, but catching them when they first approach for help would help lessen the severity of their eventual need. This would involve active referral not just signposting.
- Other services are imperative in preventing homelessness. These include support around: abuse; mental health; debt; rent arrears; family breakdown; training and education; work-finding, amongst others. Working well with other agencies, and referring well, may contribute to preventing homelessness.
- Following up with people who have reported themselves as in housing need.
- Move services out of the Dawn Centre; its core clientele and setting is intimidating to many. Ideally, this would mean offering services at more than one venue.
- As the city recognises, there is a need for more housing and more beds.

I agree that the App will assist a certain group of people who are experiencing difficulties but I do not feel it could replace face to face assistance.

There are many reasons why people fall into difficulties and an App will be unlikely to fit/advise all the variations.

Many people do not have access to internet/App, or have the skills to work through an App.

If a tenancy is failing I believe it takes housing related support to be able to assist with prevention.

In some situations tenancy failure is unavoidable and so there will still be the need for temporary accommodation.

I do not believe an App will be able to prevent homelessness on its own, for many residents in the city.

The key to preventing homelessness is to be able to offer choice to people. Needs and situations are different to each individual and to reduce choices, reduces the chances of successfully preventing homelessness.

If I was homeless, I don't know if an app was the first thing I would look at. I also question how a homeless person would know about an app. I also question whether homeless people are always SmartPhone users.

I agree with early intervention, however self help by way of apps will only benefit very small number of people, by providing information only and the ability to act on this. There are large numbers who are digitally excluded, cannot read or write. Issues around housing/homelessness are the result of multiple, complex events having taken place in an individuals life. This leads to problems such as mental health, with drawl from services, inability to deal with day to day issues. At a time like this there is great need for face to face contact, for advise, for support to engage, to remove barriers to access services, and for advocacy to put right what has gone wrong. Valuable information is gained by home visits as individuals can present well due to shame regarding their situation. A caring, non judgemental, human approach is required.

Online is not the only way as people can access information in other places such as drop I centres or day centres

Not only on-line. Most people may not have access to internet and may need other forms of access. There is need for face to face and one to one support. Drop-in services like the Centre Project do provide information and support. The council is already sending people from Housing Options to the Centre Project.

Homelessness & people who are homeless a majority of time do not have access to the internet, use drop in services to access www.

Need to provide information in other ways such as face to face and be able to get support to understand the information like day centres. I get support from Centre Project

More 1 to 1 support, not just online

Not just online must be able to access face to face support e.g. centre project at Central Baptist Church

Not all people are able to access online information. Still need places like the Centre Project to help with face to face support. Vulnerable people need help with accessing services

Not just online access but face to face also i.e. the centre project

Homeless app seems to ignore the fact that many vulnerable and chaotic people facing homelessness are digitally excluded. This means the most vulnerable could be excluded from services.

The prevention role of the different services is in decline because of channel shift and hardstop. For the minority of individuals who are at the most risk of losing their homes making prevention services such as basic help with housing apps, assistance with HB, means people become more in debt and more likely to get into crisis with nowhere to turn.

The culture of HOC as a gatekeeper of scarce resources means that the hard to engage will not engage with the development of housing support plans.

Homeless is a big problem and need assisting a lot more as vulnerable people at danger daily

Yes online but I get more information from Centre Project

Vulnerable clients who have language barrier, Mental health, does not have even basic computer skills; etc will struggle on online Self- help information.

These responses represent the views of the Shelter Housing Aid and Research Project (SHARP). I am the Chair of the Trustee Board at SHARP. SHARP has the prevention of homelessness as its first object. We agree entirely with the proposal to improve homelessness prevention. Improved prevention can save many people from the horrors of homelessness and also in the longer term result in a far more effective use of public money. The Homelessness Reduction Act attaches far greater importance to preventative work. SHARP has for well over 40 years been providing advice and support to people in Leicester to help to prevent homelessness. We believe the experience and expertise we have built up puts us in an excellent position to continue to deliver these services well into the future.

Action Homeless fully supports the development of a more preventative and holistic service to single people facing homelessness. However, we would ask that consideration be given to how this service is provided and accessed by those in need.

We feel that support could be provided more effectively by other partners, and accessed in the community, rather than in the current Housing Options Centre. We have submitted a separate response from our service users, but they reinforce that they find the current Housing Options Service to be difficult to navigate and felt that it has culture that looks to “keep the gate closed” rather than one that looks to assist and enable them to avoid homelessness.

There are some innovative services being delivered in other parts of the county. One example being the service provided in Westminster by the Passage Day Centre and Places for People on behalf of Westminster Council:

[http://www.placesforpeople.co.uk/news/latest\\_news/innovative\\_new\\_housing\\_service\\_to\\_focus\\_on\\_preventing\\_homelessness.aspx](http://www.placesforpeople.co.uk/news/latest_news/innovative_new_housing_service_to_focus_on_preventing_homelessness.aspx)

Action Homeless also believes that a preventive service can only be effective if there are viable housing options for people to access. Something that will need to form part of the Council’s wider homeless strategy.

I think the proposal is not taking into consideration the vulnerability of some of the Service Users. These SU need much more support than an app.

Response from Y Support service users:

- how will the council make that 'duplication' of facilities available, will not occur?
- how will teams & agencies work together in order to provide a 'full' service?
- hopefully, the main source of information is NOT through the internet, as this will alienate a large section of the community
- housing options needs to be more customer friendly
- recognition that individuals have very different needs and circumstances

We approve of proposal 1 to “extend prevention support for singles and improve advice and information available to all especially on-line”, and we have some further questions;

- Alongside raising awareness with the public about help available for homeless people, we feel there also needs to be a campaign aimed at the general public with the goal of preventing violence and abuse towards homeless people in particular “rough sleepers”
- What does schools awareness work look like? Will links with CAMHS (Prof Vostanis) & public health be made? Important that this work isn’t about telling children how to get help in a crisis but is about how to look after their wellbeing and social networks (i.e. initiatives that will prevent people becoming homeless)
- Will “online” information link to all support services (Inc. mental & physical health & social care) available to people in order to prevent homelessness or to assist those at times of crisis? This will also be a helpful reminder for staff within and outside commissioned services. How will LCC skill up homeless service users to be able to use computers, smart phones etc? There is known to be high levels of literacy problems in the homeless community, so access to face-to-face support for using this technology is essential (eg via Y Support computer suite).

Proposal 2 Comments:

Many people could be missed as they are not confident in explaining needs etc. Agree that many ex offenders could be adequately supported in generic supported accommodation. Specialist offender accommodation should be for challenging cases.

What happens if the person has a dog? Many homeless people have dogs for companionship, warmth, and protection. Will they be accommodated with their dog?

I do agree, but we need to ensure that that specialist accommodation is available, even for people who are difficult and risky

Who will determine who meets the criteria?

Highest - should include the severity and impact of their issues.

I agree with targeting more vulnerable people but without support the other people will become vulnerable in a very short space of time, so this proposal is acceptable if the less vulnerable people are kept off the streets.

The city council are still failing to see that a multi agency approach to help people with drug, drink, abuse or other problems need to be a part of the package.

other council priorities

could you be explicit as to why one wider criteria priority group as opposed to others - what is the rationale based on

Concerned about rough sleepers and individuals with support needs slipping through the net

One size doesn't fit all. A wet house along the lines of Evesham House needs to be re-introduced.

An Emmaus type community for upto 25 homeless people is needed in a quiet part of The City or County. This is a world wide proven model and works in Hinckley. It offers free accommodation and support. The resident/companion commits to working to the best of his/her ability within The Community normally being a social enterprise collecting, repairing and selling second-hand goods. This revenue plus HB makes The Community self supporting. It offers work, self esteem and purpose. Some Companions will stay for the rest of their lives being unable or not wishing to live more independently, others move on into accommodation and houses.

There is year round need for an Emergency Shelter not just for a few months around Christmas.

concerned regarding the lack of information provided on the "sanctions" that may be imposed. Difficult to agree when sanctions are not clear.

housing options should not be the only source of advice and assistance. What does it mean by 'highest' support needs.

False flag proposals

30 points is too high for F this should be set at 20 points.

Some of category f should not exist. People subjected to domestic violence should be classed as vulnerable people. Anyone under 25 should be classed as vulnerable especially if they were looked after children. Clearly the authorities had failed them as children. Also people who have mental illness or physical disabilities should be seen as vulnerable.

2. The Council will not provide a bed space when there are no vacancies and there is no statutory duty to do so. Advice will be given. Where there is a duty and there are no suitable hostel bedspaces, other temporary accommodation will be offered.

I could not find any info how to contact the Council with my premises. Also there is no info ( I could not find it) if the Council wants to rent it for such purposes

They should provide more support for those who are not currently shortlisted

There needs to be more access for single people where they need to feel safer and so there should be more services available for them,

make it easier for people to get the information about support which is available to them.

homeless is a serious thing , people die because of this on the streets , although there are old people get a bit of a pension young people sometimes are not on anything and can still not get in anywhere

there should not be any discrimination homelessness is homelessness

it should be prioritized by need

although we support this in principal we do have concerns around Category F and the weighting apportioned within the Substance Use support need. Whilst a service user with active substance use can be problematic for a variety of reasons, this is on a case by case basis and we believe having a stable place to live provides an opportunity to begin to address these issues.

Additionally, our experience has demonstrated that substance misuse can often be a form of self-medication for yp with complex mental health needs who are unable to access other specialist services. Therefore it is our recommendation that this support need should have equal weighting between those who are and those who are not on a programme.

I agree that people without housing related support needs should not have to enter temp accommodation if it is not required, but, who assess the needs of the service users and are they qualified to make recommendations for the needs of the family. Are they qualified to make decisions regarding the needs of the children.

We have had service users come to Border House with little or no support needs (as deemed on the SAR) but when they arrive and are assessed by the Family Support Team lots of issues arise, such as hidden DV, Child Abuse, and one lady who spoke limited English stating that she had never had an interpreter so couldn't tell them anything even if she wanted too.

Eligibility matrix needs attention, including points especially.

it should be fair to everyone no one should be on the streets

There is need to diversify away from Housing Options for information on eligibility. Currently people are directed to a phone, where one can wait for a long time to get information, or sign posted down to the Centre Project to access telephone facilities to call the council.

Not enough space in hostels. In the last few years LCC has closed down 3 LCC hostels and supported housing which supported and assisted move on to perm accommodation. dawn centre is mistely full and if you are able to manage to secure a bed for the night chances are you will not get in the next day. Due to all the cutbacks staffing levels have decreased no quality work can be done with services uses. Abu h also means longer stay in hostel that's if you are a lucky one that managed to secure a bed. If you don't have any issues and just fall on hard times and need a little help there is nothing out there for you. Which in the long term has effects. Which offen include rough sleeping then getting involved in drugs and alcohol which puts more pressure on service. Would it not be better to assist in the first instance then later on down the line when the persons life is out of control? Support and assist is just words anybody can do that. If no accommodation how do you intend to put your words into action? Again words mean nothing but sounds good on paper. In my opinion it's a get out clause.

People with mental health needs are on a lower point system which makes no sense as the criteria for prioritisation contradicts the need to support the Vulnerable sections of the community.

In the current cost-cutting culture, I feel that the Category F criteria would form a barrier to people in need of support. The use of the phrase 'those most in need' in the proposal 2 description constitutes a thumbnail sketch of such a barrier to support, bringing us back to old-fashioned notions of the 'deserving poor' where the implication of 'non-deserving' persons hovers in the background. The DWP are incentivised to fail

benefit claimants using similar abstract categories.

Proposal 2: Access to the accommodation based homelessness services.

Proposal: Amended eligibility criteria for non-statutory groups. Prioritised support for those with the 'highest' support needs.

Category D: Proposal 4 indicates no change to number of units of Offender bed space provision. Is there a possibility that if demand 'outstrips' bed space units available in Offender provision that other Commissioned temporary accommodation providers would be expected to accommodate such referrals?

Category B: Rough sleepers. What defines a 'Rough Sleeper'? Is the expectation that they have to be seen 'bedded down' to meet this proposed criteria. If so, this would be very difficult to quantify particularly in the Spring/Summer as the Outreach Team (particularly the 'Twilight' team) would invariably find very few (if any) individuals 'bedded down' before 9 PM. Does intelligence gained i.e. known encampments, qualify as confirmation of rough sleeping?

Category F: Individuals with support needs. If services will be allocated on a principle of 'priority to those in greatest need' via points scored then the only viable way that this can be done would be to have an 'end of day' assessment to identify those who have scored the highest. The question is, how will individuals be informed? Also if decisions are not being made until the end of the day, this will put undue pressure on the temporary accommodation provider to process all of these referrals at the end of the day.

Whilst it is important to prioritise certain groups, I think the idea of 'scoring' people is quite unpleasant. Simply, everyone should be helped. If we run out of beds we need more beds. If needed rent them a b&b for the night. No one should be on the streets on the first day of homelessness.

I have spoken to many homeless people who are not offered help because they have no connection to Leicester and I think this is disgusting. In one case the man had grown up in Charnwood but was told this wasn't a connection to Leicester. We need to have more of a heart and help anyone we can.

Sanctions should never involve being denied entry to hostels unless they create issues in the hostel (e.g. violence in the hostel). They should not be denied entry for another activity that has happened elsewhere.

Where do victims of domestic abuse fall in the priority system? Will those presenting out of city be awarded lower points?

We think that the prioritisation criteria will only be successful if the people scoring it are very familiar with homelessness in all its forms. Assessing physical or mental health needs will be taxing, for instance. We question whether the Category F prioritisation criteria represent need accurately, and recognise that this is often a case-by-case question: for instance, some substance users are in desperate need of accommodation in order to start reduction programmes, and some are not unduly affected by their substance use, at least in some stages.

We suggest that former youth offenders should be grouped with former care leavers.

I do agree that individuals who do not require support do not need to come into

supported temp accommodation. However, if someone presents as homeless on the day where will they go? How will they 'be able to access settled accommodation'. What 'settled accommodation'.

There is already a shortage of single private rented accommodation, restrictions with benefits to help fund those places eg. under 35 year olds are also now a problem securing lets in the private sector along with using those available for stat homeless singles and families. The waiting list for local authority housing can be up to 4/5 months.

There will likely be quite a time period for someone to wait for settled accommodation.

I think we need to be careful about assessing someone as 'vulnerable' or who has 'support needs'. Needs often cannot be picked up in a short interview and the interviewer would require a certain skill set/mind set to enable any needs to be identified in a short space of time. An individual could struggle to voice any issues they may have or be uncomfortable raising issues in that environment and with a stranger. Information will likely be picked up throughout the 56 day 'prevent' or 'relief' periods but questionable for on the day presentations/decisions.

To introduce a 30 point system for category F narrows the group of people support is provided for at point of access. Many referrals happen as a trigger and at this point not all information is available for the referrer. The service user themselves may not be able to provide all the information due to their vulnerability thus missing the 30 point criteria and ending at crisis point. This method would negate prevention.

Advising assistants will need to be increased as people with priority with different needs need to be seen to

But broaden the provision not only available at the Housing Options. Alternative advice should be available - face to face support

Specific question on Section F criteria-how will the eligibility below be determined:

Health & wellbeing (considering physical, mental and social health & well-being):

High- needs

Lower level-needs

Need to see criteria for what is defined as High and Lower-level needs. This leaves quite a range where there is no 'moderate/medium' level. May be challenged but need to see on what basis decisions made.

More information & support is needed to those whom don't know where to access it

Make sure more people have more information people with different priority need to be seen to

The service needs to be broadened to different venues not just a single access point. Alternative advice should be available

But service needs to be broadened to more access points i.e. the Centre Project. Alternative advice should be available

Broaden the service to other access points i.e. the centre project. Alternative advice should be available

The assessment is roughly based on the STAR vulnerability assessment. My concern is that if the assessment is carried out by a team which is under immense pressure to

minimise assistance the right questions will not be asked in the right way. Vulnerable hard to engage people may not want to reveal vulnerabilities in a one of interview if it is perceived they are not going to be supported. The nature of working in an environment where you are mostly saying no means to survive you must become hardened to customers needs etc. I am not sure vulnerable people will engage and therefore receive support

More info face to face. Service needed. Some people not got internet

Providing advice and accommodation to not just those classed as statutorily homeless is to be welcomed. The difficulty is that with a limited supply of affordable housing and a need way in excess of supply, how can the City help all those in need? Any homelessness strategy must therefore be closely linked to a wider housing strategy including policies and proposals to increase the overall supply of housing in the City and in particular affordable housing.

Action Homeless welcomes the proposed approach. We recognise the demand placed on the Authorities' resources and the need to ensure that there are clear and effective assessment criteria. However, we would caution on having a strict criteria that can be inflexibly applied by the staff assessing need.

We think that consideration should be given to assessing an individual's competence to solve their own housing situation and that their personnel resilience be considered as part of the assessment. We acknowledge that these are subjective judgments, but we think there are indicators that can be taken into account.

An example of this would be issues such as experiencing homelessness as a child or youth. We know that those who have been homeless as children are much more at risk of experiencing homelessness as adults. In addition, we know that there are disproportionate amounts of homeless people with low-level learning disabilities and any contact with educational support services might indicate their vulnerability. Another indicator is personal trauma, with 40% of people living on the streets stating that they have suffered significant emotional abuse.

As stated in our response to the previous question, a change in approach needs to be adopted that looks to support and resolve issues, rather than looking to prevent access to services. We again would ask that thought be given to how these services are commissioned.

I don't agreed to the proposal because it's very specific to only accommodation-based support. Some Service Users need deeper housing support so they don't fall into the pattern of becoming homeless in the future.

To support Service Users, we need housing related support services that cover a wide range of services, so they can support and re-direct the Service User to the best service available for them.

Mental health is a big problem.

Response from Y Support service users:

- being able to access accommodation in different towns / cities will enable people to migrate to where jobs are more available

- specialist accommodation needed

We strongly support the principle that specialist offender accommodation should be reserved for those with a recent offending history. "Within 1 year of leaving a custodial sentence" seems an appropriate threshold for entering such services. We expect that this definition includes those leaving custody who have been recalled to custody under an initial sentence (and who arguable therefore "left a custodial sentence" over a year ago).

We also support the principle that those with low or no needs should be enabled to avoid temporary accommodation where necessary. Homelessness commissioning reviews elsewhere have shown that needs can often increase as a result of a stay in temporary accommodation.

Where we have some reservations, is your proposed approach to prioritisation for those in category F. Whilst we agree that those with highest needs should be prioritised for temporary accommodation and that a fairly rigid approach will assist in this aim, we would propose that some kind of management override exists to enable a personalised approach to be taken where necessary.

We are pleased that health and wellbeing is considered in the list of prioritisation criteria for Housing Options assessments in proposal 2 "Amended eligibility criteria that for non-statutory groups prioritises support to those with the highest support needs", and we have further questions regarding the implementation of the priority criteria;

- How will it be determined whether someone's health and wellbeing needs are high or low? There are a lot of points separating the two (20-5) so this distinction, and consistently applying it, is going to be very important. Will specialist housing options officers with appropriate Mental / Physical health training be provided to make these assessments? If not then will assessments undertaken by health professionals be taken into account (supporting letters)? If supporting letters from health professionals are going to be part of the assessment, further detailed guidance will be required so that health professionals can tailor their supporting information so that the information that Housing Options require is foregrounded, as presently in our experience service users identified by health professionals as being "vulnerable and in priority need" are not always allocated access to temporary accommodation.

### Proposal 3 Comments:

MMM... this is about cutting the service to meet budget projections rather than meeting the needs of families. It is a VERY dangerous strategy to rely on the use of PRS accommodation, particularly in light of the roll out of Universal Credit. You will be aware that Housing Options are struggling to find landlords to accept families on benefits so I don't see where you are going to source these properties from. There are also very poor properties out there in terms of quality which only adds to the complex issues these families will have. This is a very unimaginative solution to a serious and increasing issue!

In my view this will only work if there is alternative non specialist accommodation available.

The private rented sector is known for not being considerate regarding families in receipt of welfare benefits. Relying on this sector is a VERY dangerous move and partially moving a public duty into a privatised area, which is not recommended.

Transition over the life of the strategy, as more settled accommodation is available, to

reduce the amount of temporary accommodation by half.

how frequently will progress be monitored and publically reported on - what's plan B if this is not working - will it be amended before the strategy ends if necessary - how will this be achieved

concerned if you reduce temporary accommodation and we have an increase in support where will they go.

The majority of rough-sleeping homeless people are estranged from their family.

Under handed/ to allow backhanded

Practices

Why not get a place built similar to student accommodation. Developers such as code or large business can be made to pay for this. Why not tax large scale student accommodation providers, or alternatively say that for each 30 rooms for students they build 1 must be available for the council to use as a temporary accommodation, or permanent accommodation. Most of these places will have porters, security guards on anyway.

Using other means is ok, but getting rid of temporary accommodation will not make new accommodation viable. I doubt we have such luxury in leicester but if anyone has property unoccupied that is purely for investment purposes, ( not due to illness or imprisonment) it needs to be forced into being rented or if the property was acquired through illegal means and that is why the person is in prison e.g. drug dealer, pimp then the property should be forfeited and sold with only sufficient being left to buy a small home to house the family and the prisoner.

You have to inform landlords that you are looking for such accommodations

Families should be given more support as they might find it difficult to access particular services.

There needs to be more services for families and they need to be more permanent than just being temporary.

vulnerable should get settled accomadation straight away

if they are working familys they could have tempory until things are sorted

I feel its important to keep the family unit together self contained people need privacy , getting support they need to move on to get self worth and confidence

I agree accommodation should be self contained. I don't agree the accommodation was under used....two families I worked with were offered accommodation in the East midlands area yet their family support (siblings with their own families) lived in the city. even days/a week away in this temp accommodation will be mentally oppressive. I believe Universal credit will increase the number of units required due to the loss of homes through payment delays impacting on rent arrears even with the budget amendments. I believe this proposal is short-sighted.

I understand the theory around reducing temporary bed spaces for families and a move into permanent accommodation is obviously always a positive thing.

however I do have concerns as a mental health nurse within the homeless mental health service that people will play down or deny any extra support that they may need to gain access to permanent accommodation quicker.

hostel and temporary accommodation although not ideal provides an opportunity to identify support needs (around mental health) by support staff and for service users to access our team which can help to maintain successful tenancies.

Whilst supporting the aim of settled private and social lettings for families, we are concerned that there isn't the housing stock available particularly in the PRS sector where landlords are increasingly reluctant to accommodate anyone on Universal Credit whilst rent is paid direct to tenants, also given a large reason for family homelessness is ending of a tenancy from PRS we're not confident that this proposal will be achievable.

Agree that it should be self contained - this has been an issue for years and the families would benefit from self contained units - at what financial cost to the family? Can they afford it? If there is only a 3 bedroom flat left available and a mother and 1 child needs it - will they have to pay for the 3 bedrooms?

24/7 - staffing - agree this is not needed.

Support during the day - this should happen and should be provided by qualified staff that make valuable contributions to the welfare and safeguarding of the family. The children need a service that is qualified to understand their needs and to safeguard at all times. The most vulnerable people in the city are homeless children and the get lost in the system and professionals lose contact. To sustain tenancies families needs to right support and they need to overcome the reasons they are homeless in the first place. The Family Support Team can do everything that is needed. We are trained and qualified to support both adults and children with, benefits, housing advice, mental health, safeguarding, drug and alcohol support as well as providing the children with a safe environment to play and learn which builds future confidence and ambitions. The Family Support Team have face to face valuable contact with families - this is what the families want and need - they do not want to be key worked by staff that are not consistent as they do not want to tell their story over and over again, which happens at Border House, therefore service users choose our service as the preferred point of support. If you were to take away the support my service offers, in my opinion, you wouldn't meet the families needs - we do everything, the whole package, and have so many success stories.

Yes, there has been a reduction in families coming in to Border House - but not all the time - most of the time we are full. We had 108 referrals, that's 323 children - 58 of these children had social work involvement - we attended 114 safeguarding meetings so far this year - the only representation from housing is us.

But still need to have some family emergency accommodation to support families through the transition into somewhere permanent. Families need to be taken out of crisis and given some time to think before they need to choose where to live permanently.

familys shouldnot have to share as i feel it could cause conflict and they should have the right to have private facilites.

Only deal if you have a duty.. that's the main issue! It all boils down to money and not people! If there was money I. The pot then this would not even be discussed. Hit the most vulnerable who don't have a voice and the council hope will just disappear as they make to many hoops to jump though to get help.

"The temporary accommodation for families is currently staffed 24/7. We do not think this is required for this client group as families rarely require support out of office

hours. We believe future accommodation should only have on-site staff available during office hours with an emergency call-out being available outside these hours."

There must have been a good, viable reason to provide 24/7 support for families in the past: a key one is security. The simple presence of staff has a preventative effect: it helps to prevent violence from occurring, for example; it also guards against theft. Why is this not mentioned?

give families there privacy

What incentive is there for a private landlord to accept a family on benefits? If private lets are not available where will the family be accommodated?

Are refuge units included in the 60 units of commissioned accommodation?

Where do without recourse families sit within the proposal and what funding arrangements are in place for them?

We welcome the proposal to find settled accommodation for families as a priority and only revert to temporary accommodation when absolutely necessary and no other is available.

We also welcome to amend eligibility criteria to secure access to suitable accommodation for those whom the Council may not be statutorily obliged to house but recognise that this may place an extra strain on already stretched resources, especially those comprising settled accommodation.

At Park Lodge, we struggle to move residents into more appropriate accommodation when they are pregnant. We would prefer not to have to formally make them homeless.

We note that services are often available to families while in temporary accommodation and suggest that any families presenting as homeless should be referred to support as standard.

Agree in the main but we need to be cautious. The proposal mentions 'as more settled accommodation becomes available' - how will this be achieved? How certain is it that this will happen to accommodate the potential numbers required?

We are already seeing families using 1 bed flats in the private sector which is reducing the option of 1 bed flats away from single homeless, providing less and less accommodation for singles.

Could the current site of temp accommodation for families be split and used for single homeless females as well, using the current 24/7 to support them while being available for any issues on the family side?

The move away from 24/7 appears more to do with budget cuts, rather than an analysis of requirements.

Agreed permanent accommodation is better than temporary, but families need support to sustain their new tenancies, biggest failure is new tenancies without support. This gives families a good start and access to support advise.

Provide more housing for YP. Not just hostels. More move-on accommodation

Families should not be in temporary accommodation

Families should not be in temporary accommodation

Firstly I am not clear who is assessing families as not requiring support. Is DV, Child protection, child in need, MH taken into consideration.

Secondly, discharging into private sector is just building a crisis for future-the accommodation is insecure and not high standard. In addition at the last homeless meeting P3 stated they were being starved of referrals by HOC-that there was a bottle neck and referrals getting stuck in HOC. It is completely incomprehensible that there is some assumption that private sector tenant do not need support.

If they do-why is the service not being utilised?

Therefore if we are putting families into private sector accommodation , we are refusing them access to support. These may be some of the most vulnerable families-as disaster waiting to happen.

Removing the 24 hr cover from a family hostel is a frightening proposal. The hostel occupants have high levels of drug, DV, MH, safeguarding issues-specifically with the safety of children. I would say the most vulnerable end up in the hostel. leaving them without 24 hour cover is leaving the door open to an increase of violence, grooming, and possible sexual exploitation.

I feel lots needs to be done

lots of homeless familys

Not sure if enough private landlords

Placing more families into settled accommodation clearly makes sense and should be supported. The caveat again though is the supply of accommodation set against the much greater overall need. SHARP recognises that for some families, a period of support is needed and therefore placing families in temporary accommodation in such circumstances is acceptable. As proposed, this should be self contained accommodation. It is also important to have temporary accommodation for families available in not just one part of the City. Strong family connections, schooling and other personal needs mean that some choice of family accommodation by location is required.

Action Homeless agrees that where possible accommodation for families should not be temporary and a settled housing solution sought from the outset. We also recognise the reduced demand for the council's own temporary accommodation and that most families do not require 24/7 support. However, the review of accommodation should also include that provided by other partners. Our own Bridge House project has seen an increase in referrals for the SARS of families who do not have DV history, but require accommodation.

There are some families how do require additional support who are often not catered for. Move on for families that we accommodate at Bridge House is also problematic, however we have procured and number of leased properties to meet their needs.

I think it's more important to avoid families to become homeless and that service is very well done by services like STAR, which does a brilliant job.

Response from Y Support service users:

It's felt that more intervention is needed with families BEFORE the event of being

made homeless. It was stated that it is know of families staying with other families even though it is said in the review that the service was under used

Provided that demand has sufficiently reduced and continues to remain so to allow this reduction.

We have concerns regarding the proposal 3 “to reduce by half temporary accommodation for families by increased relief of homelessness through arranging settled private / social lettings;

- If there are fewer beds available at Border house, fewer support needs will be identified amongst the homeless families population because they will not get the extended assessment and support available from staff at BH and FSS which allows families to feel safe enough to share with them. It is sometimes only through close observation by these services that issues are identified (abuse / Domestic violence / MH issues). At other times it is only when HMHS get involved with a family (following referral by BH / FSS) that the extent of their support needs are identified due to trust issues regarding fear of disclosure affecting custody of children etc.

- We have the same concerns as in proposal 2 regarding appropriate training for Housing Options staff to enable them to be able to identify underlying complex issues during a brief housing / homelessness assessment interview.

- The placement of families straight into tenancies (rather than an assessment period in supported / temporary accommodation) also limits access to further mental health assessment & support, in that they will no longer be “homeless” and therefore ineligible to access our service for assessment / support. If placed in permanent tenancies & they are able to negate the referral pathways (via GP referral) –the majority are also unlikely to meet the threshold for mainstream mental health services (unless presenting with Serious Mental Illness - Psychosis, Bipolar disorder, severe depression), as unlike the HMHS – mainstream services are only commissioned to work with this severe spectrum of illnesses, whereas we are able to offer a more open & flexible access criteria (homeless presenting with MH problems / illness) & also offer psychological support to people presenting with other issues such as domestic violence / childhood trauma etc., often referring & engaging them with other essential voluntary sector services (First step, Women’s Aid / UAVA etc.). If the pathway into these direct lets could include a probationary period where the family’s tenancy takes the form of a temporary license and therefore the family can still be considered homeless (as was the case with the Model C properties), they would be able to access our support.

- HMHS referral rates from border house to HMHS (2016/17 – 22, 2017 to date 14) have not decreased which suggests that rates of distress to the degree that intervention from services required is not substantially reducing. If these families had been placed directly into substantive tenancies their complex needs may not have been picked up and the HMHS not have been able to offer a service to them.

Proposal 4 Comments:

Or to increase the accommodation.

What happens when there are more than 20 spaces needed?

If there are less than 20 spaces needed can other people be placed there?
It was reduced enough last time.
The city council, police and some well intended agencies only deal with the homeless in "public view" in the city centre.
However, the problem is also evident on various estates and in the main is ignored
The current provision and support for former prisoners needs improving and more appropriate support and accommodation. Emmaus works for some
If the existing 20 beds are "generally fully occupied" this suggests that extra capacity is required. therefore bed numbers should be increased.
All of the Same.. Lies
Do a study and find it people are missing out. If they are increase the number. Modular buildings can be fast and effectively built to assist. Reading Council has done this recently.
it sounds dangerous to have deal with offenders
If the numbers of rough sleepers / homeless have gone up then the provision of temporary accommodation should increase
the last thing we want is for people to reoffend I think accommodation and support to break the cycle would mean less crime
Support the decision not to reduce further, however, feel there is a need to consider increasing this specialist provision as in our experience the offending threshold has been raised resulting in problematic placements in other general needs or specialist accommodation which compromises a safe environment for those living within.
i think this should be increased the amount of units , so people do not re offend or end up on the streets
I work in the city and have seen rough sleepers figures rise. Why? Not enough temp accommodation and when there is you have to jump through hoops just to get a bed for the night. Council now relies on charity's to assist. Saves them money. Homelessness the council do not like and try to shove under the carpet. You shut services this is the outcome! And it's onlt going to get worse.
There needs to be more units available for young people trying to change and turn their lives around
Keeping the existing number is positive; increasing the number of units, where appropriate, is better. There is nothing like specialist support: once the expertise is gone, it's hard to replace it.
we need more housing for offenders to stop further re offending
We need to increase this back to 30 if there are more offenders on the streets
If the need is there, this should be addressed by increasing the number of units available
We often see offenders coming out of prison who are deemed too high risk to be placed in the offender provision meaning their options are to rough sleep, apply for general needs temp accommodation or sofa surf. If they are a struggle to manage specialist temp accommodation how effective will general needs temp accommodation and what risk to they pose to those vulnerable people in temp accommodation.
Surely, if we want to reduce rough sleeping we need to ensure those most likely to reoffend are not forced to be homeless on release, posing a threat to public and the recurring costs to the criminal justice system.

A more effective, planned release and move on plan could be looked at.

Your own narrative suggests that more units may be required; again a victim of budget cuts and ignores need.

Agree temporary specialist units are required but I am certain 20 are not enough. Where offenders are placed in permanent accommodation it does not follow that their support needs is negligible. This group have a huge struggle to live independently and require outreach/floating support to maintain their tenancies. Probation monitor these people but do not always provide support or help them to deal with things like mental health etc.

Should be wider and not just the Dawn Centre. The crash pad should not be run by the council instead it should be voluntary or charities

Its great that the accommodation is staying. But where is the Floating Support. STAR without extra training or support and with less staff are dealing with increased numbers of high risk offenders. A 2 person visit means 1/3 of the team is occupied.

Need more places not just Dawn Centre and Y Project as this is not enough

The crucial consideration is to ensure that the provision of accommodation for former offenders meets demand. If the current accommodation is "generally fully occupied", the Council must regularly review its provision to ensure that no former offenders in need are being left without appropriate accommodation. The consequences of this for the individual concerned and for society in general would be worrying.

Think this is the right proposal . Almost all of our clients have some level of offending history and we feel that all support service should be able to understand and meet the needs of these individuals.

Would be better if this could be extended as this will help them to integrate back into society safely.

Response from Y Support service users:

- It was felt that there is not enough accommodation as it is. Private tenancies were not working in the longer term
- It was felt private landlords are not prepared to tolerate too many problems before applying to effect evictions and if accommodation is going to be provided, hopefully it will not be all left for the private sector to fill the gap
- Not enough specialist support to stop / reduce re-offending
- People should not come out of prison to have to live on the streets because they cannot access accommodation

We are fully in support of this proposal and applaud the council for delivering on their responsibilities in relation to ensuring that offenders are given a proper opportunity to make a fresh start upon leaving prison. Prioritising higher need clients for what is now only 20 units seems sensible. We would strongly urge against any further unit reductions in future years.

We approve of proposal 4 - to continue with current levels of funding for "20 units of temporary accommodation for offenders", although we have some further concerns;

- There has been a dramatic Increase in HMHS referrals considered to be 'high risk' (highlighted by an increase in aggressive incidents towards HMHS staff) alongside this increase, there have been wider government funding cuts to other essential

public services (Police / Probation / social care) who are commissioned to support people deemed high risk and manage risk to staff and the public. Those service users assessed as high risk are often “unsuitable” for generic hostel accommodation which inevitably results in them rough sleeping (posing a greater risk to the public). Whilst this presents as an increasingly common problem, not only for ourselves but also the wider Frontline MDT in supporting these individuals and minimising risk, we feel there should be an increase in funding (beds) for placement of these “high risk” individuals in order to fully protect other homeless service users, members of the public & staff, but also to offer these individuals greater opportunity to address & change their challenging behaviours, in order to move on to a longer term settled lifestyle.

Proposal 5 Comments:

You are not telling us what you are looking to reduce to.
Children's services & Housing need to work closer together to identify those young people that are leaving care and then have discussions with the young people at least a year in advance on what their wishes are. I am of the view that time is the key here, leave things too late then that's when potential problems arise. It is likely to be daunting step for the young person, not many young people leave home to live independently at aged 18, so they will need support and guidance to work towards that.
Still feel young people will slip through the net . I agree that social care and housing should work more closely together . not sure there is a lot of settled accommodation in existence . Don't believe you will be in a position to match services to needs giving false promises.
Not sure what is being proposed here. The information above provide a very brief summary of what is currently commissioned but is unclear on what is proposed. What are the "wide range" of accommodation solutions that "should" be available for young people?
need more providers of young people services. Move on service.
All of the Same..??!
Yes providing the charities are assisted and funds are provided to assist them. Charities should be in addition to the council helping homeless
It is important to work with children's services. Things like getting younger people in care learning independent living earlier in support ed living me get help.
shared accommodation
Not enough, and what is available is inadequate.
Provision for young people is limited and so more provision of services for young people should be increased so that they receive more support.
There needs to be more services that are available to take them on and they need to be less institutionalised
ensure there is a broad provision of settled accomodation
i think they should have their own accomodation to give them independence and keeping them all together in places like ymca creates crime
Tried it before, all talk no action!
Agree with Pooling of resources between the two key referring agencies which should enable a clearer understanding of referral routeways and need. A better use of limited finances.

However, the disparity between support costs of spot-purchase and providers under a framework agreement need to be looked into and consideration of tiered funding based on support needs that fall outside of the agreed contract tolerance levels.

more young peoples provision for housing, its good for short term but not long term as they will become institutionalized

Current temporary housing for young people does not full meet the needs of those wanting to move-on. More diverse provision is needed.

Just words! Where is the accommodation, because all I see is closers. And most of the time there are no bedspace as over the years bed spaces have been cut to less then half. With benefit cuts this only makes the matters worse. Homelessness will always be there but what you have put on paper is just that it's on paper. Looks good but in reality it's laughable.

who decides on "particular" providers.

There is not enough information provided to give a realistic in depth analysis of what your proposals are really all about.

I don't feel I know enough about the details on this point to comment to a great degree.

build more lcc flats

I think we need to increase the number of units being offered. I do not know the details but 85 units does not sound enough to offer the longer term support that these young people may need in the early years of their adulthood.

Park Lodge welcomes the recognition that a range and mix of styles of accommodation and support are needed for young people. We make the following additional comments.

- There are more than 85 young people who are homeless and in need of support in Leicester. We house a further 25 who are in need of support and homeless and not recognised as such by Housing Options, though they meet the eligibility for enhanced rate – hostel rate - Housing Benefit within Leicester. We also house an additional 20 or more through contracts with CYPS and other local authorities some of whom are unaccompanied seeking asylum. Other providers also offer accommodation beyond the 85 beds commissioned by the Council's Housing Division.

- We find amongst our residents there is a surprising rate of formerly undiagnosed special educational needs or disability around learning or development, e.g. autism, ADHD, dyslexia, issues processing information; sometimes basic literacy and numeracy is lacking. Some of these young people have gone on to supported accommodation after extended residence with us, often more than two years. We wonder if permanent accommodation for those who are unlikely to live totally independently has been considered.

- We also support residents for an extended period who have serious mental health concerns, some previously diagnosed and others not recognised previously, or not apparent.

- We welcome shared accommodation for young people, both with 24-hour support and less frequent contact. We find that people housed on their own can experience loneliness, however some young people will need significant support to learn to live

harmoniously with others. Without adequate support, there is the risk of a failed household rather than a failed tenancy. And we note that for some young people shared accommodation will not be a viable option.

Support needs:

We find that young people often need:

- Greater levels of self-awareness and consideration of the needs of others, information about life options, the ability to communicate their needs and wishes and listen to others
- Support for better mental and emotional health
- Support for better sexual and physical health
- Basic skills of daily, weekly, and monthly living, from laundry to budgeting to cooking
- Greater awareness of risk and vulnerability
- Educational support for higher levels of attainment in basic skills of language, literacy and numeracy as well as access to appropriate training and employment.

The suggested 12-week pathway may not allow time to establish good relationships and assess needs. If we want young people to avoid future homelessness, they need security alongside support. The average length of their residence with us is 6-9 months, but occasionally up to two years. When they leave us they generally maintain their tenancies, preventing repeat homelessness.

Young people suffer extensively and if they have been in care it is worse as they are not prepared for independent living. The cut off date at 21 years for receiving support is not enough as many do not have families. Shared housing does not always give the individual freedom of choice who they share with.

There is not enough services for young people and it is not appropriate as it is institutionalised and is not considered homely. Therefore, more providers should be available.

Provide different strands not only YMCA. Stop institutionalism of young people. Not location based.

There's not enough providers for young person's who are coming out of the care system

More floating support, let more people know about various support services. Also services that are more accessible such as drop in centres, one on one, & over the phone

Hostels not ideal for accommodating needs of young people

Leaving Care cases STAR works with are some of the most complex cases. There are battles for Leaving Care team to keep cases open.

Not just this group we been homeless and am vulnerable and had never heard of P3. I got help from staff at Centre Project

Increase the number of providers

It clearly makes sense for the housing division to work more closely with children's services and to have a range of appropriate accommodation available. Joint commissioning should certainly help to achieve better value for money. The question is whether the housing service's 85 units of temporary accommodation for young people is sufficient? Evidence suggests that it isn't

Action Homeless agrees with the proposal to have a more integrated service for young people. We have seen an increase in the number of 18-25s in our service and

that age bracket now makes up over 33% of our client base. Although many of these individuals have not been looked after, many have had interventions from Children's Services through their childhood and experienced homeless as children. We would like to see the new integral model of support for young people that address some of their underlying low resilience and look at an asset based model to support them.

Action Homeless would very much like to work with the Authority to develop new models of accommodation, including adopting its' existing units and developing more units through RTB

Is important to consider resettlement services. STAR does a lovely service.

Response from Y Support service users:

- It was felt that an increase in accommodation levels across the board is needed
- Also services need to be increased, or more funding into existing services, as the services provided by some agencies work very well, just not enough time is allowed to them
- services are pressured to 'move people on' before some individuals are ready - this creates people ending up on the streets sometimes, then coming back through services (this sets people back)

We support the maintenance of "85 units of temporary accommodation for young people" & tentatively support the "joint work with children's services to undertake analysis of the range & volume of supported accommodation required", with the view that hopefully this will result in an eventual increase in temporary accommodation options for young people in line with the increase of young people in the homeless population? (HMHS under 25's referral data 2016/17-88 people, 2017/18 67 – to date (projected figure 89)). Our experience with singles accommodation suggests that it is helpful to have more than one provider of accommodation so as one setting does not always meet the needs of all service users. We do however have some questions regarding the implementation of this proposal:

- If this were to result in closure of other voluntary sector "non-commissioned" projects, this would impact negatively on availability of "choices" for young people in types and range of suitable accommodation. Unfortunately young people are sometimes excluded from individual projects following challenging behaviour or non-payment of rent etc, but are able to access alternative accommodation as part of an "MDT management plan" – if the range of accommodation providers is further restricted the work of agencies who support young people who challenge services will be much more difficult.
- If young people are placed into "shared houses" we would have concerns about the suitability of many homeless young people in maintaining this "communal lifestyle". From our experience of supporting this group of vulnerable people, we can identify that many have traumatic backgrounds, with limited social / coping skills – many with additional mental health & substance use issues which wouldn't lend itself to this type of accommodation option. We would also have similar concerns as previously mentioned re previous proposals in that if young people are allocated "tenancies" without initial placement in temporary accommodation - this would exclude them the opportunity from accessing appropriate health assessment & support (HMHS &

Inclusion HC) due to access criteria requiring them to be “homeless” & many wouldn’t be able to access mainstream health services appropriate to their needs (don’t meet diagnostic access criteria).

Proposal 5 Views on how the council could develop more settled accommodation:

volunteer mentor schemes -
Are they allowed to stay with foster carers longer . Why not have a couple of houses where the young people can live and have some staff just keeping an eye on them similar to sheltered accommodation but for young people.
Not without further information on what is currently provided.
It's Not just About the Young.. You Do Not do..Enough or Anything to Help the Struggling over 50s
As in my earlier point, why not say all student accommodation buildings above 30 flats must have at least 1 for use by the council for homeless, if it is used by young people they will be with people of a similar age. You may find it more beneficial for a 2 flats in each building to be used so they have at least 1 person in similar situation to them
Bring more providers.
More services could be provided and not be institutionalised and should instead be more caring and homely for them.
Less institution
accomodate in shared houses with staff living in.
age for adoption
Support them to remain by funding rent shortfalls with DHP where HB is in payment and they are looking for or have gain employment. They will be helping themselves and have secure accommodation an not need to worry about loosing it. their UC housing element should be paid direct tot he landlord and the DHP. I know this goes against a earning an income intention but what more important secured accommodation or budgeting skills?
Prevention much earlier on, teaching life skills to vulnerable young people, not doing things for them! but getting them to learn for themselves. Nurturing environments that offer a sense of purpose and ownership.
We think the councils role should continue to be an 'enabler' rather than developing the ideas itself per se. Also, we suggest that the length of stay limits imposed in the previous strategy are revised to be based on support need in addition we also recommend that the provider is required to 'evidence' that the young person is ready to move into their own tenancy i.e. via agreed milestone achieved by young person.
offer more flats for young people and support across the city and county
Yes stop closing temp accommodations. Providing “support and assistance” is a get out clause for LCC
There are a lot of buildings around the city not in use; could these not be used, if renovated to a good standard?
build more flats for homeless
Its very hard for care children to become self sufficient, living in normal adult accommodation. Many 18 year olds not in care now remain with their families until they are much older. I think there needs to be a smoother transition, particularly for those who want to remain in education and go to university. Can you imagine leaving a childrens home and going to live next to a middle aged drug dealer? Its hardly a surprise what happens to these young people who are so vulnerable. Run a

consultation with this group and ask them what would of helped or what is helping. They are the experts in this area!
We believe that shared accommodation is a reasonable approach, but that regular and ongoing practical support will be important, including advice and guidance regarding keeping a household harmonious, regular house meetings, cleaning agreements, conflict avoidance and resolution, choosing who to live with, as well as lessons and support in household basics. In our experience, if properties are managed, landlords are willing to rent, and ongoing agreements may be possible.
Involving more partners outside the council who work with children.
Shared housing ? There are good examples of shared housing working, particularly where 'sharers' were known to each other and took on joint tenancies
More services and providers across the city
Yes. Extend the YMCA & more one to one support for youngsters
Work with other groups to provide move on accommodation. Not just hostels.
More day centres for the vulnerable and people with mental health issues or other illnesses
I feel more communication
Action Homeless has developed an innovative shared housing model that allow people to have a level of independence , but in LHA thresholds . Support can be flexed to the individual, or property depending on need.
We would be keen to develop more of this accommodation with support from Right to Buy receipts.
Young people need to be taught and help to settled and this will be save the council struggling to find suitable accommodation.
More flats can be built for young people.

Proposal 6 Comments:

You do not mention anywhere about people with dogs - this really worries me as for many their dog is their only friend and they will not take up help if it does not include their dog. What provision is made for this situation?
I would be very keen that we're able to provide temporary, urgent accommodation even for those people who are difficult or pose risks.
You have been working to reduce repeat homelessness for many years, particularly with the Revolving Door initiative. Need to develop real solutions.
As long as the other solutions are timely ie the person is accommodated quickly and there is not a gap while permanent accommodation is acquired.
I do believe this is a good proposal and in theory could provide support to those who need it; however it is vital that necessary professionals have information on how to signpost and support these people. For example, Emergency Duty Team (Adults Social Care) who cover out of hours and weekends, they need to have information on the short-stay temporary accommodation as people can be in need of support outside working hours. In addition to EDT, Police, Ambulance and UHL's need to have the information or how to signpost to those can give the advice.
I believe this is a way to out source council services by using the word commission more that is obviously your intention here . Keep public services in house.
Isn't it now time for The Council to acknowledge that its housing responsibilities are very diverse and it would make sense to contract out the provision of all services

concerning single homelessness to AHL/ The Y being specialists in the field.

It is also time to be realistic that there will always be rough sleepers and for planning to be based around accepting this inevitability and to reduce numbers. Answers need to be found around rough sleepers from Eastern European countries where is no "duty" to house and no financial means to do so. Should there be some form of working communities and accommodation and if they aren't willing to work to the best of their ability to be deemed to have forfeited their right of residence and to be reconnected. We shouldn't set targets unless we have strategies that are capable of attaining them, who are they intended to impress?

the 'crash pad' needs to be a separate provider. work with other charity organisations.

More Lie's

Yes in principle. could you release land for the charities and you to work together on to build more accommodation? Could be in Leicestershire rather than in city if easier?

Stop cutting so many services and they might be able to help.

does not work this window... try it

Yes, but crash pads should be available for anyone.

The number of accommodation should be increased as it needs to be more than just one centre and there should be wider provision.

Crash pads need to be more available and need to be run by the charities.

Its a good idea , it should be accessable to all not just local connections. It should not be a the dawn centre. work in parnership with local charities to provide this.

More places should be opened in order to accomodate single people. Places like the churches should be available run by charities and volunteers.

that would reduce rough sleepers

Prefer services to be in-house.

Although supporting the idea of crash pads in particular, in keeping with our ethos of everyone deserving a safe clean accommodation, we would want to have minimum agreed standards for crash pads so they don't become uninhabitable.

it would have to be clean facilitys , and it should be open to anyone rough sleeping

The additional provision like the Crash Pad should be away from the Dawn Centre, as many people already view the Dawn Centre rather negatively.

Yes but the above only happens if you have a duty to them. And if You have space. So no will not work. Lack of accommodation is the main issue.

Referrals via the council and other agencies are due to be largely online so those vulnerable people who have no recourse to internet services will be left unaided and essentially blocked form the system that pretends to be accessible

Proposal 6: Singles accommodation.

Proposal: increase the range of housing solutions –

‘Crash Pad’ accommodation

Temporary solutions (high support)

Different models of settled solutions with a range of support

Reduce repeat homelessness by providing more settled choices and options. Move from offering temporary solutions to offering settled solutions by increasing the

number of settled solutions available to relieve homelessness.

Terms used, such as, 'more choices/options – different models – increase the range of housing solutions '. This infers that such accommodation is available in Leicester. Reading the Homelessness Review 2017, the inference is very different:

2.27 The availability of suitable and affordable PRS in Leicester has become a growing issue..... Other local authorities may also look to rent properties here..... especially London

2.51

- need for more affordable housing
- increasingly difficult for people receiving benefits to access private rented accommodation. Impact of welfare changes – Universal Credit
- increased demand for social housing..... fewer lettings..... waiting times are increasing.

To enable quick 'move on 'from temporary accommodation into suitable settled accommodation requires the available provision of suitable housing. At present this is not available and individuals are remaining in temporary accommodation for too long. This invariably results in 'bed blocking'.

Housing allocation needs to be reviewed. At point of referral the inference has to be that individuals are eligible to progress a registered Housing Application. The 'bidding process 'should commence immediately as the current waiting times for a 1 bedded property is approximately 5 months. Once under offer the onus has to be on providing the relevant information/proofs. All of those in temporary accommodation should progress their housing through 'auto bidding '.

Reduce institutionalisation.

The only way to reduce institutionalisation is to provide settled accommodation as quickly as possible and to reduce the need for staying in long-term Hostel provision. I'm afraid such accommodation only reinforces institutionalisation. Average length of stay in such temporary accommodation of 5 months only reinforces this. Invariably most service users (singles) who access such temporary bed space provision have been 'cared for ', for most of their lives. This may be through foster placements, youth offending, prison and numerous hostel placements (interspersed with prison sentences).

Embrace the ethos of the Homelessness Reduction Act and the need for personalised housing plans.

Such personalised housing plans should be realistic, taking account of local housing markets and the availability of relevant support services, as well as the applicant's individual needs and wishes. Who will have the necessary skills/knowledge and resources to be able to complete such numerous and potentially time-consuming

personal housing plans – how will these be reviewed and by who?
Again is 89 units enough? I dont think we should work with private landlords over this, this should come from council housing as this can be subsidised.
Cheaper/more affordable temporary accommodation is required. There is a struggle to work of repayment of former tenants arrears when residents are paying high current rents.
Non- catered projects.
Smaller supported accommodation providing intensive support.
Places should be available to anyone not just for certain people with specific criteria
If you can't prove that you are from the local area you cannot get anywhere, these services should be accessed by all
Should be wider and not just Dawn Centre
Crash pad to be provided by charities
Places should be available to anybody who need it, not just for certain people with specific criteria
To engage with vulnerable people you nee people who can show empathy and build relationships. This cannot be supported if staff are being permanently rotated .
We are still putting vulnerable people into empty tenancies without support. Then a late referral comes and STAR and other agencies are expected to resolve the situation.
NASS to accommodation needs a better pathway. Also resources need to be put into CSG team to help them deal with the demand.
Are we taking furniture from voids to re use? When I rang to donate furniture there was a 2 week wait so contacted another charity who took it within days.
Needs to be more places. Not enough help centre project helped me outreach are good
The proposals to have an increased range of temporary and settled solutions for single people and childless couples is welcomed.
Action Homeless fully support the proposals to re-configure accommodation for single people in the City. There are two aspects we would welcome being taken into account.
Previously, support to the most vulnerable and entrenched homeless people has been time limited. It should be recognised that the principles of Housing First need to be adhered to in terms of support being flexible and available as long as it needed. In addition, the principles of Housing First mean that receiving support is not a condition of receiving housing
There should also be regard to developing a range of housing options that included shared and self-contained housing.
Action Homeless would very much like to work with the Authority to develop new models of accommodation, including adopting its' existing units and developing more units through RTB.

Consideration should be given to joint commissioning of services with CCG and Adult Care to look at more specialist services that focus on supporting those with the most complex needs.

Building flats is a good solution. But it's important to help the service users to keep their property. STAR teaching them to budget so they can keep their roof over their head.

Response from Y Support service users:

For the council to work with partners (external too) who already offer tailored support to individuals

Both the strategy and this proposal suggest that Leicester City Council has no responsibilities to those that have no recourse to public funds. Whilst this is the case in so far as the Housing Act 1996 is concerned, there is of course other legislation (e.g. care Act 2014, Children's Act 1989, Human Rights Act 1998) which can require local authorities to undertake assessments which may, in certain circumstances, lead to the necessary provision of accommodation and subsistence support. Other local authorities (such as Nottingham and Islington) have taken a council wide approach to this matter (putting protocols in place etc) to ensure that appropriate support is given. Such support can include repatriation payments and does not necessarily require the provision of accommodation.

Whilst we are supportive of the range of accommodation options for singles and couples and are, in principle, supportive of the developments of settled housing options for singles who are at risk of homelessness, we would caution that crime and disorder considerations should be fully thought through (in partnership with the Police) before firm decisions are made regarding significant developments. We would urge that significant clustering is avoided.

We approve of proposal 6 to maintain the current "89 units of temporary accommodation" for single people and tentatively that "Over the life of the strategy increase the range of housing solutions" in addition to this. We would like to raise some concerns however:

- We are unclear about what is meant by "Crash Pad" accommodation? Does this infer a "night-shelter" – if so we do feel that in addition to supported temporary accommodation (which incurs a charge) there is a definite need for casual emergency "night by night" shelter beds to facilitate engagement with "rough sleepers" with aim of promoting positive health and wellbeing. We are excited about the potential for intensive and flexible support being offered at this stage which may eventually lead to access to more secure accommodation and engagement with longer term support services. We agree that there is a need for additional singles accommodation as beds at the Dawn Centre & Mayfield are always full, as are non-commissioned beds elsewhere (Heathfield, CoG etc) and there are still dozens of rough sleepers without accommodation who are reliant on faith-based charity organisations to provide emergency respite beds over the winter months.

- "Moving on from offering temporary to settled solutions by increasing the number of settled solutions available to relieve homelessness" – we are not clear as to what this exactly means and so find it difficult to comment. If this refers to offering people who are homeless tenancies – we would like clarity about what kind of tenancies these will

be? If people are placed directly into tenancies they will be ineligible to access specialist health services for homeless people. From years of working as part of the Frontline MDT we know that this group of people largely consists of people with multiple & complex needs. These people are often not diagnosed and their lives are often too “chaotic” to access mainstream health services to address their needs (or don’t meet access criteria), so access to the kind of flexible assertive service that the HMHS (or Inclusion Healthcare?) offers is crucial. We would also like to know how Housing Options staff acquire suitable health assessment skills to determine whether people are suitable to place directly in ‘settled accommodation’? (Without a period of time in temporary accommodation). People with Serious Mental illness (Psychosis, Bipolar disorder) can be mistrustful of services and will often avoid disclosure of mental illness / symptoms in non-specialist settings for fear of repercussions, we fear that there is a danger that these people and their needs will be missed if placed directly in secure tenancies.

Proposal 6 Views on how the council could develop more settled accommodation:

When travelling around the city I see many empty properties which with a little work could be brought back up to a suitable standard for habitation. I feel if these properties could be acquired you could use them as family homes or HMO's and reduce the number of homeless people to almost zero. I realised VAT has to be paid on these properties and builders prefer to build new houses that are zero VAT rated, but there must be some way that these properties can be used so they do not become derelict or vandalised - a prime example is the vicarage on St. Peter's Road which by my estimation has been empty for at least 10 years and is just now being renovated.

I know you cant but build some.

1. Contract out all these services

2 Voluntary sector and health professionals and adult services work together to supply services in places and ways that engage with beneficiaries. If those who are currently housed but vulnerable engage and are better supported they are less likely to lose their accommodation and those in hostels etc are more likely to maintain their accommodation

3 A greater diversity of accommodation ie Emmaus type working communities, wet house, a year round emergency shelter for short term stays- the quicker people are off the street the less their decline and the easier the return to society if they have basic educational and social skills if not a long programme of appropriate support is needed

5 Trained volunteers on a one to one support basis would give single people a better opportunity to maintain settled accommodation

6 In the USA there have been successes in rolling out clusters of pre- manufactured housing units for 20/ 30 individual residents creating a largely self supported community. It is low cost, radical and effective. If we keep doing much the same through much the same organisations why do we expect different outcomes- just look at the rough sleeping counts over the last 10 years and it shows the need for radical change in the way things are done, by whom and where. I know this will be hard to swallow and perhaps be considered unacceptable. There are some very good

services but we need to look in the mirror and say why hasn't it worked.

The focus needs to be around engagement. I would make that the key word for this strategy and work to offer hope, develop wellbeing and create opportunity. This will enable people to be more settled and maintain their accommodation

make a comfortable environment so they feel safe.

Yehh' Not All Single People are Under 35.. Or are they Students.

So Allocate some of the Student

Accommodation.. For them

As in my earlier point, why not say all student accommodation buildings above 30 flats must have at least 1 for use by the council for homeless, if it is used by young people they will be with people of a similar age. You may find it more beneficial for a 2 flats in each building to be used so they have at least 1 person in similar situation to them. Large providers of student accommodations should be expected to give up 1 room per X number they rent out.

if council could have a program to support private owners/developers to build such crash pods...

Ensure services are available to ensure communication can be made i.e. telephone and access to internet as well as libraries, leisure centres, social activities, volunteering, ways to help community / others, guidance to work etc. encourage friendships / family

The crash pad should not be run by the council and should instead be run by volunteers or charities.

as above

Charities and volunteers should open churches. Crash pads should be given and opened in other places aside from the dawn centre.

build more social housing

taking over more propertys empty houses

Provide environments that foster ownership and support individuals holistically and offer a reason to live.

No. Think the proposal covers some good options providing it is resourced fully e.g. Housing First.

build more accomodation and more support for people who are going to be living alone for the first time

Offer long term supported housing do service users are not set up to fail

Provide face to face help as opposed to hardlining and going online

get support from centre project to help them maintain the flats

Prioritise and ensure that the Dawn Centre is an assessment centre (as it was always intended to be).

Sufficient and suitable accommodation then needs to be found to ensure 'fluidity' to ensure ongoing bed space vacancies

Provide more affordable accommodation for single people. Incentivise the private rented sector to accommodate single people.

Investigate training and work opportunities for single people.

Where accommodation is sourced, tailor support to ensure it is sustainable.
I understand the focus on single people but couples can be in a worse position if they are a poor influence on each other. What if one wants support and the other doesn't? It's important to help people as people
The desire to work with all agencies must be genuine and must be carried through.
Increased provision should be away from the Dawn Centre. It is not safe and most people will not access it.
The increased provision should be away from the Dawn Centre
Increase provision away from the Dawn Centre
Increase provision away from Dawn Centre
The University seems to have a great deal of cash-what about some joint community funding.
I feel not enough services
The private rented sector provides a large and growing supply of accommodation which could be accessed. Could the Council (or a related organisation) facilitate this by leasing such properties on a long term basis? SHARP's experience is that disrepair is becoming an increasing problem in the private rented sector so any arrangement must ensure that the quality of accommodation is good and is maintained as such. The Council needs the resources to be able to do this. Also relevant here are the recent changes to housing benefits and the roll out of Universal Credit in the City in coming months. This has implications in respect of the private rented sector and would need to be managed as best as possible.
A reconfiguration of existing homeless accommodation to support the Housing First services, this includes that owned by social landlords and is currently being disposed of.
Tackling of empty properties in particular large houses that are often operating as un-registered HMO.
Looking at innovative schemes like containers and flat pack.
Using RTB schemes to acquire more existing stock and converting into use for homeless people.
More flats, even splitting current houses into flats.
Response from Y Support service users:  Closing hostels has proven to be a mistake, they could have been used for more specialist type of care i.e. preparing service users for their own accommodation, more ongoing work in the hostels, more available work like activities, there is a need for setting up bank accounts, obtaining IDs, help with proper debt advice and budgeting  - This is already being done in some services who work with other partners - like at the Y Support project by support workers and the mental health access worker

Proposal 7 Comments:

We have tried to refer into floating support and informed that there is a waiting list. For us the need is essential.

<p>A review would be great but we need to recognise that the removal of lower level support services could lead to the Council spending more on more intensive support. The impact of any change has to be considered across the Council</p>
<p>I thought STAR was already undertaking this role.</p>
<p>said yes but not sure I fully understand. Is there a reason the commissioned services were not being utilised eg lack of knowledge, need there but referrals not being made.</p>
<p>75 units of floating support services (primarily available for private sector tenants). The current contract has not been fully utilised - which indicates it has been used - what impact analysis has been done if this is withdrawn - could it not be a scaled reduction reviewed over a longer period to assess impact.</p>
<p>We think it would be helpful to define what housing related support would be available to an individual in each of the above scenarios - defining the offer is a good idea it sets out intent - informs the public of entitlement and holds services to account. It also protects services from being held to account for things they are not able to deliver so works both ways</p>
<p>The Bridge Homelessness to Hope welcomes this and has been advocating it for over 5 years. They would welcome the opportunity to be part of this planning. Mentoring can achieve fantastic results, as we can demonstrate, when offered to people who have aspiration but who aren't seeking some form of support worker.</p>
<p>the level of need how can it be under-utilised. people do not know where to get it. let day centres like the centre project do it. since people can get to it easily.</p>
<p>Just more of the Same.. Bull</p>
<p>The council is cutting so much preventative work throughout the council services like social care there won't be any preventative services to use.</p>
<p>Current floating support: People don't know about it.</p>
<p>Current providers are not known by the general public and so should be put in a position where they are more widely known. This would then make sure they are more aware and then these services can be provided.</p>
<p>who is doing the work now , others are already doing the work like centre project who are already doing this work and not being paid for this .</p>
<p>More organisations should be made available in order to be seen quickly as someone with an issue does not want to wait to be seen if they want to have their issue resolved as quickly as possible.</p>
<p>it should not be time bounded on individual need , some adapt quick others don't it shouldn't be time bounded</p>
<p>I believe the funding STAR receive over £1m could be better used ACROSS the tenure particularly focusing on private rented accommodation as STAR work with those in social housing the MOST secure... how fair and equal is that to all tenants? its not.....I suggest you disband STAR, get housing officers to expand their role to carry out the work STAR do as they should 'know' their tenants and re envision the support focussing on the private sector.</p>
<p>We think Floating support services are needed and provided a great service however, we don't support reduction in units as we feel that the under-utilisation may be due to factors not yet fully understood including the need for people to build trust with a prospective worker which can take a significant amount of time in our experience and the number of young people particularly who fail their tenancy within the first year and haven't engaged with current FSS.</p>

Agree - Prevent, Transition, Sustain - STAR & Family Support Service have been doing this since 2001.

The whole reason the Family Support Team was put in place was to prevent re-occurring homelessness by building on existing life skills and helping sustain tenancies - you all say there is no reoccurring homelessness - so if it isn't broken don't fix it.

Floating support is needed - face to face consistent support is the way forward. Help people to help themselves, help the most vulnerable people sustain tenancies - ultimately this will save money and lives.

i think you should keep the 94 units , there should be more places where support needs can be met like the centre project where you can access without an appointment

Floating support should be available at the point of need and readily accessible. Some of the day centre clients get support to sustain their tenancies by getting ongoing support to deal with issues such as repairs, rent, utilities, without the need to make appointments. Day services are more responsive to client needs than floating support services that have to fit someone in when the appointments are available.

You are trying to gloss over what Star actually do.

This is a service which is dedicated in supporting vulnerable clients with face to face support.

Is this something that will definitely be offered by another service and can you guarantee on-going face to face support for the most complex vulnerable cases?

We look after council tenants- in order to access help from other agencies - you need to be privately rented - how many of those cases got past the gate keeping approach endorsed in order to limit the help public receive in the end to prevent homelessness ??

Swift referrals form single access and referral services can make the key difference in preventing someone from sleeping on the streets.

Housing related support is an important aspect of homelessness prevention and wellbeing and should be given a strong backing from the council. If pursued properly and with the right resources, it can also maintain and improve health and wellbeing. It is essential that more attention is paid to preventing health problems arising from damp accommodation and to ensuring that private landlords are forced to pay attention to their duty to provide for the safety and wellbeing of their tenants. Accommodation should be a home, not an unhealthy, unsafe trap. It is a crying shame that the Private Member's Bill introduced to address these issues properly did not make it through Parliament and included opposition from Labour MPs. Leicester must make the difference here! Housing related support must be part of that.

letters and advice can be obtained from the centre project

I like the idea of coaching aka counselling to keep people off the streets. I think this is the best proposal.

We welcome this and would be interested in working in partnership as all people who are at risk of homelessness or have recently experienced homelessness would benefit from a service to address specific questions or concerns and to build

resilience.

Access to continuing support from a trusted mentor at times of transition and stress or on a regular befriending basis can make a big difference between sustaining a tenancy or becoming repeatedly homeless, or survival and thriving on the one hand and despair and defeat on the other. It is important to determine the best circumstances and conditions for providing this kind of support – the terms of engagement, the location and the regularity.

In house floating support services already provide coaching/mentoring type support within their own wrap around/holistic approach. They work through all three main situations.

The new trailblazer scheme would be useful to the private sector as support provided is shorter term.

If the coaching/mentoring scheme is aiming to be used at the Prevent stage - how are the cases identified - usually people only present when things are failing or when in crisis? It is likely difficult to coach/mentor someone who is at crisis point.

Dependent on the review outcome

This is a very simplistic way of looking at support and inline with providing an advise app! and shows complete lack of understanding of the human cost of homelessness. STAR already provide individual support plans through assessments and with the service user agreement. To put support in tick boxes is to say everyone's experience of homelessness is similar and derogatory to STAR workers.. If what support is provided is unclear then no effort has been made by the individual to understand what support is required by someone who is vulnerable and their vulnerability. To "coach" someone to make a call to their Landlord for repairs also has to accept that the service user must be able to challenge and complain when a repair is not completed. Empowering is not through coaching but through confidence building from a positive place in an individuals life.

Nobody knows about it and it should be more accessible for people 24/7 and not just by appointment such as the centre project who provides support

No one knows how to access the service. People moving on to new homes come to places like the centre project does most of the work. because it is easy to access via drop-in. It meets the need of the clients when they want support, not when the service is ready to support them.

Floating support should be accessible, like the centre project

Why under-utilisation?

Services are provided by other groups like Centre Project and Y Support. Give more money to day services

As long as the review and analysis does not result in a reduction of funding. Places like the centre project need more funding to stay open longer. A lot of the Centre Project user do not feel safe anywhere else and are most vulnerable

Nobody know how to access the service. Most of them work is currently done by the Centre Project itself

Nobody knows how to access these services. Centre Project clients say they won't go into places like libraries etc. Centre Project signposts clients to these services.

Centre project service users do not know about these things. A strategy on how to

best advertise would be good. The centre project does much of this type of work

The SAR is a bottle neck. It is under resourced and will only ensure delays in allocating support. Ask P3 who are adamant that the reason they are under utilised is HOC.

Any provision which goes through SAR is starved of referrals. There is little transparency and even as part of the council it is extremely difficult to contact and find out information.

#### Coaching and Mentoring

I am disappointed that after managing the STAR service for 17 years no one has bothered to ask about how we coach and mentor. We have a wealth of experience including the boost project, pre tenancy training, service user involvement.

It to be reinventing the wheel and not benefitting from the experience and knowledge within the sector. I can only presume that coaching and mentoring is anticipated as cheap version of support.

There are no shortcuts and a more joined up approach to problem solving would be much more useful

I needed support never heard of them got support centre project

The floating support should be more accessible at places like the Centre Project which I go to. I get support when I need it.

If the current 94 units of housing-related floating support are not fully utilised then it is important first to understand why they are being under utilised. The need seems to be there so are the referral mechanisms working effectively? It would make sense therefore to review first and then based on evidence gathered make any reductions. It should also be noted that it is often easier to provide the support necessary if you are not the landlord.

We support the shift in emphasise of floating support. However, for those with long-term support needs there needs to be on-going support that focuses on health and well-being, as well as tenancy sustainment. Again as outlined in the principles of Housing First, some tenants will need on-going support.

The other key service missing from the current homeless pathway is effective resettlement support. Currently we are experiencing a gap between those leaving supported accommodation and moving to their own tenancy. Our clients highlighted this issue in their feedback.

STAR Floating support services cover all of the 3 scenarios. Personal contact is important as not many people like using the phone. STAR will even go into people's houses and this often reveals underlying issues that need attention beforehand. This service can never be done over the phone and the council will suffer the consequences.

Response from Y Support service users:

- Where does the council think the extra help will be coming from?

- Floating support needs to be more flexible - not just a card / letter through your door then they close your case

- Floating support need to be able to carry on supporting people until people are confident enough to manage on their own - they should be part of this decision making process, not just be 'closed'

We would not support proposal 7 to “reduce the number of 94 commissioned units of floating support to 75” for the following reasons:

- If LCC are aiming as a larger goal “to prevent homelessness & repeat presentations” then we think that floating support for individuals should be increased rather than reduced? Especially as LCC predicts that the majority of homeless people will in future be placed in private rental accommodation.
- We would also like to see floating support accessible for longer than the current 4 months if there are complex and longstanding needs, and if it has been a significant length of time since the individual managed their own tenancy.
- We would however commend LCC for re-adopting the “coaching/mentoring service for individuals to prevent homelessness” as the pre-tenancy training previously delivered by the LCC STAR teams in the past as part of preparation for new tenancies, proved in our experience to be a very useful & effective initiative in maintaining tenancies.

#### Proposal 8 Comments:

My response would be the same as for proposal 7.

I assumed duplication had been reduced as a result of the last Review and Strategy. Why is it still there?

I have said yes to this in the hope that this will help to reduce the number of people on the streets of Leicester. I realise this is probably as a result of government benefit changes and the council is left picking up the pieces, but I don't want to live in a city where people are sitting on the streets with a wheelie suitcase looking like they are freezing. I want to help and don't know what to do.

Long as this does not mean a reduction in service.

Sounds a good idea but why are the outreach services not available 24/7. Rough sleepers need support to be accessible

Not really sure about this - whatever is available is clearly not working there are a high number of rough sleepers in the city centre which as a person walking through town appears to have increased significantly over the last 5 years. What's the evidence base for the proposal and changes - is it working in others areas similar?

Again as previously stated, ensure that there is an out of working hours support service.

it is important to keep an outreach team .

There needs to be year round Emergency Shelters. There needs to be specialist provision for people who are excluded and a new attitude that an exclusion is a failure by the provider. The provider should only accept people it feels competent to deal with and then if an exclusion follows they need to view it from where did we go wrong. Did we work within pie principles? For those no one feels able to accommodate then new specialist facilities need providing, housing first (like anything else isn't the answer to everything- nothing is )

<p>The information provided suggests that all is happening is a service analysis review. I agree with this but is it necessary to consult on this? There is no information on what will be different so cannot express support or opposition.</p>
<p>Same bull..</p>
<p>It sounds good but probably means cuts which are not reasonable or moving the problem so it is less obvious.</p>
<p>Yes, as long as its a better service.</p>
<p>As long as they work together correctly</p>
<p>Bring teams together to help the situations and deal with the problems.</p>
<p>work better together more ideas to eliminate homelessness</p>
<p>about time.</p>
<p>The outreach team and revolving door services offer specialist support to a very difficult client group, I do not feel the more 'general needs' providers could do as good a job, These services have been cut in the past and the reinstated. Leave that service as it is or the talent and skill will be lost.</p>
<p>having worked in homeless services since 2006 I am well aware of the roles of both the outreach team and revolving door service. and work closely with them, in my opinion their roles are very different and the support that they provide for homeless people is very different although obviously linked in some ways.</p>
<p>I feel it is of course a good thing that all services work closely together but I feel that an amalgamation of these two services would not be in the interests of homeless people in Leicester.</p>
<p>Understand and agree with amalgamation of teams and development of an assertive outreach approach but would want this to be more visible and obviously focussed on street homeless hotspots.</p>
<p>I have idea..</p>
<p>Outreach needs a van.. This could be parked in the same locations across the city, at different times days etc. Rough Sleepers would know where to be at what time to receive support and sign posting - they could hop on board the back of the van for a confidential chat, fill out paperwork, get a cup of tea. This would be better then dealing with people on the street - would look more professional and have some co-ordination.</p>
<p>so there are more people looking after the rough sleepers</p>
<p>Rough sleepers need a bed. Once on a bed services can be put in place. But need th secure a bed space first. If there were beds why are so many on the streets? As from reading all the above proposals the main issue that I see is no duty no help, but the councils get out clause is support and assist. Just words!</p>
<p>Details on "transition " proposal ??</p>
<p>What are the realities of a new transition service ?</p>
<p>Again it sound like you are just trying to save money by cutting jobs and squeezing services to the inch of their lives.</p>
<p>Please ensure that the expertise acquired in the field is not lost to a cost-cutting approach. I know people who have slept rough, who have used drug and alcohol services and it is widely attested by former service users that certain of the low-cost, private options provided to replace effective drug and alcohol support services have</p>

<p>been much less effective. We don't want support services for rough sleepers to go the same way.</p>
<p>I agree that resources should be maximised and not duplicate support, however, the skill sets required between the two teams are different.</p> <p>Outreach support on the streets to move off the streets.</p> <p>Revolving Door supports once they have come off the streets, they will stay with that service user through their whole journey from temp accommodation, back on the streets if evicted, back into temp accommodation and into a tenancy and remain with them until the risk of losing that tenancy has been minimised.</p> <p>Support in temporary accommodation usually is minimised as the support is managed by Revolving Door as is housing options. Revolving Door involvement will likely increase with housing options once the personal housing plans are implemented.</p>
<p>So long as this is not another cost cutting exercise</p>
<p>Agencies should work together as long as they provide a better service</p>
<p>No information given about the timescale of the review; agree that need to ensure there is little or no duplication; one service may be advantageous although would be concerned if overall resources reduced ; close collaboration with CCG important in this area.</p>
<p>Agencies should work together &amp; share information regarding rough sleeping</p>
<p>I thought they were 2 fundamentally different teams with different remits and expertise.</p> <p>It would be a great loss of knowledge and expertise if this became a watered down version of both</p>
<p>Combining the Outreach and Revolving Door teams would seem to make sense bringing about greater co-ordination and a streamlining of the service with potential cost savings. Developing a good personal relationship with rough sleepers is crucial and needs to be a key component of any new working arrangements.</p>
<p>We agree that their needs to be a complete reconfiguration of the approach we take to supporting the most vulnerable and chaotic individuals who are stuck in a cycle of homelessness.</p> <p>Consideration should be given to looking at linking up dynamic psychological interventions with other health partners. We would also support a more assertive approach to tackle those who engage in behaviours that put themselves and others at risk.</p>
<p>The support provided by Revolving door is personal and help the service users to be safe. These supports can never be offered from an office. And the service users will be left to manage their chaotic life which is impossible. The council will be making a mistake cancelling this type of personal services.</p>
<p>Response from Y Support service users:</p> <p>- It is felt the real problem of rough sleeping and 'sofa surfing' is yet to be realised as the chaotic lifestyles that these people lead makes it very difficult to know how many are to be helped or indeed found and information / help is to be got to them</p>

- this sounds like a return to outreach and resettlement

- need for consistency

- people need to be given time to work with support

We support this proposal and feel that this should be urgently addressed.

We do not support the proposal to “Bring together the Revolving Door Service and Street Outreach teams & move towards a transitions service” and we are not clear what the rationale for it is. Our concerns are outlined below:

- We do not consider there to be a “duplication of services” as each team provides much needed unique services. The teams have distinct skill sets and differing remits, and both are effective and essential members of the MDT approach to tackling homelessness in Leicester.
- We were pleased that the Outreach team were able to expand earlier this year and extend their working hours; however, they are still a small team and this offers the advantage of being ‘known’ easily by those rough sleeping’. The ‘Transitions service’ could look markedly larger and rough sleepers would then be less able to get to know those doing outreach work. Experience of working alongside the outreach team has shown that being known to rough sleepers and staff being ‘consistent features’ in the lives of rough sleepers is crucial to successful outcomes for the team. Rough sleepers need to be able to ‘attach’ relationally to one or two members of staff who ‘don’t give up’, who keep on offering support until the time is right for it to be taken up. This model of working will be undermined by the staffing of the outreach team changing frequently or expanding substantially. A very ‘close knit’ Outreach team is also essential to risk management for the street work they do.
- We consider it to be essential that the Team Leaders of the RD and Outreach team also contribute to the case work of the team. The current Team Leaders have excelled at this and set an example to us all in how to contain and manage a team whilst at the same time working alongside them. We feel that this element of the work would also be undermined if the teams were merged together in a ‘Transitions service’ because a single manager would not be able to offer RD case work as well as undertaking outreach during unsocial hours.
- If there was any expectation for members of the RD and Outreach team to work rotating shift patterns in order to engage in both kinds of work (RD case work and O/R street work), this could have a huge detrimental effect on the health and wellbeing of staff.
- The proposals are unclear as to what exactly is meant by “Transitions service”? More explanation is required in order to fully comprehend and comment on the vision offered?

Proposal 9 Comments:

These services should have been addressed during the previous review.

For example, we plan to offer tailored structured support (i.e. individualised action plans) for rough sleepers engaging with the Outreach / Revolving door teams

('Transitions' service).

what about those who for a million complex reasons do not engage - a service offer is always an offer we need to move away from an or else philosophy there is already too much of an implied threat in terms of policies. - the service needs to retain flexibility to be responsive in ways that people want to engage.

The Bridge Homelessness to Hope doesn't suffer the unfair, in my view, stigma attached to The Dawn Centre and so to YASC. It is also viewed as at least unbiased or, by some as a trusted friend. It can potentially offer a pathway, in partnerships, to those who don't traditionally engage with current services and can build slowly through trust into engagement and onto hope, wellbeing and engagement by joined up partnership service working.

Nothing to oppose or support here. Seems as though things will continue as they are now until a review has been carried out.

do not just 'part fund', fund the service fully in order to meet the needs of individuals properly. Expand opening times as there is nothing open on a Monday.

only aware of the centre project that is open in the day and is open to all.

people get all types of support, more like floating support, when they need it.

None

Stop looking for cuts. Look at the real problems here. These are human beings treated as less than human. If you look to do it properly fine but don't seek justification to hide the issue.

As long as the review and analyses does not result in a reduced funding.

The centre project should be opened more than three days a week and then they can therefore they are more occupied during the week. If the Centre Project is not currently available, all of the service users would be isolated and be left to their own devices. Therefore they would not be able to socialise with others and would be isolated.

More funding for places to be open longer in the week such as the Centre Project and reviewing should occur as long as they don't stop the funding due to poor reviews.

the centre project gives me a place to go to , to get out of my flat , getting help when i need it , like with my finances , calling doctors , speaking to the on site nurse assisting with getting the correct benefits , when im feeling low and need someone to talk to , otherwise i would be in the pub , theres no where else for me to go in the day and i would end up spending alot more money its financially better for me to go to the centre project.

Day centres such as the centre project should continue to be funded in order to stay open. More funding should be made available so the centre project can be open more days in the week.

the centre project helps to build my confidence , helps with CV how to get a job form filling , i can access this service without an appointment there's no place like this which i can access locally where i feel safe and i can also see a nurse Councillor and pastor service this all helps with my mental health which help me maintain my accommodation

would be difficult for me to function without centre project due to my mental health , mood swings varies listening , give advice guidance with opening up with talking to staff they help me to help myself its about bettering themselves they give me the confidence to help my self. for my personal need I find I use the centre project for the

above I would feel intimidated not very welcoming I think to keep that separate from centre as the only thing we don't get at centre is a shower. I think centre should get more from the council to continue the good work of helping others to better themselves it is very inviting warm and trusting.

Yes as our Day Centre already provides much of this and has done for several years now.

i feel you should give the centre project more money to continue them to do a good job , i get support from nas and centre project for my support needs i do not access the yasc as i have never needed to

Hopefully, the proposed reviews are not just another way of reducing the already minimal funding provided to the Day Centres. The day centres already provide person-centred

support helping individuals undertake relevant actions to help prevent their homelessness. More investments should be made to the existing centres by using some of the spare capacity in floating support services.

There are many organisations that provide support a but manly in the evenings. It is only the Centre Project that is open throughout the day, where anyone can drop-in for tailored support as well as help to reduce isolation.

Many Centre Project clients do not access other services like the Bridge or YASC and are able to access the holistic service provided by the Centre Project.

The Centre Project already does more than its commissioned to deliver and can do more with additional investment.

All I see is that you are looking at more cuts due to charity's assisting they are assisting due to the past cuts and a need for assistance.

You "plan to offer".

So no guarantees then ?

the council send you to the centre project for help support aand advice without the centre alot of people will stuggle and more going to the coucil they would have to stay in there flats and be isolated people will get in a rut staying in benefits will be disrupted housing accom could be lost

But far too many of these services rely on donations!! They need to be further subsidised by the council.

We wonder if appropriate and engaging provision is available for all age ranges. We know that non-custodial parents, for us often young fathers, struggle to find a place to take their children when they see them. In addition, the activities that our client group would like are not available, including a gym, games, and other exercise options.

Day services are needed especially for Outreach/Revolving Door - both teams currently have no interview space to be able to have private/confidential contact with their service users. They often have to provide support one the streets.

Increased access/availability for those teams would be beneficial.

More joined up working with the non-commissioned sector needs to be undertaken.

As long as the review that has taken place does not result in reduced funding and instead may require more funding in order to be open more days in the week (such as the centre project)

Continue funding - actually increase funding to day services to provide more services. Places like the Centre Project is the only one open during the day. Other providers like the Bridge are only open in the evening, places like Open Hands are providing services that need referrals. keep the Centre Project and enable it to open for longer. No provision on Monday.

As long as the audit reduce funding with these organisations

Keep them open. People would be happier if they opened for longer. They prevent isolation. Vulnerable people cannot go to Dawn Centre. The Centre Project is only place open during the day. You can get any support needed. not appointments needed.

As long as the review that takes places do not result in reduced funding and may require more funding, so that places like the centre project can open longer

Day services are different to other homelessness providers. Many services are only open in the evening and cannot be considered day services. people need somewhere to go during the day

Continue funding Centre Project as they are the only service open during the day. Increase funding to support the work done by the centre project.

Continue and increase funding. The centre project is day service whereas others only operate in the early morning or evening

Need to keep funding to centres and increase funding so more work can be done I've had lots help centre project as other users have had to

Keep the day centres different. Not all people are the same. The centre project is accessible and open to all. Can do more floating support work to prevent homelessness

YASC and the Centre Project provide good services and their continued support is therefore welcomed. Public resources are very tight so there is logic in carrying out a wider analysis of all day services for homeless people to ensure that budgets are being used effectively.

We support the continued funding of day services, however we think there should be review of service to ensure that there are clear aims and objectives for these services and that they do not continue. To support and enable individuals to maintains their chaotic street sleeping or street activity.

It's important to give this group of service users a personal touch as most of the time the feel left out. They need services that go to them as they will only going to service at the last minute or sometimes too late. Hence why services like Revolving door are very important.

Response from Y Support service users:

- It seems once again that the powers that be are over relying on the volunteer sector. This though is fine as long as grants / funding is made available to them

- Recognise the work done by the Y Support project, already providing tailored, structured support

- Council need to work better with partners

We are pleased to see that day centres services are being reviewed in light of wider homelessness services. it is our understanding that day centres are something that developed when the available temporary accommodation tended to be in the form of "night shelters" which naturally required an equal and opposite "day centre". Now that

temporary accommodation has been much improved, it seems right to review this.

We would support the general proposal to continue existing funding of day centres for the following reasons;

- The HMHS is pleased to see that with retaining the accommodation, day centre and health functions of the Dawn Centre, the multi-agency one stop shop (including weekly MDT meetings) can continue. Without the one-stop shop our access to homeless people who are struggling with their mental health is severely restricted. This is partly because of the mutual risk management procedures that we and our partner agencies have put in place over the years to keep each other safe. Whilst we do work in other settings outside the DC, these risk management procedures are not available elsewhere (eg at The Bridge or other hostels and homeless services) which means that extra precautions have to be put in place which draw heavily on the resources of our small team. The close collaborative working that comes with Leicester's multi-agency approach is nationally recognised and continues to be a 'stand out experience' to those visitors that we have hosted from homeless services in other areas of the country. We would, however, like to see explicit mention of the multi-agency one stop shop in the strategy as it is notable by its absence.

- We are concerned that there seem to be more and more frequent exclusions from the one stop shop via 'building bans'; this undermines the one stop shop because people who have a ban relating to one area affects access to other services. It could also end up affecting 'footfall' to the Y Support, IHC and HMHS. In these circumstances there is need for further exploration of alternative & effective measures that can be put in place including approaches to relational rupture repair and reconciliation.

Other considerations comments:

I believe homelessness will increase post-Brexit when interest rates, inflation, food and property/rent prices will increase.

I think there will be a greater need for food banks and social / council housing. Are you able to prepare for that now by increasing the amount of property to which you have access?

Long as any responses come with action, rather than just static monitoring that does not result in a change or newly commissioned services that will respond to demand.

I feel it is important that the issue of homelessness does not become some form of lottery. Where people see that they can get better treated by one council as opposed to another. This would obviously put a strain on resources whilst other councils would see a percentage of their homeless problem walk away !!

can we have a service which can change quicker in terms of demand - so for example respond to seasonal variations increasing and contracting a more 'live time' response - it all seems a bit big picture

It is important to monitor these services. With brexit people will be worse off financially

Jobs may move abroad this will lead to more homelessness

Prevention is economically viable. However if numbers are set to increase by 12% it would make sense to reduce the number of rough-sleeping homeless prior to any

g.estimated increase in homelessness.

Street surveys counted by support services one day do not account for the real magnitude of homelessness the day before or the day after. They can only count the number of visible homeless people at that time - numbers that fluctuate on a daily basis.

There needs to be some in depth local research into the impact of NPS on the increase in homelessness. I have lived in and around Leicester for 20 years and have seen a much more visible and growing homeless population over the past three years. Whilst it is obvious that austerity has a huge role in this I also believe that the impact of NPS (as opposed to other traditionally available drugs such as cannabis, heroin / crack etc) is having a devastating impact on already vulnerable people. Until we as a society can get a grip on the rise of NPS (not helped by the blanket ban and passing another source of income into the hands of the black market) the situation will get worse.

You are a Publicly Elected Body..So

Treat All your People.. With Honesty

and Respect they Deserve..Not just your Politically strategically Chosen

Members of your New inner city..

Asylum's & Refuges'

Look at why there is an increase in homelessness. Get the true message of the austerity being faced by the poor in our city. Do a freedom of information on what the differences are between how people were classified as unemployed in pre Thatcher times to now. Look at the homeless issues pre Thatcher and now and how many food banks now exist to then. Look at social housing stock differences, look at the real cost of living and real wages the poor are earning, excluding electrical goods like computers. Cover food, rent, fuel, amenities. Look at what used to be covered in benefits prior to Thatcher. Look at the lack of choices of work available for those with limited academic qualifications. Then be brave enough to publish your findings. Her policies led to the mess we are in now .

It is important to continually monitor the situation and adapt provision accordingly.

they could build other housing in the city to accomodate homeless people.

Favour the bias to prevention.

I suggest you do more to get local landlords on board. You are not doing enough partnership working with DWP/JCP to secure UC housing element to private landlords to secure these payments go where they should and work with the secure to encourage offering accommodation to those on HB/UC housing support

Think it's positive to retain an element of flexibility and the ability to negotiate further provision from key providers as the need arises.

So homelessness is increasing (as above) but there is a need to reduce units because homelessness is reducing (said somewhere is this survey)..

Homelessness will rise and will never go away (unfortunately) especially with the introduction of UC.

<p>There will always be a need for holistic, emotional, pro-active, caring, child focused, qualified, quality services when working with homeless and the most vulnerable - its not all about saving money, its all about saving lives.</p>
<p>Joined up thinking is needed! Put pressure on other departments within the council to stop selling off stock, make properties available, etc, including planning to re-define permissions on disused buildings. Putting pressure on vacant private properties too! It make complete sense to add a mental health and social care needs assessment to Housing Options initial registration and process this information quickly to ensure the support is in place as people start a new tenancy, not months later once they've messed up already.</p>
<p>Mental ill-health and the lack of support for it, is one of the biggest needs / gaps</p>
<p>keep centre project open i have help with:</p> <p>fill in forms if i need to</p> <p>make phone calls if needed</p> <p>print documents if needed (save money)gets you out the house which reduces isolation make new friends</p>
<p>The proposal to end homelessness by 2020 is a noble one but will not be achieved if funding cuts are implemented.</p>
<p>So what you really mean, you know homelessness is going to get worse and you hope more charity's will step in to assist where you are not willing too even though you know it's needed. Cost saving very clever on the back of charity's. More thay step in more you withdraw. They have had to step in for a reason! Care about human beings which obviously the council do not.</p>
<p>give the centre more money and more events to help them to stay open more funding to get more staff to continue its a welcome ing place</p>
<p>Paid work has always been identified as the priority to ensure individuals are not caught in the poverty trap.</p> <p>The Local Authority needs to (as a major employer in the City) be innovative enough to provide paid employment – initially through monitored supervision for those most in need. This opportunity will give individuals both purpose and confidence in preparation for long term employment. With the support of the City Mayor, Leicester can look to improve on its current DCLG ranking of the 21st most deprived local authority (out of 326).</p>
<p>Homelessness is rising because our current government do not care about the poorest people. We need to set an example in Leicester and help these people. Homelessness is an issue any one of us could face. Preventing is important, but working with people to work out how to support them back into normal life is also very important. I know some people refuse help but we need to understand what they need to help them best.</p>
<p>Young people aged 16-25 would benefit from regular access to facilities that provide somewhere to go, something to do and someone to talk to. This is probably true of older adults as well.</p>
<p>Day services is the way to provide more information to meet statutory</p>
<p>The National Homelessness Property Fund (NHPF) managed by Resonance is a social impact property fund. The NHPF purchases properties and then leases them to</p>

homelessness charities who tenant them in partnership with the Council, taking people from the homeless register and moving them in to quality, secure homes on ASTs. The charity (in Leicester this would be NACRO) then provide light touch support to tenants, signposting to existing services as well as utilising their own programmes and expertise to break the cycle of homelessness and allow families to move on with their lives.

Considering Leicester's proactive strategy proposal, the NHPF could be very well placed to provide guaranteed LHA-rate rental homes for the Council as well as making savings by removing the need to supplement (often expensive) TA costs.

Resonance and NACRO would very much welcome the opportunity to be involved in the conversation around future homelessness prevention strategies and perhaps where the NHPF may be able to get involved.

Attached are links to a Q&A session which explain the Fund in a bit more detail as well as this year's social impact report which outlines the positive impact that this Fund is already having for it's tenants in Bristol, Oxford and Milton Keynes.

Q&A Session - <http://www.room151.co.uk/treasury/qa-john-williams-of-resonance-on-their-social-impact-property-fund/>

Social Impact Report 2016/17 - [http://resonance.ltd.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/NHPF\\_Social\\_Impact\\_2017.pdf](http://resonance.ltd.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/NHPF_Social_Impact_2017.pdf)

To discuss further, please get in touch with John Williams - [John.williams@resonance.ltd.uk](mailto:John.williams@resonance.ltd.uk)

No more flim flam on numbers get a real view of the number of hidden homeless who use day centres

The Centre Project needs more funding so they can open longer instead of 3 days a week. All of the user would feel lonely and isolated if they were home alone instead of coming to the centre project which all of them really look forward to

Day services should be prioritised as people need to access services during the day. Many do not want to venture out at night particularly in winter

Day services are vital to prevent homelessness and should have more financial support. Vulnerable people don't like accessing night time services

UC and general harsh welfare reform is anticipated to increase the numbers of homeless people. Digital exclusion will exacerbate this. I think digital inclusion officers with welfare/housing knowledge would be a great preventative/early intervention tool. They could be based at Libraries where there is currently no support

I feel centres need to be funded and kept open

No

SHARP's experience is that homelessness is increasing in the City and the pressure we are under to try and help all those who approach us for help is very considerable. We believe, however, that we have the expertise to help prevent homelessness and as the only VCS organisation specialising in housing advice in Leicester then we are keen to play a key role in homelessness prevention in the future.

SHARP understands the financial pressures which the City Council is facing and that the homelessness service has already had to make significant budget savings over

the last 4 years. Our calculations suggest that this could amount to a 27 % cut. We appreciate there will be an expectation to make further savings but believe that your homelessness strategy should be driven primarily by need and not by financial requirements. We would hope that you would be able to make this case in the Council's budgetary deliberations and any discussions with elected members.

While emphasising the importance of homelessness prevention, we would also want to stress the need to tackle the shortage of affordable housing in the City. So many problems come back simply to the fact that there is a huge shortage of affordable accommodation. SHARP understands that many things lie outside of the control of the City Council but if this shortage is to be overcome then ending the right to buy and securing substantial public funds to finance a very considerable house building programme by RSLs and the City Council are badly needed. Presumably the Council has been and will continue to lobby for this - you have SHARP's full support for such an approach.

No other comments.

My advice is to create services to avoid such circumstances. This will save time and money to the council.

Response from Y Support service users:

- Services like the Anchor Centre and Y Support are greatly appreciated by service users. They state that life would be very difficult if any of these organisations were to disappear. It would be better to fund these organisations, who are already doing the work needed, rather than try and start new agencies and duplicate services

- Maybe streamline other services

- Look at cost effectiveness of merging 'in house' council services - how much does this cost?

Prioritising homelessness prevention over provision of further temporary accommodation seems the sensible option should demand increase significantly.

Comments about the whether the homelessness strategy covers all the issues affecting homeless people in the city:

I understand there are priorities for families, substance users, children etc. but there seems to be an under-representation of services or means of making aware of services for regular, single, non-drug dependant, alcoholic, ex-offender homeless men, and women.

There also has been no mention at all of the people who are street sleepers who have dogs and whether or not they will be accommodated together, or of families who become homeless who may have a cat or dog or other pet - what happens to their pets?

There is also no mention of people who rely on food banks and people who are living right on the edge of society, how they are to manage in the future as food and rent prices continue to rise and they may become homeless. Again, what happens to their pets and children. Are they housed together. Do shelters take pets?

Also, do shelters charge for accommodation and if so why? I have been told that the Dawn Centre charges £52 a night. Is this correct and if so how can they justify charging more than some hotels, especially when the service user has little or no money, and housing benefit would only cover a couple of nights a week? Are they then expected to go back on the street for the remaining nights?

I would want the strategy to acknowledge those people who struggle to navigate the systems and may be left vulnerable due to their needs (MH, LD etc) that may make it difficult for them to apply

I hope its more effective than the shameful poverty plan which has been totally inadequate

I think it is wide enough to facilitate contributions on all aspects even if some aren't strictly direct answers but relevant to the issues if the reader is generous in their reading of them

Homeless Rough Sleepers foremost need food and clothes and sleeping bags to stay alive on the streets of Leicester.

There are no proposals in place over the following:

- 24hour Toilet Facilities for Homeless People
- Drug Rehabilitation Support and Services
- Anti Social Behaviour (associated with homelessness) foremost littering, urination, and defecation in the streets.
- Reduction in Police Harassment over Rough-Sleeping People

Affecting not effecting. As stated in Q12 I would like to see far more research into the effect that new psychoactive substances (NPS) are having on the increase in homelessness. This issue is not specific to Leicester and can be seen in most conurbations across England. From what I have seen these are the most damaging substances to have hit the streets in my lifetime and are destroying people's lives and their chances of getting better. Criminalisation of these substances and passing all of the trade into the hands of the black market has been a total failure for homeless people. There is some evidence that it has reduced consumption in younger people but the most vulnerable in our society are being abandoned and demonised as "zombie's", See several articles in the Leicester Mercury.

Because you Also Create the Problem.

Not involved private sector- landlords

The government need to provide the funding to resolve the problem, what they are doing now is more like a plaster over cracks

Always space for improvement.

There are more issues that people might suffer from than they are outlined and these issues might not be spoken about so they are not made clear and are not tackled properly.

There are more issues than meets the eye.

There is a bigger longer term goal of changing our society from one that is oppressive and divisive to one that is respectful and sharing. Unity and community need to be [re-]established. The stigma and blame that gets attached to people who become homeless needs to be removed, so we can all contribute to its prevention. Any consideration of the Strategy needs to consider whether the proposed actions are fostering awareness and encouraging unity [within the communities that make up Leicester].

We are forgetting that there are a high number of PFA and EU nationals, on the streets of Leicester, preferring to stay destitute rather than return to their Country of origin. These people need assistance too. Also what about those homeless in Leicester with no local connection but however still wish to be here and are in genuine need.

No-one has mentioned children and the effects it has on them - sometimes I don't think Housing sees the child.

because there are still people on the streets

you see alot of sleeping bags on the streets

some people on the streets may have mental health, drug, alcohol issues which they might need more support for.

Does not care unless it has a duty

Mental health needs is a low priority.

Homeless people over 12 months obviously cannot afford or access internet /may not be able to access face to face - as may be suffering from substance abuse/ mental health deterioration help as everything is being transitioned online.

Which means the system will forget about the most vunreable.

Offenders don't have enough units.

Elderly and people unable to access online will be forgotten about.

Once Universal Credit comes into place homelessness is going to go through the roof and the proposals do not offer enough services.

there would be less homeless

There needs to be emphasis placed on both training and employment

More funding is needed

Only briefly mentions domestic/sexual abuse.

We feel that areas not covered in this strategy include:

- Transport;
- On-going relationships with other services such as mental health or debt advice and relief;
- Prevention of first time homelessness;
- Support and activities for refugees and asylum seekers
- Those without a statutory right to services, who are nevertheless homeless/sleeping rough

At times it is hard to detect a strategy in these proposals, welcome though they are. What seems to be missing is a narrative which sets out the current baseline of need and provision, the aims of the strategy, the challenges facing providers of services,

how the Council proposes to meet them, including how various partners can work together to support the Council and each other through this next phase. It would also be helpful to set out ways in which the strategy and its component proposals will be evaluated as they evolve, and, again, how the various partners can contribute to this process.

Channel shift will affect how homeless will be able to access housing providing another barrier. Support will be required which is why floating support is needed.

There are more issues that the homeless might suffer than outline by the strategy

How do you prevent homelessness?

There is a lot of good information here but I would like to see, on balance some more about partnership work threaded through sections identifying in particular how agencies can support people with mental ill health, personality disorders and substance misuse issues.

Could we have some reference to Psychologically Informed Environments(PIE), in particular for supported accommodation and Day centres-to ensure reviews look at this.

The government & local authorities try to hide the TRUE homeless issue in their town, correct numbers & outreach nightly would be good

There are more issues that homeless might suffer from than outline by the strategy

Cannot prevent homelessness

No needs more

Subject to the comments made already in responding to this survey.

The strategy is mostly based in providing but it should be based more importantly in avoiding.

Response from Y Support service users:

- It covers the problems, but without the correct funding to the correct agencies it will fail
- Needs to recognise individuality not everyone fits in the same box!
- There should be more opportunities for service users to get involved and influence decisions!

The strategy makes little reference to domestic violence and no reference to substance misuse and mental health. These are all major drivers of homelessness and the join up of homelessness provision and wider support services should be of greater focus within the strategy.

In addition to the above feedback re direct proposals within the consultation, we have the following general feedback:

- We have sent separate feedback to alert LCC to the error of using the public health review of health services (2016) document as a basis for considering health needs of homeless people in Leicester as this does not attend to mental health or any other health services that are outside primary care (GP settings).
- Whilst we recognise that the overall scope of the homelessness review 2017 did not include provision of health services (mental & physical), we do feel that in order for the overall strategy to be fully effective, there needs to be recognition of existing

services and a commitment from LCC to continue improving access to support for homeless people experiencing mental & physical health problems.

- The role of non-commissioned temporary accommodation projects in Leicester is not adequately acknowledged in the review. This means that the review cannot be considered to be representing the whole picture of homelessness and homeless service provision in Leicester as a significant number of homeless people are accommodated via non-commissioned beds. This again means that the new strategy is not adequately informed. We understand the non-commissioned projects to be running at full capacity; therefore it would be useful to know how many people who LCC had accepted a duty to have taken a route out of homelessness by accessing these non-commissioned projects. We would also like to know how LCC proposes to regulate and monitor the quality & consistency of services provided by an expanding non-commissioned temporary accommodation & day service sector?

- Over the last three years, LCC has been working in partnership with the HMHS and the University of Leicester to implement the DCLG Psychologically Informed Environments guidelines. This project is currently ongoing. The guidelines state:

To be effective, there needs to be corporate commitment to the introduction of a psychological informed approach, which ideally should then become part of an organisation's service commissioning or business plan. Developing into a psychologically aware service means transforming the way a service operates, rather than being just an add-on to an existing way of working.

We are supportive of LCC's commitment to continuing to develop services that are psychologically healthy places to be. The Leicester PIE project has been set up as a collaborative partnership. Therefore whilst we would not expect individual partner agencies to be named in the strategy we would expect an explicit commitment in the strategy from LCC to continuing implementation of the PIE guidelines?

We welcome further involvement / discussion in respect of the above

Comments about the strategy's key aims:

Point two - I am sure this will be linked to eligibility criteria so not sure this will happen in reality.

of course no one would have an issue with aims the issue is whether the proposal will be followed through and fit for purpose in achieving them -

I would suggest you add in the service aims to regulate its success thorough robust and transparent monitoring which will result in changes to any section of the strategy not performing in line with the agreed performance targets

don't believe you will end rough sleeping by 2020 . There are more rough sleepers and this is likely to increase with brexit and universal credit.

I would be happier if the word engagement appeared within the objectives eg to maximise engagement by the way in which and places in which are provided

I believe working towards ending rough sleeping doesn't say much. The word "towards" makes it nebulous. Why say it? Why not establish something that is a

realistic and attainable target . Have the means of delivering the improvement, hopefully through this strategy, then set a measureable target
how do you address homelessness for people who do not have a priority. you can only help people who want help.
Your too busy lining your Own Pocket's
wait and see
Agree with the aims however, we would want to see transparency in the methods and processes implemented to achieve the above.
But please offer a quality service to prevent homelessness.
i think it will take longer than 2020
Relying more on charity's. do not care about the vulnerable they have no voice
As stated above
if there were more places like centre project they could help eliminate by helping before it gets to far
As well as the 4 identified key aims then needs to be a further one that looks at training and meaningful employment.
As previously mentioned Leicester City Council can be innovative in providing training and paid employment for this particular client group (invariably with supervision)
Dont just focus on single people
Agre with the aims but not the methods
Need for info
The first bullet point should also refer to the services themselves which are needed to prevent homelessness. It should not simply refer to awareness and access to these services.
Please consider avoiding those situations as service users most of the time go to services when is too late.
Response from Y Support service users:
This only seems what was available a couple of years ago, but work closed down or restricted during the last council cuts

Comments about the actions outlined in the action plan:

I cannot view the action plan pdf on the consultation website so I cannot say yes.
Many people do not want to stay in the Dawn Centre but this seems to be the only option out of hours. Suggest this needs to be looked at
cannot see the action plan
Can't download action plan
The plan didn't down load so can't agree or disagree!
Cannot view the action plan on the online consultation hub so cannot comment
None of It
Most of the proposals I can agree with
As long as the action plans are carried out in the correct and proper way.
As long as they follow their plan
you can never predict how may will end up homeless due to up and coming changes universal credit?

Cant comment - wont download
i think its going to take longer than 2020
Makes no difference the council will do what they want they always do.
cant access this information so very helpful- NOT
as above
It's hard to know what the actions will actually entail, and thus to know whether we agree or disagree.
I do not think there is enough detail in the proposals to see what will actually happen.
Stop the cut
See response for question 14.
Don't change them
If they follow the outline plan
The Family Support Service would be an excellent partner with Think Family and also use of the Corner Club.
The P3 service needs to be promoted with landlords and made more accessible.
50-70% of STAR referrals come from IMT -there needs to be encouragement of use of STAR as prevention from wider services.
NASS route to accommodation seems disconnected-why are people being put in properties with nil income and no furniture. This can be an issue for non NASS too.
Subject to the comments already made in responding to this survey.
Please consider services that go to the service users as that's the best way to prevent chaos
Response from Y Support service users:
Of they are given the full attention they require and not just to tick a box
We are supportive of all of the actions within the action plan but believe that there need to be some stronger actions in relation to domestic violence, substance misuse and mental health.

Comments about whether the proposed actions in the strategy / changes to future services could have an adverse impact on people with protected characteristics:

No. I don't think it will discriminate although some groups will clearly have a need for priority such as pregnant women, which may make other users feel less valued. I think single men will end up as the lowest risk group and therefore be the last to be helped.
Anything where reviews take place and reductions are made could have an adverse impact
People with complex needs.
Has an EIA been filled in to consider this?
no
I wouldn't like to think that they do.
Rough sleepers and not sure you have got proposals right on young people.
No
You Do so.. Discriminate Especially

Within your Own Organization.. ie

Staff/ employees.. and especially

Again if they Happen to Work within

Your Lower Pay graded departments

yes

Yes. I think that we are going to be trying to hide the problem under the carpet and not actually meet their needs.

More flexibility within the system is required to mitigate against adverse impacts

NO

not funding day centres i feel will affect vunerable and disabled people it would make me more isolated and make me socially isolated and depressed.

without the cent re project i don't know of anywhere else which caterers for all walks of life you can be any age, gender, disability all under one roof

Theres no where else in the city like centre project who accommodate all walks of life , again with mental health its about trust it would be more difficult there would be a lot more homeless and more crime it soon will start adding up there should be more support out there for how to better themselves

Yes lone parents particularly female lone parents and their children

No

no

No

YES - on all groups - if you the need the service and its not there then all groups will be impacted.

Children haven't been mentioned enough - what about their needs, especially in temp accommodation - sometimes decisions are made without knowing what services you have and what they provide.

Lowering offering of housing to single people and basing it only on priority categories of people. Many will slip through this net, due to having undiagnosed needs and disabilities that make them vunerable, and it will lead to more people on the streets and not receiving support. This is more reason to include a mental health assessment into the Housing Options registration.

people would become lonely and isolated

bored

not many place to access without an appointment where you can feel safe comfortable be yourself

be able to use the photocopier and stationary free

staff are friendly and understanding

Age.. no issues no duty.,

Yes all of it

The cutting in support services and the hiving out of support to agencies who clearly

have little knowledge in the field has an adverse impact upon all client groups. As current welfare policy is causally linked to many instances of homelessness in Leicester and country-wide, it goes without saying that any failure to explicitly address the harm incurred upon disabled people by welfare reforms - such as cuts to disability benefit and removal of PIP to individuals following eligibility assessments to give two examples - will shore up a system of wide-reaching neglect of the most needy. The 'F' criteria mentioned above in your strategy seems clearly to imply that your application of a similar exclusionary approach as that used by the DWP upon job claimants, would most likely have the effect of incentivising exclusion as a cost-cutting exercise. The most vulnerable are the first to be affected. The fight against discrimination barely scrapes the surface.

i got bullied at the yasc and if you get your own place so i am not entitled to use it centre make me feel welcome and help

no

We have noted earlier that we struggle to refer pregnant young women for housing, and they are required to be made homeless before they can approach Housing Options for support. We feel this strategy does not recognise that their need is different from other singles or couples without children and adds an undue burden to the those who are pregnant.

Yes the level of support required could affect the chances of removing barriers and prevent ending someone's homelessness.

I cannot identify.

Yes. The heartless assumption that homelessness can be prevented by an App.

No ,

Equality Impact assessments should ensure there is no adverse impact.

Yes as the homeless people will have more support and guidance

Not on the face of it but the reviews will need to take this into account through EIA's

Especially funding as it is done on how many people are TRULY homeless

Vulnerable people will be affected if Centre Project closes. Keep day services open for longer.

Yes because the homeless will have more support and guidance

Online strategies can mean older people and people where English is not there first language are excluded. I cannot see anything in the strategy that addresses this.

Hopefully make better

People would be stressed if not able to get support say those with disability, learning difficulties and those who cannot know where to start getting help

Yes

Not as far as I am aware.

No

Yes. Few service users require interpretes and they need one to one services.

The council needs to consider their approach to those that have no recourse to public funds.

Comments about whether anything more could be done to ensure discrimination does not take place:

Not really, unless you set a time limit, such as 4 weeks to help everybody who comes

for help, but that is probably not achievable.
Consider the support that people require to access services.
Assume you have equality impact assessed the proposals before consulting on them?
The recent city count of homeless people conducted by the De Montfort university was nothing more than a photo opportunity for the Councillors.
It was little more than a disgusting display of "i'm all right jack" attitude where the importance of various city councillors gaining column inches was more important than the plight of any of the homeless people.
To use the homeless in this manner goes to prove the inability of the council to show any real compassion towards the homeless and the whole point of this consultation is due to requirements of central government.
build in service user evaluation and impact monitoring
No
Poverty is the greatest discriminator of all. Poverty is a predictor of all the ills around this issue. Poverty can be educational, family neglect or social/ economic.
Have a Public Elected Board/Panel
To oversee.. How dirty you in fact
Operate..
yes
not specify ages in the F test for 30 points, why should people 30 - 55 not get points? when over 55 gets 10 points
See previous section about getting historical comparative and see the stark differences in what is now available to help the disadvantaged and publish it.
I as a Landlord am not sure that would like to have deal with drug or alcohol dependent person. The same with offenders.
I do not know how to deal with them in conflicts and it looks very dangerous.
Communication for all (specifically public) and training for staff utilising service users stories
No
Take into account sexism and racism.
keeping the centre project open would make my life better , if you give them more money we could keep it open .
support the centre project to them enable people to access without an appointment. they do not discriminate and are always happy to help
give more to the centre project to help them to continue to help people as the council already sign post people to there to get this good support to prevent them going back into there. by the time things get higher up to get more places like this the damage is already been done it could take many years if at all possible.
no
Yes, ensure that in our own administration of these aims we do not inadvertently discriminate by imposing our own belief / judgement systems on people as much as possible (e.g. substance use weighting referenced earlier).
Ensure the right services are available to the right people at the right time - look at what quality you already have.

Tackle perceptions of homelessness, including among business owners
theres no other service locally the same as centre project where all age and abilitys, disabilitys can attend together
Treat everybody equally, it's not happening no issues no help.
stop cutting services that are needed what will happen to all those eon universal credit in March ??
all disabilitys are not visable and centre project dont discriminate age gender mobility or anything they take us as we are
The strategy should ensure that people for whom English is not their first language are not inhibited from accessing services by language barriers. Sustainable provision should be made for interpreting where necessary and for sensitively and flexibly provided English language tuition and support combined with civic awareness.
Constant impact assessment.
Understand that the situation may not be what you see or are told initially. That vulnerable people already struggle to be heard, we need to provide an environment where they are valued and happy to communicate, not where their shortfalls are highlighted.
Review outcomes regularly and monitor groups at prevention stage to ensure they are not more likely to fail.
Lots more info
No
I'm sure we could always do more to ensure discrimination does not take place.
No
Yes, keeping/creating services that can tackle discrimination by contacting the service user personally.
The council needs to consider their approach to those that have no recourse to public funds.

## Appendix 2: Summary feedback from the Homeless Reference Group (28<sup>th</sup> November 2017)

### Group A

<p><b>Proposal 1: Homelessness prevention</b></p> <p>Schools / Education  Expert advice on front line  When does prevention start? Interventions needs to be put in place as soon as possible  Targeted prevention (services/advice/guidance) in the community e.g. special schools Keyham Lodge etc.  Support outside the council office  Access to the advice and information  Sign-posting to advice  Face to face support  Earlier intervention and information in to complex cases  Sure Start etc  Face to face advice is essential for people with vulnerabilities  Is customer services the best place for homelessness prevention to start  Advocacy can be particularly useful for people who are hostile or aggressive towards LCC  Access to advice, phone / internet. Readily accessible. Good range of accessible options</p>
<p><b>Proposal 2: Eligibility Criteria</b></p> <p>What happened to ex-residents of Network East Midlands? Mainly ex-mental health services patients  Accessing homeless information if already homeless  Complex cases to be accessed via social care not homeless route  Concern that the current rough sleeper category is more restrictive  Needs to be better joint working with adult social care &amp; public health</p>
<p><b>Proposal 3: Families accommodation</b></p> <p>Rent a room schemes – see if people want to let rooms to homeless people  Needs to be support for people who don't like staying in hostel accommodation  Look at potential for alternative beds – e.g. container homes / pod accommodation  Important not to rehouse all families whose homelessness is prevented in the same geographical areas e.g. Mowmacre Hill</p>
<p><b>Proposal 4: Offenders accommodation</b></p> <p>No comment</p>
<p><b>Proposal 5: Young peoples accommodation</b></p>

Coordinated approach makes sense  
 Smaller units more homely  
 Reduced occupancy accommodation  
 Benefits for those not eligible?  
 Apprenticeships  
 More peer led services/support  
 Young people accommodation linked to jobs (to pay for the accommodation)  
 One cap doesn't fit all!  
 Create further units of follow-on accommodation for young people and older single people  
 Smaller clusters of units for young people rather just one provider (YMCA) with just 2 locations  
 Educate and support young people  
 Barrier to move-on if no housing benefit available  
 More work options for young people – engage with local businesses (good promotion for local businesses to have worked with vulnerable young people)

**Proposal 6: Singles accommodation**

Not sure one big hostel is right, some people would rather sleep rough than go to the Dawn Centre  
 Diversity language  
 “Crash pad” is a bad description of a home. Not helpful  
 Dawn Centre is seen as a barrier to access  
 Negative image of the Dawn Centre needs more positive promotion  
 Needs a more diverse provision  
 Crash pad idea is a runner – different provider from the council  
 Smaller units of accommodation  
 Quality of floating support services

**Proposal 7: Floating support (non-LCC)**

Access the floating support service is not clear  
 LCC could provide space / buildings / houses to a local group that pays a low rent for it. Group could then after accommodate people not otherwise eligible for public assistance  
 Floating support needs a better referral mechanism / means of engagement and more concentration on immediate resettlement tasks. Often a microwave!  
 Needs is definitely there. May be a problem with the referral process or that people find it hard to engage with it  
 Early intervention with floating support is key to making it effective

**Proposal 8: Support for rough sleepers / repeat homeless**

Other agencies  
 Outside organisations working closer with churches, Bridge and engage etc etc (Consider how the wider support network of church/voluntary organisations can be involved)  
 Communication of needs  
 Fears re loss of “speciality” if merge services

**Proposal 9: Day centres**

Recovery hub (Anchor Centre) to be included  
 Day centres → Proposal 1: Prevention...  
 ‘Centres’ in local community centres  
 Providing access to phone and on-line support  
 Day centres do more floating support work than is recorded

Wide range of accessible information  
Need to better capture the work of day services – better performance information needed

## Group B

### **Proposal 1: Homelessness prevention**

Online services not required. Face-to-face preferred. Frustrations and negativity created by non-face-to-face communication  
Digital inclusion is necessary but targeted services are required  
App will specify an area which will identify individual further support: makes advice and info more available  
Do all people know where to go? How do you make residents more aware of their actual rights?  
More advice and information for specific groups  
Support for individuals with low resilience  
Services need 'pinpointing' and referred to from single base: all support links together from here

### **Proposal 2: Eligibility Criteria**

Dynamics need managing and who's best suited to accommodation. Formal notification of this  
DV referral? Different referral mechanism and commissioning  
Looking at individual needs so someone who may not fit into an eligible criteria does not fall out of the preventative 'net'  
Relates to many who want more independence  
Veterans not prescriptive but covered in scope of B. Covered in new Act  
Custodial: intentionally homeless?  
Substance users not on a programme – fewer priority points! Creates division?

### **Proposal 3: Families accommodation**

Will this change with universal credit?  
Intent of UC to put responsibility on claimant, DWP will pay directly to providers. This must be used if and when available  
Proposal is to lessen supply of temp accommodation surely this presently needs increasing

### **Proposal 4: Offenders accommodation**

No change – does this suit the need?

### **Proposal 5: Young peoples accommodation**

Joint commissioning – good idea? Yes better accessibility for rooms  
Make sense. Better compatibility  
Young people 16-24: fluent handover from Childrens services to Adult Services →  
No, where chasm is created  
Structural issues need resolving  
Includes young offenders  
Categorising of young homeless can sometimes not be correct and not supportive

### **Proposal 6: Singles accommodation**

Crash-pad idea for those not wanting to be 'forced' down a pathway but a short-time level of support  
Individuals not pushed / forced into accommodation  
Similar to the old night-shelter  
Multiple ways to support individuals (part of)

Reduction in temp accommodation due to this?  
Different facilities must be available  
Ideas of what models will look like?

**Proposal 7: Floating support (non-LCC)**

Why underused? Genuine not required at same level. More targeting required: low to medium  
Careful of non-take -up of floating support – is not prescriptive or a condition of tenancy  
Put into the 'App' so floating support is visible  
Awareness

**Proposal 8: Support for rough sleepers / repeat homeless**

How will this look – a proposal to try and match so work from the start of 'pick-up' to the provision of accommodation  
Bringing teams together – 1 person: 1 support  
Requires different skills – will this work  
Idea liked – individual housing plan support  
Time scales, finite resources means only level of finite time and support. Flexible approach required

**Proposal 9: Day centres**

Also need to look at evenings and the weekends  
Constant change and evolving  
Awareness of these services – where else can you go?  
Gaps still t be filled  
Advice sessions for not just jobs but places for joined up services.

Group C

**Proposal 1: Homelessness prevention**

No one can get through to Housing Options  
Could interventions planned in schools include interventions that address the causes of homelessness rather than providing info to children about what to do if you experience homelessness?  
Incorporate a 10/15 year strategy to minimise / avoid similar issues in 2025 around parenting, special needs, mental health issues and dealing better with them in the future to avoid repetition of today's problems  
How will you skill up people in need of homelessness prevention support to use online sources of info and apps?  
App to include links to health services, mental health and physical health  
Vulnerable people are being excluded from services as they cannot use online services e.g. housing app is a gateway to HOC  
Really good that Housing Options are going to have an increased presence at the Dawn Centre but what about those people who you have identified in the review don't want to / can't use the DC? How can HO reach them?  
How do we reach hidden homeless?  
Easier access to Housing Options is needed – very difficult on the phone. People often deterred by this.  
Housing options services can be a barrier. People get stuck at this point due to lack of resources  
(Proposal 1,2 & 3) Including a mental health assessment and questions about vulnerable children or possible additional support needs into the initial assistance

from Housing Options seems a no-brainer!  
Using empty homes – could do more. Use modular homes.

### **Proposal 2: Eligibility Criteria**

Health and wellbeing needs category F (eligibility) What constitutes high level needs? Opposed to lower level? (Guidance / breakdown needed  
Our clients definitely need mental health support; often receiving diagnoses of serious and long-term conditions finally in early 20's. Also, people need support and guidance about how to live with others – that's how family breakdown / separation happened  
Where do people go who don't receive temp accommodation? What support is in place for these people?  
Any research on digital exclusion  
How is need identified? People with serious mental illness e.g. psychosis will often avoid disclosure of mental health needs  
Trained staff to be able to prioritise support needs of the clients due to vague information as people will be missed  
How define 'rough sleeper'?  
Council should not be provider these should be 'outsourced'  
If identify high support must have services available

### **Proposal 3: Families accommodation**

How will needs be identified if not placed in temporary accommodation or assessment of need. (Hidden MH problems or abuse) – linked to Proposal 2  
Risk of people being missed to health services (access to MH support if technically no longer homeless)  
Affordable temp accommodation is key as this can cause client more long-term issues  
Ensuring temp accommodation is appropriate to needs of the family. To also ensure it is temporary as families get settled when it's longer  
Direct let policy what is assessment can this be shared  
Why can't private sector tenants get P3 support HOC bottle neck?  
What is the coaching mentoring element different to current floating support  
Will families get family support in direct let – safeguarding / homeless midwife / homeless health visitor

### **Proposal 4: Offenders accommodation**

Increase in high risk offenders in generic accommodation and floating support  
Ex-offenders need to be able to access mainstream temp accommodation despite RA as at present they're denied with very little help offered  
Increase in 'risky' people on the streets who are unable to access mainstream temp accommodation due to risks but also increased challenges for staff supporting them on the streets (homeless agencies) Increase in number of "serious untoward events" in our service  
CRC welcome there will still be 20 units available however will still need to access to general needs accommodation as there are many offenders that need accommodation / support  
Ex-offenders only 5 points in eligibility criteria?  
In Nottingham they have greater access to PRS. Need to work to get greater access to PRS in Leicester

### **Proposal 5: Young peoples accommodation**

Attention and accommodation for young couples – supporting their partnerships which can be dangerous to them or / and extremely supportive

Young fathers and the ability to have their children at home  
Young people have serious mental health issues. Park Lodge thinking about commissioning on-site counsellor

**Proposal 6: Singles accommodation**

Some singles cannot at present access due to their high risk and get barred???  
Where or what provision will be provided to manage it??  
Is there a way of ensuring that those accessing new 'settled solutions' are not disadvantaged re access to HMHS or Inclusion HC?  
What does 'high support' in temporary solutions look like? How will staff be skilled up to provide this support and how will the support needs of staff be addressed?  
Institutionalisation is not exclusive to 'settings' people can become institutionalised even if they don't use hostels. How do we support staff to offer meaningful support and prevent staff burn-out?  
'Crash pad' accommodation could be an opportunity for intensive support to begin  
Crash pad specifically for 'entrenched' 'non-engaging' high mental health rough sleepers. A PIE environment would be beneficial  
What is crash pad? Is it a new term for night shelter? Another name please rather than this. Does it need to be all in one place or scattered across services (1 bed in each)

**Proposal 7: Floating support (non-LCC)**

LCC to know who / what support services are in the city as currently Housing Options more often than not do not know so do not refer  
Communication / lack of services knowledge reason for under utilisation  
Floating support to be able to complete drop in sessions, one off advice sessions and rolling tenancy support programme!  
SAR often creates a bottle neck in the referral process – could be cut out entirely and referrals go direct to the floating support service – data can be provided (also relates to Proposal 1)  
If the SAR could be bypassed, assessments could be done quicker, referrals processed more efficiently and timely. People often missed as takes so long from SAR  
Bring back pre-tenancy training  
Some floating support could / should be delivered in groups e.g. mental health first aid, dealing with aggression. Pre-tenancy training works well with a peer group  
Those in unstable accommodation need low-level support

**Proposal 8: Support for rough sleepers / repeat homeless**

Outreach and Revolving Door are distinct services with distinct roles and staff with distinct skills. Concern at idea of merging the teams and losing skills  
Concerns about capacity of 'transitions' service to do both outreach work to rough sleepers (what outreach offer now) at the same time as intensive floating support (what Revolving Door offer now)  
Hopefully not combining skills into multi-role for workers – quite different roles and speciality  
Homelessness fluid cross city / county boundaries

**Proposal 9: Day centres**

What does analysis seek to achieve? Day services are essential point of engagement process with mental health services to facilitate assessment. How to increase meaningful occupation / activities with no extra funding?  
Day services currently are limited to a few hours a day. This is not enough. With full day service, meaningful occupation intervention is possible. Day services to

coordinate with each other so that meaningful occupation programme can be coordinated.

Space for young fathers to spend time with children when they have non-custodial arrangements (Corner club was suggested as possible location)

Y Support could be used / multi-occupied to be in use at weekends. Bridge do offer support at weekends

### **Appendix 3: Other consultation responses**

#### Action Homeless Client Responses

**These are responses from Action Homeless's Client Conference held on 30<sup>th</sup> November 2017. Clients who attended felt that the on-line strategy consultation was too detailed and didn't address their main issues. Action Homeless therefore asked a number of questions that it felt underpins the Council's proposals. 37 individuals participated in the event and these are their direct comments.**

#### **1. Think back to when you first became homeless, what might have stopped it from happening?**

- Support with depression & anxiety to support them to keep tenancy
- The lack of signposting to prevention services For many the reasons they loss their accommodation is due to health problems, e.g.; depression, anxiety, alcohol and drug use, but support service are difficult to access
- Feeling from families that they have to be at crisis point before accommodation can be provided "come back us when you are evicted". Don't want a new home, want to keep the one they have.
- Housing Option offer little choice, or guidance.
- They accept that the Council cannot always help, but if not able need to signpost and direct to other services.
- Help with finance/money management
- Housing options, long wait, not very sympathetic and often given wrong advice
- More housing options
- Most Homeless People think it is only the council who can help, not true if single and are not aware of Charites such as Action Homeless.
- Better awareness of service available
- More bedsits/accommodation for single people
- If I was in control of my own funds. If I was not in a controlled relationship
- More support from council worker around preventing becoming homeless/mental health/benefits issues
- Support medically, depression, ignored everything. Signposting to relevant services (support). Benefits advice
- Landlord not sell his house
- Learning to budget more with money to help gain more savings
- Medical support, signposting to different services. Signposting, Early intervention
- Mediation required to talk to landlord
- Additional hostels required
- Emergency housing following relationship breakdown
- Better advice about facilities that should have been made available from an early age

- Council process of referrals not right for mothers/children, DV status not taken into account for safety & security. Band 3 council register. Council should change 'age' range from young to old to house homeless people!

## **2. Would a mobile app that signposted you to advice have helped you?**

- Need an expensive smart phone
- No, as on pay as you go
- Need to understand how to use it
- Prefer Live chat
- Need a Freephone
- Info leaflet
- Not me personally but it would help people with a mobile
- Don't be stupid, pointless, headline-grabbing waste of money
- No! What if no internet, no money for Wi-Fi, no use at all
- No as if you don't have no Wi-Fi or no internet on your phone
- Yes
- Yes + no. Not everyone computer savvy. Good for people that are. Should not replace people.

## **3 Did you know where to go to get help? Would someone sitting down with you to do a plan have helped?**

- Yes
- No I didn't get this, and yes would help
- Central library – leaflets. Housing options – no help, very lucky if you get to see someone.
- Posters in strategic places around town centre
- Yes I did, no it wouldn't have helped
- No, I did not know where to go and they didn't do a plan with me. Also on phone, every day to try and get help
- No, but during my stay in hospital someone came to see me and got me in a hostel. This was after I stayed to hospital. I was homeless upon being discharged.
- Incorrect and inconsistent advice
- No

## **4. When you became homeless, did you need support, or just a place to live?**

- Both, at the bottom
- Roof first, then support
- It's not just a rough sleeper who needs food etc.
- Support
- Peer support
- Personalised to the individual
- Too many people with needs.
- A place to live
- Just place to live
- Bit of both, initially
- Just somewhere to live
- I need support and help
- Both
- A range

**5. Are hostels a good way to provide accommodation for people who are homeless?  
If not what would have been better?**

- Employment & volunteering
- Explore reasons why homeless
- Need own space
- Integration
- Use Empty Homes including Councils
- Council need to get the turnaround their properties quicker
- Important that support is given to meet the neighbours other residents
- Yes, although you could get lazy and work shy.
- A good short term option, but could be damaging/discourage change long term.
- Better/more emergency accommodation.
- Hostels are good and bad, if stay too long
- In some circumstances
- I would like to go through the hostel and then into a flat. Also have a keyworker to help you when you need to talk about things as I talk to my support worker
- Hostels are a great way to provide help with accommodation and I also found very kind support and advice from my key worker
- Tenancy feels more secure than a hostel. Smaller hostels ok if you share mind set with other residents.
- Yes but those with higher needs want better safeguards.

Leicestershire Partnership NHS Trust – Health Visiting Homeless Families

I agree with the strategy for the most part - I feel very strongly that families should have sole occupancy in temporary accommodation and so the move towards that is greatly welcomed. As is the move towards getting families into a tenancy rather than a hostel.

My concerns are about the lack of joined up working with health.

A holistic approach is required when managing vulnerable families and single adults and whilst there is good communication with inclusion health care there is very limited communication with leicester partnership trust and community service particularly families.

The stress that goes with moving towards homelessness has massive impacts on health of the individual and the growth and development of children.

Health therefore wants very much to work in unity with homeless housing services as it will benefit both agencies.

Floating support should include a relevant health professional who can assess the needs of families and support with addressing those needs quickly or providing direct care.

Communication needs to improve health should be notified as soon as a person or family present as needing support to prevent homelessness so that the impacts on their health can be addressed. Something like notify that they use in London.

When people change addresses the loss of contact with the person often results in missed appointments with health or interruptions in medication this has huge costs for

the NHS that could have been avoided or mitigated against if we had been informed sooner that the family or adult was at risk of moving or becoming homeless .

There also needs to be more joined up working with education so that education can seek to find ways to reduce the interruptions to a child's education.

And lastly there need to be planning for moving on to permanent accommodation from the start of the homeless process. Having families move from temporary accommodation or sofa surfing into permanent accommodation that has no cooker fridge or beds until a grant can be sorted is ridiculous. We know families are going to need these items there needs to be forward thinking about how these issues can be resolved before the family move. I never want to work into a property to find mothers and children have slept on the floor and have no access to hot food for several weeks whilst a cooker is awaited again.

Liz Kendall MP for Leicester West

I welcome the Council's latest strategy to prevent homelessness in the City and their continued commitment to work towards ending rough sleeping in Leicester by 2020.

There are many reasons why people find themselves without a place to live, and it isn't just people we see living on the streets. It's also those people who find themselves living with friends or in one of the city's hostels; it's victims of domestic abuse who find themselves with nowhere to go.

I know how hard the City Council has worked over recent years to tackle homelessness and support those in need.

The number of people trying to access housing related support is likely to increase over coming years and I welcome the council's commitment to increase the number of places where people can go for support and its pledge to maintain the outreach programme for rough sleepers.

Partnership working with other agencies and charities across the city is imperative in tackling homelessness and I am pleased to see the council's continued commitment to partnership working – in particular for people with complex and additional needs who need help and support. A recent study by De Montfort University found homeless people in Leicester face multiple and complex health needs, with the most severe cases involving physical health, mental health and substance use issues. Some 40% of respondents to the study said their homelessness had followed a traumatic episode or experience. It is clear that homelessness is a complex issue and requires a multi-layered, partnership response.

As the MP for Leicester West, I will continue to raise issues surrounding homelessness and housing in Parliament and will continue to give the council my full support in tackling homelessness across Leicester.

Domestic and Sexual Violence Team Manager

There do seem to be issues for those fleeing sexual and domestic violence. I'm hoping that the homelessness reduction act will help in terms of personalised plans, but in general other issues include:

- Housing issues seem to be present in all Leicester DHRs – connected to reliance; separation; homelessness etc.
- The data we have received for the needs assessment was a little unclear; we were being referred to national returns when it came to homelessness presentations/declarations. Some of the outcome data we then received seemed to imply victim-survivors were turned away due to not having a local connection (but I thought this was not required when fleeing violence) – so more understanding of our particular client group from the homelessness data is needed from my perspective.
- The position of refuge residence not being counted as 'local' for the requirement to have lived in Leicester for two years seems to be blocking up refuge accommodation; the refuge network by its very nature is national to keep people safe – so a local connection seems an uneasy fit in such circumstance, and self-defeating if it then means we cannot place in a refuge as they are full.

## **Appendix 4: Feedback from Housing Scrutiny Commission 15<sup>th</sup> January 2018**

Thank you and the department for bringing back the results of the consultation on the council's homelessness strategy to the Housing Scrutiny Commission on Monday 15<sup>th</sup> January 2018. It was a comprehensive report with a wide range of information for members to consider and was set out in a very clear format.

It is now obvious that homelessness as an issue has been amplified by a shortage of suitable social housing, for reasons we are all aware, plus a reduction in support, financial and otherwise, for unemployed or low-income households.

A further issue which has exacerbated the problem and placed extra strain on our social housing is how easy it is for a private landlord to evict tenants – and this can often include households with children.

Children and their safety and wellbeing are rightly an urgent rehousing priority for the council. Most homelessness cases appear to arise from evictions by private landlords and this is a cause of anger and is a major defect in the housing system.

### **CONSULTATION OUTCOMES**

In general terms, on balance, each of the main proposals gained a significant measure of support, with a general balance in favour of each proposed measure. This was true of responses to a range of individual proposals, as set out in the report on 15<sup>th</sup> January 2018.

However views are much less obviously favourable when considering the question (Paragraph 3.11): "Do you think the homelessness strategy covers all the issues affecting homeless people in the city? Responses are split evenly between "yes" and "no". Around a fifth of respondents felt that the strategy partly addressed the most important issues. By contrast there was overwhelming support for the strategy's key aims (3.12).

However the concerns set out in paragraph 3.11 remain concerns for the Commission and we will look to review and where possible influence future outcomes relating to those issues and concerns. For reference Paragraph 3.11 is attached as Appendix A.

### **HOMELESSNESS SURVEY**

Valuable information has gained through these surveys, but members are aware that the survey concentrates mainly on the inner city areas. As members we are aware that street homelessness is not defined by the survey area. Increasingly we have found that people are sleeping rough in the outer estates. This factor needs to be acknowledged and measured, and where possible help should be offered.

We are also aware that some homeless people are going to the outer estates, ending in bus shelters and other areas like parks and entries, to get some peace and quiet. Street homeless people routinely suffer from ill health and this is exacerbated by the abuse and in some cases physical violence offered by passers-by.

We would very much welcome your response to the points I have set out on behalf of the Commission.

## **APPENDIX A - Paragraph 3.11**

### **Views on the draft homelessness strategy**

Do you think the homelessness strategy covers all the issues effecting homeless people in the city? (total responses 69)

Response	Number	%
..... Yes	27	39.1
..... No	27	39.1
...Partially	15	21.7

### **Summary comments (36 responses):**

- Under-representation of services or means of making aware of services for single non-drug dependant. Alcoholic, ex-offender men and women
- How can shelters justify high charges for accommodation
- The strategy should acknowledge those with needs (MH / LD) who struggle to navigate the system
- Rough sleepers foremost need food, clothes and sleeping bags
- There are no proposals relating to 24 hour toilet facilities, drug rehabilitation support and services, anti-social behaviour associated with homelessness and reduction in police harassment over rough sleepers
- More research into the effect that new psychoactive substances are having on the increase in homelessness
- Not involved private sector landlords
- The government needs to provide funding
- There are more issues
- The strategy needs to consider whether the proposed actions are fostering awareness and encouraging unity
- We are forgetting there are a high number of PFA and EU nationals on the streets of Leicester and those with no local connection
- No-one has mentioned children and the effects it has on them
- Does not care unless it has a duty

- Mental health is a low priority. Focus for those who are not online.
- Homelessness is going to increase with UC and the strategy does not propose enough services
- Needs to be emphasis on training and employment
- More funding needed
- Only briefly mentions domestic / sexual abuse
- Areas not included in this strategy include; transport, ongoing relationships with other services such as mental health or debt advice and relief, prevention of first time homelessness, support and activities for refuges and asylum seekers, those without a statutory right to services.
- It would be helpful to set out ways in which the strategy and its component proposals will be evaluated as they evolve, and again, how the various partners can contribute to this process
- Channel shift will be another barrier. Support will be required which is why floating support is required
- More information about partnership work identifying in particular how agencies can support people with mental ill health and substance misuse issues
- Include reference to psychologically informed environments (PIE) in particular for supported accommodation and day centres to ensure reviews look at this / explicit commitment to continue to implement PIE guidelines
- The strategy is mostly based in providing but should be based in avoiding
- There should be more opportunities for service users to get involved and influence decisions
- Covers the problems but without the correct funding it will fail
- Recognise health services (mental and physical) for homelessness people and a commitment from LCC to continue improving access to support
- Roles of non-commissioned temporary accommodation projects in Leicester is not adequately acknowledged

## **Response**

The proposed strategy provides a summary of main issues relating to homelessness whilst the homelessness review provides an in-depth look at issues affecting homeless people in the city. We have reviewed all the feedback received and made amendments to the review and strategy documents, and more detailed feedback will be used to inform future implementation plans.