Homelessness and Rough Sleeping Sub Committee

Date:	**WEDNESDAY, 1 OCTOBER 2025**
Time:	4.00 pm
Venue:	**COMMITTEE ROOMS - 2ND FLOOR WEST WING, GUILDHALL**

Members:

Mark Wheatley (Chairman)
Deputy Helen Fentimen OBE JP
Dawn Frampton
Steve Goodman OBE
Shravan Joshi MBE
Helen Ladele
Sophia Mooney

David Williams
Deborah Oliver, (Ex-Officio) (Deputy Chairman)
Robert Atkin, Safer City Partnership
James Breed, External Member
Patrick Fowler, External Member
Paul Kennedy, City Churches
Irmani Smallwood, External Member

Enquiries: **Kate Doidge**
kate.doidge@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Accessing the virtual public meeting
Members of the public can observe all virtual public meetings of the City of London Corporation by following the below link:
https://www.youtube.com/@CityofLondonCorporation/streams

A recording of the public meeting will be available via the above link following the end of the public meeting for up to one civic year. Please note: Online meeting recordings do not constitute the formal minutes of the meeting; minutes are written and are available on the City of London Corporation's website. Recordings may be edited, at the discretion of the proper officer, to remove any inappropriate material.

Whilst we endeavour to livestream all of our public meetings, this is not always possible due to technical difficulties. In these instances, if possible, a recording will be uploaded following the end of the meeting.

Ian Thomas CBE
Town Clerk and Chief Executive

AGENDA

Part 1 - Public Agenda

1. **APOLOGIES**

2. **MEMBERS DECLARATIONS UNDER THE CODE OF CONDUCT**

3. **MINUTES**

   To agree the public minutes and non-public summary of the meeting held on 10 July 2025.

   For Decision
   (Pages 5 - 10)

4. **INDEPENDENT EVALUATION OF CITY OF LONDON ROUGH SLEEPING SERVICES**

   Report of the Executive Director of Community and Children's Services.

   For Information
   (Pages 11 - 56)

5. **CITY OF LONDON POLICE UPDATE**

   The Commissioner of the City of London Police to be heard.

   For Information
   (Verbal Report)

6. **HOMELESSNESS AND ROUGH SLEEPING STRATEGY 2023-2027 UPDATE REPORT**

   Report of the Executive Director of Community and Children's Services.

   For Information
   (Pages 57 - 62)

7. **TACKLING THE NEGATIVE IMPACTS OF ROUGH SLEEPING UPDATE**

   Report of the Executive Director of Community and Children's Services.

   For Information
   (Pages 63 - 68)

8. **NORTH EAST LONDON ROUGH SLEEPING PREVENTION AND RECOVERY GRANT DELIVERY PROPOSAL**

    Report of the Executive Director of Community and Children's Services.

    Note – Appendix 1 is Non-Public and can be found at Agenda Item 15.

    For Information
    (Pages 69 - 76)

9. **HOMELESSNESS PREVENTION AND ROUGH SLEEPING - COMMISSIONING AND PROCUREMENT UPDATE**

    Report of the Executive Director of Community and Children's Services.

    For Information
    (Pages 77 - 84)

10. **QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE**

11. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT**

12. **EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**

    MOTION – that, under Section 100(a) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act

    For Decision

    Part 2 - Non-Public Agenda

13. **NON-PUBLIC MINUTES**

    To agree the non-public minutes of the meeting held on xxx

    For Decision

14. **CITY OF LONDON POLICE NON-PUBLIC UPDATE**

    The Commissioner of the City of London Police to be heard.

    For Information
    (Verbal Report)

15. **NON PUBLIC APPENDIX**

   Non-Public Appendix to be read in conjunction with Agenda Item 8.

<div align="right">

For Information
(Pages 85 - 92)

</div>

16. **QUESTIONS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE WHILE THE PUBLIC ARE EXCLUDED**

17. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT WHILST THE PUBLIC ARE EXCLUDED**

<u>**HOMELESSNESS AND ROUGH SLEEPING SUB COMMITTEE**</u>

<u>**Thursday, 10 July 2025**</u>

Minutes of the meeting of the Homelessness and Rough Sleeping Sub Committee held at the Guildhall EC2 at 11.00 am

Present

Members:
Mark Wheatley (Chairman)   Helen Ladele
Deputy Helen Fentimen OBE JP   David Williams
Steve Goodman OBE   James Breed
Shravan Joshi MBE   Irmani Smallwood

Online

Members:
Deborah Oliver (Deputy Chairman)
Patrick Fowler

Officers:
Chief Inspector Nikki Gander   - City of London Police
Kirsty Lowe   - Community & Children's Services Department
Will Norman   - Community & Children's Services Department
Chris Pelham   - Community & Children's Services Department
Blair Stringman   - Town Clerk's Department

1. **APOLOGIES**
    Apologies for absence were received from Dawn Frampton, Sophia Mooney, Deborah Oliver and Patrick Fowler.

2. **MEMBERS DECLARATIONS UNDER THE CODE OF CONDUCT**
    There were no declarations.

3. **MINUTES**
    RESOLVED – That, the public minutes be approved as a correct record.

4. **MHCLG AND SUBREGIONAL PERSPECTIVE**
    The Sub-Committee received a presentation from a representative of the MHCLG.

    The following points were noted:

    The presentation, delivered by a representative from MHCLG, focused on homelessness and rough sleeping, particularly in the City of London. It aimed to provide updates on government strategy, funding changes, and sub-regional collaboration.

Government Strategy and Funding

- The government is moving towards a simplified, single funding pot for homelessness and rough sleeping, encouraging local flexibility.
- A new national strategy is expected in autumn, continuing existing goals: building homes, reducing temporary accommodation, and ending rough sleeping within 10 years.
- Emphasis is shifting from rough sleeping as a subset to a broader single homelessness pathway approach, with early intervention and prevention at its core.

Local Government Outcomes Framework

- A new framework includes 13 priority outcomes, with homelessness and rough sleeping ranked highest.
- Key metrics include numbers in temporary accommodation, long-term rough sleepers, and prevention success rates.

Challenges and Priorities

- Despite funding, local pressures may divert resources from rough sleeping to broader homelessness needs.
- The Target Priority Group (TPG) identifies entrenched rough sleepers needing intensive, wraparound support. City of London has identified 27 such individuals.
- Sub-regional data shows 956 TPG clients across London, with 220 classified as "Wanderers" who move between boroughs.

Asylum Seekers and Prevention

- Some asylum seekers with positive determinations end up rough sleeping due to unsuitable housing offers or misinformation.
- The government is piloting a Rough Sleeping Assessment Tool to better identify those truly at risk.

Multi-Agency and Community Collaboration

- Success depends on partnerships across statutory services, commissioned providers, and the voluntary, community, and faith sectors.
- The City's unique challenge is its imported rough sleeping population, requiring strong sub-regional cooperation.

Enforcement and Public Confidence

- Enforcement should be a last resort, used alongside support when individuals reject help or pose risks to public safety.

Cross-Government and Legislative Context

- The upcoming strategy will involve cross-departmental accountability, including NHS and Ministry of Justice.
- The Vagrancy Act has been repealed, reflecting a shift away from criminalising rough sleeping.

City of London's Role and Next Steps
- The City is seen as a barometer for change and a potential convenor for a London-wide conversation on homelessness.
- There's an opportunity to leverage the Lord Mayor's interest and convene stakeholders before the end of the mayoral term.
- Internal coordination across departments (e.g. housing, health, enforcement) remains a priority.

RESOLVED – That, the presentation be noted.

5. **CITY OF LONDON POLICE UPDATE**
The Sub-Committee received an update of the Chief Inspector of the City of London Police, and the following points were made:

Over the past year, the police response to rough sleeping and begging has shifted from a reactive, enforcement-led model to a more collaborative and supportive approach. Previously, enforcement was the primary tool, but now a partnership model is in place, focusing on early intervention and support.

Operation Luscombe, the main policing framework, is currently paused while improvements are made to how support is offered. This includes more immediate help and redesigned "information tickets" with QR codes and accessibility features. A new Community Support Officer will lead targeted interventions for individuals who have not engaged with support.

Efforts are also underway to reduce rough sleeping at high-impact sites through environmental changes and one-to-one engagement. Daily coordination between police, outreach teams, and local services ensures swift responses to new cases. Positive outcomes include increased voluntary compliance, removal of fire hazards, and stronger community engagement.

Looking ahead, the team plans to expand the partnership to include mental health services and other stakeholders, building on the progress made and aiming for more strategic, long-term impact.

RESOLVED – That, the update be noted.

6. **INTRODUCTION TO HOMELESSNESS AND ROUGH SLEEPING SERVICES REPORT**
The Sub-Committee received a report of the Executive Director, Community & Children's Services concerning the Homelessness and Rough Sleeping Strategy 2023–2027 Update Report.

A summary report was presented outlining the three service areas: statutory homelessness, rough sleeping, and the supported accommodation pathway. Demand has increased across the board, with the supported pathway operating near capacity. The 2025–26 budget is £5.8 million, with £1.5 million annually from MHCLG grants.

Concerns were raised about the £0.7 million annual spend on temporary accommodation. It was noted that while statutory placements are necessary, discretionary use—particularly for rough sleeping—offers flexibility but may be substituting for more sustainable supported housing. Opportunities to review allocations policy and local lettings plans are being explored.

Members discussed the need for strategic thinking around temporary accommodation, including shorter stays and better use of housing stock. A review of the local lettings plan is underway, and cross-departmental actions are being taken forward. The lack of "staging post" accommodation was highlighted as a gap in provision.

Temporary accommodation costs are partly offset by housing benefit, but a funding gap remains due to rising rents. The group agreed on the need to explore whether funds could be used more effectively to improve outcomes. A workshop in Greenwich was referenced, where better use of the private rented sector had yielded positive results. This will be followed up by the team.

RESOLVED – That, the report be noted.

7. **HOMELESSNESS & ROUGH SLEEPING STRATEGY UPDATE REPORT**
The Sub-Committee received a report of the Executive Director, Community & Children's Services concerning a summary of progress against the aims set out in the Homelessness and Rough Sleeping Strategy 2023–2027.

The report, presented in two parts, outlined the delivery plan and performance scorecard. Of the 50 actions in the plan, 44 have commenced and 23 are now complete—one more than the previous period—with one new action added. A summary of completed actions is available in Appendix 3. The performance scorecard highlighted a 33% year-on-year increase in rough sleeping in the City of London, totalling 878 individuals, compared to an 11% rise across Greater London. The late submission of the report was noted and attributed to the early meeting date and the timing of data availability. Members acknowledged the update and, despite the concerning rise in demand, expressed contentment with the report and the service's progress.

RESOLVED – That, the report be noted.

8. **CO-PRODUCTION PROJECT PROGRESS REPORT**
The Sub-Committee received a report of the Executive Director, Community & Children's Services concerning a progress report follows on from the previous co-production paper submitted to the Homelessness and Rough Sleeping Sub-Committee in December 2024.

Officers presented an update on the Co-Production Service delivered by Groundswell and Mayday, funded until March 2026. The service supports embedding lived experience in service design and delivery, with progress made through advisory groups, champions, and leadership workshops. It builds on the City Voices research and now works alongside other commissioned services.

The Deputy Chair raised a question on the impact of the service. Officers noted that while change has been gradual, co-production is now embedded in strategic commissioning, with recent work extending to women's services in North East London. A Member highlighted the need for more direct service user involvement, especially for complex cases. Officers clarified that while the service supports providers to build this capacity, direct engagement sits with commissioned services.

A Member also raised concerns about the focus on move-on accommodation. Officers responded that while aspirations are important, the challenge lies in creating the right conditions for change.

RESOLVED – That, the report be noted.

9. **STATUTORY HOMELESSNESS SERVICE DEVELOPMENT PLAN**
The Sub-Committee received a report of the Executive Director, Community & Children's Services concerning an overview of the new Statutory Homelessness Service Delivery Plan (SDP).

Members noted the report detailing the statutory homelessness diagnostic visit conducted by MHCLG's HAST team in January, which, although not part of a mandatory inspection framework, was requested to assess service effectiveness amid rising demand. Feedback received in March informed a service development plan comprising 14 actions, many of which are cross-cutting with Housing. While most recommendations were adopted, some were not pursued due to resource constraints or limited relevance, following discussions with MHCLG. Members raised a query regarding the operational management of service delivery and the low number of rough sleepers in the statutory service, which, although not explicitly addressed in the action plan, remains a key area of internal focus, particularly in relation to funding uncertainties.

RESOLVED – That, the report be noted.

10. **MEETING THE HEALTH NEEDS FOR PEOPLE ROUGH SLEEPING IN THE CITY OF LONDON**
The Sub-Committee received a report of the Executive Director, Community & Children's Services concerning an overview of support offered across the City of London to address the health needs of the rough sleeping population, both in the context of local services and wider policy developments at the North East London level.

Members received a report on public health and homelessness, highlighting housing as a key determinant of health. Officers outlined the severe health impacts of rough sleeping and barriers to accessing services, stressing the importance of outreach and the need for improved data and strategic focus.

Members noted that the North East London Strategy had been approved, though implementation planning is pending. It was emphasised the role of local partnerships and neighbourhood-level work in shaping future services.

Members raised concerns about NHS restructuring, access to primary and dental care, and the need for targeted outreach. Suggestions included mobile clinical units and leveraging planning gain from developments to support health infrastructure.

The sub-committee discussed the importance of integrating health priorities into Section 106 negotiations and proposed engaging the negotiating team to ensure health outcomes are considered.

RESOLVED – That, the report be noted.

11. **QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE**
There were no questions.

12. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT**
There was no other business.

13. **EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**
The public were not excluded.

14. **CITY OF LONDON POLICE NON-PUBLIC UPDATE**
There was no non-public City of London Police Update.

15. **QUESTIONS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE WHILE THE PUBLIC ARE EXCLUDED**
There were no non-public questions.

16. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT WHILST THE PUBLIC ARE EXCLUDED**
There was no other business.

The meeting closed at 12.55 pm

Chairman

Contact Officer: Blair Stringman
blair.stringman@cityoflondon.gov.uk

City of London Corporation Committee Report

Committee: Homelessness and Rough Sleeping Sub-Committee	Dated: 01/10/2025
Subject: Independent Evaluation of City of London Rough Sleeping Services	Public report: For Information
This proposal: • **delivers Corporate Plan 2024–2029 outcomes**	Links to Corporate Plan outcomes 1,2,3,4,10
Does this proposal require extra revenue and/or capital spending?	No
If so, how much?	NA
What is the source of Funding?	NA
Has this Funding Source been agreed with the Chamberlain's Department?	NA
Report of:	Judith Finlay – Executive Director, Community and Children's Services
Report author:	Will Norman – Head of Homelessness Prevention and Rough Sleeping

Summary

This report introduces the key recommendations arising from the independent review of the City of London's Rough Sleeping services. The report was commissioned by the Homelessness and Rough Sleeping Service in November 2024, with the final report delivered in August 2025. The review was undertaken by independent homelessness sector specialists, Homeless Link.

The review report highlights that the City of London has a comprehensive service offer with extensive and mature partnership arrangements. A number of existing services are noted as being particularly valued, including the Snow Hill Court Assessment Centre, Rough Sleeping Social Worker, and our focus on homelessness health and access to emergency beds for rough sleepers with no recourse to public funds.

The report makes several recommendations for additions or adaptations which would strengthen the City's approach. The areas covered include more short-term

accommodation for rough sleepers, access to specialist immigration advice, and further enhancements to the outreach team.

The report includes a section that sets out how officers will use this information to influence current and future decision-making.

This report references the following priorities from the Homelessness and Rough Sleeping Strategy 2023–2027:

- Priority 1 – Providing rapid, effective and tailored interventions
- Priority 2 – Securing access to suitable, affordable accommodation
- Priority 3 – Achieving our goals through better collaboration and partnership
- Priority 4 – Providing support beyond accommodation.

Recommendation

Members are asked to:

- Note the report

Main Report

Background

1. In 2019, the City of London commissioned Homeless Link to deliver the New Interventions and Approaches for Rough Sleepers – Options Appraisal. Among the recommendations from that report was a reconfigured Outreach service, including a qualified social worker, residential assessment beds and additional high-support hostel capacity, all of which have since been implemented. Further insights and recommendations were also used when drafting the current City of London Rough Sleeping Strategy 2023-27.

2. Members received a report at the 9 September 2024 Homelessness and Rough Sleeping Sub-Committee which set out a proposal to commission a new review of the City of London's response to tackling rough sleeping. This decision was made in the context of four consecutive years of rising rough sleeping in the City of London.

3. Published Combined Homelessness and Information Network (CHAIN) data for 2024/25 tells us:

    - 878 unique individuals were recorded rough sleeping in the Square Mile. This is a 34% increase on 2023/24.
    - 65% of our rough sleepers were 'flow' or new to rough sleeping – up from 57% in 2023/24.
    - 35% of rough sleepers remained unidentified, meaning our Outreach services were unable to engage them – up from 24% in 2023/24.

- 41 individuals were seen more than 20 times by our Outreach services – down from 50 in 2023/24.
- 279 accommodation outcomes were recorded – 34 more than in 2023/24. This includes multiple outcomes for individual rough sleepers.

4. Homeless Link were commissioned to carry out the review. The work began in November 2024 and concluded with the submission of the final report in August 2025. This report can be found at Appendix 1.

5. In July 2025, Members were updated on the outcome of the Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government (MHCLG) Housing Advice and Support Team (HAST) diagnostic visit, which was carried out between January and March 2025. While this process looked specifically at the City's Statutory Homelessness team, and the Homeless Link review is limited to our Rough Sleeping services, there are cross-cutting themes and interrelated factors across the two processes.

Current Position

6. The report groups findings and recommendations around four thematic areas: i) the ability of the existing service to meet expected future demand; ii) effective use of grant funding; iii) partnership and integration with wider homelessness services; and iv) demonstrating service impact.

7. The review examined supporting documentation and data, extensive stakeholder engagement and best practice examples found elsewhere in the sector.

8. A summary of the findings is as follows:

   I. Challenges faced by the existing service in meeting expected future demand include:

      - Continued high 'flow' (new) and high transience of rough sleeping population
      - A high proportion of people experiencing rough sleeping who have mental health needs; an increasing number of people with complex needs; and a shift to a younger age group
      - A higher-than-London average of 'stock' (long-term) rough sleepers
      - A continuing significant proportion of non-UK nationals, including those with no recourse to public funds
      - Significant numbers of people sleeping rough in encampments.

   II. Effective use of grant funding – the report suggests that consideration should be given to how grant funding is or could be used in the following areas:

      - The outreach health van/mobile health delivery model

- The focus and priorities of the Homeless Health Co-ordinator
- The Rough Sleeper Navigator model and how we engage with transient and long-term rough sleepers.

III. Key observations relating to partnership and integration with wider homelessness services include:

- There are many examples of successful and effective partnership arrangements already in place
- Opportunities exist to strengthen collaboration between Rough Sleeping and Statutory Homelessness teams, which could in turn improve access to homelessness applications
- Further development of the Rough Sleeper Social Worker role to improve access to the Care Act, along with consideration of the possibilities for deeper system change around the interface between Adult Social Care and Rough Sleeping services.

IV. Demonstrating service impact observations include:

- Output and outcome expectations are clearly communicated through service specifications and key performance indicator frameworks
- The profile of City of London rough sleepers is well understood and is used to inform service design and delivery
- Opportunities exist to increase monitoring of the Sub-regional Rough Sleeping Co-ordinator, particularly in relation to the interface between Rough Sleeping and Statutory Homelessness services across the sub-region.

Next steps

9. Officers are currently reviewing the report and considering the findings and recommendations in the context of:

- Current and near future procurement activity
- Statutory homelessness and rough sleeping demand data
- The allocated budget for Homelessness and Rough Sleeping Services
- MHCLG Rough Sleeping Prevention and Recovery Grant (RSPARG) funding announcements for the City of London and the North East London sub-region.

10. Learning from existing contract delivery combined with the recommendations included in this report will be used to set operational priorities and inform our allocation of RSPARG funding (both City of London and sub-regional). At present this is limited to the 2025/26 financial year, pending confirmation of further funding.

11. Long-term and more complex ideas will be included in the next iteration of the City's Homelessness and Rough Sleeping Strategy, which will continue from 2027/28.

12. Officers are engaging with the MHCLG, Greater London Authority and London Councils around the future of grant funding and governance arrangements in the North East London sub-region to ensure that future structures help the City of London to achieve its strategic and operational objectives.

13. An analysis of the City of London's use of, and options for, Temporary Accommodation and the Private Rented Sector is underway. This cuts across the Homeless Link and HAST reviews.

14. The Homelessness and Rough Sleeping Sub-Committee and Health and Wellbeing Board received a report setting out how primary care needs are being delivered for rough sleepers in the Square Mile. Members will receive an updated report with a more detailed vision for potential future service delivery in February 2026.

15. An updated position, including a summary of new or amended work resulting from the findings and recommendations from the report, will be presented to Members at a Homelessness and Rough Sleeping Sub-Committee in early 2026.

Options

16. There are no options for Members to consider.

Proposals

17. There are no proposals for Members to consider.

Key Data

18. The key data can be found at paragraph 3.

Corporate & Strategic Implications

19. Financial implications – none

20. Resource implications – none

21. Legal implications – none

22. Risk implications – none

23. Equalities implications – none

24. Climate implications – none

25. Security implications – none

Conclusion

26. Homeless Link were commissioned to undertake an independent review of the City of London's rough sleeping services. The work began in November 2024 and a final report was provided in August 2025.

27. While not linked to the HAST diagnostic review of the City's Statutory Homelessness team, the two reviews combine well to create a comprehensive and cross-cutting evaluation.

28. The findings confirm that the City has a comprehensive and well-established service offer, which is supported and delivered by mature and productive partnership arrangements.

29. The report provides recommendations for how the City of London could improve its current service delivery and develop new and additional workstreams which will help the City tackle changing and emerging demand.

Background papers

- Meeting the Health Needs of Rough Sleepers – 10 July Homelessness and Rough Sleeping Sub-Committee and 11 July Health and Wellbeing Board

- Statutory Homelessness Service Delivery Plan – 10 July Homelessness and Rough Sleeping Sub-Committee

- North East London RSPARG Proposal – 1 October Homelessness and Rough Sleeping Sub-Committee

Appendices

- Appendix 1 – Rough Sleeper Services Review Report August 2025

Will Norman
Head of Homelessness Prevention and Rough Sleeping

T: 020 7332 1994
E: will.norman@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Rough sleeping services review

Report for City of London

August 2025

Helen Lewis, Homeless Link Senior Associate

Adriana Gaganis, Homeless Link Analyst

Sophie Price, Head of National Consultancy Development
consultancy@homelesslink.org.uk

Homeless Link

Contents

Overview

This report includes findings and recommendations from an independent review of rough sleeping services in City of London. The work has been commissioned by City of London as part of its ongoing commitment to developing operational service delivery and to inform short and longer-term strategic decision making for the rough sleeping service.

The report is intended for presentation to City of London Members, its Senior Leadership Team and Departmental Leadership Team. Key lines of enquiry for the work have included:

- The ability of existing interventions to meet near future demand.
- How effectively available grant funding has been used.
- The extent to which rough sleeping workstreams are integrated into the wider homelessness service – including interactions with City of London's supported accommodation pathway and statutory homelessness services.
- Exploration of potential gaps in existing service delivery.
- Strengths and weakness of partnership arrangements, including with health and statutory services and the commissioned substance use service (Turning Point).
- The extent to which services can demonstrate their impact in reducing rough sleeping.

Work for the review has included a review of available documents and data relating to rough sleeping, and engagement with stakeholders working with people experiencing rough sleeping in City of London and other London boroughs, City of London's chair of its Homelessness and Rough Sleeping Sub-Committee, other London boroughs, London governmental, and sub-regional organisations.

The review also takes into account objectives and priorities contained in City of London's Homelessness and Rough Sleeping Strategy. These include providing rapid, effective, and tailored interventions for people experiencing rough sleeping, ensuring access to suitable, affordable accommodation, increased collaboration and partnership working with statutory and voluntary sector services, and offering support beyond accommodation, to improve outcomes, enhance employability, support recovery, and prevent experiences of repeat homelessness.

Executive summary and recommendations

The review indicates that City of London has a comprehensive service offer, which is likely to meet the needs of most of the people experiencing rough sleeping in the near future. Discussions indicate that the Snow Hill Court assessment centre, accommodation offer for people with no recourse to public funds (NRPF), the specialist rough sleeper social worker, homeless health offer, and the private rented sector (PRS)

access scheme are highly valued. There are also effective partnerships between statutory and voluntary sector services. City of London commissioners are viewed as highly knowledgeable around rough sleeping and homelessness, committed to partnership working and a coproduction approach with stakeholders, and being willing to try new approaches to meet emerging rough sleeper needs and to tackle barriers to engagement and successful outcomes.

Continuing high demand and transience in City of London's rough sleeper population, significant numbers of non-UK nationals, including people with NRPF and increasingly complex needs, signal the need for City of London to enhance its offer in some areas and/or develop new interventions. The planned shift away from verification as the gateway to accessing rough sleeper services within GLA-funded services by 2028 and proposed expansion of Ending Homelessness Hubs across London, both as set out in the Mayor's Rough Sleeping Plan of Action 2025, may help reduce demand for City of London rough sleeper services in the medium term. Sub-regional funding and services provide additional opportunities for accommodation and support, including people with unclear accommodation status and people with additional support needs but who are below the priority need threshold. However, medium-term funding for sub-regions has not yet been confirmed.

Summary of findings relating to existing services' ability to meet future service demand and potential service delivery gaps

The review identifies several factors which will make it challenging for City of London services to achieve successful outcomes with all rough sleeper groups in the near future within its current service configuration. Key factors relate to high overall service demand, the profile of City of London rough sleepers, and changes within this. This includes:

- Continuing high flow and high transience.
- A high proportion of people experiencing rough sleeping with mental health needs, increasing number of people with complex needs, and shift to a younger age group.
- A higher than London average of stock rough sleepers.
- A continuing significant proportion of non-UK nationals, including those with NRPF.
- Significant numbers of people sleeping rough in encampments.

Continuing high flow and transience makes it challenging for outreach staff to assess all individuals coming on to the streets. Large caseloads and expectation to respond to all Streetlink reports may restrict capacity for casework with people who have multiple and complex needs. Transience also makes it challenging for rough sleepers to maintain engagement in structured substance use treatment. Good practice within Westminster City Council services may offer a way forward around outreach practice.

Page 20

The assessment centre's acceptance of people experiencing entrenched rough sleeping and people without an active welfare benefits claim reduces immediate rough sleeping but increases concentration of support needs within the resident group, and this is associated with housing management challenges and some negative accommodation outcomes. It is challenging to source move-on accommodation and support move-in within current staffing capacity at Snow Hill Court, especially as many service users require reconnection to other local authority areas.

City of London's accommodation pathway works effectively and offers regular voids. The upward trend in people experiencing rough sleeping aged 35 and under has implications for move-on pathways. Some stakeholders see a need to expand City of London's accommodation pathway in the near future to meet increasing demand, whilst others have highlighted the need to make best use of current City of London provision at The Lodges, to ensure that the MIST service has sufficient capacity for effective work with complex needs clients and to maximise move-on into the private rented sector.

The high number of non-UK national rough sleepers, including people with NRPF and lack of capacity within the commissioned immigration advice provider (Praxis), signals the need for additional access to immigration advice. There is a need to consider if evidence around immigration status and advice needs can be gathered by outreach workers whilst people are still on the streets, and how to make best use of NRPF bedspaces at Snow Hill Court. Approaches utilised by the London Borough Lambeth may be of assistance in this area.

City of London is developing an approach to working with rough sleepers involved in anti-social behaviour (ASB) and people living in encampments, which balances support and enforcement activities. To date, this includes recruitment of additional Community Safety Team staff, additional policy and procedures, and monthly operations. The review confirms the need to upskill outreach workers around carrying out needs assessments with people in encampments and to review current restrictions on the Parkguard's current functions around ASB caused by people experiencing rough sleeping. Current practice in Westminster and Lambeth may offer ways forward in these areas.

There are a small number of gaps in City of London's rough sleeper services where it may be useful to consider additional commissioning. Details of these are set out in the recommendations below.

Page 21

Summary of findings around effective use of grant funding

The review has highlighted some areas of service delivery where City of London may wish to review current services and/or polices, to increase funding effectiveness. These include:

- **The outreach health van:** This is viewed as working more effectively with people who have already left the streets than current population experiencing rough sleeping. Discussions indicate that service uptake could be increased by reviewing the current location of van sessions and seeking an associated building for the service.
- **Homeless Health Coordinator:** Discussions highlight the need to clarify this role going forward and the benefits of a focus on developing hospital discharge pathways and supporting outreach staff around data recording of health issues for people experiencing rough sleeping.
- **Rough Sleeper Navigators:** Discussions highlight it would be useful to review the team's approach to engaging with transient and high-risk rough sleepers and coordinating their multi-agency support.

Summary of findings relating to partnerships and integration with wider homelessness services

There are many areas of effective collaboration and partnership working, including between accommodation pathway providers, outreach, commissioned substance use providers in City of London (Turning Point) and CGL (London Borough of Southwark), in-reach at Snow Hill Court, and the alternative giving campaign with BEAM.

Data review indicates a very low incidence of people with rough sleeping experience being accepted by City of London for a homelessness prevention or relief duty in recent years. This suggests that people experiencing rough sleeping are not approaching Housing Options services for support with their housing needs. Discussions suggest that on-going high demand for statutory homelessness and adult social care support can sometimes result in a reluctance to investigate statutory homelessness and/or care duties. Some stakeholders perceive that more consideration of risks is needed in these cases.

Whilst highly welcomed, the rough sleeper social worker role is viewed as not yet having achieved all envisaged benefits, in terms of increasing Care Act assessments and access to social care for vulnerable people experiencing rough sleeping. Discussions suggest it may be unrealistic for a single role holder to enact culture change within Adult Social Care around responding to people experiencing rough sleepings lifestyle and engagement issues, and that more consideration is needed of how to achieve this in future.

Page 22

There is an ongoing issue around the respective expectations of statutory and voluntary sector services in terms of capacity for evidence-gathering around social care needs. Discussions also highlighted lack of knowledge and confidence around legal frameworks relating to homelessness and care and people experiencing rough sleepings needs and lifestyles, and that this can act as a barrier to service engagement.

As outlined above, there is a need to develop a multi-agency response to anti-social behaviour by people experiencing rough sleeping and work in encampments. Discussions also suggest there is scope to develop joint working with City of London businesses.

The review has identified there is scope for closer work with the wider homelessness service, to develop homelessness prevention approaches for City of London residents who may be at risk of future rough sleeping. This would include low-income households struggling to manage debt and people who have lost social tenancies. The proposed merger of Homelessness Prevention Grant and RSI funding from 2026/27 may offer greater flexibility around to achieve this.

Summary findings around demonstrating service impact

Service specifications and KPI information provided for this review indicates there are comprehensive outputs, outcomes, and targets in place, including around demonstrating the effectiveness of partnerships. The profile of people experiencing rough sleeping in the City of London is recognised as impacting on data collection by outreach, with many current data gaps – particularly around health needs. Suggestions for increased monitoring and reporting are set out in the recommendations below.

Recommendations

In relation to additional service commissioning:

1. Allocating specific resources within the outreach team, to respond to Streetlink reports and work with other flow rough sleepers.
2. Setting up a staging post, to increase throughput and move on from Snow Hill Court. Estimated need is a 10-bed unit, with a three-month target length of stay. The staging post could be located within or outside City of London. Priority might be given to people awaiting move-on to PRS tenancies in other local authority areas and people with NRPF considered likely to receive a 'no merit' decision following immigration advice.
3. Additional funding for immigration advice and casework support. Given the current sector-wide lack of staffing and other capacity within specialist immigration advice services, this should consider direct delivery by City of London.
4. Commissioning a separate team to support move-on from Snow Hill Court and other City of London accommodation pathway projects. This could draw on

learning from the recent move-on team pilot run by Thames Reach, which has been successful in addressing common barriers to move-on, such as rent arrears.

5. Establishing a dedicated health data role based in the outreach team.
6. Monitor the impact of work by the North East London Sub-Regional Rough Sleeper Coordinator to increase acceptances of statutory homelessness applications in other local authorities from the assessment centre, depending on outcomes, exploring the value of funding a specialist caseworker role.

In relation to service development and effectiveness:

1. Establish an expectation that as near to 100% as possible City of London rough sleepers have a needs assessment, including around immigration advice needs, to accurately assess service eligibility.
2. Review current residents at the Lodges, to assess the extent of match with the current profile of City of London's wider rough sleeping population.
3. Introduce a 28-day review process at Snow Hill Court and consider piloting an approach which would allow eviction for residents who repeatedly refuse to engage with the move-on process.
4. Explore with St. Mungo's if they can increase access into their supported accommodation projects for people experiencing rough sleeping moving on from City of London emergency accommodation.
5. Ensure that the re-commissioned PRS access scheme includes enhanced incentives for landlords, to encourage their involvement and increase availability of units and sufficient access to shared accommodation for under 35s.
6. Consider remodelling the current navigator service, drawing on learning from City and Hackney's STEPS (Supporting Transitions and Empowering People Service), which offers intensive outreach, integrated health and social support within a relational model, and has demonstrated positive outcomes for people with multiple and complex needs.
7. Reviewing the rough sleeper social worker role – considering additional steps to increase social care assessments and access into social care services.
8. Review how the Homeless Health Coordinator role can support safe hospital discharge arrangements hospital and an enhanced offer for outreach health van.
9. Review the NRPF accommodation pathway. This should consider if additional options to Snow Hill Court should be made available, including for those with complex immigration issues and could draw on learning from Lambeth's specialist Shelter project, which works with people with restricted eligibility for local authority services.
10. Explore if outreach staff can gather information around immigration advice needs whilst people are on the streets.

Page 24

11. Explore the potential for joint work with City of London's tenancy support service to extend support to people at future risk of homelessness and rough sleeping.

12. To reduce rough sleeping and ASB within encampments:
    a. Continue to explore development of a specialist encampment sub-team within the outreach service.
    b. Work with colleagues in the Community Safety Team, other City of London services, commissioned services, and City Police to develop a multi-agency approach for people experiencing rough sleeping in encampments.
    c. Develop multi-agency strategies for individual encampments.
    d. Develop a communications strategy for voluntary and community sector services and the public around the risks for rough sleepers of living in tented encampments.
    e. Liaise with the Community Safety Team and City Police around new operational protocols and the proposed new coordinating role around reducing crime and ASB amongst the street population, including how this will operate within encampments, rough sleeping and begging hotspots, and use of enforcement actions.
    f. Consider the value of recruiting a Public Protection Officer to further support outreach workers and partnership working.

13. Develop relationships with BIDS and as a potential source of funding to address rough sleeping in City of London.

14. Monitor the progress of the Toward Ending Homelessness Accelerator Programme, run by London Councils, the GLA, and Centre for Homelessness Impact, and opportunities for City of London to participate in shaping service delivery and resource allocation for homelessness prevention and reducing rough sleeping at pan-London and sub-regional levels.

In relation to workforce development:

1. Developing clearer messages for frontline staff about the positive impacts of reconnection for some City of London rough sleepers.

2. Refresher training for all relevant frontline staff around statutory homelessness and social care frameworks and safeguarding applications.

3. Specialist training for outreach staff around working with people experiencing rough sleeping in encampments, including giving tailored messages.

4. Regular training for City Police around rough sleepers' support needs and how to effectively engage them with offers of accommodation and support.

5. Discussions including relevant statutory and voluntary sector staff around recent statutory homelessness and Care Act assessment referrals – exploring how decisions have been reached, creative approaches to gathering relevant information, and interpreting care thresholds for very vulnerable rough sleepers.

Page 25

In relation to additional data collection and reporting:

1. Monitor the proportion of people experiencing rough sleeping in the City of London who receive a needs assessment, including people with NRPF and those living in encampments. This would enable outreach workers to focus on engagement tactics with the non-needs assessed group.
2. Collect data on Snow Hill Court residents with immigration issues, to understand what proportion require referral to Praxis.
3. Report on the proportion of people experiencing rough sleeping referred to City of London Housing Options or Adult Social Care for assessment.
4. Collect data on the number/proportion of people experiencing rough sleeping not made an accommodation offer or who refuse accommodation offer(s) and how this relates to individuals' support needs and immigration advice needs.

Findings from the document review

A review of relevant documents provided by City of London managers was undertaken, to build understanding of the strategic and operational context for rough sleeping in City of London and draw out learning around key lines of enquiry for the work. The review indicated the following key points:

*   A recent shift within City of London's rough sleeper population towards a younger, more complex cohort with higher support needs.
*   A high level of transience – with almost all City of London rough sleepers having previously bedded down in another London borough or elsewhere in the UK.
*   Many entrenched experiences of rough sleeping with complex needs - many of whom have refused several offers of support, accommodation, and other welfare interventions.
*   A significant number of people experiencing rough sleeping with NRPF, who are eligible only for a limited service from City of London.
*   Recent funding and service growth within City of London rough sleeper services, including expansion of the commissioned street outreach service, a new Rough Sleeping Assessment Centre (opened spring 2024), dedicated homelessness social worker role, enhanced tenancy sustainment and Housing First accommodation, and a Homeless Health and Rough Sleeping Mental Health programme.
*   Existing strong partnerships with neighbouring London boroughs, City and Hackney Health and Care Board, City of London Police and VCSE organisations, though also a need to increase collective action and cross-sector working to address current and emerging needs.
*   Ongoing challenges around reducing rough sleeping, relating to high transience across City of London and service boundaries, the involvement of some rough sleepers in anti-social behaviour and as victims or perpetrators of crime, lack of secure, affordable housing – which also hampers timely move-on from City of

London hostel and interim accommodation – and restricted access to primary care, due to the location of current provision.

- A need to increase focus around developing rapid 'off the street' options; developing a consistent approach to managing ASB and criminality amongst people experiencing rough sleeping; stronger engagement with health partners and improving hospital discharge arrangements, closer work with commissioned drug and alcohol services, City Advice, and psychological services; improving pathways for non-UK nationals with NRPF and employability and developing sub-regional and pan-borough solutions.

- Previous work with The Bridge project in Walthamstow highlights the value of dedicated lead worker roles, collocating bedspaces and waiving the requirement for Housing Benefit claims for people with NRPF – which has enabled people with complex/immigration cases to leaving rough sleeping and enter stable housing.

- There are challenges involved in delivering credible service offers within target timeframes in emergency/interim accommodation (including discretionary temporary accommodation and staging post accommodation), with longer-term rough sleepers and those with complex needs and in supporting staff to carry out international reconnections.

- Coordinated action by City of London managers and City Police around ASB and criminal activity within encampments and rough sleeping "hotspots" can increase acceptance of accommodation offers, regularisation of immigration status and/or support to return to country of origin. Discretionary temporary accommodation can facilitate action to remove unoccupied tents and clean areas. However, lack of a clear policy position around available legal actions is hampering efforts by City of London officers and resource allocation for more sustained interventions. A dedicated role is likely to be needed to enhance planning and coordination of interventions between partners.

- Operation Luscombe's staged intervention system involving warnings and police ticketing and support via an 'intervention hub', highlighted the complexity of begging and has driven a shared response from City of London and its commissioned providers. However, the limited number of Hub attendees eligible for City of London support reduced impact. This could be increased through creating a dedicated role interfacing between police, Community Safety (CST), homelessness and rough sleeping services, co-locating the clinical welfare van to physical premises, increasing CST's work around complex clients and police, and by targeting individuals begging in City of London who do not have legitimate access to support there.

Data review

This has included a comprehensive review of available data relating to City of London rough sleepers for 2022/23 and 2023/24, including CHAIN reports, snapshot surveys of rough sleeping, H-CLIC quarterly returns, and other data contained within City of London documents reviewed for this work.[1] Analysis of CHAIN data included a group of comparator boroughs (Lambeth, Southwark, Tower Hamlets, and Hackney), selected on the basis of their similar levels of rough sleeping to City of London.

A detailed version of the data review/analysis is at the Appendix. Main findings from the review are set out here. These indicate:

- **Distribution:** A wide spatial distribution of rough sleepers across the City of London in both years (periods).
- **Total rough sleepers:** There has been an upward trend in recent years. Total rough sleepers increased by 30% in 2021/22 - 2022/23 and by 36% in 2022/23 - 2023/24. These totals were higher than London averages (21% in 2022/23 and 19% in 2023/24). The total of 656 individual people experiencing rough sleeping in 2023/24 was the fifth largest in London. Figures from annual rough sleeping snapshots also indicate recent year on year increases. The November 2024 total of 86 individuals was a 41% increase on 2023.[2]
- **Flow:** Flow rough sleepers increased significantly between 2022/23 and 2023/24, both in absolute numbers and as a proportion of total rough sleepers. However, the proportion of flow rough sleepers in these two periods was lower than London averages (63.6% in 2022/23 and 66.5% in 2023/24) and for the comparator boroughs in 2023/24 (Lambeth 64%, Southwark 66% and Tower Hamlets 63%).
- **Stock and returners:** The number of stock rough sleepers increased from 2022/23 to 2023/24, though decreased as a proportion of total rough sleepers. Total returner rough sleepers and proportion of returners within the population both decreased slightly over the same period. City of London's proportion of returner rough sleepers is similar to London averages (15.7% in 2022/23 and 13.6% in in 2023/24). However, its proportion of stock rough sleepers during this period was significantly higher than London averages (20.7% in 2022/23 and 19.9% in 2023/24).
- **Transience:** In 2022/23, 27% of total City of London rough sleepers were seen only once and 43% of flow rough sleepers were seen only once. Corresponding data for 2023/24 indicates figures of 38% and 56% respectively. This highlights an increasingly transient rough sleeper population and possibly also that some people are finding their own accommodation solutions after coming onto the streets for a single night.

---

[1] Greater London Authority (2025) Rough sleeping in London (CHAIN reports). Available here.

[2] City of London (2025) City of London Corporation Committee Report. Available here.

Page 28

- **Last settled base:** In 2022/23 and 2023/24, more new rough sleepers had their last settled base in long-term accommodation. In 2023/24, almost 10% of new rough sleepers had left asylum support accommodation (0% in 2022/23) – this is likely to reflect the impact of Government policy change in this area. In both periods, a significant proportion of people had no previous settled base in the UK (19.4% in 2022/23 and 10.6% in 2023/24). Lack of data for returning rough sleepers means it is difficult to identify trends in this area.

- **Demographics:** City of London rough sleepers are overwhelmingly male (89% in 2022/23 and 91.6% in 2023/24). This is somewhat higher than the pan-London average (83.2% in 2022/23 and 84.0% in 2023/24). There was a slight increase (around 7%) in the proportion of rough sleepers aged 35 and under between 2022/23 and 2023/24.

- **Nationality:** City of London has a higher proportion of UK national rough sleepers than London as a whole – approximately two thirds in 2022/23 and 2023/24, compared to London averages of 48.6% in 2022/23 and 45.5% in 2023/24.

- **Support needs:** Mental health issues were the most commonly reported support need in both 2022/23 and 2023/24 – experienced by around two thirds of rough sleepers. Around half of rough sleepers in both periods had an identified drugs need. Around half of rough sleepers had two or more support needs – significantly higher than London averages for 2022/23 and 2023/24 and the three comparator boroughs. A higher proportion of City of London rough sleepers had experience of prison than the London average (47% in 2022/23 and 46% in 2023/24, compared to 29% and 25%).

- **Accommodation outcomes:** The largest proportion of accommodation outcomes in 2022/23 and 2023/24 were in temporary accommodation. In 2022/23, this totalled 158 placements (including 69 B&B, 36 assessment centre, and 28 local authority temporary accommodation). In 2023/24, there were 150 placements (including 53 B&B, 38 assessment centre, and 32 local authority temporary accommodation). The most common emergency accommodation outcome in both periods was SWEP (24% of total in 2022/23 and 21.2% of total in 2023/24). Less than five percent of placements in both periods were (directly into long-term accommodation.

- **Reconnection:** In 2022/23, five City of London rough sleepers were reconnected, four within the UK and one internationally. Information on reconnection was not recorded on CHAIN in 2023/24.[3]

---

[3] This data was discontinued due to the lower than previous number of services facilitating reconnections and lack of consensus between services as to what constitutes a reconnection, making it challenging to ensure a consistent and reliable dataset in this area.

- **Leaving institutions:** The Ministry of Housing, Communities, and Local Government Rough Sleeper Data Framework data for 2023/24[4] indicates that 12 people came onto the streets after leaving hospital and 10 people after leaving prison. The monthly total of people coming from hospital reduced over the period.
- **Local authority approaches:** H-CLIC data indicates that in 2022/23 City of London owed 29 households a homelessness prevention or relief duty. Of these, one applicant had a history of rough sleeping. H-CLIC data for 2023/24 indicates that 33 households were owed a prevention or relief duty; this included one applicant with a history of rough sleeping. This compares to the national average of 5.5%.

The data review identifies that overall demand for City of London rough sleeper services is likely to increase in the near future and that there will be a need to focus work around flow and stock rough sleepers, rough sleepers with mental health issues, and complex needs. The continuing high level of transience within City of London's rough sleeper population makes it challenging to assess all individuals coming on to the streets. CHAIN does not record the proportion of rough sleepers who receive a needs assessment. The number of people without a local connection to City of London increases the importance of offering effective reconnections.

The significant ongoing number of non-UK nationals within the rough sleeper population, including people with NRPF, signals the need for access to immigration advice and effective accommodation pathways for this group. The upward trend in rough sleepers aged 35 and under has implications for move-on pathways. The very low incidence of people with rough sleeping experience being accepted for a homelessness prevention or relief duty suggests that rough sleepers are not approaching Housing Options services for support with their housing needs.

Funding and resources for rough sleeping services

Funding

City of London currently spends around £3.3m per annum on its work around homelessness and rough sleeping, within a total budget of £5.8m managed by the Head of Homelessness, Prevention, and Rough Sleeping. The £3.3m total includes a three-year RSI (Rough Sleeping Initiative) grant, averaging £1.4m. In 2024/25, this grant was £1.2m. The Rough Sleeper Drug and Alcohol Treatment Grant allocation for 2024/25 is £1,161,329 for City of London and London Borough of Hackney.

---

[4] Ministry of Housing, Communities, and Local Government (2025) Rough Sleeping Data Framework Dashboard. Available here.

Page 30

Services

Funding has been allocated to a range of services and interventions, including those listed below.

City of London Outreach Team. The service operates seven days a week and focuses equally on work with new and long-term rough sleepers. Accommodation options include City of London emergency and pathway accommodation, statutory temporary accommodation, B&Bs, Housing First and PRS access schemes, safe domestic and international reconnections. The team also supports rough sleepers with NPRF, working with advice agencies, Home Office and migrant support organisations and has funding for personalised solutions, a rapid response off the streets or into employment, B&B placements and travel expenses for reconnection. The current contract ends in July 2025.

Snow Hill Court Assessment Centre. This opened in early 2024 and provides 14 units of emergency accommodation. All referrals are via outreach. The target duration of stay is 28 days.

B&B bookings and discretionary temporary accommodation are utilised as a short-term solution to prevent the need for individuals to continue rough sleeping.

City of London Accommodation Pathway includes access to Grange Road hostel for people with high support needs and Crimscott Street for people with lower support needs). These projects are located in LB Southwark.

The **City & Hackney Housing First project** provides accommodation and long-term trauma-informed support to people with complex needs.

Two Lodge projects. These sit outside City of London's accommodation pathway and provide a total of 57 bedspaces.

Private Rented Sector Move On & Support Pilot. This runs from January 2025 for 12 months. It seeks to provide pre-tenancy support, property procurement and 12 months sustainment support to five households identified by City of London Pathways Team. The service provides personalised support for people with a range of support needs, and supports client and landlords to work together, preparing for a longer-term relationship after support ends. The service has four stages

Rough Sleeper Navigator team. This service provides additional support for long-term City of London rough sleepers to move into and maintain stable housing. At the time of the review, the service was run jointly with/in Tower Hamlets. The service has recently been recommissioned as a City of London-only service provided by Thames Reach.

Page 31

MIST. This offers specialist case management, practical assistance and other peripatetic support for City of London rough sleepers living in temporary accommodation across London, including within unsupported TA, hotels, SWEP and independent accommodation. One worker focuses on supporting women. Referrals come from City of London's Homelessness and Rough Sleeping Team and commissioned services and LB Hackney's Greenhouse. Many service users have complex needs, including around drug/alcohol needs, street-attached lifestyles and mental health. Move-on support includes moves into and within the City of London accommodation pathway. The current contract runs until August 2025.

SWEP provision is provided within the accommodation pathway. Hot Weather SWEP is provided to help rough sleepers into cool daytime spaces.

City of London previously had access to 19 beds at a **staging post** based at City Inn Express in Hackney. This subsequently reduced to seven beds, when the staging post became a tri-borough service with LB Hackney and LB Tower Hamlets.

Additional outreach support and work with the street population is provided via Parkguard. The current contract runs until June 2027. The team shares intelligence about rough sleepers and people in the street population and identifies accommodation options for vulnerable rough sleepers. The team is involved in joint shifts with outreach staff and substance misuse outreach workers and patrols with City Police, City Homelessness and Rough Sleeping Team Officers or City Cleansing Officers, and managing ASB and crime within the rough sleeping population, including via patrols on estates and in parks and supporting enforcement action with the Community Safety Team (CST) and City of London Rough Sleeping Team.

Physical and mental health: City of London has a commissioned Homeless Health Coordinator role which aims to improve rough sleeper health. A commissioned inclusion health in-reach to Grange Road hostel is delivered by Guy's and St Thomas' hospital.

The Health Community Wellbeing Van (launched February 2023) is a partnership between City of London, City and Hackney Public Health, North East London Integrated Care Board and East London Foundation Trust. The service supports people who are less likely to access traditional healthcare sessions, including through GP-led primary care interventions, health and wellbeing interventions, substance misuse support and signposting. City of London coordinates weekly sessions at Liverpool Street.

Mental health support is provided via the Rough Sleeping Mental Health Programme (RAMHP), delivered in partnership with East London Foundation Trust.

Page 32

Substance misuse. The commissioned provider is Turning Point. The service carries out weekly joint patrols with street homelessness services, a weekly drop in Portsoken Community Centre and weekly attendance at the outreach health van service. There is also an extended substance misuse offer for ex-rough sleepers now accommodated outside City of London.

Social care. A specialist social worker embedded in City of London's Homelessness and Rough Sleeping Service (RSSW) carries out all statutory social work functions for City of London rough sleepers. The role supports eligible individuals to receive appropriate care and support and case coordination around their additional needs and line with Care Act duties. This involves building a relationship-based approach to managing risk and safeguarding vulnerable people. A Strengths-Based Practitioner role supports the work of the RSSW.

The **Homelessness Pathways Co-Production Service** works to increase service user involvement and coproduction across all City of London accommodation pathway projects.

An advisory panel works with City of London commissioners. There are regular events to encourage involvement and work with City of London managers to embed lived experience and coproduction. Work is on-going to develop a network of co-production champions, to act as link between co-production services and City of London pathway services and to design a peer-led outreach service, to deliver health-focused engagement and support.

City of London additionally has access into a number of initiatives funded via the North East London sub-region. These include:

- **Private rented accommodation and support scheme.** This is funded via the Winter Pressures Fund. It supports rough sleepers with diagnosed mental and/or physical health issue or who have been recently released from prison, but who are unlikely to have a priority need for housing. Funding covers initial placement into B&B, landlord incentives and there is six months tenancy sustainment support.
- **Psychotherapy service.** This now operates in five London boroughs (City of London, Hackney, Tower Hamlets, Newham and Redbridge).
- **SIAS extension support.** This offers up to 16 weeks accommodation for people requiring additional time to resolve their UK immigration status, after pan-London provision has ended. Funding enables use of B&B and floating support and is targeted at London boroughs with less access to supported accommodation.
- **Personalised health budgets.** These support target prevention group rough sleepers with up to £5,000 per individual, with funding being utilised for a range of

items, including private Care Act assessment, accommodation for NRPF rough sleepers and gym membership.

The North East Sub-Regional Rough Sleeping Coordinator is currently involved in work with Snow Hill Court to support statutory homelessness applications with other London boroughs.

KPIs relating to City of London commissioned services for rough sleepers

Service specifications and KPI information were available for the street outreach, MIST and Navigator services. Review of this information indicates:

- Partnership working is supported via an expectation to attend all relevant City of London multi-agency meetings.
- Outreach SLAs with key partners, including, assessment centre, Parkguard, Praxis, RAMHP, the outreach health van and Navigators.
- A range of appropriate outputs, outcomes and targets in place to support the work of these teams. These include moves into and sustaining accommodation (avoiding repeat homelessness); outreach targets to reduce the annual headline street count figure, people spending a second night on the streets and becoming long-term rough sleepers.
- Use of street audits to track rough sleepers and forecast demand for outreach services.

Comments

Given the current and anticipated profile of rough sleepers in City of London, it would be useful to increase monitoring/reporting around the following:

- The proportion of City of London rough sleepers who receive a needs assessment, including those living in encampments. This would enable outreach to focus on engagement tactics with the non-needs assessed group. The proportion of rough sleepers whose immigration status/needs have been discussed (assessed) with an outreach worker whilst they are on the streets.
- The proportion/number of rough sleepers who have been referred to City of London Housing Options or Adult Social Care for assessment.
- The number/proportion of rough sleepers who are not made an accommodation offer or who refuse accommodation offer(s) and how this relates to support needs (including complex needs) and immigration advice needs.

Stakeholder engagement

Meetings were held with a total of 16 stakeholders within City of London, its commissioned services and other London and sub-regional government representatives. The full list of stakeholders is contained at the Appendix.

Page 34

Discussions were semi-structured, utilising a pre-agreed topic guide. Discussion areas were drawn from findings from the document review, data analysis and key lines of enquiry. Key findings/summary findings are set out below.

Impacts of national and London regional policy and economic conditions

Discussions indicated the near future policy focus will be on ensuring an effective crisis response and homelessness prevention approaches.

To this end, there are envisaged changes in funding arrangements for local authorities around rough sleeping and homelessness from 2026/27. These will involve the merger of Homelessness Prevention Grant and RSI funding streams and replacement of bidding by funding formulas. It is understood that more three-year funding settlements are likely. A separate consultation is being undertaken around future arrangements for funding of local authority TA.

The London Mayor's Rough Sleeping Plan of Action 2025 indicates a shift away from verification as the access route into rough sleeper services, to support provided on the basis of people's needs. The programme will include scaling up a network of 24/7 assessment and support Ending Homelessness Hubs across London and, following successful testing within the Rough Sleeping Prevention Project, a recommendation that local authorities utilise the ERSAT (Ending Rough Sleeping Assessment Tool) to screen for the most vulnerable rough sleepers and remove the incentive to bed down in order to receive a service.

The Toward Ending Homelessness accelerator programme, being run by London Councils, the GLA, and the Centre for Homelessness Impact, aims to prevent homelessness through focusing on systemic transformation, including data-driven and evidence-based solutions, scaling up innovative solutions and coordinated governance. Key priorities include: homelessness and ending rough sleeping, improving temporary accommodation, investment in affordable housing and supported accommodation (capital and revenue). Implementation is taking place in 2025, with phased delivery the next several years.

Other possible developments include a re-launch of the Inter-Borough Accommodation Agreement, which manages procurement and rates for TA by London boroughs and expansion of the PRS Tenancy Sustainment Team.

Whilst sub-regional initiatives are acknowledged as having benefits for rough sleepers and producing some economies of scale, future dedicated sub-regional funding for rough sleepers has not yet been confirmed. Clarification is expected following this year's Autumn Statement.

Comments

The new funding arrangements offer more flexibility for local authorities around how they approach homelessness prevention and reducing rough sleeping. Existing integration between City of London services and its commitment to rough sleeper services means there is unlikely to be any challenge involved in fully linking the two areas of work.

The reduced focus on verification may free up resource within outreach teams to focus on long-term and entrenched rough sleepers.

The Accelerator programme may involve a number of pan-London and sub-regional test and learn pilots. This would offer City of London opportunities to become involved in shaping service delivery and resource allocation for rough sleeper services at these levels.

Configuration of current advice, emergency and long-term accommodation and support services in and gaps in supply

Discussions indicated that City of London's current emergency accommodation and supported accommodation pathway and commissioned support services are (perceived as) able to effectively support most rough sleepers in the borough. Discussions highlighted the following as particular strengths in the current service configuration include:

- Snow Hill Court – including its policy of accepting rough sleepers without a City of London local connection.
- Accommodation and support for NRPF rough sleepers, including two allocated bedspaces at Snow Hill Court and funding for other short-term placements, which allows additional time for comprehensive assessment and evidence gathering.
- The specialist rough sleeper social worker role.
- The commissioned PRS Access service.
- The outreach health van – which has increased access to primary health care for some people with a history of rough sleeping.
- A range of opportunities to engage with substance misuse services, including via the assessment centre, outreach, the outreach health van and GP at Greenhouse.

Discussions identified a small number of specific gaps in current services:

- A rapid response for rough sleepers, for reports of rough sleepers via Streetlink. This resource could free up avoid City of London Outreach to focus on complex needs rough sleepers.
- A staging post to provide move-on from the assessment centre. This would increase capacity and improve assessment centre throughput, without inferring a City of London local connection for service users. Estimated need for this provision

Page 36

is ten beds, with a target three month stay. Consideration would be needed to agree which service users would be prioritised, such as people seeking PRS move-on and residents with NRPF, who are considered likely to receive a 'no merit' decision following immigration advice.

The effectiveness of current rough sleeping services in addressing rough sleeping, access barriers, and how these might be addressed

A summary of issues highlighted in this area is set out below.

Outreach

Discussions highlighted that increasing overall demand, high flow and transience and more rough sleepers with complex needs make it very challenging for outreach workers to offer an accommodation option to all individuals. Discussion also highlighted many gaps in assessments of rough sleepers in encampments, although these individuals often have low support needs.

Current expectations on outreach to respond to all Streetlink calls, the current shift rota and high caseloads are all viewed as negatively impacting outreach workers' capacity for casework for people with multiple and complex needs. The profile of City of London rough sleepers is also recognised as impacting on data collection by outreach, with many current data gaps.

Assessment centre

Whilst throughput has improved recently, it is challenging to achieve the assessment centre's 28-day target length of stay, for both UK and non-UK nationals. It is also understood that the assessment centre has a high level of abandonments and evictions.

Discussions suggest there is currently insufficient capacity to support move-on from the assessment centre. As most residents lack a local connection to City of London, they require reconnection to other local authority areas. Additional resources are required to develop relationships and referral routes with local authorities and landlords and also to facilitate the move-on process, though attending viewings with residents and to accompany people to their reconnection areas. MIST is viewed as having very limited capacity to support assessment centre residents.

Whilst the assessment centre's willingness to accept residents and entrenched rough sleepers without an active welfare benefits claim helps these people come off the street, this also increases the concentration of people with complex needs. This is associated with housing management challenges and risk of negative accommodation outcomes. Entrenched rough sleepers are perceived by assessment centre staff as typically less committed to engaging with longer-term move-on plans. Overstaying by

Page 37

these residents is reducing the availability of voids at the centre and reducing access for other rough sleepers.

There is consistent over-demand for the NRPF bedspaces at the assessment centre. Silt up within these beds is increased by the typically slow progress of immigration cases and recently lack of capacity within the commissioned immigration advice provider, Praxis, for new cases.

Move-on accommodation

Access into City of London's accommodation pathway is considered straightforward and offering regular voids. Discussions highlighted some 'churn' and negative accommodation outcomes, within the accommodation pathway, especially at Grange Road, where there has been high turnover within the team and loss of experienced staff.

Several stakeholders considered it likely that increasing demand means that City of London will need to expand its accommodation pathway in the near future. However, it was also suggested that a review of the current resident population at the Lodges could be undertaken, to assess its match with City of London's current rough sleeper profile and ensure best use of this provision. Discussions also suggested that it would be valuable for City of London's PRS Access Scheme to develop direct relationships with landlords, as well as managing agents.

There is a perception that the Navigator service could engage more effectively with high-risk service users and coordinate multi-agency support, including for transient rough sleepers.

Health interventions

The current primary healthcare offer via the outreach health van is viewed as working well with people who have already left the streets, but less effectively with current rough sleepers. It is considered that the current location of van sessions is not encouraging uptake by all potential service users. Stakeholders linked this to continuing unplanned use of health services, such as A&E and lapsed scripts by current rough sleepers.

Stakeholders raised the effective partnership development work undertaken by the Homeless Health Coordinator, including with Turning Point and the Hackney Greenhouse. However, discussions raised the need for greater clarity about the remit of this role going forward.

Page 38

Discussions also highlighted that there is scope to improve hospital discharge pathways, to avoid repeat homelessness and to provide support and capacity to outreach staff to improve data recording around rough sleeper health issues.

Other issues
It was raised that more work could be done to support groups of people with a City of London local connection, such as low-income families struggling with debt and those who have lost social tenancies, could help build understanding of flows into homelessness and rough sleeping and contribute to homelessness prevention.

The current patrol only function of Parkguard means there is insufficient resources to deal with ASB by rough sleepers and the street population and that this has negative impacts on City of London businesses and residents.

Suggestions for addressing these issues
These included:
- Establishing a commitment to ensure that as near to 100% as possible City of London rough sleepers have a needs assessment, including around immigration advice, to accurately assess service eligibility.
- Reviewing Snow Hill Court policy and procedure around service users who consistently refuse to engage with a move-on offer (Credible Service Offer) and the possibility of piloting an arrangement where stays for such individuals end after 28 days.
- Developing a separate team to support move-on for Snow Hill Court and other accommodation pathway service users. One potential model for this is the recent move-on team pilot by Thames Reach, which has been successful in addressing common barriers to move-on, such as rent arrears and managing 'difficult discussions' around move-on between service users and keyworkers.
- Developing clearer messages about the positive impacts of reconnection for some City of London rough sleepers.
- Exploring if St Mungo's are able to offer additional move-on into their supported accommodation projects.
- Ensuring the contractor of the re-commissioned PRS Access Service has sufficient expertise around working with rough sleepers.
- Developing incentives for PRS landlords to encourage their involvement (understood that this is currently being explored by City of London officers).
- Assessing how many City of London rough sleepers with NRPF are actually met by outreach/other City of London services and what proportion of these are in encampments.

Page 39

- Increasing expectations on outreach workers around information-gathering and ID checking for rough sleepers with NRPF, so that more information is available at the point of move-in to Snow Hill Court.

- Carrying out data analysis relating to assessment centre residents with immigration issues, to understand if all require referral to Praxis, or if some could be moved on into the proposed staging post or other interim accommodation.

- Considering additional City of London funding for purchasing immigration casework support – either directly or via a voluntary sector service.

- Exploring remodelling the current Navigator service model, drawing on the approach offered by STEPS (Supporting Transitions and Empowering People Service), funded by City and Hackney Public Health team. STEPS offers intensive outreach and integrated health, therapeutic and social support and focuses on 'long-term and relational' support, which is effective for people with multiple and complex needs. The estimated need for this provision in City of London is 15–20 people.

- Reviewing locations and times of the outreach van and seek an associated building for the service.

- Considering a dedicated health data role based in outreach team.

- Work via the Homeless Health Coordinator to develop hospital discharge arrangements with the Pathways team at Homerton hospital – including understanding rough sleepers' needs, signposting and joint needs assessments.

- Exploring the possibility of joint work with City of London's tenancy support service to extend support to people at possible future risk of homelessness and rough sleeping.

- Exploring a SWEP stay as sufficient basis for a statutory homelessness application, as is the practice in LB Hackney and LB Tower Hamlets.

Internal and external partnerships and collaborative working and how these might be improved

City of London commissioners are viewed as knowledgeable around rough sleeping and homelessness issues and as committed to effective partnership working. Examples given of this included service investment, such as the Snow Hill Court and the previous tri-borough staging post, a willingness to trial new approaches, such as keyworking at The Lodge and a 'coproduction culture, which includes regular coproduction workshops, networking and information-sharing around services.

There are effective relationships between outreach and accommodation pathway providers and good access into City of London's accommodation pathway. Mental and physical health in-reach support at Snow Hill Court is working well. Stakeholders also drew attention to the effectiveness of City of London's partnership with BEAM, which

Page 40

uses an alternative giving campaign to raise money for rough sleepers and other homeless people.[5]

Whilst some stakeholders consider there is effective partnership working between City of London's Housing, Adult Social Care and homelessness services, others highlighted the challenges statutory services face in managing demand and that this can produce reluctance to investigate homelessness and/or care duties. Some stakeholders perceive there is occasional 'shunting' of cases between Housing, Homelessness and Adult Social Care services and that risk management in these cases could be strengthened.

Some stakeholders consider that statutory homelessness applications are not encouraged in City of London and highlighted low numbers of statutory homelessness acceptances compared to other London boroughs.

The rough sleeper social worker role is viewed as not having achieved all envisaged benefits, in terms of increasing Care Act assessments and access into social care services. Some stakeholders perceive that care thresholds continue to be applied inflexibly, though it was also recognised that significant resource challenges are likely to affect this. Some stakeholders considered it may be unrealistic for a single role holder to enact the culture change needed within the Adult Social Care service around responding to rough sleepers' lifestyle and engagement issues.

Some stakeholders perceive that City of London Homelessness staff lack good understanding of rough sleepers' support needs and lifestyles and what is realistic in terms of providing evidence of need and engagement in structured assessments. However, other stakeholders highlighted that some voluntary sector staff lack understanding of legal frameworks, what statutory services are able to provide and what constitutes health rather than social care needs. This situation is viewed as being exacerbated by high staff turnover in VCSE services, with new staff lacking relevant knowledge and expertise. There is a view that VCSE staff can make referrals to Adult Social Care, the Homelessness Team and Navigator service as a 'default', rather than as a result of issues identified on an individual's needs assessment.

It is acknowledged that City of London does not currently have an effective response to working with rough sleepers in encampments. There is a need to develop an approach which balances the needs of service users and City of London residents – including being proactive around ASB and highway obstructions – and coordinating activities between teams/services. There is also a recognition that encampments are outside of

---

[5] New contactless donation points to help Square Mile's rough sleepers.

traditional outreach expertise and that staff need additional support around delivering tailored messages for this group of rough sleepers.

Some stakeholders consider that City Police lack understanding of rough sleepers' support needs and lifestyles, especially around mental health and domestic abuse and that this can act as a barrier to service engagement. It is understood that work is in progress to scope out increased collaboration between CST and City Police. This will include improved operational protocols and a new role coordinating work to reduce crime and ASB amongst the street population, including within encampments, rough sleeping and begging hotspots and involving enforcement, where needed. It is intended that this work will provide data and evidence for one or more permanent roles.

High transience makes cross-borough working more challenging for rough sleepers with substance misuse needs. There is scope to improve the experience of cross-borough transfers for service users. An arrangement has been introduced by Turning Point to improve handover and on-going support for this group. This is understood to be improving trust and engagement with the service.

Discussions also suggest there is scope to develop joint working with City of London businesses.

Suggestions for addressing these issues
These included:
- Exploring development of an encampment sub-team. It is understood that City of London has started work in this area.
- Offering refresher training to all relevant frontline staff around statutory homelessness and social care frameworks and Safeguarding applications.
- Supporting City Police through regular training around rough sleepers' support needs and how to effectively engage them with offers of accommodation and support.
- Developing clear messages for all frontline staff working in homelessness services about likely eligibility for statutory housing and care services.
- Exploring if additional information can be gathered by outreach and other non-statutory services to support Adult Social Care needs assessment.
- Reviewing recent statutory homelessness and Care Act assessment referrals, to explore how care thresholds have been applied and if there are more creative approaches to gathering relevant information and interpreting care thresholds. This would help ensure that very vulnerable rough sleepers have access to care and support, that the assessment process is not onerous for service users and frontline staff and to build consistency and transparency around decision-making.

Page 42

- Developing relationships with BIDS and as a potential source of funding to address rough sleeping in City of London.

Good practice review

This section includes good practice from two other London boroughs (Lambeth and Westminster) which may be of benefit to preventing and reducing rough sleeping in City of London.

Working with NRPF rough sleepers

LB Lambeth does not operate a staging post, with all rough sleepers moving directly into high support or shared supported accommodation within the borough's pathway.

LB Lambeth operates 'safe seats' at its assessment centre, which are accessible to people with NRPF. In addition, it runs 'The Shelter'. This is a former night shelter which accommodates people with restricted eligibility for LB Lambeth services, due to lack of local connection or unclear immigration status and people who engage sporadically with LB Lambeth services. The service is RSI-funded, and rooms are shared to maximise use of this funding. This project is utilised by many people with NRPF and is a more cost-effective arrangement than using hotels.

Access to effective immigration advice is recognised as essential. LB Lambeth expects outreach workers to gather initial information to support referral to immigration advice whilst people are still on the street.

In Westminster, there is some evidence-gathering around immigration status and advice needs by outreach workers on the streets.

Westminster City Council utilises two immigration advice providers (RAMFEL and Street Legal). However, both currently lack capacity to take on new cases. There is a recognised sector-wide lack of capacity and qualified staff, which causes delays in decision making.

Westminster City Council is planning to refurbish a former assessment centre for NRPF rough sleepers with low support needs. The service will be Housing Benefit funded, and residents will be offered shared rooms to reduce costs. It is recognised there is very little for NRPF rough sleepers with higher support needs. Access via the Adult Social Care route is difficult, due to very high thresholds for care, reluctance to carry out full Care Act assessments on the streets and lack of understanding of rough sleepers' mental health and substance misuse needs and lifestyles.

Page 43

Working with people in encampments

LB Lambeth's overall approach is to utilise enforcement as a 'change mechanism', which backs up the support offer from outreach workers.

The borough employs a Public Protection Officer, funded via RSI. The role holder is seconded from the Community Safety Team but has a good understanding of rough sleeping issues. The role has enabled partnership development, including estate managers, messaging and reassurance to councillors and members of the public via attendance at ward meetings and improved police engagement and input.

The Public Protection Officer role has been particularly useful for rough sleepers with multiple and complex needs and in working with people in encampments. The PPO always works in joint shifts with outreach workers. Their knowledge of relevant legislation means it is possible to take further steps with people who are repeatedly not engaging with offers of support, including serving notices and coordination of action with police and street cleansing services.

Westminster has several longstanding rough sleeper encampments and emerging hotspots. Encampments are often highly visible and attract political attention, though may not be easily accessible if not on land which is not owned by Westminster City Council.

Westminster does not operate a specialist encampment team. All outreach workers are responsible for monitoring encampments and rough sleeping hotspots, be creative in their engagement techniques (such as varying times of engagement and joint work with police and other Westminster City Council teams), to carry out on-going risk assessments and to develop support plans for all rough sleepers. There are also weekly multi-agency meetings including landowners, to discuss risks, actions and safeguarding concerns.

Westminster has a team of Neighbourhood Coordinators, who coordinate work with police, ASB and outreach staff to reduce rough sleeping. Coordinators are able to use a slightly more assertive approach, to 'nudge' rough sleepers into accepting support. There is not a current police liaison role, though this is considered a useful resource.

Westminster City Council considers it important that support and enforcement roles are clearly separated. For example, when Coordinators issue orders to vacate an area, outreach staff are not present. Successful outcomes also require a change of the encampment landscape, to prevent people from returning.

The Council has experienced challenges in sustaining political support for enforcement actions and buy-in from other agencies, such as British Transport Police and Transport

Page 44

for London (as landowners). There is also an aim to develop messages with VCSE services and the public around the risks of giving out tents to rough sleepers and the risks for people living in tenants, associated with reduced visibility and increased risk of overdose and domestic abuse.

Providing a rapid response

All Westminster City Council commissioned outreach teams are expected to respond to all Streetlink calls. However, it is considering setting up a small team to work solely with flow rough sleepers and having a separate team working with complex needs/entrenched rough sleepers.

Page 45

Appendix 1

Full list of documents reviewed

- City of London Homelessness and Rough Sleeping Strategy 2023–2027.
- Credible Service Offer policy (report to Cabinet, dated Oct 2020).
- Draft policy and protocol to tackle the negative impacts of rough sleeping – report to Committee (January 2025).
- Review of The Bridge.
- Review of Operation Luscombe.
- Service specifications and KPIs relating to City of London Outreach team, MIST and Navigator services.

Full list of stakeholders who participated in the review

Table 1: Participating stakeholders

Name	Organisation
Rowan Wyllie Kirsty Lowe Nisha Backory Nana Choak	City of London rough sleeping services
Simon Cribbens	City of London Community and Children's Services
Eamonn Mullally	City of London Corporation
Emma Casey	LB Lambeth
Christine Venn-Brown Becky Woodman	Westminster City Council
Bethan Adams Beth Winter	Thames Reach area managers
Charley Matthews	Thames Reach MIST
Gemma Topham	Thames Reach/Snow Hill Court
St Mungo's Navigator Team	
Sonia Mills	Turning Point
Valeria Cadena	City of London Community Safety Team
Amy Withey	London Councils
Sarah Whale	North East London Sub-Region Rough Sleeper Coordinator
Emma Casey	LB Lambeth
Ish Camp	St Mungo's Navigator service

Page 46

Data tables and commentary

Flow, stock and returner rough sleepers

Data indicates a wide spatial distribution of rough sleepers across the City of London in 2022/23 and 2023/24. Since 2021/22, there has been an upward trend in total rough sleepers in City of London. The total number of rough sleepers increased by 30% between 2021/22 - 2022/23 and by 36% between 2022/23 - 2023/24. This increase is higher than the London average of 21% in 2022/23 and 19% in 2023/24. The 2023/24 total of 656 individual rough sleepers was the fifth largest in London.

Table 2: Flow, stock and returner rough sleepers, 2022/23 and 2023/24

Year	Flow	Stock	Returner	Total
2022/23	226 (47%)	173 (36%)	83 (17%)	482 (100%)
2023/24	373 (57%)	207 (32%)	76 (12%)	656 (100%)

Source: CHAIN data reports

Flow. In 2023/24, flow rough sleepers increased significantly between 2022/23 and 2023/24, both in absolute numbers and as a proportion of total rough sleepers. However, the proportion of flow rough sleepers in these two periods was lower than London averages (63.6% in 2022/23 and 66.5% in 2023/24) and for similar boroughs in 2023/24 (Lambeth 64%, Southwark 66% and Tower Hamlets 63%).[6]

Stock and returners. In 2023/24, the number of stock rough sleepers increased on 2022/23, though decreased as a proportion of the total rough sleeper figure. The number of returner rough sleepers decreased slightly between 2022/23 and 2023/24, in total numbers and proportion of total rough sleepers decreased.

City of London's proportion of returner rough sleepers is similar to London averages (15.7% in 2022/23 and 13.6% in in 2023/24). However, its proportion of stock rough sleepers during this period was significantly higher than London averages (20.7% in 2022/23 and 19.9% in 2023/24).

In 2022/23, 27% of total rough sleepers in City of London were seen only once and 43% of flow rough sleepers were seen only once. Corresponding data for 2023/24 indicates that 38% of total City rough sleepers were seen only once and 56% of flow rough sleepers were seen only once. This data highlights an increasingly transient rough sleeper population and possibly also that some people are finding their own accommodation solutions after coming onto the streets for a single night.

---

[6] Data comparison was carried out with these boroughs on the basis of their similarities with City of London in terms of high rough sleeper numbers.

Table 3: Last settled base (new rough sleepers)[7]

Accommodation type	2022/23	2023/24
Long-term accommodation		
PRS	16.7%	20.0%
Friends/family/partner	13.9%	29.4%
Other	8.4%	9.1%
Short and medium-term accommodation		
Hostel/supported accommodation	8.3%	3.5%
Squat	2.8%	0.0%
LA TA	0.0%	2.4%
Institution		
NASS and other asylum support	0.0%	9.4%
Prison	5.6%	2.4%
Hospital	0.0%	1.2%
Probation	0.0%	1.2%
No settled base in UK	19.4%	10.6%
Other	5.6%	4.7%
Not known	19.4%	8.2%
Total	100.0%	100.0%

Source: CHAIN data reports

This data indicates:

- In 2022/23 and 2023/24, a larger proportion of new rough sleepers came from long-term than short and medium-term accommodation.
- Almost 10% of new rough sleepers had left asylum support accommodation in 2023/24, whilst this figure was 0% for 2022/23 – this is likely to reflect the impact of Government policy change in this area.
- A significant proportion of people had no previous settled base in the UK (19.4% in 2022/23 and 10.6% in 2023/24).

Pan-London data for 2022/23 and 2023/24 indicates that living with friends/family/partner and PRS accommodation were the two most common previous accommodation types for settled bases and that departures from long-term accommodation were more common than other types of accommodation.

Pan-London data for indicates a slightly smaller proportion of people with no settled base in the UK (7.8% in 2022/23 and 10.6% in 2023/24) than in City of London.

---

[7] Base 2022/23 = 112 (76 not recorded, so actually 36); 2023/24 = 85 (308 not recorded).

Page 48

Pan-London data for 2023/24 indicates a higher total of people (17.0%) leaving asylum seeker support than in City of London.

Table 4: Reason for leaving last settled base (new rough sleepers)[8]

Reason	2022/23	2023/24
Evicted	19.4%	10.6%
Left of own accord	8.3%	23.5%
Asked to leave	5.6%	16.5%
End of time-limited stay	5.6%	9.4%
Other	8.3%	12.9%
No settled base since arriving in UK	19.4%	10.6%
Not known	33.0%	16.5%
Total:	100.0%	100.0%

Source: CHAIN data reports

In 2022/23, the most common reasons for new rough sleepers leaving their previous settled accommodation (where data is recorded) were: eviction and the person leaving accommodation of their own accord. In 2023/24, the most common reasons related to leaving of own accord and being asked to leave.

In comparison, pan-London data for 2022/23 indicates the top three reasons for people leaving their last settled base were: eviction, being asked to leave accommodation and leaving of their own accord. Pan-London data for 2023/24 indicates the top three reasons were being asked to leave, eviction and end of time-limited stay in accommodation.

Table 5: Last settled base (returning rough sleepers)[9]

Accommodation type	2022/23	2023/24
Long-term accommodation		
PRS	40.0%	20.8%
Friends/family/partner	0.0%	13.2%
LA accommodation	20.0%	1.9%
HA accommodation	20.0%	7.5%
Other	0.0%	5.7%
Short and medium-term accommodation		
Hostel	20.0%	17.0%
LA TA	0.0%	5.7%

[8] Base = 2022/23 = 36 recorded; 2023/24 = 85 recorded.

[9] Base = 5 (2022/23), = 53 (2023/24)

Accommodation type	2022/23	2023/24
Institution		
Prison	0.0%	5.7%
Asylum seeker support	0.0%	5.7%
No settled base in UK since arrival	0.0%	3.8%
Employment-related accommodation	0.0%	3.8%
Not known	0.0%	7.5%
Total	100.0%	100.0%

Source: CHAIN data reports

The very low base in 2022/23 makes it difficult to identify trends between the two periods for this cohort. In 2023/24, there was an increase in the number of people who had left accommodation with friends/family or partner and a small rise in people coming from asylum seeker support, prison and employment-related accommodation.

In common with the new rough sleeper cohort, a greater proportion of people had left long-term accommodation than short and medium-term accommodation.

Pan-London data for 2022/23 and 2023/24 also indicates that PRS accommodation and living with friends/family or partner were the most common last settled base and that long-term accommodation departures made up the largest proportion of departures. In both periods, hostels were the most common short/medium-term accommodation and prison was the most common institutional accommodation.

Pan-London data for 2023/24 also indicates an increase (to 8.7%) of people with no previous settled base in the UK.

Reason for leaving last settled base (returning rough sleepers)[10]

Reason for leaving	2022/23	2023/24
Asked to leave	40.0%	7.5%
Left of own accord	40.0%	32.1%
Evicted	0.0%	20.8%
End of time-limited stay	0.0%	7.5%
No settled base since UK arrival	0.0%	3.8%
Other	20.0%	15.1%
No departure – still in accommodation	0.0%	3.8%

[10] Base = 5 (2022/23), base = 53 (2023/24).

Page 50

Reason for leaving	2022/23	2023/24
Not known	0.0%	9.4%
Total:	100.0%	100.0%

This data indicates reduction in people being asked to leave their accommodation and an increase in people being evicted. Pan-London data for 2022/23 and 2023/24 indicates the main reasons for leaving last settled base related to eviction, followed by people leaving accommodation of their own accord and end of time-limited stay.

Gender

The gender of 469 City of London rough sleepers was recorded on CHAIN in 2022/23. A significant majority of these rough sleepers (89%) were male. In 2023/24, gender was recorded for 604 rough sleepers, of which 91.6% were male. The proportion of male rough sleepers in City of London was somewhat higher than the pan-London average (83.2% in 2022/23 and 84.0% in 2023/24).

Nationality

Table 6: Nationality[11]

Nationality group	2022/23	2023/24
UK	64.9%	66.4%
EEA (main groups Romania and Poland)	25.5%	20.0%
Non-EEA	1.4%	0.8%
European not known	1.0%	0.6%
Africa	3.1%	6.6%
Asia	2.4%	3.8%
Americas	1.2%	1.7%
Australasia	0.5%	0.2%
Total:	100.0%	100.0%

City of London's rough sleeping population is less diverse than London as a whole. In 2022/23 and 2023/24, approximately two thirds of City rough sleepers were UK nationals - significantly higher than pan-London averages (48.6% in 2022/23 and 45.5% in 2023/24).

City of London had a slightly lower proportion of EEA national rough sleepers than London averages (25.5%, compared to 29.5% in 2022/23 and 20.0% compared to 23.3% in 2023/24). City of London also had a lower proportion of rough sleepers from African

---

[11] Base = 416 (2022/23), = 529 (2023/24)

countries than the London average (2.4% in 2022/23 and 3.8% in 2023/24, compared to 9.8% and 16.7% respectively) and from Asia – where the London average was 8.1% in 2022/23 and 10.5% in 2023/24.

In relation to comparator boroughs in 2023/24, City of London's proportion of UK nationals is higher than Lambeth, Southwark and Tower Hamlets. City of London's proportions of rough sleepers from African and Asian countries and the Americas are also lower than all three boroughs.

Age

Table 7: Age[12]

	2022/23	2023/24
Under 18	0.2%	0.0%
18 – 25	4.1%	4.4%
26 – 35	22.2%	28.7%
36 – 45	37.6%	37.2%
46 – 55	22.8%	21.2%
55+	13.1%	8.5%

Source: CHAIN data reports

The majority of City of London rough sleepers in both periods (around 83%) were aged between 26 and 55. There was a slight increase in the number of 26 – 35 year olds in 2023/24, matched with a slightly lower number of people aged over 55. Pan-London data for 2022/23 and 2023/24 did not indicate any significant differences in this area.

Support needs

Table 8: Support needs[13]

	2022/23		2023/24	
	City of London	London average	City of London	London average
Alcohol	43%	31%	38%	28%
Drugs	49%	32%	45%	29%
Mental health	61%	51%	66%	48%
2+ support needs	50%	35%	49%	30%
No support needs	16%	28%	15%	34%

Source: CHAIN data reports

---

[12] Base = 482 (2022/23); 656 (2023/24)

[13] Base = 309 (2022/23), = 352 (2023/24).

Page 52

CHAIN records self-reported substance misuse, mental and physical ill health, rather than clinically defined needs. CHAIN records also do not indicate the severity of need.

The most common support need amongst City of London rough sleepers in both 2022/23 and 2023/24 was around mental health, with around two thirds of rough sleepers experiencing issues in this area. Around half of rough sleepers in both periods had an identified drugs need and half of rough sleepers had two or more support needs.

The proportion of City of London rough sleepers with needs around alcohol, drugs and mental health are all higher than London averages for 2022/23 and 2023/24. The proportion of City of London rough sleepers with two or more support needs is also significantly higher than the London average and higher than the three comparator boroughs.

Amongst City of London rough sleepers whose institutional history is known, 47% in 2022/23 and 46% in 2023/24 had experience of prison. This is also significantly higher than the pan-London average of 29% in 2022/23 and 25% in 2023/24.

Accommodation outcomes

Table 9: Accommodation outcomes

Accommodation category	2022/23	2023/24
Hubs, shelters and emergency accommodation	78 placements (32% of total)	88 placements, (35.9% of total) (mainly SWEP, some night shelter)
Temporary accommodation	158 placements (64% of total)	150 placements (61.2% of total)
Long-term accommodation	9 placements (4% of total)	7 placements (2.9% of total)
Total:	245	245

Source: CHAIN data reports

Data indicates the biggest number of accommodation outcomes in 2022/23 and 2023/24 were in temporary accommodation. In 2022/23, this accounted for 158 placements, including 69 placements in B&B, 36 assessment centre placements in TA (28% of total) and 28 placements in local authority TA. In 2023/24, 53 stayed in B&B, there were 38 placements at the assessment centre and 32 placements in local authority TA.

Within the emergency accommodation category, the most common outcome in both periods was into local SWEP accommodation (24% of total in 2022/23 and 21.2% of total

Page 53

in 2023/24). Only a very small proportion of people in both periods (3% - 4%) went directly into long-term accommodation.

In 2022/23, a small number of people (five) were reconnected. Four of these were reconnected within the UK. Information on reconnection is not available for 2023/24.

In comparison, pan-London data for 2022/23 indicates 37% of placements were in emergency accommodation, 51% of accommodation outcomes were in temporary accommodation and 12% of outcomes were within long-term accommodation – including into PRS and Clearing House tenancies. Figures for 2023/24 indicate similar proportions of outcomes split across the three categories.

CHAIN data in this area does not indicate how many housing outcomes relate to flow/stock and returner rough sleepers and rough sleepers' support needs.

Rough sleeping snapshot surveys

Data from the annual rough sleeping snapshot in November 2023 (the most recent currently available) indicates a total of 61 rough sleepers in City of London. This represented an increase of 18 people (42%) on the corresponding 2022 figure and was the third highest in London. The corresponding figure for November 2024 was 86 people, an increase of 41% on the 2023 total.

Table 10: Rough Sleeping Data Framework, July 2023 – June 2024[14]

Data is available for the period July 2023 – June 2024.

Period	New rough sleepers in the month	New rough sleepers on a single night	Leaving an institution
July 2023	22	5	3 (all hospital)
August 2023	17	0	2 (all hospital)
September 2023	22	8	1 (hospital)
October 2023	40	11	1 (hospital)
November 2023	51	20	1 (hospital)
December 2023	51	6	3 (1 each of prison, hospital, asylum support)
January 2024	30	11	1 (hospital)
February 2024	35	10	6 (2 prison, 2 hospital, 2 asylum support)

---

[14] Microsoft Power BI. Accessed January 2025. And checked for updates June 2025.

Page 54

Period	New rough sleepers in the month	New rough sleepers on a single night	Leaving an institution
March 2024	63	10	5 (1 prison, 4 asylum support)
April 2024	68	10	4 (2 prison, 2 asylum support)
May 2024	42	7	3 (all prison)
June 2024	40	13	2 (1 prison, 1 asylum support)

Source: MHCLG

This data indicates an overall upward trend in flow rough sleepers over the course of a month between July 2023 – June 2024, with peaks in November/December 2023 and March/April 2024. The number of new rough sleepers on a single night varied significantly over the period, from 0 in August 2023 to 20 in November 2023.

Of departures of institutions during the period, 12 people are recorded as coming from hospitals, 10 people are recorded as coming from prison and 10 people are recorded as coming from asylum support services.

The number of people coming onto the streets after leaving hospital reduced over the period, whilst the number of people coming onto the streets from asylum seeker support services increased over the period.

H-CLIC data[15]

H-CLIC records the support needs of households owed a prevention or relief duty from a local authority. This includes a history of rough sleeping.

England-wide data for 2022/23 and 2023/24 indicates that 5.5% of households owed a prevention or relief duty had a history of rough sleeping.

H-CLIC data for City of London indicates that in 2022/23 there were a total of 29 households owed a prevention or relief duty. Of these, one applicant had a history of rough sleeping. H-CLIC data for 2023/24 indicates there were a total of 33 households owed a prevention or relief duty. Of these, one applicant had a history of rough sleeping. Data indicates that the proportion of people owed a homelessness duty and having a history of rough sleeping is lower in City of London than national averages.

---

[15] Tables on homelessness - GOV.UK. Accessed January and June 2025.

About Homeless Link

Homeless Link is the national membership charity for organisations working with people experiencing or at risk of homelessness in England. We aim to develop, inspire, support, and sustain a movement of organisations working together to achieve positive futures for people who are homeless or vulnerably housed.

Representing over 900 organisations across England, we are in a unique position to see both the scale and nature of the tragedy of homelessness. We see the data gaps; the national policy barriers; the constraints of both funding and expertise; the system blocks and attitudinal obstacles. But crucially, we also see – and are instrumental in developing – the positive practice and 'what works' solutions.

As an organisation we believe that things can and should be better: not because we are naïve or cut off from reality, but because we have seen and experienced radical positive change in the way systems and services are delivered – and that gives us hope for a different future.

We support our members through research, guidance, and learning, and to promote policy change that will ensure everyone has a place to call home and the support they need to keep it.

What we do

Homeless Link is the national membership charity for frontline homelessness services. We work to improve services through research, guidance and learning, and campaign for policy change that will ensure everyone has a place to call home and the support they need to keep it.

Homeless Link

Minories House
2-5 Minories
London
EC3N 1BJ
www.homeless.org.uk
@HomelessLink

Let's End Homelessness Together

City of London Corporation Committee Report

Committee: Homelessness and Rough Sleeping Sub-Committee	Dated: 01/10/2025
Subject: Homelessness and Rough Sleeping Strategy 2023–2027 Update Report	Public report: For Information
This proposal: • **delivers Corporate Plan 2024–2029 outcomes**	Links to Corporate Plan outcomes 1,2,3,4,10
Does this proposal require extra revenue and/or capital spending?	No
If so, how much?	NA
What is the source of Funding?	NA
Has this Funding Source been agreed with the Chamberlain's Department?	NA
Report of:	Judith Finlay – Executive Director, Community and Children's Services
Report author:	Will Norman – Head of Homelessness Prevention and Rough Sleeping

Summary

This report provides Members with a summary of progress against the aims set out in the Homelessness and Rough Sleeping Strategy 2023–2027. Strategy delivery is administered through a Homelessness and Rough Sleeping Strategy Delivery Plan (SDP). The first part of the report offers Members a high-level summary of SDP actions underway and completed. Appendix 1 provides Members with a summary of completed actions to date from the SDP.

Due to Sub-Committee scheduling, Quarter 2 (Q2) data is unavailable for the performance scorecard and dashboard. Members will receive this information in subsequent reports later in the year.

This report references the following priorities from the Homelessness and Rough Sleeping Strategy 2023–2027:

- Priority 1 – Providing rapid, effective and tailored interventions
- Priority 2 – Securing access to suitable, affordable accommodation
- Priority 3 – Achieving our goals through better collaboration and partnership
- Priority 4 – Providing support beyond accommodation.

Recommendation

Members are asked to:

- Note the report

Main Report

Background

1. This report provides Members with an update on our progress in meeting the objectives set out the Homelessness and Rough Sleeping Strategy 2023–2027. The update forms part of a regular reporting cycle to every Homelessness and Rough Sleeping Sub-Committee meeting.

2. This report presents the progress of the strategy during Q2 2025/26 which is reporting period 8 of 16.

Current Position

Service Delivery Plan (SDP) Update

	Priority 1 Providing rapid, effective and tailored interventions	Priority 2 Securing access to suitable, affordable accommodation	Priority 3 Achieving our goals through better collaboration and partnership	Priority 4 Providing support beyond accommodation	Total
Yet to begin	0	2	1	3	**6**
Risk	0	0	0	0	**0**
Underway – issues	2	0	0	0	**2**
Underway – no issues	7	7	4	1	**19**
Complete	5	4	12	5	**26**
Total	**14**	**13**	**17**	**9**	**53**

- There are currently 53 actions on the SDP.
- Three new actions have been added in the period.
- 47 actions have commenced – three more than in the last period.
- 21 actions are currently live (underway with/without issues) – the same as the previous period.
- 26 actions are now completed – three more than the last period.
- No significant risks have been identified at this stage.

3. The actions (identified by their unique SDP reference) completed in the period are:

✓ **3.11** *Develop recruitment practices to increase/sustain representation diversity in workforce/committee membership – diverse recruitment panels and blind shortlisting routinely used. Local procedures now been taken forward by DCCS, People Directorate Workforce Development Board and Senior Management Team meeting in collaboration with Human Resources Business Partner.*

✓ **4.3** *Explore business case/need for increased wellbeing offer in Square Mile for rough sleepers – one-year fixed-term post at the Providence Row Dellow Centre is now recruited to and delivering.*

✓ **4.7** *Enable move to electronic casework management system for Tenancy Sustainment Team (TST) – Salesforce Inform now purchased and at configuration phase.*

General commentary

4. Reporting period 8 represents the mid-point in the lifespan of the strategy. The SDP has grown from 41 to 53 actions in this time. Priority area 3 (partnership) has been the largest and the most productive area.

5. The number of actions yet to begin is steadily decreasing, and the number of actions closed/complete continues at a comparable rate. This suggests that, while new actions are being added to the SDP, it remains achievable, on track and reflects emerging challenges and opportunities.

6. 49% of the current SDP is now completed, with 40% open and underway. The remaining 11% is in the actions yet to start.

Performance Scorecard and Dashboard Commentary

7. No data is available.

Options

8. There are no options for Members to consider.

Proposals

9. There are no proposals for Members to consider.

Key Data

10. Metrics data can be found in appendices 1 and 2.

Corporate & Strategic Implications

11. Financial implications – none

12. Resource implications – none

13. Legal implications – none

14. Risk implications – none

15. Equalities implications – none

16. Climate implications – none

17. Security implications – none

Conclusion

18. Three actions on the SDP were completed in the period. This brings the total of completed actions to 26. Three new actions were added, bringing the total size of the plan to 53 actions. A total of 21 further actions remain underway, and six are yet to commence.

19. The performance scorecard and dashboard are not available for the October Homelessness and Rough Sleeping Sub-Committee due to the meeting schedule and Q2 data not aligning. Members will receive Q2 information at the next Sub-Committee.

Appendices

- Appendix 1 – Strategy Delivery Plan Completed Actions

Will Norman
Head of Homelessness, Prevention and Rough Sleeping

T: 020 7332 1994
E: will.norman@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Homelessness and Rough Sleeping: Strategy Delivery Plan 2023-27

Priority 1: Rapid, Effective and Tailored Interventions

Lead Area	Unique ID	Activity or Intervention	New this RP?	Who?	Does what?	With who?	By when?	Evidence/Audit	Success Measure or Service User Experience	RAG rated progress	Comments on progress
Cross-cutting	1.6	Implement safe access to online information	No	HoS	Review of cookie policy to ensure web based information is safe for DA victims to access	HO	31-Dec-23	Cookie policy	Accessing CoL webpages poses no risk to anyone seeking advice	Complete	DA web content updated and exit button built in to page.
Rough Sleeping	1.8	Improve safety at rough sleeping hotspots	No	HoS	Creation of new meterials utilising various media to explain service offer	RSSM, PC, RSC	31-Mar-25	Resources/media/feedback	Improved outcomes and safety	Complete	October 24 - Encampments Policy/Protocol/Position in draft. December 2024 - policy progressinbg to CCS in Janurary for approval. January 2025 - JWG set up to replace CM as pprinciple multi-agency planning forum for hotspots and encampments. Protocol agreed at 16 January CCS. Joint Working Group meeting established to monitor and manage HIRSS and encampments.
Rough Sleeping	1.10	Mobilise new RSAC	No	HoS	Coordinate partners and internal stakeholders to ensure new service opens by end of January 2024	RSSM, CM, providers	31-Jan-24	Mobilisation plan	Service open accordng to plan and specification	Complete	Preliminary stages of CSO review underway. FHM to include in handover for KL to pick up in April. Provisional launch pushed back to 13/03 due to delay with PC and lease sign-off. Service opened 13 March 2024. Aug 2024 - KPI's are outstanding, need to be revised, this is underway. Oct 2024 - new KPI's in place.
Cross-cutting	1.11	Develop Rough Sleeping KPI framework	No	HoS	Design set of KPI's which offers long-term trend information to inform evaluation, communications and decision making	RSSM, RSC, SHO, PC	31-Dec-23	KPI framework	More constructive conversation with RSSG, HRS Subcommitee and within service area. Clarity of purpose.	Complete	In draft. Will be incorporated into HRS Strategy metrics approach. July 2024 - now incorporated into HRS metrics and dashboard. Wider discussion needed with officers who chair CMM to align and format KPI's the same for all newly commissioned services from 2025. August 2024 - dashboard redesigned as a scorecard in lign with ASC/CSC reporting
Statutory Homelessness	1.12	Review statutory processes	No	HoS	Commissions independent review of statutory process to test resilience, quality and effectiveness	SHO	31-Mar-25	Review report	Homelessness is prevented and relieved with accuracy and consistency. Staff have the support and resources they need.	Complete	October 24 - review to be carried out by MHLCG HAST advisor by end of FY. December 24 - HAST visit scheduled for 21/1/25. January 2025 - HAST feedback being actioned.

Homelessness and Rough Sleeping: Strategy Delivery Plan 2023-27

Priority 2: Securing Access to Suitable, Affordable Accommodation

Lead Area	Unique ID	Activity or Intervention	New this RP?	Who?	Does what?	With who?	By when?	Evidence/Audit	Success Measure or Service User Experience	RAG rated progress	Comments on progress
Pathway	2.1	Deliver ETE targets across residental settings	No	PC	Use existing KPI frameworks to improve access to ETE	RSSM, PLO	31-Mar-27	KPI frameworks, CMM minutes	Increased resettlement out of the pathway and sustained within pathway	Complete	Targets not being met in residential settings or through EPS. August 2024 - new KPI's drafted in collaboration with supplier. 11/11 adjusted to underway/no issues as new KPI's in place. Still question mark over mid/long-term effectiveness. StW project ended at FYE 24/25.
Pathway	2.7	Reduce impact of service charge and rent arrears process on Pathway stays	No	HoS	Liaise with providers to explore measures and system adaptations which increase sustainablity of stays	PC, PLO, providers	31-Mar-25	Service specifications, KPI's	Avoidable evictions and abandonments due to arrears are minimised	Complete	Issues remain locally. Strategically - contribution to survey created by LB Camden and pushed through supported housing commiserners group. Aim is to influence DWP policy direct deductions. August 2024 - potential collaboration with LSE. December 2024 - CoL signs letter from London Councils lobbying Govt. for change. Situation much improved as evidenced by Grange RD CMM minutes. Direct deductions being used to good effect and residents with PSC arrears over £300 dropping.
Cross-cutting	2.9	Implement new TA framework	No	HoS	Roll out procurement framework, direct purchasing vehicle or approved provider list to enable agile procurement	CM, SHO, stakeholders	31-Mar-24	Framework, APL, DPV	Quicker access to safe and suitable accommodation. Compiant procurement.	Complete	Report proposing APL in governance system and under review by legal. Tender documentation being agreed. Expected to go live March 2024. Finalised and in mobilisation phase. First placements expected in August/September. Oct 2024 - all mobilised.
Statutory Homelessness	2.10	Develop TA quality assurance framework and approach	No	HoS	Work with Statutory team to increase skill and competence in existing staff. Implement a QA framework to track quality and safety	SHO, CM, providers, stakeholders	31-Mar-24	QA framework, WFD records	Reduced complaints and premises related incidents in TA	Complete	Working group set up to progress actions. Proving difficult to establish skill set in TSO allocated to role. Consider brining CoL Envinmental Health on board to consult. September 2024 - Systems now in place to track and record inspection outcomes. Demand needs to tracked to monitor resource implications.

Homelessness and Rough Sleeping: Strategy Delivery Plan 2023-27

Priority 3: Achieving our Goals Through Better Collaboration and Partnership

Lead Area	Unique ID	Activity or Intervention	New this RP?	Who?	Does what?	With who?	By when?	Evidence/Audit	Success Measure or Service User Experience	RAG rated progress	Comments on progress
Health	3.2	Deliver clinical mobile outreach service	No	HHC	Coordinate with local health and rough sleeping network to increase engagement with primary care	RSSM, RSC, stakeholders	01-Sep-23	Health outcome data - GP registrations, attendance etc	Improved health outcomes, redcuced inequalities, better access points. Data to inform future health commissioning	Complete	Van is delivering but question mark over quality of emerging data for business case purposes. P/T Health Coordinator role through DHSC funding planned for Q4 2023/24. 29/01/2025 Health van now well estabished and delivering to rough sleepers and SHC. Review of mobile interventions complete.
Cross-cutting	3.4	Develop dashboard approach to communicate perfomance and demand pressures	No	HoS	Bring together LOTI data sets with 'ending rough sleeping' framework indicators to create easily accessibe dashboard	RSSM, EW	31-Mar-24	Dashboard	Data informed presentations, reports, commissioning strategies	Complete	Links to KPI framework which is in hand. IG officer has approved SIT DSA and DPIA sign-off from DCCS BST. August 2024 - Scorecard replaces metrics framework.
Rough Sleeping	3.6	Review multi-agency meeting arrangements	No	HoS	Use MAM action plan devleoped as a response to the Homeless Link review report	RSSM, RSC, stakeholders, providers	31-Mar-24	MAM action pan, ToR's, Sharepoint	Clearer planning and more decisions made through consensus and with user voice	Complete	August - review complete and confirmed with HRRSG
Rough Sleeping	3.7	Establish key skills/competence audit for commissioned providers	No	HoS	Set up system to audit existing skills and competence and schedule annual review mechanism going forward	RSSM, RSC, CM	31-Mar-25	Audit and schedule, MAM action plan	Increased confidence in provider skill level, legal literacy and competence in areas such as ASC, mental health, immigration etc	Complete	Now being landed through Pathway Review and QAF.
Rough Sleeping	3.8	Establish clear procedures with Community Safety Team for hotspots and ASB perpetrators	No	HoS	Implement new MOU and refine approach to cleansing and hotspot action planning	RSSM, RSC, VC	31-Dec-24	MOU, protocols	Individuals are safeguarded and risk is managed. Community interests are represented.	Complete	Draft MOU with CST in place. Referral process into CST IN PLACE. Cleasing protocol needed. On hold pending outcome of new ASB legislation passing through parliament. New action needed once legislation through Parliament.
Statutory Homelessness	3.9	Review Sanctuary Scheme	No	HoS	Work with CST and CoLP to review referral process, published materials and payment mechanism	VC, CoLP	31-Mar-24	Sanctuary Scheme materials	Increased homelessness prevention interventions and effective safeguarding actions	Complete	Working group set up and led by Jenna Stanley in CST. New process clarified.
Rough Sleeping	3.10	Establish information sharing agreement with CoL and CST regarding Op Luscombe	No	RSSM	Link in with Op Luscombe review to ensure new working arrangements are coordinated and supported by MOU	HoS, VC, SC, CoLP	31-Mar-25	MOU, Op Luscombe review	Better outcomes derived through Op Luscombe. More measurable success.	Complete	SC leading Op Luscombe review. Any MOU, protocols or info sharing agreements should stem from that. January 2025 - CoL Rough Sleeping service pulling back from direct engagement with Op Luscombe in favour of a CoLP liaison role to link clients in with services.
Cross-cutting	3.11	Develop recruitment practices to increase/sustain representation diversity in workforce/committee membership	No	HoS	Establish recruitment practices and confirm the principles beind this in writing. Will consider gender, race and lived experience.	NB, CP	31-Mar-27	Recruitment principles document	Our workforce is more diverse and represents the communities we serve	Complete	Diverse recruitment panels now routine. Next steps: blind shortlisting and principles document. Sept 25 - decision to close off as being led by People WFD and SMT in collaboration with HR BP
Rough Sleeping	3.12	Establish missing persons/high risk rough sleeper protocol with CoLP	No	HoS	Widen existing MISPER protocols to make them more useful for safeguarding vulnerable and missing rough sleepers	RSSM, RSC, CoLP	31-Mar-25	Protocol	Missing and vulnerable rough sleepers are re-egaged with outreach services faster. More effective safeguarding practices.	Complete	CST making enquiries with CoLP on behalf of Challenge Group. Aug 2024 - RSSM made direct request to CoLP to discuss process. CoLP have confirmed reporting process through flowchart provided to April HRSSG. Rachel Bullimore confirmed CoLP are trained to consider vulnerability when making/closing MISPERS but limit to what further can be done - must remain aligned with College of Policing guidelines
Cross-cutting	3.14	Increase number of peer-led activities	No	HoS	Utilise coproduction workstream to introduce lived experience to activity across service area	RSSM, HHC, NB, CM	30-Apr-25	Coproduction outcomes framework	Better outcomes for service users. More innovation and progression from commissioned services	Complete	Mayday Trust/Groundswell commissioned to deliver coproduction workstream. KPI's confirmed. January 2025 - Advisory Panel and Coproduction Champions roles now in place.
Rough Sleeping	3.15	Develop protocol/policy approach to tents and/or rough sleeping hotspots (HIRSS)	No	RSSM	Utilise internal/external stakeholders to develop a consistent approach to tents and HIRSS	HoS, RSC, CST, CoLP	31-Mar-25	Protocol/policy	Fewer tents and less rough sleepers using HIRSS	Complete	October 24 - Encampments Policy/Protocol/Position in draft. Progressing through committees November/December 2024. Policy/protocol agreed at 16 January CCS committee. JWG meeting established.
Cross-cutting	3.16	Collaboration with LSE to explore problem solving opportunities through the LSE entrepreneurship programme	No	HoS	Consisider and potentially deliver a programme with the LSE to team which focuses on practical problems withing the HRS sector	RSSM, PC, HC, SHO	31-Mar-26	LSE documentation	Implementation of practical measures which mitigate or remove barriers to progress/change/positive	Complete	Introductory meeting held. Draft sugestions sent by WN to LSE. LSE provided initial proposal - 'Bridging Gaps. Building Futures' Not taken forward by LSE.

Intervention	New this RP?	Who?	Does what?	With who?	By when?	Evidence	Success Measure or Service User Experience	RAG rated progress	Comments on progress
Implement 'one step beyond' approach when discharging statutory duties	No	SHO	Draft Discharge of Duty guidance for Housing Officers and implement principle of going 'one step beyond' regulated expectations	HoS, stakeholders	01-Nov-23	Discharge of Duty guidance	Safer discharge of duty processes and better outcomes for statutory applicants	Complete	DoD guidance document signed off by ASMT (11/09/23) and CSMT (26/09/23)
Explore business case/need for increased wellbeing offer in Square Mile for rough sleepers	No	HoS	Use data, lived experience and provider consultation to establish need for and potential benefits of a non-accommodation based service offer	RSSM, HHC, RSC, providers, CM	31-Mar-25	Needs analysis/business case. Commissioning strategy	Evidence based approach to commissioning.	Complete	Links to Op Luscombe review. GC developing Wellbeing Hub model which will provide data re demand and impact. Line created in RSPRG for daycentre post. March 2025 - JSNA confirmed will go ahead. April 2025 - report going to HWB. July 25 - links ot AST rolel created at Dellow Centre. Sept 25 - closed as post holder now in post and delivering.
Review clinical outreach delivered by HIT to Grange Rd	No	HHC	Review at first year end and consider replicating to other residential settings	HoS, PC, providers	31-Mar-24	Review	Improved health outcomes and reduced health inequalities over GP based offer	Complete	HIT delivering to Grange Rd and data coming in to CMM. Review carried out March 2024
Enable move to electronic casework management system for TST	No	PC	Procurement of electronic system from software solutions supplier	HoS, CM	31-Mar-25	Casework management system	Improved oversight, case progression, resource allocation, team efficiencies	Complete	October 24 - now progressing. Inform selected as product. IT and commissioning teams mobilising. Sept 25 - Inform purchased and in configuration phase. Closed.
death protocol	No	HoS	Develop a decision making process for actions after the death of any client actively open to our HRS services	ASC, CP, RSSM, RSC, PC	31-Mar-25	Protocol, flowchart	Learning is gathered and used after the deaths of clients open to our services. Services are improved as a result.	Complete	First draft of decision making flow under review. July 2024 - HRSSG consulted and second draft in review. August - final draft going to HRSSG in September. In place an dbeing piloted.

City of London Corporation Committee Report

Committee: Homeless and Rough Sleeping Sub Committee – For information Safer City Partnership – For information	Dated: 01/10/2025
Subject: Tackling the Negative Impacts of Rough Sleeping Update	Public report: For Information
This proposal: • delivers Corporate Plan 2024-29 outcomes	Vibrant Thriving Destination Providing Excellent Services Flourishing Public Spaces
Does this proposal require extra revenue and/or capital spending?	No
If so, how much?	N/A
What is the source of Funding?	N/A
Has this Funding Source been agreed with the Chamberlain's Department?	Not applicable
Report of:	Judith Finlay, Executive Director of Community and Children's Services
Report author:	Philip Connor, Interim Head of Community Safety

Summary

This report provides an update to Members on the work done to date to tackle the negative impacts of rough sleeping. It notes the harms to individuals from long term rough sleeping, and the negative impact on communities from behaviours that can be associated with rough sleeping.

The report outlines the resources and governance introduced to respond to these concerns. It describes the outcomes and impact of the work to date, and outlines the proposed course of action moving forward.

Recommendation

Members are asked to:

• Note the report.

Main Report

Background

1. The City of London Corporation is committed to supporting those who sleep rough on the Square Mile, ensuring a route off the streets tailored to their needs and circumstances. The Corporation invests in specialist outreach services, hostel accommodation (including provision for those with complex needs), a dedicated social worker, health and substance misuse services and a recently opened assessment centre providing emergency beds and a place of safe assessment away from the streets.

2. On 9th December 2024, a draft policy statement and protocol was bought to the Homelessness and Rough Sleeping Subcommittee, entitled 'Tackling the detrimental impacts of rough sleeping.'

3. This Policy was subsequently approved by Community and Children's Services on 16th January 2025, and by the Police Authority Board on 12th February 2025.

4. Following the implementation of this protocol, additional resources, governance and partner initiatives have been introduced. Targeted and intelligence-led operational activities are now taking place regularly across the Square Mile

Current Position

5. A specialist Community Safety Officer was employed in May 2025 on a 12-month fixed-term contract, with the responsibility to develop a partnership model of engagement, intervention and enforcement.

6. A Joint Working Group was formed in June 2025, chaired by City of London Police (CoLP) Chief Inspector Garner and including staff from across the Corporation, including Rough Sleeping, Street Cleansing, Community Safety and all relevant teams within the Corporation with a responsibility for rough sleeping, community safety and the built environment.

7. This group meets monthly, to receive operational updates on the work undertaken by the rough sleeping engagement teams, to provide strategic support and resources for ongoing activities, and to deliver against the policy and protocol.

8. A comprehensive register of all active rough sleeping sites has been created of every known rough sleeper in the Square Mile. This register includes a log of all engagement activity, information known about the person, and facilitates effective and proportionate decision making by the strategic and operational groups.

9. The Joint Working Group has strategic oversight of the Days of Action operational group. Days of Action take place monthly, the fifth and most recent

having taken place on 3rd September 2025. This operational group is chaired by Joe Kingston, Assistant Director (Gardens and Cleansing).

10. The Days of Action involve attendance at priority encampment sites by Corporation teams and commissioned partners supported by the Police. Rough sleepers are made aware via outreach that staff are attending in advance. Amongst the activities taking place are targeted cleansing and removal of items considered dangerous or a fire risk, active supportive engagement with rough sleepers and the removal of items which have been previously served with a Notice.

11. Data on rough sleeping numbers is reported quarterly in the Chain Quarterly Report, the most recent of which was prepared in July 2025 covering the period April – June 2025. The next report will be Published October 2025.

12. Between these Action days, there are multiple Teams channels which manage day-to-day operational reporting and co-ordination of operational activities, including engagement with new rough sleepers, management of emerging issues and rapid response to incidents. These are live channels intended to provide a partnership space for real-time communication and response.

13. In addition, the Joint Working Group has a dedicated officer in the Legal team, who has provided detailed advice and support on the development of a proportionate suite of legal options to directly address the harm caused by rough sleeping. These include the service of Community Protection Warnings and Notices, and Notices under the Environment Act. At present, the teams are solely making use of Notices to remove tents or items which partners have confirmed are vacant. 16 such Notices have been issued, with 14 tents removed to date.

14. A comprehensive Equalities Act Impact Assessment has been completed in relation to the work outlined above. Rough sleeping and homelessness are not protected characteristics under the Equalities Act. However, it is noted some who rough sleep may have characteristics which are protected under the Act, including mental or physical health or pregnancy. The Impact Assessment determined there was a neutral or positive impact across all protected characteristics. The Impact Assessment will be reviewed regularly to ensure any activity remains proportionate.

15. The strategic and operational models outlined above, aligned with the partnership approach introduced by the Joint Working Group and implemented both day-to-day through comms channels and via the monthly Days of Action, are providing the Corporation and partners with a greater understanding of the condition of rough sleeping within the Square Mile. The increased fixed-term resource within the Community Safety team has provided effective co-ordination between the various internal teams and external partners, and this report notes the effectiveness of the City of London Police in chairing this Group.

16. The current operational and tactical model for partnership working and rough sleeper support is now embedded within the City Corporation, commissioned partners and the Police. Communication is effective and occurring in real time in response to emerging issues. Partners are in agreement that the current process allows for effective engagement and intervention, and a proportionate and sensitive pathway for enforcement is at an advanced stage and will be ready to be implemented within one month of this report.

17. Days of action will continue monthly to remove tents and other items, and there is an ongoing real-time response to any emerging issues which represent increased risk such as fire risks, with responses taking place within 1 working day.

18. A further report will be brought to this meeting in six months to outline the ongoing work being conducted in this area, any changes or developments to the operational protocols, and any legal actions that have taken place.

Key Data

19. As mentioned above, data on rough sleeping numbers is reported quarterly in the Chain Quarterly Report, the most recent of which was prepared in July 2025 covering the period April – June 2025. This data showed there a total of 259 rough sleepers in the Square Mile in that period, a reduction of 39 on the same period last year.

20. In the Period June – August 2025, the Outreach team made a total of 398 contacts with rough sleepers. This figures includes multiple contact points with individual rough sleepers.

21. Streetlink is the online referral tool for individuals or businesses wanting to report a rough sleeper in the Square Mile. In the period June – August 2025, a total of 173 referrals were made via Streetlink. This includes duplicate reports.

22. During the days of action, 16 Notices of removal have been placed on abandoned tents, and 14 of these have been removed to date.

23. Significant volumes of waste have been removed during the days of action, along with dozens of wooden pallets, with a review of the previous three months activities showing a marked decrease in the number of pallets needing removal from sleep sites, from dozens to single figures.

Corporate & Strategic Implications

24. Strategic implications – The work and direction of travel described above align with multiple strands of the Corporate Plan. Specifically, 'Vibrant Thriving Destination' by supporting the City to be a safe and secure destination. Also 'Providing Excellent Services' through enabling access to effective support and care pathways, which in turn supports people to live healthy and productive lives.

This work also supports delivery of the 'Safer Public Spaces' strand of the Safer City Partnership Strategy 2025-2029.

25. Financial implications - There is a potential ongoing financial requirement to fund 1 FTE member of staff within the Community Safety Team to co-ordinate this work.

26. Resource implications – None

27. Legal implications – Sensitive and proportionate legal actions must be signed off by senior staff and supported by ongoing engagement by outreach services. This mitigates risk to the Coty Corporation.

28. Risk implication – There is risk of legal challenge and reputational impacts with any such actions but the approaches set out above ensure these are mitigated.

29. Equalities implications – An Equality Impact Assessment has been completed. Whilst homelessness is not a protected characteristic, those who are homeless or rough sleeping may have a higher chance of having protected characteristics themselves. The EIA shows a neutral or positive impact on any relevant characteristics. This will be regularly reviewed, and will inform any decision making and process development moving forward.

30. Climate implications – None

31. Security implications – Ongoing work to manage the impact of rough sleeping and encampments is required to facilitate the maintenance of safe spaces within the Square Mile.

Conclusion

32. There is now a robust partnership model in place to both respond to emerging issues around rough sleeping and to positively engage and enforce behaviours within encampments. Action is being taken to remove unused items associated with rough sleeping across the Square Mile. Regular operational and tactical meetings are taking place and scheduled with all appropriate partners and commissioned services.

33. The processes outlined above will remain under regular review, and the Equality Impact Assessment will be continually monitored and updated to ensure all activities remain proportionate.

Appendices

- None

Background Papers

- Policy and protocol to tackle the negative impacts of rough sleeping: Community and Children's Services -16 January 2025; Police Authority Board -12 February 2025

Philip Connor
Interim Head of Community Safety

E: Philip.Connor@cityoflondon.gov.uk

City of London Corporation Committee Report

Committees: Community and Children's Services Committee – For decision Policy and Resources Committee – For decision Homelessness and Rough Sleeping Subcommittee – For information	Dates: 17/09/2025 18/09/2025 01/10/2025
Subject: North East London Rough Sleeping Prevention and Recovery Grant Delivery Proposal	Public report: For Information
This proposal: • **delivers Corporate Plan 2024–2029 outcome:**	Delivering Excellent Services
Does this proposal require extra revenue and/or capital spending?	No
If so, how much?	N/A
What is the source of Funding?	MHCLG Rough Sleeping Prevention and Recovery Grant (RSPARG)
Has this Funding Source been agreed with the Chamberlain's Department?	N/A
Report of:	Judith Finlay – Executive Director, Community and Children's Services
Report author:	Will Norman – Head of Homelessness Prevention and Rough Sleeping

Summary

This report seeks approval for the City of London to act as the lead authority, commissioning body and administrator for the Rough Sleeping Prevention and Recovery Grant (RSPARG) on behalf of the North East London (NEL) sub-region.

The proposal covers an initial period of FY 2025/26; however, Members are also asked to consider the possibility of in-year increases to grant funding and approval for an extended period pending confirmation of further grant funding for 2026/27 and beyond.

RSPARG grant funding is provided to individual local authorities and sub-regions through a ring-fenced section 31 grant. The funding should be used to provide vital single

homelessness and rough sleeping services, to support individuals sleeping rough, at risk of sleeping rough, or at risk of returning to rough sleeping

The proposal sets out the new governance and oversight arrangements required to safely deliver the 2025/26 grant on behalf of the seven NEL local authorities, plus the City of London.

Recommendations

Members of Community and Children's Services Committee are asked to:

- Note the report and endorse the proposal for consideration and approval at Policy and Resources Committee

Members of Policy and Resources Committee are asked to:

- Note the report and approve the proposal

Main Report

Background

1. The Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government's (MHCLG's) Rough Sleeping Prevention and Recovery Grant (RSPARG) was first awarded in 2024/25 and is split between direct awards to individual local authorities and awards to sub-regions. The City of London is part of a NEL sub-region which includes seven boroughs and the City of London.

2. The RSPARG was preceded by the previous government's Rough Sleeping Initiative (RSI) grant programme. The City of London has been in receipt of RSI funding since 2017/18, with the most recent award being a three-year award covering 2022/23 to 2024/25 and totalling £3,986,399.

3. The purpose of the RSPARG is to enable local authorities to continue vital rough sleeping services, to support individuals sleeping rough, at risk of sleeping rough, or at risk of returning to rough sleeping. It provides local authorities with the flexibility to determine the most effective services, driven by local need, to be delivered in line with the national priority impacts set out in the grant conditions.

4. The RSPARG is paid in a single tranche as a Section 31 ring-fenced payment. The grant is subject to a single, light-touch mid-year delivery report and an end-of-year declaration.

5. The current NEL sub-region was established in 2023/24 with funding from MHCLG. Five funding streams have been allocated to the sub-region across 2023–2025. All were spent and delivered significant additional interventions above those that boroughs had already individually committed to.

6. The role of the NEL sub-region is to foster a closer working relationships across local authorities through shared practice and resources. The NEL boroughs are Hackney, Tower Hamlets, Newham, Barking and Dagenham, Waltham Forest, Havering and Redbridge. Each local authority attends monthly meetings chaired by the NEL Co-ordinator. The meetings are also attended by representatives from London Councils, MHCLG and health partners. Examples of work commissioned and delivered through NEL to date includes:

   - A sub-regional reciprocal accommodation agreement between six out of eight boroughs
   - A five-month winter hub for NEL boroughs based in Newham
   - Expansion of specialist psychotherapy outreach from three to five boroughs
   - Expansion of homeless health workstreams across primary care, speech and language therapy, harm reduction and personalised health budgets
   - A Private Rented Sector (PRS) scheme with access to rent in advance, deposits, landlord incentives and access to suitable and affordable PRS properties
   - Continuation of the mental health outreach service in NEL
   - Funding for accommodation stays for clients accessing immigration advice.

Current Position

7. The Government's new RSPARG programme was publicly announced on 18 December 2024. The initial award for 2025/26 includes £1,373,509 individual allocation to the City of London and £767,448 allocated to the NEL sub-region. Payment was made on 1 May 2025.

8. Service delivery funded by the City's individual RSPARG award is managed locally by the Homelessness and Rough Sleeping Service in co-operation with colleagues in Community and Children's Services, Chamberlain's Department, Commercial Services, and Comptroller's Office.

9. For the purpose of this report, Members' attention is drawn to the NEL sub-region element of the RSPARG award, which for 2025/26 totals £767,448.

10. In previous years the MHCLG has occasionally topped-up an initial grant award payments with additional funding that is required to be committed in-year. Members are asked to consider this possibility arising in 2025/26 (please see Non-public Appendix 1).

11. The 2025/26 award has been provisionally allocated to Redbridge, pending a decision on which NEL authority is best placed to assume the role of lead authority. Redbridge is not in a position to take future procurement workstreams forward. Considering this, all seven NEL boroughs and MHCLG endorse the City of London's proposal to assume the role of lead authority.

12. A fixed-term post located in Redbridge acts as a Sub-regional Co-ordinator. The post holder convenes a monthly meeting, commissions new services, monitors and tracks existing service delivery, acts as a contract monitoring officer, and is responsible for financial monitoring returns to MHCLG.

13. The City Homelessness and Rough Sleeping Service currently liaises regularly with MHCLG Rough Sleeping Advisors, and existing arrangements are in place for expenditure declarations against City of London's specific allocations to be approved by the Section 151 Officer.

14. The Homelessness and Rough Sleeping Service is a regular contributor to the existing NEL sub-region work group; however, the sub-region currently lacks comprehensive governance and oversight arrangements. A draft work plan for delivering proposed activity in 2025/26 has been prepared by the sub-region contributors in advance of a lead authority being confirmed.

15. An opportunity exists more closely align the strategic objectives of the NEL rough sleeping sub-region with the NEL Integrated Care Board (ICB). The City of London's Homelessness and Rough Sleeping Service is already engaged with the NEL ICB Homelessness Health Strategy at place and neighbourhood level.

Options

16. **Option 1** – the City of London will act as the lead authority for the NEL sub-region. The City of London will be the recipient of RSPARG funding for 2025/26, with consideration given to extending this arrangement to align with confirmation of future funding for 2026/27 and beyond.

17. Each NEL borough will submit their own management information data on the Government's data collection portal (Delta) confirming the number of people sleeping rough. The City of London will submit a spend declaration at the end of the grant period setting out the total amount spent by the authority on behalf of the sub-region. The City of London Section 151 Officer will approve spend declarations.

18. The City of London and an MHCLG Rough Sleeping Advisor will identify a senior officer (Housing Director or similar) from another authority in the sub-region to act as a programme sponsor.

19. The Sub-regional Co-ordinator post will either move from Redbridge under a secondment, or a recruitment process will be required to identify a suitable candidate. The post will report to the Head of Homelessness, Prevention and Rough Sleeping.

20. The Programme Sponsor, Sub-regional Co-ordinator and City's Head of Homelessness, Prevention and Rough Sleeping will anchor a strategic delivery board (also including an MHCLG representative and others to be confirmed) to provide governance and oversight of procurement decisions, contractor

performance and MHCLG communication. NEL boroughs will sign up to a memorandum of understanding drafted in collaboration with City of London legal services. This addresses the lack of governance under the current arrangement.

21. **Option 2** – the City of London will not assume a lead authority function for the NEL sub-region. Redbridge will retain the budget and the role until such time as an alternative arrangement can be designed and implemented. The City of London will sustain its participation in the NEL sub-region as an equal with the other boroughs involved.

Proposal

22. Option 1 – the City of London will act as the lead authority and commissioning body for the RSPARG grant for the period 2025/26. Should this prove successful and, if the RSPARG grant programme is extended beyond 2025/26 (the most probable outcome is a three-year programme), the commitment should be extended to align with available funding.

Key Data, Facts and Figures[1]

23. **Table 1 – Summary data**

Total rough sleepers seen in Greater London 2024/25	13,231
City as a % of total rough sleepers in Greater London	6.64%
City as a % of rough sleeprs in NEL sub-region	29.25%
NEL sub-region as a % of total rough sleepers in Greater London	22.29%

24. **Table 2 – Total rough sleepers in NEL sub-region by borough, 2024/25**

Barking & Dagenham	144
City of London	878
Hackney	298
Havering	67
Newham	545
Redbridge	285
Tower Hamlets	546
Waltham Forest	239
Total	3002

---

[1] Source – Combined Homelessness and Information Network (CHAIN)

Page 73

25. **Table 3 – Single night snapshot count of rough sleepers, November 2024**

Barking & Dagenham	6
City of London	86
Hackney	20
Havering	9
Newham	28
Redbridge	19
Tower Hamlets	39
Waltham Forest	60
Total	267

Corporate & Strategic Implications

26. Financial implications – Option 1 is funded from the RSPARG programme and funding is confirmed for 2025/26. Option 1 does not anticipate the City of London contributing any funding. No decision has been made by MHCLG regarding an extended RSPARG programme for 2026/27 and beyond, and confirmation is not expected until later in 2025.

27. Resource implications – Consideration will be given to the resource implications in Community and Children's Services, Chamberlain's Department, Commercial Services, and Comptroller's Office. Grant funding will be used to add short- to medium-term capacity.

28. Legal implications – There are legal risks inherent in managing procurement projects for third parties, however these can be mitigated by clear contract language and the City does have experience in managing similar pan-London contracts. Data protection implications, and data sharing implications must be considered for the project. In this respect, the City's Information Governance Team have recommended that a data mapping exercise be undertaken, and a Data Protection Impact Assessment be completed in accordance with Article 35 of the UK GDPR.

29. Risk implications – There are inherent risks in acting as a lead commissioner in procurement and commissioning in terms of market interest/availability, provider failure, reputational risk by association, with service closure and government funding that can be subject to change. Risks will be mitigated through the City of London Corporation's contract management arrangements, Commercial Services and legal input. These areas are all to be funded by the RSPARG programme. The requirement to commit spending in FY 2025/26 increases the risk of returning an underspend in the end of year financial declaration. MHCLG notes the challenges faced in assuming a lead authority role at this stage of the financial year and acknowledges the practical implications. The NEL Strategic Delivery Board will provide governance and oversight

arrangements. The proposal echoes similar arrangements already in place in delivering the London Sexual Health Partnership and Inpatient Detoxification programmes delivered by Community and Children's Services. If Option 2 is preferred, there is a risk that operational activity to help tackle rough sleeping in the City will not be procured, and therefore rough sleeping numbers may increase.

30. Equalities implications – Rough sleeping populations are among the most disadvantaged and underserved by public services. Option 1 will help the City of London and the NEL sub-region address these issues with greater strategic focus.

31. Climate implications – none

32. Security implications – none

Conclusion

33. The NEL sub-region was awarded £767,448 of grant funding from the Government's RSPARG programme in May 2025. In-year increases in grant funding as well as an extended grant programme from 2026/27 are possibilities.

34. The RSPARG fund is allocated to help local authorities tackle rising levels of rough sleeping through prevention and relief workstreams procured using grants allocated directly to housing authorities and sub-regions.

35. There is currently no lead authority within the NEL sub-region to assume responsibility for using RSPARG funding to procure activity that helps the City of London and NEL sub-region tackle street homelessness.

36. Option 1 in the proposal section of the report sets out how the City of London will act as lead authority. The core responsibilities include liaison with MHCLG regarding progress in grant delivery, procurement activity, contract monitoring and expenditure declarations.

37. Additional resourcing to the City's Homelessness and Rough Sleeping Service, Procurement, Commissioning and Legal services will be funded from the grant and there are no additional costs to the City of London in acting as lead authority.

38. Governance and oversight will be provided by a Strategic Delivery Board chaired by an independent senior housing professional from within the NEL sub-region. NEL member authorities will sign up to a memorandum of understanding.

Appendices

- Non-public Appendix 1 - North East London Rough Sleeping Prevention and Recovery Grant Delivery Proposal

Will Norman
Head of Homelessness, Prevention and Rough Sleeping

T: 020 7332 1994
E: will.norman@cityoflondon.gov.uk

City of London Corporation Committee Report

Committee: Homelessness and Rough Sleeping Sub-Committee	**Dated:** 01/10/2025
Subject: Homelessness Prevention and Rough Sleeping – Commissioning and Procurement Update	**Public report:** For Information
This proposal: • **delivers Corporate Plan 2024-29 outcomes**	Providing Excellent Services 5,6 & 14
Does this proposal require extra revenue and/or capital spending?	No
If so, how much?	Not applicable
What is the source of Funding?	Not applicable
Has this Funding Source been agreed with the Chamberlain's Department?	Not applicable
Report of:	Judith Finlay – Executive Director, Community and Children's Services
Report author:	John Barker – Commissioning Manager, Homelessness and Rough Sleeping

Summary

This report provides Members with an update on the Commissioning and Procurement of services provided to the Homelessness Prevention and Rough Sleeping Service.

This update will be provided bi-annually to ensure that Members are briefed on commissioning activities affecting homelessness and rough sleeping in the City of London.

Recommendation

Members are asked to:

• Note the report.

Main Report

Background

1. The Homelessness Prevention and Rough Sleeper Service (HPRSS) currently commissions 21 different services of varying sizes delivering statutory and strategic outcomes. These range from small commissions with service provided on a call-off basis, to a £700,000 a year contract for the provision of accommodation and support at the High Support Hostel, as well as the high-value approved provider list for Temporary and Emergency Accommodation. The total annual value of these contracts stands at £5.5 million, (this figure is inflated by the annual value of temporary accommodation which is a ceiling figure and not actual contract cost).

2. Each contract has its own timeline, during which decisions are made on the future need for a service, how to redesign or amend the aims and objectives of the service, and how to reprocure it if necessary.

3. These decisions are made as a partnership between HPRSS, Commissioning Team, Comptrollers, Chamberlains and Commercial Services.

Current Position

4. The current list of services by annual value bracket is:

Contract Name	Annual Value	Additional Detail
Adam Housing (Emergency and Temporary Accommodation Approved Provider List)	Over £1m	Value based on demand
High Support Hostel	£500,000 to £1m	Accommodation-based support
Rough Sleeper Assessment Centre	£500,000 to £1m	Accommodation-based support
Tri-Borough Psychotherapy Service	£500,000 to £1m	Shared costs with Northeast London Regional Partnership (Grant)
Rough Sleeping Outreach Service	£500,000 to £1m	Part grant funded
Low–Medium Supported Housing	£100,000 to £250,000	Accommodation-based support
Mobile Intervention and Support Team	£100,000 to £250,000	Grant Funded
The Lodges	£100,000 to £250,000	Accommodation-based support
Rough Sleeper Navigators	£100,000 to £250,000	Grant Funded
Housing First	£100,000 to £250,000	Grant Funded

Rough Sleepers Co-production Service	£100,000 to £250,000	Grant Funded
Rented Sector Tenancy Sustainment Service	Under £100,000	Grant Funded
Dellow Centre City of London Co-ordinator	Under £100,000	Grant Funded
Private Rented Sector Move On and Support Pilot	Under £100,000	
Community Reassurance and Support Service	Under £100,000	
Health Inclusion Service	Under £100,000	Nurse provision at High Support Hostel
Homelessness Team Information Systems	Under £100,000	
Health Inclusion Service at Snow Hill Court	Under £100,000	Nurse provision at Assessment Centre
Inform IT System for Tenancy Sustainment Team	Under £100,000	
Section 202 Homeless Reviews	Pay as You Go	
Assessment of medical priority for Housing applicants	Pay as You Go	

Commissioning and Procurement Plan

5. The current commissioning and procurement activity is as follows:

Service	Target Date	Present Position
Statutory Homelessness Out of Hours Response	01/01/2026	Designing proposal
Health Inclusion (two sites)	24/11/2025	Preparing direct award of new contract
The Lodges	31/12/2025	Preparing direct award of new contract
Low–Medium Supported Housing	31/03/2026	Redesign of service specification following service review and preparing direct award of new contract
Street Homeless Outreach and Support	01/11/2026	Co-producing and designing new multi-functional service

6. The pipeline priorities are:

Service	Target Date	Present Position
Housing First	31/03/2026	Evaluating options for future of service
Sub-regional Borough Psychotherapy Service	31/03/2026	Preparing to extend contract prior to handover to Northeast

		London Regional Commissioning for retendering
High Support Hostel	09/10/2027	Evaluating options for future of service
Emergency and Temporary Accommodation – Approved Provider list via Adam Housing	01/08/2026	Establishing future options and procurement strategy

7. In addition, there are a number of potential projects dependent on the (as yet) unannounced Rough Sleeping Prevention and Recovery Grant programme.

Proposals

8. This update is provided to Members for information.

Key Data

9. The key data can be found in the tables in paragraphs 4 to 6.

Corporate & Strategic Implications

10. N/A – Information only

Financial implications

11. N/A – Information only

Resource implications

12. N/A – Information only

Legal implications

13. N/A – Information only

Risk implications

14. N/A – Information only

Equalities implications

15. The commissioning process includes production of an Equalities Impact Assessment for any new service to consider the implications of service provision and design on any potential service user with protected characteristics.

Climate implications

16. N/A – Information only

Security implications

17. N/A – Information only

Conclusion

18. An update on Homelessness and Rough Sleeping Commissioning will be presented to the Homelessness and Rough Sleeping Sub-Committee bi-annually.
19. This area of service provision draws funding from both the Corporation and Central government, amounting to c. £5.5 million per annum.
20. Current commissioning activity includes the redesign and codesign of a new Rough Sleeper Support service, combining a number of existing separate services under one umbrella and drawing on City of London and Central Government funding opportunities.
21. Additionally further contract awards to two accommodation-based projects – Low–Medium Supported Housing and The Lodges – are in train.
22. While the Homelessness Prevention and Rough Sleeper service is waiting on further announcements, further potential projects remain unclear.

Appendices

- Appendix 1 – Brief Service Descriptions

John Barker
Commissioning Manager – Homelessness and Rough Sleeping

T: 020 3834 7204
E: john.barker@cityofondon.gov.uk

Appendix 1 – Brief Service Descriptions

Contract Name	Brief Description
Adam Housing (Emergency and Temporary Accommodation Approved Provider List)	Software platform giving City of London Homelessness Officers access to accommodation providers
High Support Hostel	29-bed, 24-hour staffed accommodation project in SE1
Rough Sleeper Assessment Centre	14-bed, short-stay accommodation project for rough sleepers. Located in the City of London Corporation
Tri-Borough Psychotherapy Service	Psychological Interventions and support for rough sleepers across the sub-region
Rough Sleeping Outreach service	Frontline service identifying and supporting individuals while they are on the streets
Low–Medium Supported Housing	21-bed, 9-to-5 staffed accommodation project in SE1
Mobile Intervention and Support Team	Floating support for clients placed in temporary accommodation
The Lodges	Two accommodation projects for older or more entrenched rough sleepers, proving support on an "as you want it" basis
Rough Sleeper Navigators	Continuing support for long-term rough sleepers and those with the most complex needs
Housing First	Internationally recognised model providing Independent accommodation and support to clients who struggle in traditional support schemes. Commissioned by London Borough of Hackney
Rough Sleepers Co-production Service	Partnership with two organisations giving access to commissioned enhanced services to people with lived experience of rough sleeping

Rented Sector Tenancy Sustainment Service	Private accommodation procurement and support
Dellow Centre City of London Co-ordinator	Pilot provision of a building-based day support service for rough sleepers
Private Rented Sector Move On and Support Pilot	Pilot to assess the success of applying the refugee resettlement programme approach to people with a street homeless background
Community Reassurance and Support Service	Community Safety service
Health Inclusion Service	Nursing provision within Supported Housing schemes at the High Support Hostel
Homelessness Team Information Systems	IT system
Health Inclusion Service at Snow Hill Court	Nursing provision within Supported Housing schemes at the Assessment Centre
Inform IT System for Tenancy Sustainment Team	IT system
Section 202 Homeless Reviews	Statutory homeless reviews (statutory function)
Assessment of medical priority for Housing applicants	Medical review of homeless clients (statutory function)

This page is intentionally left blank

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank