

Committee: Homelessness and Rough Sleeping Sub-Committee	Date: 18/02/2019
Subject: Rough Sleeper Pathway Update Report	Public
Report of: Andrew Carter – Director, Department of Community and Children’s Services	For Information
Report author: Will Norman – Service Manager, Homelessness and Rough Sleeping, Department of Community and Children’s Services	

Summary

This report provides an updated summary of the current performance of the City of London accommodation pathway, as well as its related support services.

The information in the report focuses on additions and developments which are a direct result of new monies added to the rough sleeping budget with the objective of reducing rough sleeping. Where applicable, a more holistic view which includes the full range of measures available to the City will also be described.

Recommendation

- Members are asked to note the report.

Main Report

Background

1. Until the autumn of 2017 the only accommodation options available to rough sleepers in the Square Mile were Pan-London arrangements such as No Second Night Out (for new rough sleepers) and Routes Home (for non-UK nationals), The Lodge and Crimscott Street (formerly Middle Street Hostel). The only addition to this was a quarterly pop-up hub funded by Proceeds of Crime Act (POCA) money. In many respects this reflects the substantive position of most London Councils which only offer an accommodation option for rough sleepers with a demonstratable local connection.
2. During 2017, members agreed a significant increase to the Homelessness and Rough Sleeping budget. The remainder of the financial year 2017/18 saw a net increase of £195,000 and the full financial year 2018/19 has seen £409,000 added to the overall local risk area for homelessness and rough sleeping.
3. The four workstreams funded by the Ministry for Housing, Communities and Local Government aggregate to a total further investment of £245,000.

Current Position

4. **Accommodation** – the proposal was for a number of individual spot purchase arrangements in neighbouring authorities. All these are now in place; however, the final agreements have differed slightly from the original proposal. Westminster Council feels it is currently unable to offer a total of four beds across both King George's and Edward Alsop Court; instead, it is offering three beds at any one time. It has not been possible to agree the use of a bed at Hopkinson House high-support project due to the value Westminster places on this service for its own use.

4.1. Hostel provision – the following agreements are currently in place:

- Westminster – two beds at King George's Hostel, one bed at Edward Alsop Court Hostel
- Tower Hamlets – four beds at the Dellow Centre Hostel
- Hackney – one bed at Mare Street Hostel
- Southwark – six beds at Great Guildford Street Hostel

4.2. The commissioning of a pathway model has enabled us to develop a data set that provides the clearest picture yet of how effective we are at assisting rough sleepers. The beds at Great Guildford Street are used solely for the purpose of assessment, which means that many referred clients have short stays. For this reason, we will separate the Great Guildford Street beds from the longer-term beds in Tower Hamlets, Westminster and Hackney.

4.3. The data in Table 1 excludes the City Assessment Hub, No Second Night Out and the use of other 'off the street' options in addition to our commissioned services.

Table 1: Westminster, Tower Hamlets and Hackney beds for the period 01/10/2017 to 30/09/2018

Carried over from previous period	3
Moved in	6
Moved out	3
Avg. length of stay (days)	354
Avg. length of stay before positive move on (days)	67
Avg. length of stay before negative move on (days)	83
No. positive move on	2
No. known to have returned to rough sleeping	1

4.4. The number of clients carried over refers to residents already on one of these beds at the start of the period.

4.5. The average length of stay reflects the move on target set by most medium- to long-term settings of two years.

4.6. The positive moves out of these beds were to other spaces within the wider City pathway. This demonstrates good use of the 'step-down' functions

provided by a diversity of support settings. Resettlement away from the pathway into the private rented sector remains the preferred option for most people.

Table 2: Great Guildford Street (Southwark beds) for the period 01/10/2017 to 30/09/2018

Carried over from previous period	5
Moved in	10
Moved out	15
Avg. length of stay (days)	109
Avg. length of stay before positive move on (days)	97
Avg. length of stay before negative move on (days)	123
No. positive move on	8
No. known to have returned to rough sleeping	6

4.7. The data in Table 2 covers the six beds at Great Guildford Street Hostel. These spaces are used for initial moves off the street which supports our Assessment Hub model and provides better access for the outreach team to an 'off the street' option between Hubs. Stays are intended to be shorter and the likelihood of unsuccessful stays is higher.

4.8. The average length of stay across the hostel beds commissioned as a result of new pathway monies is 231.5 days. Sixteen rough sleepers moved into the pathway and there have been 10 positive resettlements to other accommodation.

Table 3: Complete accommodation pathway (Southwark, Tower Hamlets, Westminster, Hackney, Crimscott Street and Anchor House¹) for the period 01/10/2017 to 30/09/2018

Carried over from previous period	28
Moved in	24
Moved out	27
Avg. length of stay (days)	594
Avg. length of stay before positive move on (days)	654
Avg. length of stay before negative move on (days)	161
No. positive move on	17
No. known to have returned to rough sleeping	9

4.9. Table 3 represents the most complete picture we have for the accommodation options at our disposal for rough sleepers. The number of people carried over from the last period is lower than the total number of beds that we have (37 at this time) as not all the Crimscott beds are occupied by City rough sleepers.

¹ One bed in the period, total of four beds for future periods with the addition of Cold Weather Fund payment from the Greater London Authority

- 4.10. A total of 52 individuals have been assisted between 1 October 2017 and 30 September 2018. Of these, 27 have moved on which indicates a 52% move-on rate in the period.
- 4.11. **Housing First** – a social tenancy was identified, and a single individual has occupied this address, with the support of a dedicated worker from the outreach team, since July 2018. The £18,000 annual budget for this is used to pay part of the salary of the new worker, provide a personalised budget for the client, and as a contingency fund for rent arrears.
- 4.12. Hackney Adult Social Care is leading a competitive procurement process for a larger Housing First initiative which the City of London would have access to. There is a market engagement event scheduled for Monday 4 February 2019, which is intended as a warm-up event for interested providers before the procurement formally launches in early March. A Contract Award Report is currently scheduled for July based on the successful completion of the procurement process.
- 4.13. **Private Rented Sector (PRS) access scheme** – this remains a problematic sector to operate in, with huge levels of competitiveness between local authorities to broker arrangements and low levels of motivation from landlords to let to Councils. Cash incentives are seen as a largely negative mechanism and work is underway, led by London Councils, into insurance policies as an alternative. The current need for access into PRS tenancies for our rough sleeping cohort is low, as evidenced by the pathway data in Tables 1 to 3.
- 4.14. No First Night Out has developed several effective partnerships with specialist PRS providers. These organisations often operate as brokers using landlords they have spent years developing relationships with. This often negates the need for cash incentives, instead operating with a placement fee. Current providers used by No First Night Out specialise in under-35s, ex-offenders, or people requiring tenancy support. We are currently reviewing the access criteria to allow access to former rough sleepers (currently those with a rough sleeping background are excluded). Beyond the lifespan of No First Night Out, expected to be late 2019, the intention is that the City of London will develop new contracts with the same providers.
- 4.15. The £20,000 annual budget set aside for this remains within the local risk area.

5. Additional support services

- 5.1. **Outreach welfare benefits specialist** – £10,000 per year was set aside for access to a role where specialist welfare benefits advice can be accessed by rough sleepers. This function is already provided by the Providence Row Dellow Centre which has a Department for Work and Pensions outreach worker who attends the Centre every week. This service is available to City rough sleepers and is routinely used as part of the wider service offer provided by Providence Row as part of its role supporting the City Assessment Hub. The money allocated for this remains in the local risk area.

5.2. **Detox and rehab treatment** – access to clinical treatment services and residential rehab is usually secured through Adult Social Care. Further to this we have access to the Westminster Drug Project team who can arrange detox as part of their role for Public Health England. The limitations with both routes are the access criteria, usually subject to a funding panel. Clients will normally need to demonstrate high levels of preparedness and motivation and a willingness to engage with group work. Preparation normally involves reducing drug intake to a safe level. This can all be a barrier to rough sleepers accessing treatment.

5.3. Around £20,000 has already been spent on two spot-purchased detox and rehab programmes. Both were partially successful. Work is currently underway to develop a service specification that can be used to procure a provider to deliver bespoke detox solutions.

5.4. **Tackling begging/Parkguard pilot** – the successful Parkguard pilot ran between September 2017 and August 2018. During summer 2018, a competitive tender process resulted in Parkguard being awarded a three-year contract to continue their work. The contract value is £25,000 per year.

5.5. The first full quarter of service delivery under the new contract reveals:

- 98 hours of patrol time in the Square Mile focuses on begging and rough sleeping
- 120 contacts with rough sleepers
- 62 contacts with someone begging
- 35 occurrences where someone begging left their site.

5.6. Parkguard performance for the period 1 October 2017 to 30 September 2018 (combination of pilot and current contract) includes:

- 118 patrols carried out
- 327 hours of patrol time
- 256 contacts with rough sleepers
- 103 contacts with someone begging.

5.7. As well as undertaking unassisted patrols and joint shifts with the outreach team, a Parkguard patrol officer attends the Rough Sleeping Tasking and Action meeting.

5.8. **Education and engagement** – this winter we shared an awareness campaign with the Greater London Authority. The savings resulting from not needing to develop new materials allowed us to invest in more advertising space. Around £20,000 has been spent this winter to date and technology used by the media owner estimates that we can assume over 11 million views across the life of the campaign. The 'Alternative Giving' campaign scheduled for later in the summer is expected to cost less. Savings made elsewhere in the Pathway will be used to run the campaign.

5.9. **Commissioning support** – extra input from the Department of Community and Children’s Services commissioning team was secured using the £18,000 outlined in the original proposal. This is used to add extra capacity to the service to ensure that the commissioning strands for current and future work are properly supported. We currently pay for part of one full-time role.

5.10. **Severe Weather Emergency Protocol (SWEP)** – although not included in the original proposal, the City’s commitment to providing sector leading SWEP provision continues. New guidelines piloted this year by the Greater London Authority mean that we are activating SWEP more often than ever before. There is a dedicated SWEP budget, however, saving found elsewhere in the Pathway will act as a contingency fund should we exceed the budget.

Conclusion

6. Except for two beds in Westminster that are not currently available to us, the extra pathway capacity described in the original proposal is available and in use.
7. The turnover of beds at Great Guildford Street is higher than the rest of the pathway as expected. Bed occupancy in the rest of the pathway has largely been successful in terms of keeping people off the street, but is slow moving in terms of case progression.
8. A total of 52 people have been assisted – a combination of those already occupying a space at the beginning of the period and those who move in.
9. Work is underway to enable accelerated access to detox and rehab pathways for rough sleepers.
10. Parkguard have proven to be a useful link between the commissioned outreach service and the City of London Police, with 118 patrols carried out to date. The Parkguard patrol officer has been integrated into our Tasking and Action meeting.
11. Eleven million people are estimated to have seen the winter awareness campaign we shared with the Greater London Authority.

Appendices – none

Will Norman

Service Manager, Homelessness and Rough Sleeping
Department of Communities and Children’s Services

T: 020 7332 1994

E: will.norman@cityoflondon.gov.uk