

# Active Inclusion Newcastle

## Newcastle Homelessness Prevention Briefing Q2 2016-17

We want preventing homelessness in the city to be everyone's business and our quarterly briefings aim to build consensus and a cooperative approach by providing information on:

- **data and narrative that tell us about the causes of homelessness**
- **the perceptions of clients, partners and workers**
- **the outcomes and what works for people supported by homelessness services**
- **new initiatives, policy and legislative changes**

This will help us to work together to consider how to:

- **make the most of our resources to prevent homelessness and respond to crisis**
- **build on what is working well to identify and meet our challenges**
- **create opportunities to intervene earlier, build resilience and prevent homelessness**
- **revise the City's statutory Homelessness Strategy [action plan](#)**

The emphasis of our Homelessness Strategy is to maximise the value of our resources to prevent homelessness. To aid analysis we have created 5 groupings of homelessness:

- **people owed the full homelessness duty**
- **people at risk of homelessness**
- **people living with housing support**
- **young people at risk of homelessness**
- **people facing multiple exclusion and rough sleepers**

We recognise that these groupings have limitations and that people may not exactly fit the definitions but differentiating between the risks of homelessness helps to develop realistic options that include the wider aspects of social and financial inclusion, health and wellbeing. We have found that homelessness is best prevented through coordinated support that provides consistent information, advice and support that provides the foundations for a stable life:

- **an income**
- **financial inclusion**
- **somewhere to live**
- **employment opportunities**

Our primary challenge is to maintain our high levels of homelessness prevention in the face of the largest public sector and welfare cuts in 60 years. We will work with partners to innovate, reduce duplication, increase prevention and provide more effective responses for vulnerable people. More information is provided in the [Newcastle Homelessness Strategy 2014-19](#)

### Headlines for this quarter (Q2 2016-17)

- Newcastle is one of the national early adopters for the Homelessness Prevention Trailblazer part of the wider Homelessness Prevention Programme, described by the Prime Minister as "a fresh government approach to tackling homelessness by focusing on the underlying issues which can lead to somebody losing their home".
- At the Second Reading of the Homelessness Reduction Bill in Parliament on 28 October 2016 the Bill was passed through to Committee Stage without opposition. For more information on the progress of the Bill please click [here](#)
- Introduction of the lower benefit cap in Newcastle, this applied from 7 November 2016 to households who are subject to the current benefit cap.

# 1. People who are owed the full homelessness duty

## 1a. Table 1 – household types and social needs

<b>Total households</b>	<b>2015- 16</b>	<b>Q1 16-17</b>	<b>Q2 16-17</b>	<b>Q3 16-17</b>	<b>Q4 16-17</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
Households owed the full duty	178	51	50			101
<b>Household type (top 3)</b>						
Lone parent with dependent child	84	28	23			51
Couple with dependent children	57	10	11			21
Single person household 18+	17	9	10			19
<b>Social needs (confirmed)</b>						
Mental health	35	13	18			31
Physical health	41	9	1			10
Persons from abroad	43	5	16			21

Table 1 shows there has been no change in households where we have accepted the full homeless duty in Q2.

Table 2 (below) shows that loss of private rented accounted for 39% of all acceptances. This continues to mirror the national position and reflects the low level of statutory protection in this tenure.

## 1b. Table 2 – causes of homelessness and outcomes

<b>Causes of homelessness</b>	<b>2015- 16</b>	<b>Q1 16-17</b>	<b>Q2 16-17</b>	<b>Q3 16-17</b>	<b>Q4 16-17</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
Loss of private rented	52	27	19			46
Parents asked to leave	27	8	6			14
Violent relationship breakdown	23	5	3			8
Required to leave Home Office (asylum support) accommodation	18	0	4			4
Relatives / friends asked to leave	14	3	4			7
<b>Outcomes</b>						
Re-housed to YHN	125	29	30			59
Re-housed to housing association	10	6	4			10
Re-housed to private rented	4	0	2			2
Refused offer	6	1	0			1

In Table 2 the two households who moved to private rented in Q2 found this accommodation independently as it doesn't form part of the authority's statutory offer.

Table 3 (below) shows no change in the numbers of households placed in to Cherry Tree View (CTV) due to a statutory duty for temporary accommodation and shows a fall in the use of other accommodation to meet our duty for temporary accommodation.

Table 3 shows no change over Q1 in CTV's use as a prevention hub for households outside of where a duty for temporary accommodation was owed.

Table 3 continues to include information on the outreach work undertaken by staff at CTV. We have added the requirement for future briefings to include outcome information on their work to the Homelessness Strategy action plan as a way of monitoring the development of this work.

### 1c. Table 3 – use of temporary accommodation

Statutory use of temporary accommodation	2015-16	Q1 16-17	Q2 16-17	Q3 16-17	Q4 16-17	2016-17
Cherry Tree View (CTV)	182	29	29			
Other accommodation	170	40	30			
Domestic violence refuges	13	1	2			
Total	370	70				
Other Cherry Tree View placements	99	29	30			
Cherry Tree View Preventative outreach clients - admits	150	65	31			
• CTV move on cases	28	26	13			
• Homelessness prevention	20	12	6			
• Sustaining tenancies referrals	12	27	20			

The case study below gives an indication of the level of intervention work that the outreach service will undertake to support clients.

#### Case Study – Cherry Tree View Preventative Outreach

Mrs J is a 73 year female & was a preventive outreach referral from HAC to CTV. Had been a Places for People tenant since 2008, court date for eviction had been set following build-up of arrears. Staff at CTV

- Liaised with Revenue and Benefits team to clarify HB position and negotiated to reduce the amount the client was paying towards a previous overpayment
- Assisted the client to make a Discretionary Housing Payment (DHP) application which was awarded
- Supported client to prepare for her court date for eviction
- Application made (and awarded) to the Supporting Independence Scheme (SIS) to replace households that were being rented and reduce outgoings
- Supported with ongoing budgeting work

#### Outcome

- Judge suspended warrant (recognising ongoing advice & support from CTV)
- Client remains in property and is continuing to engage with support

## 2. People at risk of homelessness

Table 4 (below) shows there has been no change this quarter in the numbers of out of hours calls or firstpoint advice given at HAC. Table 4 does show a 24% decrease in HAC casework figures. We believe this reduction to be a combination of a member of staff leaving the service and Q2 traditionally covering a quieter period of the year

Table 4 shows that single people (predominantly male) make up the majority of general casework clients. Presentations at Shelter for clients at risk of homeless saw a higher number of households with dependent children, 40% of their presentations, but still single people formed the majority of clients that they saw. In 81% of cases they were able to support the client to retain their accommodation. They have noted that this quarter they have seen an increase in clients presenting who claim to be literally homeless and this is noted in more detail in section 5.

**2a. Table 4 – people at risk of homelessness contacting HAC**

<b>People at risk of homelessness</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>Q1 16-17</b>	<b>Q2 16-17</b>	<b>Q3 16-17</b>	<b>Q4 16-17</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
Emergency out of hours calls	663	170	168			338
General HAC calls		454	521			975
Firstpoint advice	818	215	223			438
HAC casework	2,231	539	409			948
<b>Household type – casework clients (top 3)</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>Q1 16-17</b>	<b>Q2 16-17</b>	<b>Q3 16-17</b>	<b>Q4 16-17</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
Single male 18+	1,162	295	208			503
Household with dependent children	493	105	94			199
Single female 18+	354	74	65			139

Table 5 (below) shows that the top reason for presenting remains the loss or the fear of the loss of a private rented tenancy.

**Table 5 – causes of homelessness and outcomes for people at risk of homelessness receiving casework interventions at HAC**

<b>Reasons for presenting (top3)</b>	<b>2015- 16</b>	<b>Q1 16-17</b>	<b>Q2 16-17</b>	<b>Q3 16-17</b>	<b>Q4 16-17</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
Loss or fear of loss of private rented	380	88	71			159
Relatives/ friends asked to leave	262	80	55			135
Parents asked to leave	190	69	59			128
<b>Outcomes</b>						
Advice –remain in accommodation	604	108	135			243
Rehoused to supported housing	400	68	73			141
Rehoused to independent tenancy	307	64	83			147

Table 5 shows a rise this quarter in people supported to remain in their own accommodation and those who were supported to find accommodation. The case study below gives an indication of the type support offered by HAC

**Case Study – Single homeless and non-priority presentation at Housing Advice Centre**

D was a 54 year old single woman who approached the Housing Advice Centre (HAC) after being asked to leave tied accommodation when employment was due to end in 3 weeks. D was assessed as homeless but not in priority need. Staff at HAC

- Liaised with employer as to whether client could remain in accommodation until alternative found
- Awarded client band C on Tyne & Wear Homes to reflect non priority status
- Gave advice on private rented alternatives
- Advised client on bidding form properties and monitored application and bids

**Outcome**

- Employer allowed client to remain in accommodation temporarily until new accommodation could be secured.
- Client moved in to a YHN tenancy after 2 months

## 2c. Table 6 – homelessness prevention

<b>Homelessness prevention</b>	<b>2015- 16</b>	<b>Q1</b>	<b>Q2</b>	<b>Q3</b>	<b>Q4</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
		<b>16-17</b>	<b>16-17</b>	<b>16-17</b>	<b>16-17</b>	
<b>Total preventions</b>	<b>3,775</b>	<b>1,087</b>	<b>1,035</b>			<b>2,122</b>
Homelessness prevented	3,647	1,058	980			2,038
Homelessness relieved	128	29	55			84
<b>Prevention activities (top 3)</b>						
Rehoused to supported accommodation	1,345	343	330			673
Resolving rent / service charge arrears	68	271	248			519
Resolving Housing Benefit problems	797	193	183			376
<b>Use of DHP</b>						
DHP awards	193	10	2			12
<b>Social housing evictions</b>						
YHN evictions	48	14	12			26

Table 6 (above) shows homelessness prevention information for Q2. For this quarter we have altered the reporting to show the type of intervention that prevented homelessness as opposed to the agency involved in the work.

Table 6 also shows that evictions from YHN continue to remain low with 12 this quarter.

## 2d Prison and hospital discharges

Table 7 (below) shows a rise in referrals from hospitals in Q2. We continue to liaise on a weekly basis with the Emergency Care Facilitator for Newcastle upon Tyne Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, and the Discharge Facilitators within the Bed Management Service for Northumberland, Tyne and Wear NHS Foundation Trust about those cases of concern or where delays are impacting upon when a client can be discharged.

## 2e. Table 7 – hospital discharge referrals (direct from hospital)

<b>Hospital discharge referrals</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>Q1</b>	<b>Q2</b>	<b>Q3</b>	<b>Q4</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
		<b>16-17</b>	<b>16-17</b>	<b>16-17</b>	<b>16-17</b>	
Total number of referrals	79	11	17			28
General (RVI and Freeman)	47	6	9			15
Mental health	33	4	8			13
<b>Outcomes</b>						
Accommodation secured	34	5	5			10
Returned to friends and family	4	0	0			0
Returned to own tenancy	10	0	4			4
Admit to CTV	7	2	0			2
Homeless presentation – no notice	0	0	1			1
Out of area case – referred back	21	3	3			6
Residential care	1	0	0			0
Advance notice – not yet ready for discharge	2	1	4			5

One client in Q2 was discharged from a mental health ward outside the area with the instruction to present at HAC with no advance notice of this given. As a result we now include discharge facilitators from facilities outside the area, who have Newcastle patients, in the weekly liaison

**2f. Table 8 – prison release referrals**

<b>Prison release referrals</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>Q1 16-17</b>	<b>Q2 16-17</b>	<b>Q2 16-17</b>	<b>Q3 16-17</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
Number of referrals to HAC	65	11	12			23
<b>Outcomes</b>						
Accommodation secured	43	8	10			18
Out of area case - referred back	3	1	0			1
Refused accommodation offer	10	2	2			4
Recalled to prison	6	0	0			0
Returned to previous accommodation	3	0	0			0
Homeless presentation – no notice	0	0	0			0

Table 8 (above) shows a reduction in clients presenting to HAC from custody. These figures come with the caveat that they relate to those where leaving prison is the direct reason for their presentation.

Those leaving custody can often present with multiple issues that can make securing accommodation difficult. The case study below is an example of such a case and but demonstrates the positive work done by a provider to support a client once placed.

### **Case Study – Cedar House – prison release**

M was a very chaotic complex need client, with a history of substance misuse, confirmed mental health issues and a serious offending background. Client was referred to HAC in advance of her release from custody as had no accommodation to return to

- Lead practitioner at HAC attended a significant number of multi-agency meetings, however limited progress was made and client was refused by almost all accommodation providers due to the significant level of risk associated with her
- Lead practitioner liaised with Cedar House about client and project agreed to take client

#### **Outcome**

- M has lived at Cedar House for 3 months, and although her behaviour has continued to be chaotic at times, she has engaged, hasn't re-offended, and that she has not been asked to leave is due to intensive support and robust risk management from the team at Cedar House. This has resulted in the longest period of stability in M's adult life.
- In recognition of the difficulty M has with communal living there are plans for her to move into her own tenancy where she will continue to receive support in the community from staff at Cedar House.

### 3. People living with housing support

3a. Table 9 – supported accommodation admits, reason for admission and social needs

<b>Supported accommodation admissions</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>Q1 16-17</b>	<b>Q2 16-17</b>	<b>Q3 16-17</b>	<b>Q4 16-17</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
<b>Total admits</b>	<b>1,396</b>	<b>365</b>	<b>349</b>			<b>714</b>
• Crisis	447	100	144			244
• Supported	763	210	170			380
• Emergency bed admits	186	55	35			90
Total of individuals	<b>1,036</b>	<b>296</b>	<b>280</b>			
<b>Reason for admission (crisis)</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>Q1 16-17</b>	<b>Q2 16-17</b>	<b>Q3 16-17</b>	<b>Q4 16-17</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
Not recorded / not known	28	8	5			13
Move from another hostel	171	63	39			104
Relationship breakdown	129	45	42			87
Discharge from institution	106	31	28			59
<b>Reason for admission (supported)</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>Q1 16-17</b>	<b>Q2 16-17</b>	<b>Q3 16-17</b>	<b>Q4 16-17</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
Not recorded / not known	30	5	3			8
Moved from another hostel (planned)	145	57	53			110
Relationship breakdown	136	29	26			55
Discharge from institutions	52	13	16			29

Table 9 (above) shows no real increase in the numbers of admissions this quarter and that there was a slight fall in the numbers of individuals that this relates to.

We have broken down the figures to show the split in numbers between those admitted to crisis and supported accommodation, as well as those admitted to the emergency bed provision. Whilst there has been a rise in admissions to crisis provision this quarter overall the level of admissions is consistent with the previous quarter and is on track to be similar at the year end to 2015-16

Table 9 shows that the number of admits where the reason for that admit was not recorded or not known has continued to fall for both crisis and supported accommodation. The majority of admissions to supported accommodation come as result of a planned move from other provision.

Table 10 (below) reports on the measures used to monitor the Supported Housing Move On Protocol and shows a large rise in the numbers of Tyne and Wear applications submitted in the quarter. As part of the review of the protocol and the monthly move on meetings providers have been strongly encouraged to support clients to make an application even in those instances where they believe a client may be found non-qualifying for the scheme. Table 10 shows that so far only 11% of those applications made have resulted in a non-qualifying decision.

Table 10 shows a fall in the numbers of people moving to an independent tenancy this quarter, demonstrating the need for the renewed focus on move on from providers.

**3b. Table 10 – Supported Housing Move On Protocol**

<b>Move on assessments completed in the quarter</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>Q1 16-17</b>	<b>Q2 16-17</b>	<b>Q3 16-17</b>	<b>Q4 16-17</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
<b>Total number of assessments added</b>		<b>473</b>	<b>534</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of 'red' (likely to require long term support)</li> </ul>		83	92			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of 'amber' (further support required)</li> </ul>		278	352			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of 'green' (ready to move to independent living)</li> </ul>		112	90			
<b>Tyne and Wear applications submitted in the quarter</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>Q1 16-17</b>	<b>Q2 16-17</b>	<b>Q3 16-17</b>	<b>Q4 16-17</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
<b>Total applications submitted</b>		<b>25</b>	<b>69</b>			<b>94</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of 'qualifying'</li> </ul>		13	16			29
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of 'non qualifying'</li> </ul>		0	8			8
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Awaiting decision</li> </ul>		12	25			37
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Information not given</li> </ul>		0	20			20
<b>Move on destination</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>Q1 16-17</b>	<b>Q2 16-17</b>	<b>Q3 16-17</b>	<b>Q3 16-17</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
<b>Total number of discharges</b>		<b>362</b>	<b>332</b>			<b>694</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supported accommodation</li> </ul>		109	107			216
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Friends and family</li> </ul>		61	73			134
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Independent tenancy</li> </ul>		59	43			102

The case study below gives an indication in to the type of support required to help a client move on successfully.

**Case Study – Move on from supported housing**

Client was living in supported accommodation at Virginia House and had been in supported accommodation for 3 years)

- Client had been diagnosed with schizophrenia and staff at project supported client to attend monthly treatment sessions
- Client was supported by project staff to attend sessions to address drinking problem
- Supported by staff to engage in social activities at the project
- Whilst in the project undertook courses on budgeting & healthy living developed by provider
- Application made to Tyne & Wear Homes and client referred to Pathways ASW
- Supported to make weekly bids and was referred to specialist mental health floating support from ISOS
- After 6 months of bidding was successful in obtaining a YHN tenancy

**Outcome**

- Client is living in his tenancy and continues to receive support from ISOS
- He remains abstinent, his mental health issues are managed & he continues to attend social functions & outings at project

**3c. Table 11- Prevention of Eviction from Supported Housing Protocol**

	2015-16	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	2016-17
		16-17	16-17	16-17	16-17	
<b>Total number of evictions</b>		<b>57</b>	<b>50</b>			<b>107</b>
• Evictions from crisis accommodation		28	34			62
• Evictions from supported accommodation		16	11			27
• Evictions from accommodation for young people		13	5			18
<b>Total NTQ issued in quarter</b>		<b>65</b>	<b>64</b>			<b>129</b>
• NTQ's resulting in eviction		17	19			36
• NTQ's issued and client still in accommodation		48	45			93
<b>Reason for eviction (served NTQ)</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>Q1</b>	<b>Q2</b>	<b>Q3</b>	<b>Q4</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
		16-17	16-17	16-17	16-17	
• Violence to staff or other residents		24 (2)	18 (4)			42 (6)
• Disruptive behaviour		10 (2)	13 (4)			23 (6)
• Drug / alcohol abuse		2 (0)	3 (0)			5 (0)
• Rent arrears		9 (7)	6 (6)			15 (13)
• Theft		3 (2)	6 (1)			9 (3)
• Other		9 (4)	4 (4)			13 (8)
<b>Move on destination</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>Q1</b>	<b>Q2</b>	<b>Q3</b>	<b>Q4</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
		16-17	16-17	16-17	16-17	
• Crisis or Supported accommodation		4	3			7
• No forwarding address		37	40			77
• Friends and family		10	7			17

Table 11 (above) reports on the measures used to monitor the Prevention of Eviction from Supported Housing Protocol. It shows there was a fall overall in the numbers of evictions this quarter. From this quarter we have broken down the figures to show the level of evictions from each type of provision and this shows us that 68% of evictions this quarter were from Crisis accommodation.

The case study below is an example of the work done by a provider in order to avoid evicting a client.

**Case Study – Prevention from eviction from supported housing**

Client was living in Praxis dispersed accommodation. He was using 'legal highs' and had formed a relationship with another resident in the project. When this relationship broke down the client's use of substances increased and his behaviour became increasingly difficult to manage

- Staff at project served verbal and then written warnings as to consequences of behaviour
- Continued to work with him to encourage client to engage with treatment services
- Updated client's Gateway to facilitate a planned move to another project
- Liaised with Lead Practitioner at HAC around need for client to move

**Outcome**

- Client was supported to move to another project within same partnership, is maintaining his placement with new provider and is progressing with original support plan aims

Table 11 (above) shows that there has been no change in the numbers of notice to quits (NTQ) issued in Q2. It is positive that of the 11 evictions from supported accommodation

this quarter 81% were given an earlier NTQ. Table 11 shows that it is those people who were asked to leave for violence that were in the main not given advance notice of their eviction and this is to be expected.

Of the 40 individuals evicted this quarter where no forwarding address was given a check of Gateway shows that 40% were back in supported accommodation within two weeks of their eviction. It is also worth noting that only 4 of those evicted this quarter were subsequently found rough sleeping by the Outreach Team.

Table 12 (below) shows a fall in the numbers of people admitted to floating support in the quarter. There continues to be work to do to improve the recording of floating support on the Gateway and this is reflected in the high number of admissions where reason for admit is not recorded or not known.

### 3d. Table 12 – floating support admits, reason for admission and social needs

<b>Floating support admissions</b>	<b>2015- 16</b>	<b>Q1 16-17</b>	<b>Q2 16-17</b>	<b>Q3 16-17</b>	<b>Q4 16-17</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
Total admits	619	157	108			265
<b>Reason for admit</b>						
Not recorded / not known	173	43	53			96
Move from other support setting	128	26	19			45
Discharge from institution	151	45	14			59
Relationship breakdown	44	9	6			15

### 3e. Table 13 - outcomes for people leaving floating support

<b>Discharges and outcomes – people leaving floating support</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>Q1 16-17</b>	<b>Q2 16-17</b>	<b>Q3 16-17</b>	<b>Q4 16-17</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
Total discharges	566	117	179			296
<b>Outcomes (in the quarter)</b>						
Maintain independent tenancy	290	76	74			150
Move to other supported	76	9	9			18
Family / friends	44	12	11			23
No information given	100	13	63			76
Other	40	8	3			11

Table 13 (above) shows a rise this quarter in people being discharged from floating support. Whilst the numbers who are maintaining their tenancy when discharged remains unchanged this quarter we have seen a rise in the instances where the outcome information has not been recorded on Gateway.

## 4. Young people at risk of homelessness

Table 14 (below) shows no change in the numbers of 16-17 year olds presenting in housing need in this quarter.

Table 14 shows that no 16 or 17 year old was accepted under the full homeless duty in this quarter and that again the majority of cases clients were supported to remain in their existing accommodation (predominantly with family) or where that was impossible to maintain were supported in to alternative accommodation.

**4a. Table 14 - 16-17 year olds in housing need (YHN YPS homelessness prevention)**

<b>Young People in housing need</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>Q1 15-16</b>	<b>Q2 16-17</b>	<b>Q3 16-17</b>	<b>Q4 16-17</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
Total admits to service	270	55	54			109
<b>Presentation source</b>						
Application to Tyne and Wear Homes	108	18	17			41
Presenting at the Housing Advice Centre	83	17	24			35
Referrals from 16+ team	76	21	10			31
<b>Outcomes (in the quarter)</b>						
Remained in existing accommodation	59	18	10			28
Referred to supported accommodation	38	7	8			15
Non-engagement – no further contact	50	1	2			3
Under 18 care leaver – floating support	41	11	4			15
Statutory homelessness	0	0	0			0

Table 15 (below) shows no change in the numbers of young people admitted to the provision expressly commissioned for 16-24 year olds. It is of course noted that there will be admissions to other provision in the city for clients in this age group.

Table 15 shows that relationship breakdown accounts for 40% of admissions, with just 26% of clients moving from another supported accommodation setting.

**4b- Table 15 – admits to supported housing (16-24 year olds)**

<b>Admits to supported housing (16 – 24 year olds)</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>Q1 16-17</b>	<b>Q2 16-17</b>	<b>Q3 16-17</b>	<b>Q4 16-17</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
Total admits	271	54	57			111
<b>Reasons for admit (top 3)</b>						
Relationship breakdown (parents / family)	151	23	23			46
Moving from other support setting	38	10	15			25
Crisis	29	13	7			20

The case study below gives a good indication of the level of support and guidance available to young people living in supported accommodation in the city

**Case Study – The Foyer**

Client had moved in to the Foyer after a family relationship breakdown. He presented with both mental and physical health issues and also addiction to heroin from which he was injecting up to 3 times a day. Through the support offered by the Foyer

- The client engaged well with his support worker and agreed to a referral to Lifeline, where he is now receiving a methadone script.
- After finding it difficult manage his finances and regularly having no money/food, was supported to access food banks and food vouchers, and was helped to make a crisis application and during his linkwork sessions he worked on his budgeting skills
- After explaining that boredom was a big factor in his drug use, the support worker created a timetable of activities that took place across the city and helped client towards a structured plan for personal achievement
- With support the client has made significant improvement in all areas and reduced his methadone from 3 to 1 per day and engaged with the training team at the Foyer.

**Outcome**

As a result of the combined support Client has obtained employment and is moving into a flat with a much lower level of support and greater independence

#### 4c – Table 16- discharges from supported housing (16-24 year olds)

Outcomes from supported housing (16-24 year olds)	2015-16	Q1 15-16	Q2 16-17	Q3 16-17	Q4 16-17	2016-17
Total discharges	246	64	62			123
<b>Move on destination</b>						
No forwarding address	32	14	11			25
Family or friends	84	18	24			42
Other supported accommodation	82	21	14			35
Independent tenancy	46	8	2			10
• YHN	27	5	1			6
• Private rented	10	2	0			2
• Housing association	9	1	1			2

Table 16 (above) shows the main outcome in Q2 was a move to live with family and friends with an associated fall in the numbers moving to other supported accommodation.

Table 17 (below) shows the discharges from the YHN Young People's floating support provision and shows 58% of those discharged maintaining their independent tenancy when support ended.

#### 4d. Table 17 – floating support (16-24 year olds) provided by YHN YPS, discharges and outcomes

Discharges and outcomes – people leaving floating support	2015-16	Q1 16-17	Q2 16-17	Q3 16-17	Q4 16-17	2016-17
Total discharges	193	53	54			107
<b>Outcome</b>						
Maintain independent tenancy	90	31	48			79
Move to other supported housing	24	5	1			6
Family / friends	28	7	5			12
Custody	2	0	0			0
No forwarding address given	25	1	0			1
Other	6	5	0			5

## 5. Multiple exclusion and rough sleeping

Table 18 shows a 27% fall in the number of individuals recorded rough sleeping in Q2

#### 5a. Table 18 – people sleeping rough and social needs

Rough sleepers	2015-16	Q1 16-17	Q2 16-17	Q3 16-17	Q4 16-17	2016-17
Average per night	6	6	5			6
<b>Individuals</b>	<b>302</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>72</b>			<b>171</b>
• Stock	158	56	28			84
• Flow	125	35	36			71
• Return	17	8	7			15
NSNO eligible / compliant	9/9	0/0	2/2			2/2
<b>Social needs (confirmed)</b>						
Drugs	153	46	38			84
Alcohol	77	25	24			49
Mental health	48	15	12			27
Offending	113	39	32			71

Table 18 (above) shows that for this quarter we met our No Second Night Out (NSNO) commitment. Further that of the 36 flow clients recorded only 6 of these clients had a Newcastle connection.

Shelter have noted an increase in the numbers people that they have seen this quarter who are reporting as sleeping rough, they are a regional office so whilst a number of presentations relate to clients with a connection elsewhere they report 29 clients in Q2 who were street homeless. It is likely that a number (if not all) of those clients are included in the individuals counted in table 18. We have encouraged Shelter and other partners in the city to report any concerns they have over individuals sleeping rough to [roughsleeping@newcastle.gov.uk](mailto:roughsleeping@newcastle.gov.uk) which will allow us to develop a consistent response to reports and ensure all reports are recorded. It will also allow for feedback to be given to the reporter, something that the Peoples Kitchen have fed back to say is very helpful to their volunteers.

**5b. Table 19 – reasons for rough sleeping and outcomes**

<b>Reasons for rough sleeping</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>Q1 16-17</b>	<b>Q2 16-17</b>	<b>Q3 16-17</b>	<b>Q4 16-17</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
Evicted / abandoned accommodation	153	29	30			59
Unknown	198	44	27			71
Relationship breakdown	39	19	14			33
Discharge from institutions	21	7	6			13
<b>Outcomes</b>						
Accommodation secured	67	12	11			23
No further contact /disappeared	49	33	44			77
Returned to existing accommodation	6	4	9			13

Table 19 shows a fall this quarter in the numbers of people rough sleeping where the reason remains unknown. We will need to look further at the numbers of people where eviction or abandoned accommodation was given as the reason in light of the fact of the 51 people evicted from supported accommodation this quarter only 4 were subsequently found rough sleeping.

**Case Study – Multiple exclusion and rough sleeping**

Single male Mr X, 58, first presented as a rough sleeper in 2010 after abandoning a private tenancy. In 2010 Mr X refused to accept supported accommodation and was supported by a daycentre to secure PRS again. Mr X presented again in November 2014 after abandoning his tenancy. There were ongoing concerns about Mr Xs mental health during these contacts. He was referred to the homeless CPN who accesses the day centre however he would not engage in an assessment so there was no intervention.

Mr X spent an extended period on the streets and displayed some signs of psychosis e.g. appearing to respond to hallucinations. He was arrested by the police for being drunk and disorderly. Following the arrest a Mental Health Act (MHA) assessment was requested due to concerns about his behaviour in the police station. Mr X was sectioned under the MHA and has spent over 6 months in hospital where he has been treated for chronic psychosis. Mr X has been suffering from psychosis for an extended period but had not received any support or assessment while in the community until the police intervention.

**Outcome**

Mr X is now receiving treatment and medication and has been supported to secure an YHN tenancy and is due to be discharged from hospital under a Community Treatment Order (CTO).

The case study above demonstrates the complexities of this client group and their engagement with services.

**Table 20 – Housing First admits – reason for admission and social needs**

<b>Housing First admissions</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>Q1</b>	<b>Q2</b>	<b>Q3</b>	<b>Q4</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
		<b>16-17</b>	<b>16-17</b>	<b>16-17</b>	<b>16-17</b>	
Admissions to Housing First	30	0	5			5
Clients in prep work end of Q1		11	11			
Clients in tenancy end of Q1		34	31			
<b>Reason for admission</b>						
Not known / not recorded	9	0	0			0
Moving from a hostel	11	0	0			0
Crisis / rough sleeping	7	0	5			5
Relationship breakdown	5	0	0			0
<b>Social needs</b>						
	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>Q1</b>	<b>Q2</b>	<b>Q3</b>	<b>Q4</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
		<b>16-17</b>	<b>16-17</b>	<b>16-17</b>	<b>16-17</b>	
Offending	15	0	3			3
Alcohol	6	0	0			2
Drugs	13	0	2			2
Mental health	6	0	1			1

Table 20 (above) shows that Q2 saw 5 new admissions to the Housing First service. There continues to be no change in the numbers of clients in prep work for a Housing First tenancy and only a very slight fall in those in a tenancy.

**Table 21 – Housing First discharges**

<b>Discharges and outcomes – Housing First</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>Q1</b>	<b>Q2</b>	<b>Q3</b>	<b>Q4</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
		<b>16-17</b>	<b>16-17</b>	<b>16-17</b>	<b>16-17</b>	
Total discharges	23	4	5			9
<b>Outcome</b>						
Maintain independent tenancy	7	0	1			1
Move to other supported housing	3	1	1			2
Custody	2	0	1			1
No forwarding address given	4	1	0			1
Other	4	2	1			3
Deceased	0	1	1			2

Table 21 shows the discharges and outcomes from the service but these are currently measures that due to the small numbers involved are unable to help determine any particular trends.

## 6. What we are doing

Our ongoing actions to address issues raised in these briefings and in consultation with partners are all detailed in our Homelessness Strategy action plan. However listed below are some new actions or initiatives that we wanted to highlight.

### Homelessness Prevention Trailblazer

On 17 October 2016 Theresa May launched a new government Homelessness Prevention Programme, announcing that Newcastle is one of only three national early adopters for the Homelessness Prevention Trailblazer part of the programme, which is “a fresh government approach to tackling homelessness by focusing on the underlying issues which can lead to somebody losing their home”. It will focus on the prevention of homelessness at an earlier

stage by working with a wider group of residents at risk to help them before they reach crisis point.

The government have acknowledged the strength of our Active Inclusion Newcastle approach to preventing financial exclusion and homelessness, which aims to maximise the value of our collective resources to help residents to maintain the foundations for a stable **life**: somewhere to live, an income, financial inclusion and employment opportunities. This approach provides the foundations for our role as an early adopter, which will bring both funding and profile to the city for our work in this area.

There will be an opportunity to find out more about the Trailblazer programme at the Homelessness Prevention Forum on 7 December 2016 and for more information on our Active Inclusion Newcastle approach and our work to make preventing homelessness everyone's business, visit [www.newcastle.gov.uk/homelessnesspreventionforprofessionals](http://www.newcastle.gov.uk/homelessnesspreventionforprofessionals).

### **Benefit Cap**

To prepare for the introduction of the lower benefit cap a coordinated citywide approach to support affected households has been developed. As well as new households being impacted, residents that are currently capped will see their benefits further reduced. Newcastle City Council, Your Homes Newcastle and partners are targeting support to these households to help them to increase their income or reduce their expenditure.

### **Rough Sleeping**

Newcastle with Gateshead will be submitting a bid to the Rough Sleeping Social Impact Bond programme, part of the DCLG Homelessness Prevention Fund, which will provide outcome funding for locally commissioned Social Impact Bonds which support cohorts of long-term rough sleepers, and entrenched single homeless people. (December 2016 update, this bid was successful)

## **7. Consultation**

This document formed the basis of discussions at the Newcastle Homelessness Prevention Forum on the 7 December where we asked people to focus on the questions below;

1. Do you agree with the data presented in this review and the future actions noted and to be included in the action plan? Is there anything we have missed that you would like to see included?

There was positive feedback on the briefing note with the following specific points being made:

- A number of people felt that the inclusion of case studies was a positive development and helped to see the 'real' impact of interventions and gave an insight to the clients beyond the figures. All were keen that these continued to be included. If any services have case studies that they feel would be good to be included in future briefings they can be sent to [activeinclusion@newcastle.gov.uk](mailto:activeinclusion@newcastle.gov.uk)
- Some of those present felt that there was still an under reporting in the recording of the numbers of people served with a notice to quit but all felt it was positive that the figures now differentiated between those evicted from crisis accommodation and those in supported accommodation. This helped to bear out that the majority of those evicted for violence or disruptive behaviour were from the crisis provision.

- It was seen as particularly positive that the briefing would include additional evidence on how other partners contribute to homelessness prevention in the city. A future development that many partners would like to see is a measure in terms of progress that clients are making towards independence as this would help to map the collective approach to resolving pathways out of homelessness. We will add the development of this reporting to the Homelessness Strategy Action Plan.

## 2. What are your ideas on the Homelessness Prevention Trailblazer?

This discussion followed a presentation on the Homelessness Prevention Trailblazer delivered by Neil Munslow at the Forum.

- There was general support for the premise as outlined in the presentation with a number of people noting that the quarterly briefings demonstrated a good platform for this work to build on
- The importance of building links and working in partnership with agencies such as health and probation were seen as crucial as homelessness wasn't an issue that occurred in isolation. Especially those agencies where their involvement was at life changing events and subsequent income shock and potential homelessness.
- Make better links with partners and agencies who would hold data clients across life course events to allow us to better target homelessness prevention advice and support. The example given at the Forum of such an agency was the Registrars and information held on births and deaths
- A number of people in attendance did note that there had be a sense of perspective about what the additional money would be able to achieve, that it wouldn't be able to replace services that may be lost but that it was an opportunity to build on existing systems and processes to widen the scope of homelessness prevention

## 8. How to get involved.

Please feel free to discuss the issues raised in this briefing with your residents and services users. Staff from the Active Inclusion Unit would be happy to attend team meetings / service user groups you have if there are any specific issues that people would like to raise or discuss in more detail. You can contact Sarah Blakey (Active Inclusion Officer) on 0191 277 1733 or email [activeinclusion@newcastle.gov.uk](mailto:activeinclusion@newcastle.gov.uk) to arrange this.

You can comment on the Homelessness Strategy action plan and our progress towards the actions and on the protocols and procedures we have developed with partners to tackle homelessness by contacting [activeinclusion@newcastle.gov.uk](mailto:activeinclusion@newcastle.gov.uk) and copies of the action plan and the protocols and our governance arrangements can be found [here](#).

As part of our ongoing work to better identify issues that could lead to homelessness we would ask partners to inform us of cases where you're working with clients but the current methods for preventing homelessness have not worked. You can raise these issues at [activeinclusion@newcastle.gov.uk](mailto:activeinclusion@newcastle.gov.uk) our intention is for this to complement, not replace, our existing means of liaising with partners, where you can still raise issues in person; we appreciate that it's not always possible for people to get to all meetings.

### December 2016

**Contact Officer:** Sarah Blakey, Active Inclusion Officer

[sarah.blakey@newcastle.gov.uk](mailto:sarah.blakey@newcastle.gov.uk) / 0191 277 1733