



A report for:  
Ashfield District Council, Broxtowe Borough Council, Gedling Borough  
Council, Rushcliffe Borough Council

## Housing Options for Young People Under 35

January 2019

Christine Spooner, Trish Reed, Helen Woods: Homeless Link Associates  
Chris Brill; Policy Manager, Wendy Green; Consultancy Manager: Homeless Link

**Contact us**

Homeless Link  
Minorities House  
2 – 5 Minorities  
London  
EC3N 1BJ  
020 7840 4430  
[www.homelesslink.org.uk](http://www.homelesslink.org.uk)

<b>CONTENTS</b>		<b>Page</b>
<b>1.</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2.</b>	<b>Brief</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>3.</b>	<b>Thanks</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>4.</b>	<b>Summary of Recommendations</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>5.</b>	<b>Methodology</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>6.</b>	<b>The National Context:</b>	<b>6</b>
	5.1 Horizon Scan and Policy Summary	
	5.2 Key legislation	
<b>7.</b>	<b>The Local Context:</b>	<b>9</b>
	6.1 The local area	
	6.2 Homelessness Strategies	
	6.3 Allocations Policies and Choice Based Lettings	
	6.4 Housing Stock	
<b>8.</b>	<b>Quantitative Data Analysis – Summary</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>9.</b>	<b>Housing Options and Choices for Low Income Single Person Households under 35 years of age</b>	<b>12</b>
	9.1 Homelessness Statistics and Young People in the Family Home	
	9.1.1 Analysis of Housing Registers	
	9.1.2 Young people living in the parental home	
	9.2 Prevention of Homelessness	
	9.3 Young people’s Income and Gross Housing Costs	
	9.4 Social Housing	
	9.5 Private Rented Sector	
	9.6 Tenancy Sustainment, Resettlement and Floating Support	
<b>10.</b>	<b>Supported Housing and Peripatetic Housing Support for Single Households aged 18-25</b>	<b>27</b>
	10.1 Move on	
<b>11</b>	<b>Cross-cutting Themes</b>	<b>33</b>
	<b>11.1 Information and advice about housing and homelessness</b>	
	<b>11.2 ‘There used to be’ ... The loss of wider support services and more</b>	
	<b>11.3 Skills, training and employability</b>	
	<b>11.4 Partnerships</b>	
<b>12</b>	<b>Increasing the availability of accommodation for single people under 35</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>13</b>	<b>Recommendations</b>	<b>40</b>
	Appendix A – Horizon Scan and Policy Summary	
	Appendix B – Quantitative Analysis	
	Appendix C – Qualitative Questionnaires and Consultation Documents	

# Housing Options for people Under 35

An assessment of the housing options and choices for low income single person households under 35 years of age, including a review of the provision of Supported Housing and peripatetic housing support for single households aged 18-25

## 1. Introduction

Ashfield District Council, Broxtowe Borough Council, Gedling Borough Council and Rushcliffe Borough Council commissioned Homeless Link to carry out a study of housing options and choices for low-income single person households for people under 35.

The study was first conceived in response to Government proposals to extend Housing Benefit Local Housing Allowance limits to social housing for people in this age group. Whilst those proposals were not in the end taken forward by Government, the four local authorities recognise that people under 35 who have low incomes face particular challenges in the current housing market. This study aims to improve their understanding so that they can more effectively find solutions.

## 2. The Brief

The study has two key objectives:

1. Assessment of the housing options and choices for low income single person households under 35 years of age in the private and social rental markets.
2. A review of the provision of Supported Housing and peripatetic housing support for single households aged 18-25.

The following outputs were required for the study:

- assess the housing options for single person households under the age of 35;
- assess the gross housing costs across the Study Area in both social and private sectors as a proportion of net assumed income (for working and non-working households);
- utilising the latest statistical datasets determine the current housing situation of single person households under the age of 35;
- comment on and, where possible estimate, the gap in 'affordable' housing provision across all housing tenures;
- comment on and, where possible estimate, the gap in Supported Housing provision and peripatetic housing support for 18 to 25 year olds;
- identify good practice to improve housing options for the Study Group;
- in respect of the above, propose build/refurbishment options that include on-site training and employment for young people.

Within these outputs it was expected that the following be addressed:

- Mapping of the existing supply of Supported Housing for young people between 18 and 25 years of age;
- Commentary on the wider family and societal impact of adult children remaining in the family home;
- Assessment of current good practice to improve the housing options for the Study Group; and
- Determination of the best way of enabling or delivering such provision (through private sector provision, Local Authority and Registered Provider new build and existing stock conversions, etc.).

### 3. Thanks

A wide range of stakeholders contributed to this study and thanks are due to:

Ashfield District Council - Housing Strategy Lead Officer

Broxtowe Borough Council - Housing Options Manager

Gedling Borough Council

- Customer Service Manager
- Housing Strategy & Development Officer(dual role)
- Housing and Welfare Support Manager

Mansfield District Council - Engagement & Development Officer, Shared Homelessness Services

Rushcliffe Borough Council

- Housing Solutions Manager
- Principal Community Development Officer
- Principal Officer (Food, Health and Safety and Housing)

Nottinghamshire County Council

- Public Health, Commissioning Manager for Health and Housing (dual role)
- Group Manager, Strategic Commissioning
- Commissioning Manager, Younger Adults
- Programme Manager, Early Intervention and Promoting Independence
- Service Manager, Homelessness and Commissioning
- Strategic Commissioning Manager
- Stakeholder Manager, Building Better Opportunities (D2N2 LEP)

DWP Partnership Managers

East Midlands Chamber of Commerce

- Director of Policy and External Affairs

East Midlands Property Owners

- Business Development Manager

Broxtowe Youth Homelessness

- People with lived experience
- Drop-in Worker
- Project Manager

Framework Housing Association

- Service Manager 16-21s Supported Housing
- Service Manager 18+ single homeless core and cluster, Mansfield
- Service Manager 18+ Elizabeth House, and EH Move-on

- Outreach Support Team Leader (Notts County, except City)
- Longhurst Group
- Housing Manager – East of the Country
- Nottinghamshire YMCA
- People with lived experience
  - Head of Commercial Development
  - Head of Residential and Housing Management
- Notts Social Landlords Forum
- South Notts Landlords Forum
- The Friary
- People with lived experience
  - IT Advice Worker
- TunTum Housing Association
- Head of Specialist Housing

#### 4. Summary of Recommendations

1. **Work with commissioners to ensure services are commissioned which meet the levels of need highlighted in the Quantitative Analysis**
2. **As part of Homelessness Reduction Act strategies increase access to advice, assistance and mediation** that successfully prevents tenancies from breaking down.
3. **Commission a support service that helps individuals and households in a range of ways to remedy homelessness or prevent tenancy loss;** this can take the form of a floating support service for 105 people, shared across the 4 districts to enable some economies of scale and consistency of service, and addresses the need identified in the quantitative analysis for:
  - **Support to prevent loss of accommodation** – around 19 people under 35 will require short term housing related support to prevent the loss of tenancy
  - **Support to help move into a new property** - around 34 people under 35 will require support on move in to remedy their homelessness
  - **Resettlement Support:** Around 52 people under 35 will require housing related support as they move into new tenancies.
4. **Improve the availability of, and access to, alternative affordable housing for under 35s in the following ways:**

**Social Housing**

  - Reinvigorate the Social Landlords Forum by encouraging sharing of practice which would meet this aim and harness the energy and innovation within the social landlord sector to work with the Councils to address these pressing priorities (eg Nottingham Community Housing Association is a member of ‘Homes for Cathy’).
  - With social landlords pro-actively identify ways to work together to tackle and find solutions to the Councils’ most pressing priorities

including increasing the supply of affordable housing and removing barriers to access. This will make them active partners at the table, contributing meaningfully to the strategic priorities of the Councils.

- Work closely with individual social landlords to agree a course of action to find affordable housing options.
- Maximise Discretionary Housing Payment and Exempt Accommodation Rules to open up opportunities in working with the voluntary and faith sectors and align approaches across districts/boroughs to encourage providers to respond flexibly to need.
- Bring Section 106 development partners 'into the tent' to ensure that new developments include affordable accommodation which meets the full range of local need.

### **Private Sector Housing**

- Maximise use of Discretionary Housing Payment/Prevention Funds 'at the front end' to remove financial barriers to tenancy access.
- Develop a social lettings service (or partner with an existing lettings service) working with private landlords for a.

### **5. Pilot and evaluate additional models of housing provision for people under 35, developing those which work best for particular groups (aim at range and diversity in provision)**

- Supported lodgings
- 'Lead tenant' or 'Peer landlord' shared housing
- 'Spare to Share' initiatives.

### **6. Develop closer relationships with young people and involve them in the delivery of information, advice and other projects**

- Young people are keen to be involved. Consider developing the work of Broxtowe Youth Homelessness across all four districts. This could form the basis of a more dynamic approach to co-production between the councils and the customer base and offer new approaches to housing options for young people.

### **7. Ensure young people are well prepared to take up a tenancy by introducing a pre-tenancy training programme**

### **8. Develop the partnerships which are over-arching in achieving all of the above**

- Building on the existing strong partnership between districts, agree a consistent set of approaches (for example, move-on allocations

protocols, local connection, use of Discretionary Housing Payment, Exempt Accommodation rules, rent deposits). This helps improve supply, but also removes confusion and encourages innovation.

- Bolster partnership working between county and districts to support future commissioning and the collection of relevant data sources to evidence need. Use the current studies on health and homelessness (JSNA) and Housing Strategies to ensure effective collaborative working between wider partners include County Council and districts/ boroughs. Identify a relevant set of metrics that will evidence need across the county without being over-burdensome.
- Harness what other agencies, including non-commissioned services, can, or do, contribute towards prevention of homelessness and collect evidence.
- Harness the contribution of all sectors in ensuring a supply of housing with support. If done well, bringing all providers 'into the tent' maximises opportunity and can encourage innovation, whilst enabling an element of oversight and reduces the number of 'outliers' operating on the fringe of the system. The landscape is changing and supported housing is now a mixed economy.
- Establish data-sharing protocols to build up a local 'data bank'.
- Maximise opportunities to develop partnerships which are presented by the Homelessness Reduction Act's 'Duty to Refer'.
- Establish closer working between the D2N2 LEP, external funding streams and commissioned services to leverage funding to establish better co-ordinated skills and training for young people.

## **5. Methodology**

The study has been carried out using a range of methods:

- Policy Summary – setting the policy context for this study through a summary of current policy and a horizon scan of relevant good practice nationally and locally
- Analysis of submitted Quantitative data. This has included the use of a data modelling tool which has taken a three-stage approach to assess the need for supported housing for populations at risk
- Qualitative stakeholder interviews
- Meeting with commissioners
- Consultation with stakeholders

The work has been overseen and facilitated by a Steering Group, which commissioned the study, with members drawn from Ashfield District Council and Broxtowe, Gedling and Rushcliffe Borough Councils and invited membership to Nottinghamshire County Council.

## 6. The National Context

### 6.1. Horizon Scan and Policy Summary [Appendix A]

The Policy Summary draws on secondary data, including research reports to provide a national horizon scan of key issues regarding housing for young people summarising

- housing trends for young people;
- affordability;
- access to the social rented sector;
- supported housing and homelessness accommodation services (including funding issues);
- housing options in the private rented sector.

It shows that:

- Over the last 20 years home ownership among young adults was down from 55% of 25- to 34-year-olds in 1997 to 35% in 2017, 35%.<sup>1</sup>
- A similar decrease in young households accessing housing in the social rented sector shows that the number of new lets to younger tenants has dropped steeply, by almost a third between 2009/10 and 2016/17<sup>2</sup>
- The Chartered Institute of Housing identify a corresponding rise in the proportion of younger households in the private rented sector, from 43% in 2000 to 64% by 2015.<sup>3</sup>
- Sharing is now at its highest rate for 20 years, 4.8% in the private rented sector and 3.4% in the social rented sector (a rise from 1.7%).<sup>4</sup>
- There has been a rise in both number (0.6 %) and share (27% vs 21%) of 20-34 year olds living with their parents between 1996 and 2013.<sup>5</sup>
- Compared to other age groups, young people were more than three times more likely to have experienced homelessness in the previous five years than others.<sup>6</sup>
- Centrepoint's Youth Homelessness Databank estimated that 86,000 young people approached their local authority for help in 2016/17 because they were homeless or at risk of homelessness.<sup>7, 8</sup>
- As Robinson and Coward have shown, the actual number of young people who were homeless or at risk of homelessness will have likely been far higher; sofa-

---

<sup>1</sup> IFS (2018) Barriers to homeownership for young adults. Available at:

[https://www.ifs.org.uk/uploads/publications/budgets/gb2018/GB9\\_housing\\_summary.pdf](https://www.ifs.org.uk/uploads/publications/budgets/gb2018/GB9_housing_summary.pdf)

<sup>2</sup> Wilcox, S., and Williams, P., (2018) Dreams and Reality? Government finance, taxation and the private housing market. Available at:

<http://www.cih.org/resources/PDF/Policy%20free%20download%20pdfs/Dreams%20and%20reality.pdf>

<sup>3</sup> Fitzpatrick, S., Pawson, H., Bramley, G., Wilcox, S., Watts, B., and Wood, J., (2018) The homelessness monitor: England 2018. Available at:

[https://www.crisis.org.uk/media/238700/homelessness\\_monitor\\_england\\_2018.pdf](https://www.crisis.org.uk/media/238700/homelessness_monitor_england_2018.pdf)

<sup>4</sup> ibid

<sup>5</sup> ibid

<sup>6</sup> Watts, B., Johnsen, S., & Sosenko, F. (2015) Youth homelessness in the UK: A review for The OVO Foundation, Available at: <https://pureapps2.hw.ac.uk/ws/portalfiles/portal/9258335>

<sup>7</sup> Homeless Link's analysis of the statutory data is available at

<https://www.homeless.org.uk/facts/homelessness-innumbers/statutory-homelessness>

<sup>8</sup> Centrepoint Youth Homelessness Databank

<https://www.yhatabank.com/about-data/>

surfing with family or friends and many young people do not approach their local authority as they are unaware of their housing rights and entitlements<sup>9</sup>

- Work by Homeless Link highlights how young people who have experiences of the care system or are from BME groups or identify as LGBTQ+ face higher risks of homelessness than others.<sup>10</sup>
- Beyond figures around statutory homelessness, Homeless Link's 2018 Annual Review indicates that roughly half of the individuals who access homelessness accommodation projects in England are between the ages of 18-24.<sup>11</sup>
- 83% of providers who responded to the same review said the number of young people presenting with multiple and complex needs had increased in the last year
- Of the estimated 4,751 people recorded as rough sleeping in 2017, 19% were aged 25 or under.<sup>12</sup>
- The supply of new social housing has been in decline since the late 1980s, and has contracted sharply in the past decade - 6,463 new homes for social rent were made available in 2017/18 compared to 24,670 a decade earlier in 2006/7, making up fewer than 3% of all new dwellings<sup>13</sup>
- The private sector doubled in size between 2001/02 and 2011/12<sup>14</sup>, and demand from under-35s has also been growing<sup>15</sup>
- Shared accommodation remains the only viable option for many low-income young households. However Centrepont have highlighted that almost nine in ten landlords (89%) reported not letting any shared accommodation.<sup>16</sup>

## 6.2. Key legislation

The Policy Summary [**Appendix A**] gives a detailed analysis of key legislation and impacts, but these are summarised in brief:

### (i) Homelessness Reduction Act (HRA) 2017

The HRA came into force in April 2018 and places new legal duties on English local authorities, so that everyone who is homeless or at risk of becoming homeless has

---

<sup>9</sup> Robinson, D., & Coward, S. (2003). Hidden Homelessness: Your Place, Not Mine. Available at: <http://www4.shu.ac.uk/research/cresr/sites/shu.ac.uk/files/hidden-homelessness-your-place-not-mine.pdf>

<sup>10</sup> Homeless Link (2018) Young and Homeless, Available at: <https://www.homeless.org.uk/sites/default/files/site-attachments/Young%20and%20Homeless%202018.pdf>

<sup>11</sup> Homeless Link (2018) Support for single homeless people in England: Annual review 2017 Available at: <https://www.homeless.org.uk/facts/our-research/annual-review-of-single-homelessness-support-in-england>

<sup>12</sup> Ibid

<sup>13</sup> Affordable housing supply in England: 2017 to 2018 <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/affordable-housing-supply-in-england-2017-to-2018>

<sup>14</sup> ONS (2014) Trends in the United Kingdom Housing Market, 2014, Access at: [https://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/dcp171766\\_373513.pdf](https://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/dcp171766_373513.pdf)

<sup>15</sup> Pattison, B. Reeve, K. (2017) Access to homes for under-35's: The impact of Welfare Reform on Private Renting. Available at: <https://research.rla.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/SHU-Access-to-homes-for-under35s.pdf>

<sup>16</sup> Centrepont (2018) Ready to Move On, Access at <https://centrepont.org.uk/media/3048/ready-to-move-on.pdf>

access to meaningful help, irrespective of their priority need status; as long as they are eligible for housing assistance.

The Act largely amends part VII of the Housing Act 1996. It redefines the meaning of threat of homelessness by extending the period of threatened with homelessness from 28 to 56 days. There are six key aims of the Act which include:

- a) Prevention – Duty to provide casework intervention to resolve threatened homelessness and work with applicants to draw up a personalised housing plan tailored towards their individual circumstances
- b) Relief - Homelessness relief occurs when an authority has been unable to prevent homelessness, but helps someone to secure alternative accommodation, even though the authority is under no statutory obligation to do so
- c) Duty to provide advisory services – Local authorities must provide free homelessness advice and information to any person in their local authority area. This should include advice and information on preventing homelessness, securing accommodation when homeless, the rights of homeless people or those threatened with homelessness, and on the help that is available from the local authority or others and how to access that help
- d) Full Homelessness Duty – The full homelessness duty of providing settled accommodation for priority need households where prevention or relief duties have failed remains in place
- e) Co-operation – Applicants will be expected to co-operate with local authorities. The duties outlined can be ended if applicants are found to have deliberately and unreasonably refuse to co-operate
- f) Duty to refer – This is a new duty on other public services to refer people to homelessness teams if they are working with people who are homeless or at risk of homelessness came into force in October 2018.

## **(ii) Review of Funding of Supported Housing**

In August this year, following consultation with the sector, Government announced that the funding model for Supported Housing would remain unchanged. Rent will continue to be paid by Housing Benefit via the local authority (lower tier) and will be paid directly to the supported housing provider. Whilst this decision has been welcomed by the sector, the system remains imperfect and continues to raise questions about how services can be effectively commissioned. In two tier systems of local government such as Nottinghamshire, Housing Related Support, which funds the support element of supported housing, sits with the County Council, while responsibilities to prevent and relieve homelessness sit with the district councils. For example, Nottingham City is a Unitary Authority and is therefore responsible for both.

## **(iii) Welfare Reform**

### **• Universal Credit**

Universal Credit is now in place across the country for new claimants and brings together a number of previous benefits into one monthly payment which includes housing costs.

Migration for those on other benefits is currently planned between 2020 and 2024. Claimants work directly with a Work Coach and have an Online Journal as a communication tool between them.

The default arrangement currently remains for Universal Credit that the Housing Costs Element is paid directly to the claimant along with their Standard Allowance.

- **Local Housing Allowance (LHA) - Shared Accommodation Rate (SAR)**

People under 35 can only access the Shared Accommodation Rate of Local Housing Allowance (this is the level of Housing Benefit payable for people living in Private Rented Sector accommodation) rather than the Single Room Rate. People between 25 and 35 who have spent a cumulative total of 3 months in supported accommodation are exempt from this ruling and can claim Single Room Rate unless they are living in shared accommodation.<sup>17</sup>

- **Removal of Spare Room Subsidy ('Bedroom Tax')**

The Spare Room Subsidy has been removed from Housing Benefit for social housing tenants, thus bringing it into line with the rules applied to private sector tenants. This means that working-age people in receipt of Housing Benefit or the Housing Costs Element of Universal Credit who have a spare bedroom and who are council or housing association tenants now have their benefit reduced if they are deemed to be under-occupying their home. The reduction is calculated based on the number of unused bedrooms the claimant is deemed to have. While many tenants have been able to move to smaller accommodation, the lack of alternative housing to move to has resulted in many people having to make up the shortfall from their benefits or apply for Discretionary Housing Payments.

## 7. The Local Context

### 7.1. The local area

The four Local Authorities considered by the study all border on Nottingham City and all have some parts in the Nottingham Urban Area. However, whilst Nottingham City Council is Unitary, these four councils are within the Nottinghamshire County Council area. Ashfield District Council additionally makes up part of the Mansfield Urban Area and shares a joint Housing Options Service with Mansfield District Council.

Of the 326 districts in England the 2015 Indices of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) ranks Ashfield (79th) as the most deprived of the four in the study, followed by Gedling (203rd), then Broxtowe (218th) with Rushcliffe the least deprived (319th). Nottingham City is 8th in the list. Ashfield has 9 Lower Super Output Areas (LSOAs) in the lowest 10% nationally and 2 in the lowest 2%.<sup>18</sup> Rushcliffe is generally affluent and is geographically the largest and most rural of the four.

---

<sup>17</sup> Shared Accommodation Rate is the amount payable for a room in shared accommodation whilst Single Room Rate is the amount payable for self-contained accommodation, i.e. 'your own front door'.

<sup>18</sup> <https://www.nottinghamshireinsight.org.uk/research-areas/deprivation/>

Universal Credit has been introduced across the four local authorities during the period of this study. It is too early to assess the impact of this.

## **7.2. Homelessness Strategies**

Homeless Link is currently carrying out a Homelessness Review and developing a new Mid-Nottinghamshire Homelessness Strategy for Ashfield, Mansfield and Newark & Sherwood District Councils. Broxtowe, Gedling and Rushcliffe Borough Councils have a joint strategic approach and are currently implementing the South Nottinghamshire Homelessness Strategy 2017 – 2021.

## **7.3. Allocations Policies and Choice Based Lettings**

Whilst taking joint strategic approaches, each local authority has its own Housing Allocations Policy. All operate a Choice Based Lettings (CBL) bidding system, with Ashfield District Council working with Mansfield District Council via HomeFinder and Broxtowe, Gedling and Rushcliffe Borough Councils sharing HomeSearch.

## **7.4. Housing Stock**

Ashfield and Broxtowe have their own housing stock. Gedling's stock was transferred to Gedling Homes, which in 2018 became part of Jigsaw Homes. Rushcliffe's stock was transferred to and is managed by Metropolitan.

# **8. Quantitative Data Analysis [full analysis at Appendix B] – Summary**

The analysis of quantitative data draws on a range of statutory data to estimate 'Population at risk' of homelessness in the four Boroughs. It then uses informed estimates to calculate the number of people who are likely to need service interventions - the 'Population in need. Quantitative Needs assessment

### **Calculated future need**

Our quantitative analysis indicates that across the four districts there are likely to be 1061 under 35 households at risk of homelessness in 2019/2020. We have set out a recommended model of service responses which includes:

1. **Prevention Activity** (access to advice, assistance and mediation): Around **83** households will require advice that successfully prevents their tenancy from breaking down. This will require a significant increase in the success rate of preventing tenancy failure and homelessness.
2. **Tenancy Sustainment, Resettlement and Floating Support:**
  - Around **19** people under 35 will require short term housing related support to prevent the loss of tenancy
  - Around **34** people under 35 will require help to move into a new property to remedy homelessness
  - Around **52** people under 35 will require a Resettlement Package when moving on from supported housing
3. **Emergency Housing:** Approximately **42** units of emergency housing will be required for those who are homeless and in need of crisis accommodation
4. **Alternative Affordable Housing:** For those people who are homeless **469** will require access to alternative affordable housing. Some will require support, and some will not.

5. **Accommodation based supported housing** is required for people with additional needs. Across the districts **75** units of supported housing is required. Approximately **33** of these should be 24-hour cover.
6. **A Housing First<sup>1920</sup> provision:** We recommend the commissioning of Housing First to respond to homelessness and complex needs. There should initially be **13** units for under 35.
7. **Domestic Abuse Supported Housing / Refuge Accommodation:** The available data and the cross-authority nature of refuge accommodation makes it difficult to estimate the need for refuge accommodation so the estimate of need should be treated with considerable caution. This is outlined more fully in Appendix B. We estimate the need to be **5** refuge spaces for households under 35 but stress that further work would need to be undertaken to produce a more robust assessment.

### Quantitative analysis methodology - a brief description

The general methodology for the quantitative needs assessment is based on the modelling of the flows within the homelessness system. This consists of the following elements:

- An estimation of the numbers of people presenting in need because they are homeless or at risk of homelessness. These are described as the **Populations at Risk** of homelessness. These estimations are based on actual data ascertained from several sources.
- An estimation of the proportions of people from the Populations at Risk needing a range of different service responses. These are described as the **Populations in Need** of different service interventions. These estimations are based on informed estimates rather than specific evidence.

### Populations at Risk

Across the whole of Nottinghamshire there are 159,096 people between 18 and 34 years of age<sup>21</sup>

- At around 26,000 people, Ashfield has the highest number of younger people aged 18 – 34. This is 20.6% of its population
- Rushcliffe has the lowest number (20,614) of adults aged 18 – 34; (17.8% of its population).
- Under 35's represents the largest proportion of the district population in Broxtowe (21%) and total some 23,694.
- Rushcliffe the lowest proportion at 17.8%.
- Ashfield has 16.3 % of the counties 18 – 34 year olds.
- Rushcliffe has the lowest proportion at 13% (totalling some 20,614 people)

---

<sup>19</sup> Housing First is an approach by which people who are homeless with multiple needs in the areas of drug and alcohol, mental health and offending have their housing need prioritised with intensive support to keep them housed. With a stable housing situation they may be more able to address any issues – although their housing and support is not dependent upon them doing this. This is an alternative approach to the 'treatment first' approach which currently predominates where people with multiple needs are required or expected to address their needs before they can be offered a tenancy – they are expected to be 'tenancy ready'. Housing First offers intensive support via a high staff:client ratio. More information about Housing First can be found here: <https://www.homeless.org.uk/our-work/national-projects/housing-first-england> .

<sup>20</sup> Housing First England (2017), Housing First: Guidance for Commissioners <https://hfe.homeless.org.uk/sites/default/files/attachments/Housing%20First%20Guidance%20for%20Commissioners.pdf>

<sup>21</sup> UK Mid-Year Estimates 2017

- In Gedling the proportion of people aged 18-34 is 18.9% - 22,105 people

The Populations at Risk identified in this exercise were divided into 2 broad categories. These were described as those with **General Needs** and those with **Additional Needs**. Additional Needs indicates that there is some additional factor that links those people's path into homelessness to a personal history of vulnerability. The following Additional Needs were recognised:

- An offending history
- A history of substance abuse
- Mental ill-health
- Vulnerable young person
- Being a looked-after child
- Experiencing domestic abuse
- Physical disability
- Learning disability

Those with general needs are therefore people who experience homelessness or are at risk of homelessness without these additional needs.

The Populations at Risk categories and the estimation of the size of these groups is detailed in the summary of the quantitative analysis. [*Appendix B*]

## **9. Housing options and choices for low income single person households under 35 years of age**

Whilst the quantitative analysis gives an indication of numbers, the analysis of qualitative data illuminates the challenges faced by people under 35 in finding housing. Our study group is made up of single people without dependants; if they are at risk of homelessness or become homeless they are, in the main, likely to be non-statutory (namely that the local authority does not have a duty to provide housing). There is historically a paucity of data as under the P1E reporting system, used until April this year, local authorities were not required to collect data on this group. However, this is improving with the new local authority responsibilities under the HRA and the introduction of the new H-Clic data system. Our qualitative findings support the Quantitative Data Analysis [*Appendix B*] in showing that the greatest need for low income single person households is 'alternative affordable accommodation'. This also mirrors the national context as evidenced in the Policy Summary and Horizon Scan (*Appendix A*).

Single people under 35 need housing which is affordable, long term and of a good standard and it is very clear from speaking to stakeholders that there is not enough available – or sufficiently accessible - for people on low incomes. Where housing is available, under 35s face many barriers in accessing it. This lack of access to suitable housing leads to people being inappropriately housed or living in short-term, insecure or temporary housing or becoming homeless.

Stakeholders interviewed cited the causes of homelessness of people under 35 as breakdown of relationship with family amongst the younger cohort, relationship breakdown

for the older cohort and breakdown of Private Rented Sector (PRS) tenancy, with an increase in Section 21 evictions. Under Section 21 of the Housing Act (1988) a landlord can issue a tenant with 2 months notice without giving a reason. This is often referred to as a 'no-fault' eviction. Breakdown of care-leaver interim accommodation, and prison discharge were also mentioned.

Young people who had experience of being homeless highlighted key issues as being:

- not having a steady income or a job
- fluctuating incomes due to zero hours contracts, and agency work
- family issues
- poor mental health and
- not enough support to sustain the tenancy

One felt that peer influences were a factor, with young people *'following the same path'* as each other in terms of decisions and life choices which might, in the end, lead to homelessness.

**9.1. Homelessness Statistics and Young People in the Family Home**

**9.1.1. Analysis of Housing Registers**

Some sense of the situation can be gleaned from the local authorities' Housing Registers. On the 30 August 2018 there were 206 single people and 366 families on Broxtowe's Housing Register, 28 single people and 115 families in Gedling and 38 single people and 42 families in Rushcliffe who were under 35 on the Housing Register.<sup>22</sup> Figure 1 shows the current living situation of the single households in those areas.

	<b>Broxtowe</b>	<b>Gedling</b>	<b>Rushcliffe</b>
<b>Private Rented Tenant</b>	26	4	2
<b>Council Tenant</b>	15	0	2
<b>Housing Association Tenant</b>	20	6	4
<b>Living with Family/Friends</b>	86	10	16
<b>Lodging</b>	5	1	0
<b>No Fixed Abode/Sofa surfer</b>	29	3	6
<b>Living in Hostel</b>	8	1	2
<b>In Social Services Care/Foster Care</b>	2	0	0
<b>Sleeping Rough</b>	6	0	1
<b>Not completed</b>	9	3	5

*Fig 1: Single people under 35 on the Housing Register. Broxtowe, Gedling and Rushcliffe, 30 August 2018*

Ashfield uses a different system and has 562 single people under 35 on the Housing Register.

	<b>Ashfield</b>
<b>Private Rented Accommodation</b>	75
<b>Council or Housing Association Tenant</b>	38

<sup>22</sup> 30 August 2018 – Single people under 35 on the Housing Register. Broxtowe, Gedling and Rushcliffe

<b>inside the HomeFinder area</b>	
<b>Council or Housing Association Tenant</b>	13
<b>outside the HomeFinder area</b>	
<b>Living with Family</b>	230
<b>Living with Friends</b>	35
<b>Lodger</b>	17
<b>No Fixed Abode</b>	93
<b>Supported Housing</b>	28
<b>Living in a Residential Care Home</b>	1
<b>Hospital</b>	1
<b>Rough Sleeping</b>	21

*Fig 2: Single people under 35 on the Housing Register. Ashfield, September 2018*

Whilst the numbers of people sleeping rough is relatively low in the three South Nottinghamshire authorities (though there is a suggestion that rough sleeping is hidden in Nottinghamshire's more rural areas), Ashfield's Housing Register shows very high numbers. Forms of hidden homelessness, such as sofa surfing with family or friends, in spare rooms and on floors was seen by stakeholders as a far greater issue in terms of numbers.

The numbers of people with no fixed abode/sofa surfing or living with family or friends and with no fixed abode appears particularly high in Broxtowe in the first table and Ashfield appears to have very high numbers. However, the Housing Register data is not directly comparable. Broxtowe, Gedling and Rushcliffe share a Choice Based Lettings system (Homeseach) whilst Ashfield shares the HomeFinder scheme with Mansfield. Each local authority has its own Allocations Policy and eligibility criteria, so their housing registers are not directly comparable. Gedling and Rushcliffe have 3 bands (Band 1, Urgent Priority; Band 2, High Priority; Band 3, Medium Priority); Broxtowe has 4 bands, which include a wider range of priority categories from people in urgent need to those who are housed and have lower need; Ashfield has 5 bands, and again, a wider range of priority categories.

Those who do not meet a local authority's Allocations Policy eligibility criteria are not included in their register; these people are truly hidden. It is worth noting, too, that this does not include people who are not on the Housing Register – those who may not have approached the local authority.

### **9.1.2. Young people living in the parental home**

Data from the Office for National Statistics (ONS) published in November 2017<sup>23</sup> shows that 26% of people aged between 20 and 34 are living in the parental home, a higher percentage than previously (21% in 1996). In terms of numbers, there was a statistically significant increase from 2.7 million in 1996 to 3.3 million in 2013, and since then the numbers have remained at around 3.4 million. ONS analysis of the reasons for this are: people staying longer in education and training; people formalising relationships and having children later and the increased costs of buying and renting a home increasing. There is very little wider research on the impacts of this.

---

23

<https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/birthsdeathsandmarriages/families/bulletins/familiesandhouseholds/2017>

Living in the parental home as a young adult can bring tensions. Increasing mental health need, diagnosed and undiagnosed was cited as a factor and increasing numbers of young people with challenging behaviours likewise. Stakeholders reported that whilst hard drugs and alcohol weren't generally a great issue amongst under 25s, many did smoke cannabis which could contribute to family arguments. There were also cases of young people whose parents had issues with drugs and mental health and were abusive, which made it hard for the young person to cope.

In Rushcliffe, there were reportedly high numbers of young people living with their parents and supported by them who were, in effect, 'NEET' but not included in the statistics as they were not claiming benefits.

It was mentioned by young people that families (mistakenly) believe that someone presenting as homeless to the council will be given accommodation. In addition, one commented:

*'Your family can evict you straight away. They don't have to go through a process.'*

One young person mentioned Non-Dependant Deductions though it was not mentioned by any other stakeholders. This has been renamed Housing Costs Contribution under Universal Credit and is a set deduction from benefits of £72.16 per month whatever the income of the non-dependant over 21 (it was previously calculated according to the income level of the non-dependant). If the non-dependant does not contribute to the household budget from their own income this puts pressure on low income households and there is a high risk they will be asked to leave.

Local authorities gave examples of how they carried out mediation when there was to be a parental eviction. Mostly this is done by phone but Broxtowe carries out home visits. Food parcels and vouchers are offered to support the family. Where prevention isn't possible this can 'buy time' so a young person's move from the family home can be planned. It can take several weeks to find a suitable accommodation placement for them if mediation is not successful.

## 9.2. Prevention of Homelessness

The Quantitative Analysis has found that there is a requirement for a service to be commissioned to prevent homelessness through advice, assistance and mediation and it is calculated that 83 people under 35 will need this service.

The local authorities already undertake prevention work but with the Homelessness Reduction Act placing greater responsibilities on local authorities to prevent homelessness, the four councils are building on their range of prevention initiatives. Implementation of the HRA is encouraging use of a wider range of prevention mechanisms and such a service would add to their range of prevention tools.

<p><b>Local good practice:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>Broxtowe:</b> Home visits in cases of parental eviction, to mediate and with offers of food parcels/vouchers, where finances are tight. Where prevention isn't possible this can 'buy time' so a young person's move from the family home can be</li></ul>
--

planned

- **Broxtowe, Gedling:** Use of Homelessness Prevention Funds/Discretionary Housing Payment (DHP) for rent in advance/rent deposits/contribution to arrears to help people access accommodation or prevent eviction
- **'Upstream' information and education.** Broxtowe Youth Homelessness does a range of highly regarded work in schools (praised by many stakeholders), including peer learning: Broxtowe and Rushcliffe contribute funding to this project
- **'Call before you serve'/'call before you evict'** initiatives are currently being implemented in Broxtowe, Gedling to prevent evictions, mainly in PRS accommodation and encouraging landlords to speak with the Council before evicting to give the Councils time to look at prevention measures
- **Ashfield** has a Complex Cases Team – a multi-agency team working within the Council to resolve issues for people with more complex needs.

### 9.3. Young people's Income and Gross Housing Costs

Single person accommodation is generally thought of as one-bedroomed self-contained accommodation or a room in shared accommodation, either with social landlords or shared in the private sector. However, a look at the financial situation for people under 35 in the four boroughs shows how limited their options are. Self-contained accommodation is not a realistic option for young people on low incomes, the group who are the focus of this study.

However, as well as low income, *fluctuating* income is a big issue for young people and was raised by some of those spoken to including young people and landlords who were consulted. Young people are more likely to be insecurely employed, with zero-hours contracts and agency work a feature. Speaking with young people, they described how where they worked irregular hours and days led to their income going up and down, making it hard to budget. Temporary, agency work could mean they worked one week then not for the next three. This led to them being on and off benefits, with their claims being disrupted. One young person told us,

*'They tell you to sign on but by the time you do your Housing Benefit is stopped.'*

In terms of Universal Credit, whilst it is designed to be a benefit where work is possible, delayed initial payments and fluctuating levels of income make temporary work almost impossible. It is possible to apply for a Budgeting Advance (the equivalent of a Budgeting Loan under Job Seeker's Allowance) from Jobcentre Plus but this then has to be paid back out of an already low and unpredictable income.

Affordability is a key issue in both the private and the social sector for people under 35, and for those aged 18-24 is a particular issue as their benefit levels are lower. One interviewee highlighted that if they are paying back arrears, a loan or a fine they can be left in great hardship. Some young people consulted had been evicted from previous tenancies because of arrears.

In private sector accommodation, there is a 'gap' between Local Housing Allowance (LHA), which sets the rate of Housing Benefit, and rent levels. Young people cannot afford to make

up the difference from their benefits or their low, and often irregular pay, rendering private sector accommodation inaccessible.

The advent of Universal Credit is compounding the issue. If a young person is working, the Housing Element amount will remain the same but their Standard Allowance will adjust and fluctuate according to their earnings in the previous month. Social landlords can access the Universal Credit Landlord Portal and can request a managed payment for a tenancy with the DWP checking the situation with the tenant directly. Private landlords can only request direct payment when the tenant is in two months' arrears; a true case of closing the stable door once the horse has bolted.

One social landlord felt that there should be more funding available to support young people onto Universal Credit. A local authority spoke of increased numbers of sanctions on Universal Credit, whilst a young person told of hearing of people being evicted when they moved to Universal Credit.

The charts below show current social security benefit levels as well as 'assumed' wage levels for this group – based on an assumption of a regular 37 hour working week, and given the discussion above of fluctuating income, the 'best case scenario'.

	<b>18-24</b>	<b>25+</b>
<b>JSA</b>	£57.90	£73.10
<b>UC Standard Allowance</b>	£58.10 (£251.77/calendar month)	£73.34 (£317.82/calendar month)
<b>ESA Work Related Activity Group</b>	£57.90	£73.10
<b>ESA Support Group</b>	Up to £110.75	

**Fig 3: Current Benefit Levels**

	<b>18-20</b>	<b>21 -24</b>	<b>25 and over</b>
<b>Minimum Wage</b>	£5.90 per hour.	£7.38 per hour	£7.83 per hour (National Living Wage)
<b>Assumed 37 hours per week</b>	£218.30	£273.06	£289.71
<b>Per calendar month (37 hours per week)</b>	945.97	£1183.26	£1255.41
<b>Per annum (37 hours per week)</b>	£11,351.60	£14,199.12	£15,064.92

**Fig 4: Assumed Income Levels**

Recent research by the BBC on rent affordability<sup>24</sup> states that “There is no official UK measure of what constitutes an ‘unaffordable’ rent, but based on recommendations from housing organisations the analysis uses a threshold of no more than 30% of income.

The BBC research cites the National Housing Federation’s recommendation that 30% of gross median income as the measure generally used by people in the housing sector and

<sup>24</sup> <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/business-45559456>

academics. The research also cites Shelter’s definition of anything over 33% as ‘unaffordable’ and additionally anything over 50% as "extremely unaffordable". Whilst the BBC research found that young people aged 22-29 were spending 28% of their income on an average 1-bed rent in the East Midlands as a whole, closer analysis of our four local authority areas using latest Government data shows a more complex picture.

The table below uses the latest available government data on rent levels in each local authority area to calculate two things:

- the percentage of income that would be spent on rent (without any additional claim for Housing Benefit/Universal Credit Housing Element by a working person which it is difficult to calculate here)
- the gap between rents and Local Housing Allowance, the level at which Housing Benefit is set.

These rental levels are based on data collection from a range of sources and are based on accommodation that has been marketed. As such they may not exactly reflect current rents in each area, and rentals for rooms often include bills, but they are indicative of the issue. All the four boroughs have rent levels that vary according to location. Ashfield and Gedling have differing levels of Local Housing Allowance according to which Broad Rental Market Area the property is in.

	<b>Ashfield</b>		<b>Broxtowe</b>		<b>Gedling</b>		<b>Rushcliffe</b>	
	<b>Room</b>	<b>1-Bed</b>	<b>Room</b>	<b>1-Bed</b>	<b>Room</b>	<b>1-Bed</b>	<b>Room</b>	<b>1-Bed</b>
<b>Lower Quartile Rent £ per calendar month</b> <b>1 Oct 2017-30 Sept 2018</b>	375	330	322	395	260	425	No figure listed (303)*	487
<b>Monthly minimum wage £946</b> <b>Age 18-20</b>	40%	35%	34%	42%	27%	45%	(32%)*	51%
<b>Monthly minimum wage £1183</b> <b>Age 21-24</b>	32%	28%	27%	33%	22%	36%	(26%)*	41%

<b>Monthly minimum wage £1255</b>	30%	26%	26%	31%	21%	34%	(24%)*	39%
<b>Age 25 and over</b>								
<b>LHA £ per calendar month</b>	254.89 – 299.00	315.12-393.90	299.00	393.90	253.11-254.89	315.12-393.90	299.00	393.90
<b>(Weekly £)</b>	(58.41-69.00)	(72.72-90.90)	(69.00)	(90.90)	(58.41-69.00)	(72.72-90.90)	(69.00)	(90.90)
<b>LHA gap £ per calendar month</b>	Between -76.00 and -120.11	Between +63.90 and -14.88	-23.00	-1.10	Between -5.11 and -6.89	Between -31.10 and -109.88	(-4.00)*	-93.10

**Fig 5: Private Rental Market Statistics<sup>25</sup>**

\*No room rent figure was listed for Rushcliffe in the Sept 2017-Oct 2018 data; the bracketed figure is from the previous data set covering 1 April 2017- 30 March 2018

There is a need for good quality, well managed, long term affordable shared accommodation in both sectors – but also a need to ‘market’ it to younger people as a step on their housing journey. Feedback from young people showed a general reluctance to share.

## 9.4. Social Housing

### The local situation

Broxtowe and Ashfield are stock-holding authorities (ie, they hold their own stock of council housing). **Broxtowe** does have differences between the more affluent City area and the less affluent former mining towns in the North, but there is general needs accommodation in both areas. In Broxtowe, for someone in Band 3 or 4, the two lowest bands, a wait for 1 bed accommodation would be likely to be 3-4 months. **Ashfield** has 1 beds and studios amongst its stock but very little becomes available, applicants in the two highest bands are likely to wait 3-6 months for 1 bed accommodation, those in the lowest bands are unlikely to be rehoused.

**Gedling’s** housing stock was transferred to Gedling Homes who later merged with, and become, Jigsaw Homes earlier in 2018; **Rushcliffe’s** housing stock was transferred to Metropolitan. All four local authorities work with a range of Housing Associations who advertise vacant properties via Choice Based Lettings (CBL) on the HomeSearch and HomeFinder websites.

<sup>25</sup> <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/private-rental-market-summary-statistics-october-2017-to-september-2018--2>

People with arrears and other issues such as Anti-Social Behaviour can be excluded from the Housing Register by local authority eligibility criteria specified in their Allocations Policies. It was also reported that some Housing Associations won't house people with histories of previous failed tenancies, for example, those who might have lost a tenancy due to arrears or anti-social behaviour. However, one agency reported that where local authorities are trying to place people who are deemed vulnerable, Registered Providers<sup>26</sup> have Vulnerable Person's Policies which work well.

Whilst Temporary Accommodation is used for those who are most vulnerable, single people under 35 are not generally given greater priority on housing registers. In addition, they face a number of other barriers to accessing social housing.

Affordability is a significant barrier to accessing your own home. Additionally, social landlords are mitigating what they perceive to be the financial risk to themselves in a number of ways:

- asking for rent in advance
- carrying out affordability checks
- asking for references
- looking more closely at tenancy track record

This impacts on under 35s' capacity to access a property in the first place particularly for the 18-24s – the younger cohort whose benefit levels are lowest, yet who might most need the security of social housing and the potential safety net it offers.

One young person felt that social landlords '*need to recognise that people can be vulnerable when they're young and growing into an adult.*' And there is a sense that some are focusing more on their 'property ownership' function than their 'social' purpose.

Social landlords highlighted that there were higher eviction/abandonment rates for people under 35, with the greatest risk of tenancies failing due to anti-social behaviour and rent arrears amongst the 18-25 age group, as was property being left in poor condition.

The theme of lack of support, and often the need for relatively low level and short-term support was frequently raised: one supported accommodation provider described how young people were given social housing tenancies without support when they were very young, with their tenancies going on to fail and their debts following them for many years. A young person described how she found it hard to budget when she got a job and was evicted by a Housing Association having built up a serious level of arrears.

Social landlords also reported that a lack of support available for people with mental health, drug or alcohol issues and there were 'limited options to signpost' for people with high or complex needs. One believed that support was only available when eviction action precipitated a crisis, which of course flies contrary to current endeavours to develop a range of prevention approaches to homelessness. A social landlord said,

---

<sup>26</sup> A 'Registered Provider' is a social housing provider who is registered with the Regulator of Social Housing. This is a statutory register of non-profit and profit-making providers, and local authorities. Housing Associations are non-profit providers.

*'There is a problem accessing support services but this is due to lack of available funding, rather than a lack of desire'.<sup>27</sup>*

Pre-tenancy training and 'front end' support for new tenancies was seen very positively by social landlords - with one social landlord believing if they couldn't manage a tenancy they should be in supported housing. There was a view that support should be flexible and available for as long needed and that early support be linked to a support/action plan to include money advice, training and education.

One was looking at Liverpool's 'Resettlement Passport'<sup>28</sup> which takes a very 'joined up' approach, but there are other models too, for example, that delivered by 'Your Own Place' in Norfolk.<sup>29</sup>

Local Connection can be a barrier for people wanting to access social housing. Rushcliffe has a 3 out of 5 year connection yet, consistent feedback has told us that this is a locality where younger people do tend to move away 'to the city' and may lose their connection. One young person spoke of people losing a local connection by moving away to access support services (although local authorities do pick up move-on responsibility for people placed in supported housing out of area) whilst another mentioned not being able to access a bond scheme to get PRS because of a lack of local connection.

Young people stated that they often found the local connection criteria overly strict or confusing. Some said they needed more support with the bidding process.

#### **Local Good Practice**

- One Housing Association described how they were encouraging tenants to pay an extra £1 or £2 per week to get into credit before migration to Universal Credit.
- Drawing up an Action Plan for new tenants linking to in-house money advice/support
- One provider is looking at the 'Resettlement Passport' (Liverpool) – pre-tenancy training
- Local Authorities looking at Credit Union – jam-jar accounts for young people<sup>30</sup>

## **9.5. Private Rented Sector**

### **The local situation**

#### ***Availability of private rented accommodation***

In Gedling, most of the private options are out of the borough; in Rushcliffe there is no private rented accommodation within the LHA rate. Broxtowe has some availability in the north of

---

<sup>28</sup> <https://www.resettlementpassport.org.uk/>

<sup>29</sup> <https://www.yourownplace.org.uk/>

<sup>30</sup> A 'jam-jar' account is an account where payments into the account go into separate 'jars' to aid budgeting. For example, an account might include 'jars' for rent, utilities, food etc. They are sometimes called 'budgeting accounts'.

the borough but the City-end is largely unaffordable. In Ashfield, it has been reported that landlords are reluctant to consider either shared accommodation or people on benefits. This adds up to a picture of very limited availability within the PRS across the districts. The majority of landlords consulted at the South Nottinghamshire Landlords Forum reported that they did not rent to people under 35 and the majority did not have shared accommodation. Landlords that do, prefer to rent to people who are working, or students.

### **Local Housing Allowance**

A key issue for those on low incomes is the gap between LHA and rent levels. Rent levels are high especially in Rushcliffe, with no private rented accommodation within the LHA rate and self-contained one-bed accommodation beyond the reach of people under 35 on a low income; the only realistic option for those seeking to rent privately is shared accommodation in an HMO (House of Multi-Occupation).

### **Willingness to rent to young people**

Often, landlords have a negative perception of young people. The level of maturity and experience of younger people was an important negative factor for many them. Landlords perceive them as noisier, more likely to cause nuisance/anti-social behaviour in the neighbourhood than older tenants, less likely to respect the property and more likely to have parties and invite friends to stay. Apart from the financial barriers, landlords have concerns that they have less experience than older people of maintaining a tenancy and looking after a property. They have less tenancy history to check out.

The main concern of private landlords is the security of rent payments.

One contributor stated that:

***anecdotal evidence suggests that '35% of HMO tenants aged 18-35 will get into some kind of arrears'.***

This has led them to mitigate that risk with high-level front-end checks such as credit checks, references and the requirement for Guarantors – all difficult for low income under 35s. These 'filters' to ensure they get the lowest risk tenants are becoming increasingly robust as Universal Credit adds a further layer of risk.

However some landlords saw no particular issues in renting to younger people: *'By 25 they should be responsible people with a solid credit history'* and *'No issue, as long as they pay the rent and treat the property with respect'*. But people under 35 with low incomes may not tick all those boxes.

### **Rent Deposit Guarantee Schemes**

The four local authorities all have Rent Deposit Guarantee Schemes. However, one local authority reported a high claim rate from landlords and a young person told how: *'Landlords make judgements about you. My landlord wanted me to top up the rent bond.'* One voluntary agency mentioned that not all landlords will accept the Rent Bond.

### **Students**

Some of the negative views of young people did extend to students but they are frequently regarded as a more desirable group. Student accommodation tends to be higher

'specification'. Rents, and thus yields, are higher. Yields for those on LHA rates are at the bottom end of the spectrum.

In relation to students, there are mixed findings. Local universities are building their own accommodation which is leading to some former student lets becoming available, for example, in Broxtowe, and this might provide opportunities for local authorities to partner with landlords. However, it was felt that universities are building accommodation for first year students, who will be seeking accommodation in the local area in subsequent years so the opportunities may be limited.

One young person believed landlords were evicting families to rent to students, as yields are higher, and a voluntary agency commented that the investment in student accommodation and not in general needs housing didn't go unnoticed by their service users. In addition to students, landlords have a preference to rent to people who are working, with one saying they would have more confidence in letting to under 35s with the 'Ability to mix in easily with an existing household of young professionals, e.g. lawyers, accountants and engineers'.

### ***Ending of PRS tenancies***

Loss of private sector accommodation is a big driver for homelessness. People with support needs are being placed in or sign-posted to private sector accommodation, and as one local authority stakeholder pointed out, those needs are unknown and unsupported. This increases the risks of tenancy failure amongst a potentially already vulnerable group.

### ***Working with the Private Sector***

Landlords were asked what might make a difference (in terms of their willingness to let to young people).

They said they would have greater confidence in renting to under 35s on low incomes if:

- Rent was guaranteed
- Void periods were covered
- Rent paid directly to landlords
- Tenants coming with support/pre-tenancy training
- Tenancy track-record
- Lower tenancy turnover (i.e. more sustained tenancies)
- Help with insurance
- Quick access to problem resolution/independent mediation
- Support where welfare benefits issues arise

Some of these things can be provided under a social lettings agency approach. Cambridge City Council's 'Town Hall Lettings' and Norwich City Council's 'LetNCC' are worth exploring.

### **Practice Example: Town Hall Lettings**

Cambridge is an area of high rental demand from students and professionals. Rents are among the highest outside London. Working with district local authority partners, Cambridge City Council has a lettings service, Town Hall Lettings, which leases properties from private landlords for people in housing need. Town Hall Lettings offers a full property management service, including for shared accommodation, guaranteeing rents and covering void periods.

<https://townhallettings.com/tenants/s>

#### **Practice Example: LetNCC**

Norwich City Council worked with partners the Eastern Landlords Association to set up a Private Sector Leasing Scheme, LetNCC. Benefits for landlords include leasing for up to four years, with guaranteed rents, property condition and landlords can decide on either a full repairing agreement or do their own repairs.

LetNCC is actively encouraging landlords with Empty Homes to bring them back into use via the scheme.

[https://www.norwich.gov.uk/info/20048/private\\_sector\\_housing/1090/letncc -  
\\_private\\_sector\\_leasing\\_scheme](https://www.norwich.gov.uk/info/20048/private_sector_housing/1090/letncc_-_private_sector_leasing_scheme)

One landlord said they would be given confidence to rent to an inexperienced young person if they were backed up by a scheme such as Nottingham Private Rented Assistance Scheme (NPRAS) – a package of support offered by Nottingham City Council with Bronze, Silver and Gold packages.

#### **Practice Example: Nottingham Private Rented Assistance Scheme (NPRAS)**

This range of support packages assists Nottingham City residents who are homeless or in need of good quality private rented accommodation. It issues a ‘tenancy passport’ indicating that the applicant is ‘tenancy ready’ and offers a range of incentives to landlords including a bond amounting to one month’s rent to cover rent and damages, an assessment of support needs, support to liaise with Housing Benefit and legal advice for landlords on tenancy issues.

Broxtowe is exploring Ark Passports<sup>31</sup> to improve landlords’ confidence. Ark Passports provide ‘jam-jar’ accounts for tenants and an element of landlord insurance.

One local authority suggested that the ‘lead tenant’ model for shared housing management could be explored. In this model, one tenant acts as ‘lead’, and is supported to do so, to ensure that key tenancy responsibilities are carried out for the household. This is also known as the ‘peer landlord’ model.

#### **Practice Example: Commonweal Housing, in partnership with Thames Reach and Catch 22 – Peer Landlord, or Supportive Shared Housing**

<https://www.commonwealhousing.org.uk/projects/peer-landlord>

Commonweal Housing used a Social Investment Bond model to procure three bed properties for sharing schemes with Thames Reach and Catch 22. One tenant – the peer

<sup>31</sup> <https://www.arkpassport.co.uk/>

landlord - takes the lead in ensuring that key tenancy responsibilities are carried out within the accommodation.

Peer Landlord is a developing and evolving programme. The latest evaluation can be found here: <https://www.commonwealhousing.org.uk/blog/new-peer-landlord-interim-evaluation-released>

and a guide on replication: <https://www.commonwealhousing.org.uk/blog/commonweal-publish-internal-reflections-report-on-peer-landlord-project>

Two landlords at the South Nottinghamshire Landlords' Forum considered themselves to be 'philanthropic landlords' – landlords who were running a business but also thought they were doing some social good. Local authorities could partner with this kind of landlord to work at developing models of making shared accommodation work. There are existing models, too, of partnering with the faith sector. One of these is Hope into Action, who now have a Nottingham base.<sup>32</sup>

There are some positive local initiatives. Ashfield is developing referral arrangements and support with local landlords to encourage them offer tenancies to Housing Options customers, and Broxtowe is working closely with private landlords to develop shared accommodation.

Selective Licensing has recently been introduced in Gedling and Ashfield and some landlords have said that they are worried about that. Feedback tells us that there is concern that this will reduce the availability of private rented sector accommodation.

- Loss of PRS is frequently a big driver for homelessness—the ending of PRS tenancies is the greatest number of all those applying to the Councils seeking help
- Closer relationships with landlords help, including 'call before you serve/call before you evict' initiatives
- Landlords are clear what the obstacles are but also identified what might help them to let to young people
- Impact of introduction of Selective Licensing on the availability of private rented accommodation

#### **Local Good Practice**

- All four local authorities have Rent Deposit Guarantee Schemes
- 'Call before you serve/before you evict' initiatives
- Use of DHP at 'front end' of tenancies
- Use of Prevention funds
- Broxtowe is working with landlords to develop shared accommodation
- Ashfield is developing referral arrangements and support with local landlords to encourage them offer tenancies to Housing Options customers
- One RP in Nottingham is piloting shared housing using 3 x 2 bedroom properties in a share with a friend initiative.

<sup>32</sup> <http://nottingham.hopeintoaction.org.uk/>

## 9.6. Tenancy Sustainment, Resettlement and Floating Support

The availability of affordable accommodation and the capacity for it to be accessed by people under 35 forms only part of the picture. A key question is, will they be able to sustain it?

The Quantitative Analysis breaks support for tenancy sustainment into three different elements:

- Around **19** people under 35 will require short term housing related support to prevent the loss of tenancy
- Around **34** people under 35 will require help to move into a new property to remedy homelessness
- Around **52** people under 35 will require a Resettlement Package when moving on from supported housing

Floating support services took a big 'hit' when it was agreed to prioritise accommodation-based services at the time of the SP cuts. When Nottinghamshire County Council's HRS funding was substantially cut in 2014, the decision was taken, following consultation with the lower tier councils to prioritise accommodation services for 16-25s, above tenancy support and outreach services.

The lack of floating support in both private and social and housing has been identified by all stakeholders as one of the most significant gaps in service provision locally and a major contributor to tenancy failure in younger people. There was a strong view that with no support mechanisms in place young people were being set up to fail, especially the younger cohort. They may be able to get accommodation but whether or not they will be able to sustain it is an issue for many stakeholders. One local authority which places young people in shared private sector accommodation described it as being like a 'hostel environment with no staff'.

There was a widely-held view amongst both professionals and young people that relatively low-level, signposting and 'hand-holding' support services were the thing that was most needed and feedback from young people confirmed that this was important. Support at every key transition, but not necessarily continuously, was identified as a need.

A key transition is, of course, moving into a new property, especially when someone has been homeless. With changes to benefits, utilities to set up, furniture to find, budgeting, bills to pay, and more, this can be an overwhelming time.

Floating support helps people to sustain tenancies, through the provision of housing related support at key times. It can provide support with areas such as finding accommodation, the move, setting up utilities and equipping your accommodation, understanding how to manage your tenancy including issues such as rent and bills, budgeting, getting on with your neighbours, noise and other anti-social behaviour – many are critical areas of understanding for a young person. It was a major element of the Supporting People (SP) provision across England, offering an effective intervention at a relatively low cost. It can also be very effective for people who are unhappy in shared accommodation or where disability or other disadvantage make sharing difficult. It can help make shared housing work. Where

tenancies are maintained there is less likelihood of people's situations worsening and their situation declining until they need statutory support.

And when young people move on from *supported housing* they are likely to need considerable support during the initial resettlement phase. Framework is commissioned by Nottinghamshire County Council to support young people for 3 months following move-on, whilst YMCA offers some support in its transitional flats. Some councils and housing associations have their own in-house schemes. But this is the extent of the floating support available across the four districts.

Young people who had received this kind of support said that the help they received with benefits, with moving on and moving in – 'being helped to know what to do next' – worked well for them. However another would have liked to see a longer offer of support:

*'at the moment support is all in buildings and transitional houses but not before and not after'*

Young people were very clear about the 'aftercare' which they felt would help give them the skills they needed to manage effectively in their new home and sustain their tenancy. They said they needed financial advice and support, including budgeting help, addressing arrears early on before they built up. They flagged up those times of transition when they needed extra support, for example, on finding a job or losing a job – times when their income and outgoings would change. Help 'on the end of a phone' was mentioned as something which would be beneficial at these times, maybe just someone to give support with reworking their budget. Interestingly much of this matches the need identified by landlords.

Some mentioned more practical issues, for example, young people learning about cooking or cleaning when they hadn't been taught by their parents, whilst another described not knowing how to use the immersion heater. She had been shown on move-in but was given so much information she couldn't remember it all. It had been the first time she'd had her own tenancy.

Whilst young people were conscious of the things they would need when they had their own accommodation – bills, food, utilities or furniture – they maybe find it hard to manage on an everyday basis. One said:

*Most people are focused on [payment of] rent but then spend on nails, drink and phone before large bills.*

Some said they needed help with sorting out their benefits, that it was getting harder and harder to navigate the system. One supported housing provider flagged up young people's learning, literacy and social skills needs, but also said that their own staff team found it challenging to sort out benefits issues.

One young person praised the help offered by their DWP Work Coach who resolved issues the same day.

## **10. Supported Housing and peripatetic housing support for single households aged 18-25**

The Quantitative Analysis has calculated that accommodation-based supported housing is required for people under 35 with additional needs with, across the districts a need for:

- 75 units of supported housing with approximately 33 with 24-hour cover.
- 42 units of emergency accommodation

It also calculates the need for Housing First provision for people who are homeless with multiple needs as 13 units initially.

In terms of the need for domestic abuse accommodation, the Quantitative Analysis puts this need at 5. However, to ensure that this is robust further analysis is needed.

Housing Related Support (HRS) budgets nationally have been substantially eroded since 2010 (See Policy Summary, Appendix A). When Nottinghamshire County Council's HRS funding was substantially cut in 2014, the decision was taken, following consultation with the lower tier councils to prioritise accommodation services for 16-25s, above tenancy support and outreach services.

There is a small range of supported accommodation available across the districts and feedback from several stakeholders indicates that there is not enough commissioned supported accommodation to meet the needs of 18-25s. All four local authorities referred young people to services which have not been commissioned by Nottinghamshire County Council and which are thus outside strategic planning and monitoring mechanisms. These services predominantly use Housing Benefit to cover costs and rely on other funds to cover anything else. Young people with support needs are being referred to non-commissioned supported accommodation, sometimes out of area, or, where there is no alternative are being placed in unsupported PRS accommodation where they are vulnerable to tenancy failure.

Nottinghamshire YMCA has two hostels and a range of transitional homes, funded from Housing Benefit and YMCA's charitable funds. It has high utilisation rates – 96% - 99% - but if there is a vacancy it is able to respond quickly. Broxtowe Council, for example, refers to the Canaan Trust (16+ males only) 'over the border' in Derbyshire. Broxtowe also referred into Derwentio Housing Trust's Private Rented Sector leasing scheme, which does offer some support, some also in Derbyshire.

The Nottinghamshire County Council's Care Leaver Offer, Pathway and Protocol is strong and stakeholders believe it to be well-implemented. It supports Care Leavers until they are 25 and prioritises their accommodation needs during their transition to adulthood. It was reported that only a small number of Care Leavers become homeless because they are on this managed pathway. Where possible they remain in their Looked After Children placements and start to transition into supported housing from 17 years of age.

Both commissioned and non-commissioned 18+ services reported taking young people whose semi-independent care accommodation had broken down, whilst one local authority highlighted the challenge of finding supported housing for young people of 18, 19 and 20 who are not on the Care Pathway in both non-commissioned and commissioned services.

One young person described what waiting for a suitable solution can mean:

*A homeless young person needs an immediate response but you have to wait ... 'We'll get back to you in two weeks.' Well, two weeks is a long time to find sofas to sleep on.'*

Nottingham Night Stop (see Policy Summary, Appendix A) is used by all four local authorities as a short-term response. Designed to provide young people aged 16-25 with a meal and a bed for the night in the home of a trained volunteer, one agency reported that it was '*always positive and transforms young people*' with its 'safe and secure' environment. Night Stop, intended as a single night emergency service has moved from 1 to 3 nights and sometimes a young person will still be there after several weeks whilst a suitable accommodation outcome is found for them. In that case, Night Stop is being used almost as a supported lodgings service. Bed and Breakfast is also used as an emergency response.

Ashfield and Broxtowe have no supported accommodation within their districts and place people in neighbouring local authority areas. Whilst the young people retain their local connection and the referring local authority accepts move-on responsibility, they have to move outside their local area to access the supported accommodation - and return when they move on. Difficulties regarding local connection were raised by an accommodation provider in that young people could be placed with them whilst their local connection was explored, but then when it was found that they didn't have one, there was no suitable 'exit' for them under allocations policies. One young person felt that there could be closer working between councils and accommodation providers regarding this issue.

One provider highlighted an affordability issue even in supported housing for young people who would be left with very little disposable income after paying their service charge and paying off some former arrears. One young person felt that service charges should be lower for younger people as they earned low wages and received lower levels of benefit. For young people who are working, supported housing rents and service charges can become unviable. There is a need for more supported accommodation options where young people can work. Care Leavers are supported financially by the Leaving Care Service to ensure they can maintain their accommodation but for others there is a disincentive to work.

Most of those expressing a view on the amount of supported housing saw a particular gap in services for 18-25s with higher or more complex needs, who it is felt are falling through the net. Whilst all the commissioned services are deemed low to medium needs they do usually accept young people unless there are significant safeguarding risks. However, stakeholders identified groups whose needs were not being met and it was pointed out that there were always some who may need support for life.

These include people with Learning Disabilities, ADHD or who were on the Autistic Spectrum – diagnosed, or undiagnosed – who can find it difficult to cope in a hostel situation. There are also young people with mental health needs such as anxiety, depression, or personality disorder who were previously receiving CAMHS (Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services) but have fallen through the gap between children's and adult services where thresholds are higher. This group may need specialist supported housing services with a higher level of staffing.

And there are people with multiple needs in the areas of mental health, drugs, alcohol and offending, where even relatively low-level unmet needs in several areas can 'add up' to a

high level of need. Whilst the greatest number of people with complex needs relating to these issues tended to be in the older cohort, moving towards their mid-30s, there is a growing number within the 18-25 group.

There is a distinct lack of support for this group including the need for a specific support service for those who are unable to live independently yet are unable to share. Housing First, as a model for those for whom other, more traditional options have not worked, may provide an approach which will lead to improved outcomes for them.<sup>33</sup> Rotherham Council is piloting a Housing First model through the re-design of an existing supported housing service with 2 local housing associations. One stakeholder mentioned the Gloucestershire Housing First project, funded by Social Impact Bonds.<sup>34</sup>

Access to mental health accommodation services is not through housing departments but through a clinical/GP route. A survey of support needs conducted for the homelessness review in Mid-Notts showed that over 50% of occupants of supported housing and TA in Newark and Sherwood, Ashfield and Mansfield have a mental health support need and this is indicative for the four authorities covered in this study, suggesting a greater need for mental health support than is currently available.

In relation to domestic abuse, one stakeholder reported that refuges lack the capacity to support people with other issues (for example, mental health, drug and alcohol) and those people’s needs remain unmet.

**Supported Housing Services accessed by the four authorities**  
**Commissioned services are in BOLD ITALICS**

area served Service location	LA	Service	Units	Ashfield	Broxtowe	Gedling	Rushcliffe
Mansfield		<b><i>Framework Transitions North</i></b>  <b><i>16-21 Accommodation</i></b>	<b><i>17 core</i></b>  20 cluster flats	Can access			
		<b><i>Framework Sherwood Street</i></b>  <b><i>(People who have been rough sleeping/are at immediate risk of rough sleeping)</i></b>  <b><i>18+</i></b>	<b><i>15</i></b>	Can access			
		YMCA Mansfield Hostel Commercial Gate		Can		Can	

<sup>33</sup> <https://www.homeless.org.uk/facts/our-research/housing-first-in-england-evaluation-of-nine-services>

<sup>34</sup> <https://www.gloucestershire.gov.uk/gloucestershire-county-council-news/news-september-2018/funding-boost-for-county-homelessness-support-services/>

LA area served Service location	Service	Units	Ashfield	Broxtowe	Gedling	Rushcliffe
		23	access	Can access	access	Can access
	YMCA Transitional Houses	33	YMCA move-on	YMCA move-on	YMCA move-on	YMCA move-on
Rushcliffe	<b>Framework Transitions South</b>  <b>16-21 Accommodation</b>	<b>17 core</b>  38 dispersed across Broxtowe, Gedling and Rushcliffe		Can access	Can access	Can access
Gedling	<b>Framework Elizabeth House</b>  <b>16+ Accommodation (though most 18+ and not Care Leavers as LA referral)</b>	<b>21</b>		7 allocated units	7 allocated units	7 allocated units
<b>Derbyshire Nottinghamshire (and Shropshire Staffordshire Wiltshire)</b>	Derventio Housing Trust  SmartShare Scheme	220 whole area  (Private Rented Sector 'shared housing with support)		Can refer into Broxtowe and Derbyshire		
Derbyshire	Canaan Trust  Long Eaton - Erewash  16+ Male only but mix of all, individual	Jordan house x 9  3 in a semi-independent house		Can access – need local connection to Erewash  Broxtowe on border		
	Lighthouse Project  Male only 21+ (consider 19+)	16				
Nottingham	YMCA Nottingham City	20	Can	Can access	Can	Can access

area served Service location	LA	Service	Units	Ashfield	Broxtowe	Gedling	Rushcliffe
		Hostel Shakespeare Street 16+ 20 units reserved for 16-25s	(16-25)  78  (18-25)	access		access	
		YMCA Transitional Houses	12	YMCA move-on	YMCA move-on	YMCA move-on	YMCA move-on
		YMCA currently developing 18-35 services within existing units in some areas					

**Fig 6: Supported services accessed by the four local authorities.**

*(There may also be other small agencies who have occasional spaces in Long Eaton or Nottingham City)*

### 10.1. Move-on from Supported Housing

Both commissioned and non-commissioned services take a Pathway approach. Young people start the pathway in hostel accommodation and as their need for support reduces they move into transitional, semi-independent housing before moving into their own accommodation.

Under the Ready to Move protocol which operates across the county, young people move on into either social housing or PRS. To get to this point they are expected to show that they will be able to manage their own tenancy. There are no nominations in social housing for people moving on, but in all four areas they will be placed in Band 2 as soon as they have met the Ready to Move criteria.

Those who go on to the Housing Register and bid via CBL are likely to receive an offer for social housing, though in some areas they may have a long wait. Some go into PRS but it isn't seen as a realistic option because young people may have difficulties sustaining it without support. One accommodation provider reported real challenges in meeting throughput/move-on targets set by commissioners and one Housing Association which worked with local authorities via CBL said it advised young people to consider private sector accommodation as well because of the time it takes to get a social housing flat.

Framework has 42 units of their own self-contained transitional accommodation in the 3 South Nottinghamshire boroughs and have built some in Broxtowe (Eastwood) and Gedling. They also have 53 units dispersed across Ashfield and Mansfield. Framework's 18-21 service is commissioned by Nottinghamshire County Council to provide 3 months support on move-on.

YMCA has transitional houses across the County – some owned by them and some leased from private landlords. They have 12 units in the City and 33 in Mansfield specifically for 18-25s and will deliver weekly support with the aim that people manage independently ahead of moving in to their own accommodation.

There is wide recognition that it's not always helpful to young people with support needs to all live in one place. A local authority respondent noted that it has been known for people to leave supported housing with needs they didn't go in with. One young person described how they developed an alcohol problem whilst they were in supported accommodation, whilst another described leaving a hostel to rough sleep when they smelt Spice on a landing. If those with lower needs could be supported in the community with floating support this would leave hostel places for those who already have most need for support.

## **11. Cross-cutting themes**

### **11.1. Information and advice about housing and homelessness**

Young people highlighted that they feel there is an 'information gap' about housing. When asked what the main issues were in looking for housing, comments included:

*'I don't know what my rights are' and 'Not knowing what to do or who to speak to about it' 'Knowing what services I can access and where I can get the help I need'.*

One didn't understand how he could be classed as homeless but still have no knowledge of any entitlement to emergency housing/accommodation. Another would have found it helpful to know *'A timeline, or how long it takes.'*

Other stakeholders who were interviewed believed that more 'upstream' prevention work could be carried out with schools in relation to housing and homelessness with one young person talked about the value of learning from people with lived experience, people who had 'been there'.

- i. Broxtowe Youth Homelessness are commissioned by two local authorities to go into schools and they aim to dispel myths about housing. They also have a website with helpful information and advice for young people.
- ii. The developing Nottinghamshire Help Yourself website is also a useful web resource: <https://www.nottshelpyourself.org.uk/>.
- iii. Citizen's Advice offer dedicated advice on housing issues.

However, there was also a view from both agencies and young people that the public generally, need to be more educated about today's housing issues. Things have changed, yet the prevailing public view is, 'if you're homeless, you'll be housed.'

Young people expressed the view that social media could be better used in promoting information and advice about housing. Some said that people needed something to lead them to a website. Facebook and Twitter were suggested and one person proposed a 'meme' – (text, video or an image that can capture the imagination and rapidly spreads via social media). The young people were willing to work with councils to support better promotion of advice and information.

It was reported that care leavers whose independent accommodation had broken down weren't always aware of the support system that is available for them.

With advice and information being of prime importance for local authorities in fulfilling their responsibilities under the Homelessness Reduction Act there is a real opportunity to engage with young people to involve them in how this might best be done.

## **11.2. 'There used to be ...' The loss of wider support services, and more**

Stakeholder feedback told us that people with needs are presenting to housing where previously they would have presented to other services which may have helped people earlier. In interviews, there was a great sense that things had been lost due to budget cuts.

*'Services are no longer there. There used to be more services.'*

Alongside the loss of floating support, decommissioning of some supported housing and lower staffing levels in those that remain, there was a feeling that thresholds in statutory services are higher than they used to be. One supported housing provider said it could be 'an ongoing battle' to access support for people whom agencies believed should meet that threshold. 'Prevention of Crisis' services in mental health were said to be disappearing.

Drug and alcohol services are reported as doing what they can for people with dual diagnosis (people with mental health and drug/alcohol issues), but two stakeholders mentioned the loss of a specialist dual diagnosis service that had worked with people in supported housing services. There was a sense that people with the dual issue of mental health and substance use support needs were falling between two stools.

Short term funding was also regarded as an issue. For example, Broxtowe's previous 2-year pre-tenancy training Trailblazer was mentioned by two stakeholders as a loss, and one young person's organisation reported that its employability projects come and go depending on funding.

The loss of statutory grants to set up home was seen as concerning and was mentioned by young people as well as agencies. Young people moving into tenancies may have no family support and without grants they have no means of getting basic furniture other than second hand furniture projects. Without adequate furniture, accommodation is not a home and lack of it can impact on a young person's capacity to maintain the tenancy. Whilst it is possible to apply for a Universal Credit Budgeting Advance, affordability is already a major issue and paying back loans from benefits can put young people in financial difficulty, especially the 18-24 group whose benefit levels are already very low.

### **Practice Example: Your Own Network (Your Own Place)**

Your Own Network is a platform where young people moving into a tenancy can receive messages of support and donations towards their 'Argos Wishlist'

<https://yourownnetwork.co.uk/>

One stakeholder mentioned a 'data gap' between the county and the districts. Whilst in the past there had been a need to collect a range of data for government purposes which could be used to improve understanding at county level that data has disappeared. Only when young people are in crisis do they become visible in data terms and the stakeholder's view was that this created a gap in understanding. This finding is corroborated by the findings of the homelessness review taking place in Mid-Notts that countywide there is a significant lack of robust data that would help evidence need.

The H-Clic data collection/reporting system which has replaced the former P1E system will supply good data for the future in terms of understanding more about homelessness and housing issues. For the first time, local authorities will be required to report on those who approach them.

### **11.3. Skills, training and employability**

Although the areas surrounding Nottingham City have a skills gap at all levels, one stakeholder reported that apprenticeships can be hard to fill. When young people are in supported housing they can access a range of education and training which is offered by providers, including functional skills, life skills, pre-tenancy and more. Providers encourage attendance at college and pathways towards work such as volunteering.

However, there seemed no central information point in relation to education and training and there was a sense that things could be more 'joined up' and promoted so that young people could be more effectively signposted. Things change all the time and some agencies didn't know what was currently available.

A range of programmes are funded by Building Better Opportunities funding via D2N2 LEP and there is possibly more scope for using this funding for apprenticeships linked to construction training projects. One stakeholder reported that apprenticeships are hard to fill, reflecting a national trend but Community Campus, a Stoke-on-Trent project which is refurbishing empty homes, has a high proportion of apprenticeships amongst its workforce:<sup>35</sup>

*Amid a dramatic national collapse in apprenticeships, about 15% of Community Campus' staff are apprentices ..... The group, which has refurbished about 250 homes so far, also offers help with job interviews, jobcentre appointments and finding free educational programmes at local colleges.*

The DWP is implementing the Youth Obligation for people aged 18-21 who are on Universal Credit. It provides intensive support by the Work Coach to address barriers that young

---

<sup>35</sup> <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2018/sep/25/england-has-more-than-200000-empty-homes-how-to-revive-them>

people are finding. Work Coaches work with the Princes Trust and employers, including the public sector. Three of the councils mentioned that they had an apprenticeship scheme and it could be worth pursuing links.

Additionally there are a number of schemes that combine the development of work-place skills with the development of housing. As well as 'Community Campus', 'Giroscope' in Hull and 'Canopy' in Leeds both work with local communities to acquire and refurbish empty homes, skilling up the young people to carry out much of the refurbishment work. Some schemes include apprenticeship places, whilst others rely on volunteers to support the property development and the acquisition of skills by the young people.

#### **11.4. Partnerships**

The district/borough local authorities have strong relationships and a great deal of trust between them. With a strong history of working closely together and there is real scope for them to pull together, working with their Members to improve housing options for people under 35 in their areas. However there is significant further scope to develop the relationship between district local authorities and the County Council.

The Government's Rough Sleeping Strategic Plan introduces the idea of local Homelessness Reduction Boards which will facilitate sub-regional strategic approaches to reducing homelessness and preventing rough sleeping. This could provide an effective mechanism to strengthen joint working. The HRA Duty to Refer also presents opportunities for stronger partnership approaches with specified public authorities.

Closer joint working with younger people could draw on the voice of their experience. Broxtowe Youth Homelessness, The Friary and the YMCA brought the voice of younger people into this study and with Framework could support young people's engagement in the future.

There were also suggestions for partnership approaches, for example, one stakeholder spoke of young people being 'everybody's responsibility'. The stakeholder advocated joint thinking to develop 'Young Person's Hubs' in buildings owned by Nottinghamshire County Council such as Children's Centres and Youth Centres. They could be staffed by funding from pooled budgets from a range of agencies.

#### **12. Increasing the availability of accommodation for single people under 35, including supportive options**

Local Authorities and some of their partners are being creative in attempting to increase the availability of accommodation for people under 35 with low incomes including closer working with landlords. Closer working with private landlords, piloting and considering innovative sharing schemes are just two examples of work that is taking place. For example, one Housing Association is exploring a sharing with friends approach. And Ashfield is also currently procuring general needs properties which are for sale on the open market.

More availability of accommodation (backed up by floating support) would make more efficient and effective use of supported housing for 18-24s as well as increasing supply. Those without needs or with low needs would be able to go straight into accommodation, bypassing the hostel system (where is a risk they might become more dependent) and supported accommodation could be reserved for those who would most benefit from on-site support. With a variety of exit routes it would be easier for agencies to meet move-on targets

There are a range of approaches which could enhance the diversity of options available, including:

- **Supported Lodgings Schemes** are seen as having positive outcomes for young people aged 18-25 and these could be delivered in both private and social sectors. It could be an appropriate option for some young people needing a supported setting (See Policy Summary, Appendix A)

#### **Practice Example: Supported Lodgings**

##### **Horton Housing**

- Horton Housing manages supported lodgings for young people
- <https://hortonhousing.co.uk/get-support/young-persons-prevention-support-service/>

- **Social Lettings/Private Sector Leasing Schemes**

Private landlords were positive about some of the things that these kinds of schemes could offer, such as guaranteed rent, cover for void periods and rent paid direct. If there is no appetite for creating a separate legal entity, approaches like those taken by Cambridge's 'Town Hall Lettings' and Norwich's 'LetNCC' could be explored; or partnering with a sympathetic private lettings agency which already has a structure in place. Remember, it does not need to 'break even' as long as any costs incurred can demonstrably evidence a reduction in homelessness and an enhanced prevention approach.

- **YMCA** is looking to develop permanent, affordable accommodation for single people and is developing a leasing scheme to provide affordable homes for young people across Nottinghamshire.

- **Returning empty homes to use**

One young person said, *'they should do up all the derelict flats - people wouldn't be on the street taking Spice and this and that drug.'*

Whilst the government-led Empty Homes Programme no longer exists, there are models which are being taken forward. Norwich City Council actively encourages owners of empty properties to bring them back into use by leasing them to the Council's 'LetNCC'. In addition, there are examples in Community Campus, Canopy and Girescope of schemes that bring empty homes back into use whilst also developing skills within the workforce.

- **Development and refurbishment**

There may be opportunities to work together with partners such as Framework and YMCA and others in developing harder to let social properties such as flats above shops or decommissioned buildings such as sheltered housing developments.

- **Construction-led education and training can be a part of the above**

Stakeholder feedback highlighted that the business community is supportive of housing development to support economic development as well as construction-led training initiatives. D2N2 LEP funding should be explored in relation to education and training opportunities.

### **Practice Examples: Freebridge Community Housing**

Freebridge Community Housing and Purfleet Trust developed 'Jog On', a programme where people with lived experience of homelessness/long term unemployment could get a CSCS card and an NVQ in painting and decorating.

Freebridge went on to partner with the Nationwide Foundation to transform a derelict commercial building into housing. Participants of 'Jog On' will work on the refurbishment of the building.

<https://www.freebridge.org.uk/News/news130.html>

### **Practice example: Community Campus<sup>36</sup>**

Community Campus is a housing provider with a construction and building maintenance arm which provides work placements in construction (and administration and tenant support). It purchases empty homes in the Stockton on Tees area and offers them to formerly homeless people at below social rents. <http://www.communitycampus87.com/>

### **Practice example: Giroscope**

Giroscope buys and renovates empty properties in west Hull, encouraging prospective tenants to be actively involved in the refurbishment and housing many of the volunteers. Rents are affordable and they do not charge rent deposits/rent in advance or non-returnable fees. ([www.giroscope.org.uk](http://www.giroscope.org.uk))

### **Practice example: Canopy - self-help for the homeless in Leeds**

([www.canopyhousing.org/about](http://www.canopyhousing.org/about))

Canopy renovates empty and derelict homes, providing self-help housing opportunities giving people that are homeless the opportunity to participate in the renovation and decoration of their new home. They have developed partnership arrangements with housing providers and the local authority and has negotiated lease arrangements

### **Nationwide is opening a new round of funding in the spring of 2019**

<http://www.nationwidefoundation.org.uk/available-funding/>

---

<sup>36</sup> <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2018/sep/25/england-has-more-than-200000-empty-homes-how-to-revive-them>

- **Spare to Share:** Local Authorities and Housing Associations could introduce and promote 'Spare to Share' Initiatives where tenants affected by the removal of the Spare Room Subsidy (i.e. affected by the 'Bedroom Tax') rent their spare room. (Under Universal Credit, rental income from lodgers or boarders is not included as income and the Spare Room Subsidy will still applied to the Housing Costs element of UC)

#### **Practice example: Solo Housing**

Solo Housing have been offering a lodgings scheme in Norfolk for people of all ages for many years, and have expanded this into Suffolk and more recently, Essex.

From their website, '**The Lodgings Scheme** enables people with a spare room to let, to meet someone wishing to rent it. This gives the householder useful extra tax free income. It also provides people who do not have a home with a quick solution to their problem at an affordable rent.'

<http://www.solohousing.org/>

- **Partnering with Business:** Partnership with the business sector can present opportunities. For example, as the business community is supportive of housing development there may be opportunities around young people's training initiatives. Many businesses have a philanthropic element or promote staff volunteering and there may be opportunities around this, for example, in providing mentoring or other support for young people. Social lettings is based on partnership with private landlords.
- **Housing First:** For those with the most complex needs allocating some accommodation with a high ratio of staff to client support should be pursued. Housing First is a successful model of support for those with multiple/ complex needs for whom other solutions have not been effective in the long term. There are a range of Housing First models and an emerging body of knowledge  
<https://www.homeless.org.uk/our-work/national-projects/housing-first-england>

#### **Social Impact Bonds (SIBS)**

##### **'Young Futures Fund'**

In its 2018 Rough Sleeping Strategy<sup>37</sup> the Government introduces its planned launch of **Social Impact Bonds (SIBS)** funding streams. The 'Young Futures Fund' will be aimed at young people aged 18-24 who are not in education, employment or training and at risk of homelessness or rough sleeping.

There are various examples of (SIBS) programmes and the evaluation of the young people's 'Fair Chance Fund', on which 'Young Futures' builds, is referenced in the Policy Summary [Appendix A]. The Government has developed a range of tools that can be used for the development of SIBS

<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/social-impact-bonds#uk-government-outcomes->

<sup>37</sup> <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-rough-sleeping-strategy>

[funds-for-sibs](#) and which will help the local authorities better understand the cost-benefits value of what they do.

- **Homes for Cathy**<sup>38</sup>: This is a national coalition of Housing Associations who came together in 2016 at the 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the film ‘Cathy Come Home’ to highlight the needs of people who are homeless. There is an active national campaign to encourage Housing Associations to sign up to 9 commitments:
  1. To contribute to the development and execution of local homelessness strategies
  2. To operate flexible allocations and eligibility policies which allow individual applicants’ unique set of circumstances and housing history to be considered
  3. To offer constructive solutions to applicants who aren’t deemed eligible for an offer of a home
  4. To not make any tenant seeking to prevent their homelessness, homeless
  5. To commit to meeting the needs of vulnerable tenant groups
  6. To work in partnership to provide a range of affordable housing options which meet the needs of all homeless people in their local communities
  7. To ensure that properties offered to homeless people should be ready to move into
  8. To contribute to ending migrant homelessness in the areas Housing Associations operate
  9. To lobby, challenge and inspire others to support ending homelessness.

### 13. Recommendations

This study generated many ideas for ways to improve the availability of and access to accommodation for young people and the Quantitative Analysis has modelled the numbers that will be required if the needs of people under 35 are to be effectively met.

#### Quantitative Analysis Summary

The Quantitative Analysis has identified the following overall need for housing for U35s across the 4 districts:

- **An overall need for access to approximately 470 units of alternative affordable housing for this client group**– with some of this cohort also requiring support.
- **The provision of prevention activity (access to advice, assistance and mediation)** that successfully prevents their tenancy from breaking down; (approx 80 households require this service).
- **Support to prevent loss of accommodation** – around 19 people under 35 will require short term housing related support to prevent the loss of tenancy.
- **Support to help move into a new property** - around 34 people under 35 will require support on move in to remedy their homelessness.
- **Resettlement Support:** Around 52 people under 35 will require housing related support as they move into new tenancies.

---

<sup>38</sup> <https://homesforcathy.org.uk/>

- **Emergency Housing:** Approximately 42 units of emergency housing will be required for those who are homeless and in need of crisis accommodation.
- Across the 4 districts 75 units of **Accommodation-Based supported housing** is required for people with additional needs. Just under half of these should be 24-hour cover.
- **A Housing First provision:** We recommend the commissioning of Housing First to respond to homelessness and complex needs. There should initially be 13 units for under 35s across the 4 districts.
- **Domestic Abuse:** Initial analysis has suggested 5 spaces but further work would need to be undertaken to provide a robust assessment.

Our key recommendations are:

1. **Work with commissioners to ensure services are commissioned which meet the levels of need highlighted in the Quantitative Analysis**
2. **As part of Homelessness Reduction Act strategies increase access to advice, assistance and mediation** that successfully prevents tenancies from breaking down.
3. **Commission a support service that helps individuals and households in a range of ways to remedy homelessness or prevent tenancy loss;** this can take the form of a floating support service for 105 people, shared across the 4 districts to enable some economies of scale and consistency of service, and addresses the need identified in the quantitative analysis for:
  - **Support to prevent loss of accommodation** – around 19 people under 35 will require short term housing related support to prevent the loss of tenancy.
  - **Support to help move into a new property** - around 34 people under 35 will require support on move in to remedy their homelessness.
  - **Resettlement Support:** Around 52 people under 35 will require housing related support as they move into new tenancies.
4. **Improve the availability of, and access to, alternative affordable housing for under 35s in the following ways:**

#### **Social Housing**

- Reinvigorate the Social Landlords Forum by encouraging sharing of practice which would meet this aim and harness the energy and innovation within the social landlord sector to work with the Councils to address these pressing priorities (eg Nottingham Community Housing Association is a member of 'Homes for Cathy').
- With social landlords pro-actively identify ways to work together to tackle and find solutions to the Councils' most pressing priorities including increasing the supply of affordable housing and removing barriers to access. This will make them active partners at the table, contributing meaningfully to the strategic priorities of the Councils.

- Work closely with individual social landlords to agree a course of action to find affordable housing options.
- Maximise Discretionary Housing Payment and Exempt Accommodation Rules to open up opportunities in working with the voluntary and faith sectors and align approaches across districts/ boroughs to encourage providers to respond flexibly to need.
- Bring Section 106 development partners 'into the tent' to ensure that new developments include affordable accommodation which meets the full range of local need.

### **Private Sector Housing**

- Maximise use of Discretionary Housing Payment/Prevention Funds 'at the front end' to remove financial barriers to tenancy access.
- Develop a social lettings service (or partner with an existing lettings service) working with private landlords for a.

### **5. Pilot and evaluate additional models of housing provision for people under 35, developing those which work best for particular groups (aim at range and diversity in provision)**

- Supported lodgings
- 'Lead tenant' or 'Peer landlord' shared housing
- 'Spare to Share' initiatives

### **6. Develop closer relationships with young people and involve them in the delivery of information, advice and other projects**

- Young people are keen to be involved. Consider developing the work of Broxtowe Youth Homelessness across all four districts. This could form the basis of a more dynamic approach to co-production between the councils and the customer base and offer new approaches to housing options for young people.

### **7. Ensure young people are well prepared to take up a tenancy by introducing a pre-tenancy training programme**

### **8. Develop the partnerships which are over-arching in achieving all of the above**

- Building on the existing strong partnership between districts, agree a consistent set of approaches (for example, move-on allocations protocols, local connection, use of Discretionary Housing Payment,

Exempt Accommodation rules, rent deposits). This helps improve supply, but also removes confusion and encourages innovation.

- Bolster partnership working between county and districts to support future commissioning and the collection of relevant data sources to evidence need. Use the current studies on health and homelessness (JSNA) and Housing Strategies to ensure effective collaborative working between wider partners include County Council and Districts/ Boroughs. Identify a relevant set of metrics that will evidence need across the county without being over-burdensome.
- Harness what other agencies, including non-commissioned services, can, or do, contribute towards prevention of homelessness and collect evidence.
- Harness the contribution of all sectors in ensuring a supply of housing with support. If done well, bringing all providers ‘into the tent’ maximises opportunity and can encourage innovation, whilst enabling an element of oversight and reduces the number of ‘outliers’ operating on the fringe of the system. The landscape is changing and supported housing is now a mixed economy.
- Establish data-sharing protocols to build up a local ‘data bank’.
- Maximise opportunities to develop partnerships which are presented by the Homelessness Reduction Act’s ‘Duty to Refer’.
- Establish closer working between the D2N2 LEP, external funding streams and commissioned services to leverage funding to establish better co-ordinated skills and training for young people.

To help the local authorities plan the implementation of the above recommendations we have categorised them as: ‘Quick wins’ – the things that can be done immediately using existing resources and will show impact; ‘Medium term’ – those things where mechanisms need to be established (at minimal cost) and will develop with time, and those that need longer term planning and funding.

<p><b>‘Quick wins’</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Maximise Discretionary Housing Payment and Exempt Accommodation Rules to open up opportunities in working with the voluntary and faith sectors.</li> <li>❖ Maximise use of Discretionary Housing Payment/Prevention Funds ‘at the front end’ to remove financial barriers to tenancy access.</li> <li>❖ Maximise opportunities to develop partnerships which are presented by the Homelessness Reduction Act’s ‘Duty to Refer.’</li> </ul>
----------------------------	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Extend prevention activity (access to advice, assistance and mediation) to approximately 83 households across the 4 districts to successfully prevent their tenancy breaking down.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Medium term</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Reinvigorate the Social Landlords Forum by encouraging sharing of practice which would meet this aim and harness the energy and innovation within the social landlord sector to work with the Councils to address these pressing priorities.</li> <li>❖ Work closely with individual social landlords to agree a course of action to find affordable housing options.</li> <li>❖ Bring Section 106 development partners 'into the tent' to ensure that new developments include affordable accommodation which meets the full range of local need.</li> <li>❖ Young people are keen to be involved. Consider developing the work of Broxtowe Youth Homelessness across all four districts. This could form the basis of a more dynamic approach to co-production between the councils and the customer base.</li> <li>❖ Building on the existing strong partnership between districts, agree a consistent set of approaches (for example, move-on allocations protocols, local connection, use of Discretionary Housing Payment, Exempt Accommodation rules, rent deposits).</li> <li>❖ Bolster partnership working between county and districts to support future commissioning and the collection of relevant data sources to evidence need. Use the current studies on health and homelessness (JSNA) and Housing Strategies to ensure effective collaborative working between wider partners include County Council and Districts/ Boroughs.</li> <li>❖ Harness what other agencies, including non-commissioned services, can, or do, contribute towards prevention of homelessness and collect evidence.</li> <li>❖ Harness the contribution of all sectors in ensuring a supply of housing with support. If done well, bringing all providers 'into the tent' maximises opportunity and can encourage innovation, whilst enabling an element of oversight and reduces the number of 'outliers' operating on the fringe of the system. The landscape is changing and supported housing is now a mixed economy.</li> <li>❖ Establish data-sharing protocols to build up a local 'data</li> </ul>

	<p>bank’.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Establish closer working between the D2N2 LEP, external funding streams and commissioned services to leverage funding to establish better co-ordinated skills and training for young people.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Longer term planning and/or funding</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ <b>Work with commissioners to ensure services are commissioned which meet the levels of need highlighted in the Quantitative Analysis</b></li> <li>❖ <b>Commission a floating support service</b> for 105 people (U35s), shared across the 4 districts to enable some economies of scale and consistency of service. This will provide support where existing tenancies are at risk of breakdown or new tenancies at risk of failure and this will address a number of stress points identified through quantitative and qualitative analysis – including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>support to prevent loss of accommodation</b></li> <li>○ <b>support to help move into a new property</b></li> <li>○ <b>resettlement support</b> - housing related support as people move into new tenancies.</li> </ul> </li> <li>❖ <b>Develop a service that supports landlords ‘at both ends’, encouraging them to widen their lettings criteria, but also supporting them when they need help with tenancy queries or other issues. This could be via a social lettings service (or partner with an existing lettings service) working with private landlords for a</b></li> <li>❖ <b>Pilot and evaluate additional models of housing provision for people under 35, developing those which work best for particular groups (aim at range and diversity in provision):</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Supported lodgings</li> <li>○ ‘Lead tenant’ or ‘Peer landlord’ shared housing</li> <li>○ ‘Spare to Share’ initiatives.</li> </ul> </li> <li>❖ <b>Ensure young people are well prepared to take up a tenancy by introducing a pre-tenancy training programme</b></li> </ul>

## Appendix A – Horizon Scan and Policy Summary

The Horizon Scan and Policy Summary sets the context for this work and is embedded here.



Appendix A -  
Horizon Scan and Po

**Appendix B – Quantitative Needs Analysis**

**Appendix B - Quantitative Needs Analysis**

Appendix B1 - Methodology of Quantitative Assessment

**Principles**

The general methodology for the quantitative needs assessment is based on the modelling of the flows within the homelessness system. This consists of the following elements:

- An estimation of the numbers of people presenting in need because they are homeless or at risk of homelessness. These are described as the **Populations at Risk** of homelessness. These estimations are based on actual data ascertained from several sources.
- An estimation of the proportions of people needing a range of different service responses to meet the needs of the different populations at risk. These are described as the **Populations in Need** of different service interventions. These estimations are based on informed estimates rather than specific evidence.

**Populations at Risk**

At around 26,000 people, Ashfield has the highest number of younger people aged 18 – 34. Rushcliffe has the lowest number (20,614) of adults aged 18 – 34. Under 35's represents the largest proportion of the district population in Broxtowe (21%). Rushcliffe the lowest proportion at 17.8%. Ashfield has 16.3 % of the counties 18 – 34 year olds. Rushcliffe has the lowest proportion at 13%

<b>UK Mid Year Estimates 2017</b>	Population (18 - 34)	% of population 18 - 34	% of the county 18-34 population in each district
Nottinghamshire	159,096		
Ashfield	26,004	20.6%	16.3%
Broxtowe	23,694	21.0%	14.9%
Gedling	22,105	18.9%	13.9%
Rushcliffe	20,614	17.8%	13.0%

The Populations at Risk identified in this exercise were divided into 2 broad categories. These were described as those with **General Needs** and those with **Additional Needs**. Additional Needs indicates that there is some additional factor that links those people's path into homelessness to a personal history of vulnerability. The following Additional Needs were recognised:

- An offending history
- A history of substance abuse
- Mental ill-health
- Vulnerable young person
- Being a looked-after child
- Experiencing domestic abuse
- Rough Sleeping
- Physical disability
- Learning disability

Those with general needs are therefore people who experience homelessness or are at risk of homelessness without these additional needs.

The Populations at Risk in detail were therefore

- People known to National Probation Service and Community Rehabilitation Company without settled housing
- Homeless with support needs due to Learning Disability
- People know to Sub Misuse services without settled housing
- Homeless with support needs due to Mental Health
- Homeless with support needs - vulnerable young person

## Appendix B – Quantitative Needs Analysis

- Homeless with support needs due to physical disability
- Leaving LA care with a need for housing with support
- In contact with Leaving Care Team with unsuitable accommodation
- other
- People experiencing domestic abuse whose housing is not safe as a result
- At risk of homelessness without additional needs
- Homeless without additional needs

The details of the estimation of the size of these groups can be found in the summary of the quantitative analysis in [the Appendix 1](#).

There obviously is the potential for overlap between these groups, as in any one year the same person could fall into more than one group. This is allowed for in the calculations and the way this is done is explained in the [Appendix 2](#).

### Service Interventions and Duration of Service

The Service Interventions that we calculated the *Population In Need* for were as follows:

- a) Prevention Action, including
  - Action to prevent loss of housing through advice and information (including welfare benefits) or mediation
  - Tenancy sustainment services to prevent loss of accommodation
  - Crisis accommodation to prevent the need for sleeping on the streets while long-term solutions are found
- b) Access to alternative affordable and decent housing, including
  - With no additional support required except basic advice / financial assistance
  - With some short-term support attached (Floating Support or Dispersed Supported Housing)
  - With longer-term support attached (Housing First)
  - With resettlement support attached (as part of move-on arrangements from supported housing)
- c) Access to some form of single-site supported housing including
  - 24 Hour Cover Supported Housing
  - Non-24 Hour Cover Supported Housing
- d) Refuge Accommodation for people who have experienced domestic abuse

There is some allowance built into the calculation to reflect people receiving more than one service intervention as follows:

- It is assumed that crisis accommodation is an immediate response to someone who is emergency homeless, and would always be followed by some other service intervention
- Supported housing is assumed to be short-term and there will need to be some form of follow-on provision. In most cases this will involve access to move-on housing. For some people, it is assumed that this will require an associated resettlement package of support.
- It is assumed that a certain proportion of each service placement will break down and this will result in a new intervention being provided in a number of cases

The assumptions used here are explained in the [Appendix 2](#) to this report.

It is not always that easy to distinguish between these service interventions. We have broadly assumed however that supported housing means single-site provision (whether in shared or self-contained accommodation). Dispersed supported housing is taken to be a form of access to “alternative, affordable and decent housing” with time-limited support attached. This distinction between “single-site” and “dispersed” supported housing should be

**Appendix B – Quantitative Needs Analysis**

considered when comparing the results of the needs assessment with the current supply configuration.

The other key factor that affects the bottom-line result in terms of the units of service needed, is the assumed average length of time that a service intervention goes on for. These assumptions are explained in the Appendix 2.

In interpreting these results, it is important to regard these as indicative rather than precise - an indication of a direction of travel rather than something to determine exact numbers and precise commissioning targets. This is largely because the Population in Need calculations are based on informed assumptions rather than a sound evidence base of actual need.

Historically, needs assessments for support interventions have been hindered by the fact that such need is not regularly or consistently measured anywhere. The model used here is designed to be informed by the development of a single assessment framework which would generate the actual evidence to populate the assumptions. The development of such a framework is a key part of our recommendations.

In the meantime, the methodological framework provided can be used to model the impact of several scenarios - so the impact on demand for interventions can be re-calculated as needed e.g. if specific types of need increase or the performance of different interventions becomes less or more effective.

**Service Requirements**

Overall our modelling of needs would estimate that there are in the region of 1061 people who are 18-35 likely to be at risk of homelessness in 2019/20 across the three districts.

18 – 35 Population at Risk of Homelessness 2019/20	1061
--	------

Service requirement are broken down into the following broad categories

1. Access to Advice, Assistance and Mediation
2. Tenancy Sustainment, Resettlement and Floating Support
3. Access to alternative Affordable Housing
4. Housing First for Complex Needs
5. Temporary Crisis Accommodation
6. Single Site Supported Housing
7. Refuge Accommodation

Using the information collected we have produced an estimate for the services required in 2019/20. The results are as follows:

Type of Service Required 2019-20	
Prevention of homelessness through advice, assistance and mediation etc	83
Tenancy sustainment / resettlement support	105
Access to alternative affordable accommodation	469
Housing First level support	13
Crisis Accommodation	42
Supported Housing	75
Refuge Accommodation	5

**Prevention of Homelessness through Advice, Assistance and Mediation**

Most significantly the model assumes that it is possible to do much more to prevent people losing their accommodation in the first place when this is at risk, as part of the Homeless Reduction Act strategies. Across the 4 districts we estimate that at least 83 people under 35 will require successful advice and assistance to prevent their tenancy from breaking down.

## Appendix B – Quantitative Needs Analysis

The H-CLIC data indicates that Housing Options services secured existing accommodation for 6 cases in Ashfield in the first 6 months of 2018/19, Broxtowe 2, Gedling it was 1 person and in Rushcliffe, Housing Options Service secured 7 in existing accommodation. 16 in total across the districts. Projecting to an annual figure, a total of 32 may be prevented whilst many more (83) would be required across the four districts.

### Tenancy Sustainment

The Tenancy Sustainment figures include 3 separate elements.

- 19 units of support targeted at helping people sustain their existing accommodation (5 months average duration)
- 34 units of support attached to the offer of a new property when someone is homeless or at risk of homelessness (5 months average duration) and
- 52 units of support linked to a resettlement package when people move out of supported housing (6 months average duration)

Type of Tenancy Sustainment	
Homelessness prevention: helping people to sustain their existing accommodation	19
Support to help move into an offer of a new property to remedy homelessness	34
Resettlement Package when leaving supported housing	52

### Emergency / Crisis Accommodation

Using the needs modelling we have estimated that the need at any one time is in the order of 42 units of emergency/crisis accommodation. The model assumes a 3-month average stay in emergency housing.

There is a consensus that preventing homelessness in the first place is the most important policy priority for future provision, but historically the district councils have a stronger record of finding alternative accommodation rather than identifying early on where homelessness is imminent and deploying strategies to prevent this, so this approach needs development. This includes the need to develop early intervention when someone does become homeless – including the provision of adequate crisis accommodation with appropriate support when required.

Stakeholders highlighted that the use of B&B provision was not considered suitable for vulnerable people, as support is not in place.

In 2017/18

District	Number of B&B placements
Ashfield	17 (10 to single people)
Broxtowe	52 (42 to single people)
Gedling	63 (31 to single people)
Rushcliffe	23 (17 to single people)

The data was not made available to allow for an analysis of age. Across the 4 districts B& B accommodation was used for 155 homeless people. Of which 55 were homeless families.

### Access to Alternative Affordable Accommodation

Type of Service	
Access to alternative affordable accommodation	469

**Appendix B – Quantitative Needs Analysis**

The “Access to alternative affordable accommodation” figures includes 469 cases where people under 35 need this because of becoming homeless or where homelessness is unavoidable, as well as people needing move-on accommodation from supported housing.

Some of the people needing “Access to alternative affordable accommodation” will also need “Tenancy Sustainment” support to ensure that the move is successful, but some will not, and some of the people moving on from supported housing will need “Access to alternative affordable accommodation” alongside “Resettlement Support” and some will not.

For the purposes of comparison, the services that are currently described as dispersed supported housing are treated for the purposes of our model as “Access to alternative affordable accommodation” but additionally with tenancy sustainment support. At the same time what is currently described as floating support is the same as what we have described as “tenancy sustainment / resettlement support”.

**Housing First to meet Complex Need**

Type of Service	
Housing First level support	13

It is estimated that across Ashfield, Broxtowe, Gedling and Rushcliffe there is need for Housing First for 13 people with complex need. The Housing First needs figure should be treated as an initial estimate. Unlike all the other service interventions outlined here, Housing First is a long-term service.

**Supported Housing**

Type of Service	
with 24-hour cover	33
Without 24-hour cover	42
Supported Housing	75

In relation to single site supported housing we have made an initial assumption that this might break down as 36 units of supported housing with 24-hour cover and 51 units without 24-hour cover across the four districts. The assumed average duration of services is 8 months.

**Refuge Accommodation**

The only domestic abuse specific resource identified here is “Refuge Accommodation” but the numbers of people at risk of homelessness for this reason does impact on all the other categories of service intervention quite significantly. The duration of a refuge stay is assumed as 3 months.

‘Domestic and Sexual Abuse in Nottinghamshire – March 2016: Understanding Prevalence, Need and Risk’ tells us that the total at risk of domestic violence offences are 27,350 each year across Nottinghamshire.

The figures suggest that there is a significant difference between the number at risk of domestic abuse and in housing and support need and the numbers who engagement with Housing Options Services as reported on H-CLIC returns. The 5 refuge places required is therefore likely to be a significant under-estimate. There is a shortage of safe accommodation that can effectively protect people from the abuser.

## Appendix B – Quantitative Needs Analysis

### Appendix B2: At Risk Groups

The needs modelling for this project has been undertaken on the basis that there are two broad categories of people who experience homelessness or the risk of homelessness. We have coined the phrase *General Needs* to refer to people whose principal need relates to their housing situation, and *Additional Needs* to those who have a specific additional vulnerability that is on top of their pure housing need. :

The Additional Needs therefore are specifically:

- Offending
- Substance Misuse
- People who were “looked after children”
- Vulnerable Young people
- Experiencing domestic abuse
- People who have Mental Health problems
- People with physical poor health
- People with learning disabilities

Within each of these broader additional needs groups we have identified the key junctures in people’s pathway where people may present a need, and this leads to the establishment of separate at-risk groups within some of the additional needs groups.

It was hoped to be able to categorise “offending”, “substance misuse” or “mental health” between those leaving institutional settings (prison, residential treatment or in-patient care) and those starting a period of community supervision or community treatment. However, this data was not made available in a way that enabled this to happen. For looked-after children the distinction lies between those in need at the point of leaving care and those who look for assistance while receiving after-care. A single at-risk group is retained for those experiencing domestic abuse.

For those within the General Needs at-risk group a distinction is made between those who are at risk of homelessness and those who are already homeless.

Estimating the size of these at-risk groups is the starting point of the modelling and the principle is that this should be based on published data i.e. something substantive. In many cases, this is currently missing or inadequate in some way. The validity of the conclusions will therefore be improved as the data collection improves. The recently implemented H-CLIC data has great potential to improve data availability and thereby feed locally-specific and up to date numbers into the model.

The first 6 months of H-CLIC data across the four district councils has been made available for the purposes of this research. The detail of how this data has been used to identify populations at risk is outlined in the table below. The data collection in this way is in its infancy and local councils are currently grappling with the interpretation and collection of the information. There may be issues of consistency when comparing one council’s data to another. Some of the data provided was incomplete. So, although there is great potential to utilise H-CLIC to report on homelessness in future for the moment **the results of the Modelling should be treated with caution. They provide informed guidance about the scale of need and the “direction of travel” but should not be treated as exact.**

All the subsequent algorithms applied to the *at-risk* populations to generate a projection of the level and types of service interventions needed by these “at-risk groups” are also estimates at the moment because they reflect things that are not currently measured or not currently recorded. These algorithms are explained in Appendix 2.

## Appendix B – Quantitative Needs Analysis

We set out below the size of all the at-risk groups that we have estimated, the data year to which this figure refers, and the basis upon which this has been calculated

Population at Risk Groups	Who	Base Year	Description	Data
<b>Starting Probation Community Order / leaving prison without settled housing</b>	NPS	2017-18	<p>clients have a serious problem with their housing such that it is assessed as creating a risk of re-offending.</p> <p><b>NPS</b> 196 (County wide) Apportioned across population (apportionment based on % of homeless or threatened homeless from H-CLIC)</p> <p>Ashfield 0.16 = 31 Broxtowe 0.16 = 31 Gedling 0.10 = 20 Rushcliffe 0.08 = 16</p> <p>Total is 98</p> <p>% of population that is under 35 and over 18 (19.5%) 19</p> <p>South Notts districts offenders managed by CRC report to central Nottingham office and therefore are put into the Nottingham cohort No data</p>	<b>19</b>
<b>Homeless or at risk with support needs due to Learning Disability</b>	H-CLIC data	April 2018-Sept 18	<p>Number of people who are homeless or at risk of homelessness who have additional learning disability support need. Number for 6 months so needs to be doubled to get annualised figure</p> <p>Ashfield 3 Broxtowe 9 Gedling 5 Rushcliffe 3 Learning Disability Total 20 x 2 =</p>	<b>40</b>
<b>Starting Sub Misuse community treatment without settled housing</b>	Substance Misuse Service	2017-18	<p>the number of people starting a period of substance misuse treatment who were categorised as having a “housing problem” or an “urgent housing problem”</p> <p>Ashfield 16 Broxtowe 6 Gedling 11 Rushcliffe 3</p> <p>“In relation to residential treatment, we have a clear criteria and it is really important that the person has a stable accommodation to return to post rehab. Pre-rehab there is an expectation that the</p>	<b>36</b>

## Appendix B – Quantitative Needs Analysis

Population at Risk Groups	Who	Base Year	Description	Data
			person would have engaged with the service and be highly motivated. I can say for the past year no one has gone to rehab who hasn't been in settled accommodation prior to rehab."	
<b>Homeless due to mental health</b>	H-CLIC data	April 2018-Sept 18	Number of people who are homeless or at risk of homelessness who have additional mental support need Ashfield15 Broxtowe22 Gedling18 Rushcliffe11 Total 66 x 2 =	<b>132</b>
<b>Homeless with support needs due to being a young person</b>	H-CLIC data	April 2018-Sept 18	Number of people who are homeless or at risk of homelessness who have additional young person need Ashfield 9 Broxtowe10 Gedling 2 Rushcliffe13 Total 34 x 2	<b>68</b>
<b>Homeless with support needs due to physical disability</b>	H-CLIC data	April 2018-Sept 18	Number of people who are homeless or at risk of homelessness who have additional physical health need Ashfield 7 Broxtowe 5 Gedling 2 Rushcliffe 2 Total 16 x 2 =	<b>32</b>
<b>Leaving LA care with a need for housing with support</b>	County Council	Current	the current cohort of looked-after-children who are over 17, less those that it is anticipated will be "staying put" with foster carers once they turn 18. Ash 23 Brox 4 Ged 7 Rush 2	<b>36</b>
<b>In contact with Leaving Care Team with unsuitable accommodation</b>	County Council	Current	the number of young people (18-21) who are in contact with the Leaving Care Team and not in satisfactory accommodation Ash 5 Brox 1 Ged 2 Rush 2	<b>10</b>
<b>People experiencing domestic abuse whose housing is not safe as a result</b>	District Council H-CLIC data	2017-18	Number of people who are homeless or at risk of homelessness who have additional support need due to domestic abuse and are under 35 years old Ashfield 14 Broxtowe 7 Gedling 3	<b>66</b>

## Appendix B – Quantitative Needs Analysis

Population at Risk Groups	Who	Base Year	Description	Data
			Rushcliffe 9 Total 33 x 2	
<b>Homeless without additional needs</b>	H-CLIC data	April 2018-Sept 18	Number of people who are at risk of homelessness who have no support needs and under 35 years old Ashfield 67 Broxtowe 50 Gedling 50 Rushcliffe 26 Total 193 x 2	<b>386</b>
<b>Homeless without additional needs</b>	H-CLIC data	April 2018-Sept 18	Number of people who are homeless who have no support needs and under 35 years old Ashfield 39 Broxtowe 40 Gedling 29 Rushcliffe 10 Total 118 x 2	<b>236</b>

### Adjusting for Overlap

In any needs assessment where you are looking at multiple routes in to provision and therefore multiple separate cohorts over a fixed period there is obviously the danger that you are going to double-count the same person numerous times because they present in numerous places. To account for that we employ an “overlap deflator”.

In most cases this is based on a piece of research funded by Lankelly Chase on mapping severe and multiple disadvantage.<sup>39</sup> This calculated the overlap in the occurrence of aspects of disadvantage, substance misuse, offending, homelessness and mental health.

The main resulting overlap deflators are as follows:

Offending at-PAR Groups	56%
Substance Misuse PAR Groups	62%
Mental Health PAR Groups	96%
Homelessness Groups	55%

Additionally, an assumption is made that the overlap factor that should apply to domestic abuse is set at 90% and that which applies to Refugees is set at 80%. No overlap has been allowed for other at-risk groups.

The algorithm for the calculation of the Population at Risk totals is therefore

### Initial PAR x Overlap Factor

<sup>39</sup> Bramley & Fitzpatrick (2015), *Hard Edges: Mapping severe and multiple disadvantage*, Lankelly Chase

**Appendix B – Quantitative Needs Analysis**

[Appendix B3: Needs Modelling diagrammatic](#)



B4  
NeedsModel\_southno

## Appendix B – Quantitative Needs Analysis

### Appendix B4 – Establishing the Need for Service Interventions

The Population at Risk (PAR) figures are translated into the need for Service Interventions through a series of steps:

#### 1. People making their own arrangements or not engaging.

It is assumed that some people within each PAR will have the capacity to resolve their own difficulties and that some others will effectively be “lost to the System” because they never follow through or engage with the assistance offered. The assumed percentages for each of these categories in the base year are as follows:

Population at Risk Groups	% making their own arrangements	% not engaging
Starting Probation Community Order / Leaving Prison without settled housing	10	5
Homeless with support needs due to Learning Disability	0	5
Starting Sub Misuse community treatment without settled housing	10	5
Homeless with support needs due to Mental Health	10	5
Homeless with support needs - vulnerable young person	10	5
Homeless with support needs due to physical disability	10	5

**Appendix B – Quantitative Needs Analysis**

<b>Population at Risk Groups</b>	<b>% making their own arrangements</b>	<b>% not engaging</b>
<b>Leaving LA care with a need for housing with support</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>In contact with Leaving Care Team with unsuitable accommodation</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>People experiencing domestic abuse whose housing is not safe as a result</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>At risk of homelessness without additional needs</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Homeless without additional needs</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>5</b>

**2. Need for Service Interventions**

Assumptions are then made about the service interventions most suitable for the remainder of the PAR's identified. The optional service interventions are as follows:

<b>SERVICE INTERVENTION</b>	<b>NOTES</b>
Assistance to stay in existing housing through prevention intervention	This includes interventions such as mediation and advice services

**Appendix B – Quantitative Needs Analysis**

Access to tenancy sustainment to secure existing housing	This includes floating support to help prevent loss of accommodation
Access to suitable alternative affordable housing without support	Support is limited here to one-off advice or financial assistance
Access to suitable alternative affordable dispersed housing with time-limited support	This includes what might currently be described as floating support and dispersed supported housing
Access to affordable dispersed housing with ongoing support	This is taken to mean essentially Housing First-type arrangements
Access to single site supported housing with 24-hour cover	This includes placement in time-limited housing with attached support located on a “single site”. This could be shared or self-contained housing
Access to single site supported housing without 24 hour cover	This includes placement in time-limited housing with attached support located on a “single site”. This could be shared or self-contained housing

The proportions allocated to each of these service interventions for each PAR in the base year is as follows:

<b>Population at Risk Groups</b>	<b>Prevention</b>	<b>Tenancy Sustainment</b>	<b>Access to Alt Hsg with no support</b>	<b>Access to Alt Hsg with time-limited support</b>	<b>Access to Alt Hsg with Ongoing Support</b>	<b>24 Hour Cover Supported</b>	<b>Non 24 Hour Cover Supported</b>
----------------------------------	-------------------	----------------------------	--	--	---	--------------------------------	------------------------------------

**Appendix B – Quantitative Needs Analysis**

<b>Population at Risk Groups</b>	<b>Prevention</b>	<b>Tenancy Sustainme nt</b>	<b>Access to Alt Hsg with no support</b>	<b>Access to Alt Hsg with time-limited support</b>	<b>Access to Alt Hsg with Ongoing Support</b>	<b>24 Hour Cover Supported</b>	<b>Non 24 Hour Cover Supported</b>
<b>Starting Probation Community Order / Leaving Prison without settled housing</b>	20%	20%	5%	20%	2%	5%	13%
<b>Homeless with support needs due to Learning Disability</b>	10%	20%	5%	20%	2%	15%	23%
<b>Starting Sub Misuse community treatment without settled housing</b>	20%	20%	5%	20%	2%	5%	13%
<b>Homeless with support needs due to Mental Health</b>	20%	20%	5%	25%	2%	5%	8%
<b>Homeless with support needs - vulnerable young person</b>	5%	20%	5%	15%	2%	15%	18%
<b>Homeless with support needs due to physical disability</b>	20%	20%	5%	15%	3%	10%	7%
<b>Leaving LA care with a need for housing with support</b>	0%	0%	5%	0%	2%	40%	28%
<b>In contact with Leaving Care Team with unsuitable accommodation</b>	10%	20%	10%	0%	2%	5%	8%

**Appendix B – Quantitative Needs Analysis**

<b>Population at Risk Groups</b>	<b>Prevention</b>	<b>Tenancy Sustainment</b>	<b>Access to Alt Hsg with no support</b>	<b>Access to Alt Hsg with time-limited support</b>	<b>Access to Alt Hsg with Ongoing Support</b>	<b>24 Hour Cover Supported</b>	<b>Non 24 Hour Cover Supported</b>
<b>People experiencing domestic abuse whose housing is not safe as a result</b>	10%	5%	10%	15%	10%	30%	18%
<b>At risk of homelessness without additional needs</b>	20%	0%	55%	10%	0%	0%	0%
<b>Homeless without additional needs</b>	0%	0%	75%	5%	0%	0%	0%

**3. Allowance for Crisis Accommodation**

In addition to a need for one of the listed service interventions it is assumed that a small proportion of the PAR's presenting in need will also require some form of crisis accommodation as an intervention.

The percentages that this represents by PAR are as follows:

<b>Population at Risk Groups</b>	<b>% requiring crisis accommodation</b>
----------------------------------	---

**Appendix B – Quantitative Needs Analysis**

Population at Risk Groups	% requiring crisis accommodation
Starting Probation Community Order / Leaving Prison without settled housing	15
Homeless with support needs due to Learning Disability	15
Starting Sub Misuse community treatment without settled housing	10
Homeless with support needs due to Mental Health	20
Homeless with support needs - vulnerable young person	20
Homeless with support needs due to physical disability	20
Leaving LA care with a need for housing with support	0
In contact with Leaving Care Team with unsuitable accommodation	10
People experiencing domestic abuse whose housing is not safe as a result	30

**Appendix B – Quantitative Needs Analysis**

Population at Risk Groups	% requiring crisis accommodation
At risk of homelessness without additional needs	0%
Homeless without additional needs	75%

**4. Services Failing and Re-Presentations**

Not all placements or service interventions will be successful.

We have however assumed a relatively high performance of services in relation to stabilising people’s housing.

<b>PROPORTION WHOSE HOUSING IS STABILISED</b>	
Prevention Intervention to stabilise existing housing	80.0%
Tenancy Sustainment to retain existing housing	75.0%
Access to suitable affordable alternative housing without support	80.0%
Access to suitable affordable alternative housing with time-limited support	75.0%

## Appendix B – Quantitative Needs Analysis

<b>PROPORTION WHOSE HOUSING IS STABILISED</b>	
<b>Access to suitable affordable alternative housing with ongoing support</b>	80.0%
<b>Single Site Supported Housing with 24-hour cover</b>	70.0%
<b>Single Site Supported Housing without 24-hour cover</b>	80.0%

### 5. Move-On from Supported Housing

We have also modelled what happens to people after they have received a supported housing service. We have assumed that 40% of people successfully moving out from that service require a resettlement support service to help them resettle successfully, and that 80% of them require access to suitable affordable accommodation to facilitate this move.

<b>PROPORTION OF THOSE MOVING FROM SUPPORTED HOUSING WHO NEED ADDITIONAL SERVICES</b>	
<b>Resettlement Support</b>	50.0%
<b>Access to Affordable Housing</b>	80.0%

### 6. Average Duration of Service

A couple of the service interventions are effectively conceived of as one-off interventions – those aimed at maintaining existing housing and accessing alternative housing without ongoing support. A number of service interventions have a length of stay set and this creates a multiplier to translate the number of people assumed to need this intervention into a number of units needed.

## Appendix B – Quantitative Needs Analysis

We separately estimate the average length of stay for Refuge provision, and for Resettlement Support as part of the moving on from supported housing. The average length of stay for those whose initial arrangements breaks down is assumed to be the same across all service interventions

The figures used in the model are as follows

<b>SERVICE DURATION</b>	
<b>Crisis Accommodation</b>	3
<b>Floating Support - Prevention (months)</b>	5
<b>Affordable housing with time-limited support (months)</b>	5
<b>Affordable housing with ongoing access to support (months)</b>	72
<b>Single Site Supported Housing with 24 Hour Cover</b>	8
<b>Single Site Supported Housing without 24 Hour Cover</b>	8
<b>Refuge</b>	3
<b>Resettlement Support</b>	6
<b>Where arrangements break down</b>	2

## Appendix B – Quantitative Needs Analysis

### 8. Calculating the Units of Service Needed

We start with the total PAR in need of that service intervention initially and add in those needing it once another service intervention has failed. This we could refer to as the crude Population in Need (PIN). To calculate the number of units needed is a question of the following algorithm

We then divide multiply the crude population in need total by the average service duration – doing two separate calculations for those whose service breaks down and those who successfully complete the service intervention.

The algorithm for the calculation of the number of units needed is therefore:

$(PIN * \text{Proportion successfully completing service} * (\text{Relevant Average Duration}/12)) + (PIN * \text{Proportion not successfully completing service} * (\text{Relevant Average Duration}/12))$

As Housing First is a service that is anticipated will on average be longer than 12 months will have a cumulative element to the number of units needed in future. Possibly the impact may be worked on an assumption that 20% of HF arrangements will have broken down or no longer be necessary by the end of Year 1, a further 10% will have broken down or no longer be necessary by the end of Year 2.

**Interview Schedule**

Under 35s project, Ashfield DC, Broxtowe BC, Gedling BC and Rushcliffe BC

Project information sheet shared with participant

NB Prompts to be used flexibly according to participant role

<b>Interviewee Name:</b>	<b>Date:</b>	<b>I/v No</b>
<b>Agency:</b>	<b>Role:</b>	
<b>LA - District/Borough</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>LA - County</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Housing Provider</b>	<b>VCS</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	
Supported Accommodation <input type="checkbox"/>		
LA Housing <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>YP Organisation</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	
Housing Association <input type="checkbox"/>		
Private Sector Landlord <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Drug/Alcohol</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Day Services</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Mental Health</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Floating Support/ Outreach</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Domestic Abuse</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Advice Services</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Employment/Training Education</b>	
<b>Criminal Justice</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>DWP</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Health</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Other sector (specify)</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	
Client age group: 16-18 <input type="checkbox"/> 18-25 <input type="checkbox"/> 26-35 <input type="checkbox"/> Other <input type="checkbox"/> (specify) _____		Geog/LA area covered: Ashfield <input type="checkbox"/> Broxtowe <input type="checkbox"/> Gedling <input type="checkbox"/> Rushcliffe <input type="checkbox"/> All <input type="checkbox"/>

**Appendix C – Qualitative Questionnaires and Consultation Documents**

1	<p><b>What is being done locally to prevent young people 18-25 and under 35s becoming homeless?</b></p> <p><i>LAs prevention toolkit? Rent Deposit Scheme/RD Guarantee Scheme? Singles eligible? Home visits? Mediation? Active work with landlords? Partnership working with DWP re sanctions? Pre-Tenancy training? Tenancy support/sustainment? If yes, who commissions/funds? Employment support? Other partnership working, eg, Active work with employers, criminal justice sector, health?</i></p>
2	<p><b>If young people 18-25 and under 35s do become homeless, what are their presenting issues?</b></p> <p><i>Family/relationship breakdown? Care leavers? Mental health? Drugs/Alcohol? Financial-Debt/Sanctions/Arrears/Loss of income etc? Loss of tenancy-PRS/Social Housing? Rough sleeping? Offending?</i></p>
3	<p><b>How are people aged 18-25 referred into supported housing?</b></p> <p><i>Referral routes? Eligibility criteria?</i></p>
4	<p><b>Is there sufficient supported or designated housing for homeless young people aged 18-25 seeking housing or housing with support?</b></p> <p><i>What models are there? What is working best? What is most needed? What/where are the gaps?</i></p>
5	<p><b>What education/training/apprenticeships/employability support are available to 18-25s in supported housing? What general employability support is available for under-35s not in supported housing?</b></p> <p><i>Is this delivered in-house by the agency/Local Authority? Do they work with/signpost to partners? Who are the partners?</i></p>
6	<p><b>What are the housing options for people aged under 35 on low incomes?</b></p> <p><i>Social housing? Do you have Choice-Based Lettings? Are the CBL or other systems easy to work with? Are U35s being added to housing registers? Are young people being given Personal Housing Plans under the HRA? How are they supported with their PHP? PRS? Work with landlords? HMO Licencing? Do they have to go out of borough? Any sharing schemes?</i></p>
7	<p><b>What are the move-on options for people 25 and under leaving supported housing?</b></p> <p><i>Interim accommodation? Social housing? Are there allocations specifically for move-on? How does this work? PRS? Particular relationships with landlords? Innovative local initiatives?</i></p>
8	<p><b>What barriers do 18-35 year olds face in accessing housing?</b></p> <p><i>Insufficient availability of social housing? PRS: High rents? LHA – gap between LHA and rents? SAR? Is the SAR exemption properly applied by LA for those with 3 months cumulative supported housing? Landlord reluctance/alternative landlord target</i></p>

**Appendix C – Qualitative Questionnaires and Consultation Documents**

	<i>groups/welfare benefits/Universal Credit? Personal barriers such as mental health/drug/alcohol/offending histories/arrears? Relationship between LA/VCS? Any others?</i>
<b>9</b>	<b>In which ways could those barriers be addressed?</b> <i>Sharing? Refurbishing decommissioned/hard-to-let stock? Building new accommodation? Closer working between agencies/LAs/landlords? Ongoing support from referrer? Support package for landlords? Innovative use of DHP?</i>
<b>10</b>	<b>Are you aware of any particularly good services/schemes that work well and might also work/be worth trying in this area? Have you initiated any services outside those commissioned by either county or districts?</b>
<b>11</b>	<b>Do you have any data or documents that you could contribute to the project? (Or do you know who does). This might be quantitative data or any useful local strategies/plans/reviews/evaluations/pilot projects etc that you are aware of, including in-house.</b> <i>Data examples: Service providers – data on outcomes/turnover. Age profile. Any substance misuse/mental health/offending/domestic abuse/complex need data. Health related to young people. Housing – Area stock profile? Availability of affordable housing. Use of private sector housing. Impact of welfare reform? Nos of YP in receipt of HB/LHA/UC. Care leavers. NFA – Prison/Hospital</i>
<b>12</b>	<b>Is there anyone else we should be talking to including young people’s groups/fora. Is there anything else we should know about?</b> <i>Could they link the project in? Can they suggest places where we can meet YPs/help to arrange?</i>

End

**Flipchart Consultation Exercise for young people with lived experience**

10 young people were consulted and received a £5.00 voucher

The following questions were written on flipcharts at Broxtowe Youth Homelessness and The Friary. Young people's 'sticky note' responses were added.

**1 If you're looking for housing, or have looked for housing ...**

- What are the main issues?
- What would make it easier to find a place to live?

**2 If you're in supported housing (eg, a hostel) or have been in the past ...**

- What works well?
- What could be improved? And how?

**3 If your local council wanted to ask young people their views about housing issues ..**

- How could they do this?
- What questions do you think they should ask?

## **Focus Group**

5 young people took part with 2 feeding in their views afterwards

## **Homeless Link**

### **We'd like to know your views on housing issues**

Homeless Link is looking into housing issues for single people aged 18-35 for these councils:

- **Ashfield District Council**
- **Broxtowe Borough Council**
- **Gedling Borough Council**
- **Rushcliffe Borough Council**

To do this we are talking to lots of different people and lots of different agencies. We would like to hold a focus group to hear about the experience of people who:

- are aged 18-25
- currently in supported housing
- have a local connection to one of the council areas

### **What is a focus group?**

- A focus group is a group discussion (up to 10 people) about some set issues
- It will take no longer than 1 hour

The issues we are interested in are:

- Things that can cause homelessness
- Things that might prevent homelessness
- Getting a place in supported housing
- Moving on from supported housing
- Ways the system could be improved

There are no right or wrong answers – we want to hear your views.

### **How we will use the information you give us**

- We will take notes as you talk and try to capture your point of view
- We will make sure that you cannot be identified in anything we write
- Our findings will help the councils to improve what they do in the future

**Thank you very much for your help**

**We will give a £10 supermarket voucher to those who take part**

## Appendix C – Qualitative Questionnaires and Consultation Documents

### South Notts Landlord Forum

**‘Hands up’ questions of audience to get a general profile of landlords present:**

How many landlords are here from Rushcliffe?	12
Broxtowe?	11
Gedling?	9
Who has properties in more than one of those areas	10
Properties elsewhere too?	c10
Who is currently renting to young people 18-25?	13
Who is currently renting to younger people, 18-35?	15
How many people have been directly approached by young people/or via an agency? (NB Question not really clear or partic valid)	1
How many landlords have shared accommodation?	14
How many landlords would consider themselves a ‘philanthropic’ landlord (clarified with them – yes, it’s a business, but who likes to also think they’re doing some social good?)	2

## Summary of responses under broad headings

### Q1 Are there any issues with renting to people 18-25? Under 35?

#### Property condition

- No respect for the property (students mainly)
- Damage property
- Respect for the property
- Don't look after the property
- Property damage

#### Behaviour

- ASB x 2
- Lack of sense of responsibility
- Creating noise and disturbance (parties)
- Inviting friends to stay

#### Maturity

- Maturity
  - noisier
  - more likely to cause nuisance
  - less history to check out
  - more likely to change jobs/career/location/mind
- Maturity levels
  - Knowledge of maintaining a property
  - Lack of rental experience/previous reference/history
- Level of maturity
  - Need to fit in with other housemates in a HMO

#### Tenancy length

- Biggest turnover of tenants
- Don't stay long in one place → added costs for vacancy and to find new tenants

#### Financial

- Not able to manage finance
- Non-payment
- Employment, therefore rent security
- Affordability – (can they afford £500 per month for a room) – credit ref
- Rent Arrears
- No issues other than non-payment of rent

#### Guarantor

- No guarantor
- Guarantors

#### References

- May be no references
- Lack of referees
- References

#### Licensing

- Selective licensing increasing costs
- The changes to the HMO regulations have made things worse (room sizes)
- Licensing criteria and guidance from council are unclear and confusing, especially fire risk related guidance.

## Appendix C – Qualitative Questionnaires and Consultation Documents

### Students

I rent to students so:

- 1 Bills – how to manage suppliers
- 2 Managing their money

### No particular issues

Not really (By 25 they should be responsible people with a solid credit history)  
No issue, as long as they pay the rent and treat the property with respect

### Solutions suggested

Solution: 1 Higher/market rent guaranteed 2 Clear licensing criteria and higher efficiency

## Q2 What would make it easier for you to rent to people under 35?

### Nothing

Nothing

### Rent deposits/rent deposit guarantee/rent in advance

Easier if deposit guaranteed by the council (Tenants not as easy to find)  
First month's rent  
Deposit scheme (1<sup>st</sup> month rent)  
Guarantees

### Rent guaranteed

Guaranteed rent

### Financial schemes/incentives

Insurance schemes subsidised

### Guarantors

Guarantor

### Support/mediation

Contactable reactive dedicated support manager to deal with issues  
Better agencies – realise they have never done this before  
Support in meeting financial obligations  
Help from council to deal with:

- Disturbance complaints
- Rents not paid
- House (& garden) not looked after
- Vacancies between tenants

### Faster eviction

Quicker eviction process for real problem tenants x2

### Personal issues

Vetting of character and personality and history  
Will they fit into profile of an existing HMO?  
If U35s understood their credit record better

### Nothing needed

Currently I let all my properties to under 35 – I would not make any distinction as long as they can pay the rent and look after my property

**Q3 What would give you more confidence in renting to under 35s on a low income or on benefits?**

**Financial**

That the rent will be paid  
Guaranteed rent  
Rent guarantee by gov/council  
A guarantee that the rent is paid and that they will look after the property  
Rent guarantee from the council  
Rent paid during vacancies  
Direct payments for landlords  
Guaranteed rents paid directly to landlord  
U35 low income on benefits help with security of monthly rent (as Cambridge example)  
would give greater confidence  
Guarantee of rent payments  
Rental guarantee

**Property condition**

Compensation for trashed houses and neglected gardens etc

**Tenancy length**

Long term contracting

**Incentives**

To encourage letting to younger people offer tax breaks/incentives

**Insurance**

Insurance

**Schemes**

If an (inexperienced) U35 was backed up by an 'NPRAS' to 'hand hold' that would give confidence to LL to rent to them

**Guarantors**

Guarantors

**Support/mediation**

Quick access to services – anti-social, etc  
And if there were any problems there would be support to sort them out or remove any problem tenant  
Free mediation service with independent body

**Personal**

Ability to mix in easily with an existing household of young professionals, ie, lawyers, accountants, engineers.

**Nothing**

Nothing I'm afraid

**Notts Social Landlords Forum**

**Summary of responses under broad headings**

**Q1 Are there any issues with renting to people 18-25? Under 35?**

**Financial**

Affordability  
Affordability = sustainability  
[Unable to read]/lower incomes  
More funding to support those young onto UC  
Rent in advance paid – mitigate risk

**Tenancy-related**

Some tenancy issues  
High rate of tenancy abandonment  
High rate of eviction  
Tenancy turnaround (18-25)  
Greater risk of tenancies failing due to asb/rent arrears (18-25)  
Sustainability  
Higher eviction/abandonment rates  
Getting them tenancy ready

**Property condition**

Property left in poor condition

**Support**

Appropriate support networks (18-25)  
Lack of support  
Lack of support (Under 25s and 35s)  
Limited options to sign post  
More support

**Maturity**

Ability to live independently (18-25)  
Renting to young people  
More vulnerabilities

**Behaviour**

Issues/Complaints from neighbours once tenancy commences (18-25)  
ASB – lack of consideration  
ASB issues (Under 25s and 35s)

**Personal issues/needs**

Complex needs (Under 25s and 35s)  
High support needs but lack of available support

**References**

Appropriate reference info

**Q2 What would make it easier for you to rent to people under 35?**

**Nothing needed**

Confident we are doing everything we can to prevent tenancies failing.

**Support**

There is a problem accessing support services but this is due to lack of available funding, rather than lack of desire

## **Appendix C – Qualitative Questionnaires and Consultation Documents**

Additional support where complex needs are evident

### **Education, training and employment**

More work opportunities and removal of 0% contracts. To combat =employment support services/training

### **Tenancy training/Tenancy support**

Tenancy training or support

We are looking at the 'Resettlement Passport' used in Liverpool

More funding for tenancy support

Reinforcement of tenancy conditions

Coming with support plan/tenancy ready

More done to prep people for having a tenancy

Pre-tenancy training

### **Engagement by customers**

More engagement from this group with RSL/Community Groups etc

## **Q3 What would give you more confidence in renting to under 35s on a low income or on benefits?**

### **Financial**

Rent in advance paid

### **Pre-tenancy checks/history**

Thorough pre-tenancy checks

Tenancy track record

### **Tenancy training/tenancy support**

More flexible support being provided and maintained once in the tenancy (more intensive)

More flexible support – eg, more at start/move in and then ongoing for as long as needed

More support to prep for a tenancy

A joined up approach to how new tenants are supported like the 'Resettlement Passport' in Liverpool

Additional support or basic life skills prior to tenancy

Strong pre-tenancy process/sustainability matrix linked to affordability and action plan, ie support, money advice, training and education

### **Support**

Support – where required

Support available to sign post

### **Engagement by customers**

Engagement



### **About Homeless Link**

Homeless Link is a membership organisation with some 750 members, representing the homelessness and supported housing sectors. In 2016 Homeless Link merged with Sitra. We now operate as Homeless Link, with a specialist supported housing arm - the Supported Housing Alliance. Between us we have operated across the homelessness, housing, support and health & social care sectors for over 30 years.

We are recognised and consulted by Government departments and other bodies, including the Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government the Department of Work and Pensions, Department of Health and Homes England as representatives of the sector.

We offer training, consultancy and advice, lead on policy development and play a key representative role as the voice of our sectors, contributing to emerging policy, raising awareness and promoting best practice. Alongside our representative role, we keep the sector updated through our Partnerships, Policy, Research, and Innovation & Good Practice teams.

The linking of our policy & representative role with our detailed support for specific organisations makes for a strong combination; our work on good practice and policy and procedural development draws on the strength of our large membership base and on our role in discussing and developing policy to respond to merging issues at a national level.

We are committed to customer engagement in shaping services and have extensive experience in coproduction and customer engagement; we have an expert by experience panel that helps direct our policy and we are pleased to host and support (but, crucially, not manage) Expert Link, a peer-led network which aims to amplify the voices of people who have experienced severe and multiple disadvantage.



@Homelesslink



**Like us on Facebook:** [www.facebook.com/homelesslink](http://www.facebook.com/homelesslink)

Homeless Link is a Charity no. 089173 and Company Limited by Guarantee no 4313826

Minorities House      2-5 Minorities      London      EC3N 1BJ      020 7840 4430;  
[www.homelesslink.org.uk](http://www.homelesslink.org.uk)

