



HEALTH & WELLBEING BOARD ADDENDUM

4.00PM, TUESDAY, 30 JANUARY 2018

COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL



ADDENDUM

ITEM		Page
46	FORMAL PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT	1 - 2
52A	Housing First Item referred by the Housing & New Homes Committee on 17 January 2018	3 - 12



PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

(B) WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

The following written questions have been received for the Health & Wellbeing Board meeting to be held on 30 January 2018:

PQ 1. Submitted by Mr Thomas

"St Mungo's/B&HCC contracts

Brighton and Hove City Council have two current contracts with St Mungo's:

1. "Rough Sleepers Outreach Service" that expires 31.3.18 at a value of £975,000.00
2. "St Mungo's Housing First" that expires 3.3.19 at a value of £365,700.00

In light of their involvement in the deportation of EU nationals purely due to them being homeless, the absence of trust in St Mungo's by rough sleepers in our city, and their reported failure to meet contractual obligations can we have an assurance that no new contract will be issued without proper due diligence."

Subject: Housing First – Extract from the Proceedings of the Housing & New Homes Committee meeting held on 17 January 2018

Date of Meeting: 30 January 2018

Report of: Executive Director Health & Adult Social Care

Contact Officer: Name: **Caroline De Marco** Tel: **01273 291063**

E-mail: Caroline.demarco@brighton-hove.gov.uk

Wards Affected: All

FOR GENERAL RELEASE***Action Required of the Committee:***

To receive the item referred from the Housing & New Homes Committee for approval:

Recommendation: That the following be referred to the Board for consideration:

- (2) That this report is referred to the Health and Wellbeing Board, for consideration of successes achieved by Housing First in terms of wellbeing outcomes and overall cost-effectiveness, and to explore the identification of resources in collaboration with the CCG in order to be able to contribute to its expansion in 2018/19.

BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL**HOUSING & NEW HOMES COMMITTEE****17 JANUARY 2018****COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL**

Present: Councillor Meadows (Chair) Councillor Hill (Deputy Chair), Councillor Bell (Opposition Spokesperson for the meeting), Councillor Gibson (Group Spokesperson), Councillors Atkinson, Barnett, Bell, Druitt, Lewry, Moonan and Wealls.

DRAFT MINUTE**PART ONE****69 HOUSING FIRST**

- 69.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Health & Adult Social Care which was provided as a response to a request at the 14th June 2017 meeting for a follow up report outlining the effectiveness and progress with the Housing First approach to housing rough sleepers. The Committee had also agreed that a further report be undertaken to identify the potential savings across the council and other public service providers that are achievable from using additional properties from Housing First. It had been further agreed that this report was completed by January 2018, in order that any savings identified could inform the budget process of 2018/19. The report was presented by the Commissioning & Performance Manager.
- 69.2 Councillor Bell referred to the legal implications in paragraph 5.2 and asked for clarity as to which committee had responsibility for Housing First. The Senior Lawyer explained that major funding decisions would be considered by the Health & Wellbeing Board, however as the report considered homelessness which was clearly within the remit of Housing & New Homes Committee it was appropriate for members to receive reports on the agenda. The Health & Wellbeing Board was a service committee to the extent that it was able to make decisions.
- 69.3 Councillor Gibson raised the following questions/issues:
- What was the average time rough sleepers seeking accommodation had to wait on the streets, bearing in mind the government's goal of no second night out? The last figure Councillor Gibson had seen was about three months.
 - Three things could help to reduce rough sleeping. i) That people out on the streets were given a greater priority for the limited housing that exists in hostels & supported housing.

ii) That there is a greater supply of supported accommodation iii) That there is more move on accommodation at the end of the pathway homeless people travelled along, and more Housing First accommodation for those people that are described as revolving door homeless and never make it along the pathway.

- What types of accommodation might be suitable for housing people under a housing First model as being operated at the moment in the city?

69.4 The Commissioning & Performance Manager responded as follows:

- It was difficult to answer the question about the average wait on the streets. People would wait a different length of time based on their priority and their needs. For example, if someone had a dog they tended to wait longer as there were not so many hostels that would take dogs. People who needed level access also waited longer as there was less suitable accommodation available. Some people waited three months and others waited significantly longer.
- All the suggestions made by Councillor Gibson would reduce rough sleeping.
- With regard to the type of types of accommodation which might be suitable for housing people under a Housing First Model, it had been found that some people found the Housing First fidelity model quite difficult. This model provided dispersed accommodation across a geographical area in the local communities. Some Housing First clients become lonely and did not make friends in those locations. Officers wanted to trial the congregate Housing First Model which had been used in Scandinavian countries. These were self contained units in a block or in a locality where people would be able to integrate and keep contact with other homeless people. However, there was still a need for self contained dispersed accommodation.

69.5 Councillor Moonan stated that Housing First played an important part in the range of homeless services. She agreed that all of the suggestions made by Councillor Gibson would address rough sleeping which was why all of those things were in the Rough Sleeping Strategy. The model worked well internationally and in the city and Councillor Moonan was pleased to see some of the life changing outcomes as set out in paragraphs 3.10 and 3.15 of the report. The model was working and was cost effective. There were challenges in the city in finding suitable accommodation whether it was dispersed or congregate. Both types were needed and this was something the council was working hard to achieve. Councillor Moonan agreed that it would be good to expand the Housing First model and hoped that there would be positive progress to report in due course.

69.6 Councillor Wealls referred to some of the questions asked by the public earlier on in the meeting and asked what was holding back progress in implementing Housing First more quickly. He asked if the problem was finding suitable sites rather than the financial model.

69.7 The Commissioning & Performance Manager responded by explaining that the commissioning budget included money spent on the Housing First model, however, there was no spare money. Therefore it was impossible to expand any of her services. The Chair stressed the Health & Wellbeing Board would need to consider whether they wanted to expand that model, as it was funded via the Board.

69.8 Councillor Bell welcomed the current report which had been requested by the committee, but did not think it was going far enough. Councillor Bell stated that he would like to see a further report showing where the problems were, who was blocking progress and how the council could improve the situation by providing more accommodation for people who needed it. He stressed that a further strategy report was required setting out decision making policies which could improve people's lives.

69.9 Councillor Gibson stressed that Housing First clearly worked and cost an average of £10,000 per person in terms of homeless support, yet a homeless person cost around £25,000 according to the New Economics Foundation report. This was a cost saving for the public purse. Councillor Gibson set out the following amendment which was seconded by Councillor Druitt as follows:

“To insert new recommendations as shown below in ***bold italics***;

(1) ***2.2 That this report is referred to Health and Wellbeing Board, for consideration of successes achieved by Housing First in terms of wellbeing outcomes and overall cost-effectiveness, and to explore the identification of resources in collaboration with the CCG in order to be able to contribute to its expansion in 2018/19***

2.3 That this report is referred to Policy, Resource and Growth committee, and that the committee is requested to call for a further report to consider identifying the necessary budget to contribute to expansion of Housing First

2.4 That a future Housing and New Homes Committee receive further information indicating options to enable housing providers to make suitable properties available to expand provision of Housing first accommodation.”

69.10 The Committee voted on the amendment which was agreed unanimously. The Committee then voted on the substantive recommendation which was agreed unanimously along with the addition of 2.2 to 2.4 as set out above.

69.11 **RESOLVED:-**

- (1) That the contents of the report which is provided for information only, is noted.
- (2) That this report is referred to the Health and Wellbeing Board, for consideration of successes achieved by Housing First in terms of wellbeing outcomes and overall cost-effectiveness, and to explore the identification of resources in collaboration with the CCG in order to be able to contribute to its expansion in 2018/19.
- (3) That this report is referred to Policy, Resources & Growth Committee, and that the committee is requested to call for a further report to consider identifying the necessary budget to contribute to expansion of Housing First.
- (4) That a future Housing & New Homes Committee receive further information indicating options to enable housing providers to make suitable properties available to expand provision of Housing First accommodation.

- 3.3 The Housing First model is recognised as an exemplar of good practice¹ and recent DCLG bids² and large scale responses³ to increasing homelessness nationally have focused on Housing First as an important and innovative model that should be adopted across the country.
- 3.4 The Housing First service is commissioned and funded by Health & Adult Social Care and delivered by St Mungos. The contract is for 10 individuals including 2 young people who were previously looked after aged 18-25 being funded and referred by Children’s Services. The contract has the flexibility to be extended to support additional individuals should further accommodation and funding become available.
- 3.5 This model provides a highly personalised approach to working with individuals with multiple and complex needs recognising the cross department, cross agency impact of these clients.
- 3.6 This model of accommodation and support fits with the aims of the Rough Sleeping Strategy:
- To reduce rough sleeping
 - To reduce revolving door homelessness
- 3.7 Currently the clients of the Housing First service are placed in a variety of accommodation types;

Type of Housing	Number of clients
Temporary Accommodation	2
Private Rented Sector Accommodation (accessed via the Private Rented Sector Access Officer in Housing Options)	1
Social Housing (gained as Homeseekers prior to Housing First going live)	2
Emergency Accommodation	1
Supported Housing (1 high support (shortly disengaging from Housing First) , 1 low support specifically for the Housing First model)	2
Care Home	1 (client is in the process of disengagement from the service)
Training Flat	1
Total	10
Pending	2

¹ <https://www.bigissue.com/news/sajid-javid-i-want-roll-housing-first-britain/>

² <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/40-million-homelessness-prevention-programme-announced>

³ <http://www.ghn.org.uk/shien/wp-content/uploads/sites/5/2017/05/Housing-First-Report-1.pdf>, <https://www.insidehousing.co.uk/news/news/greater-manchester-to-launch-18m-housing-first-programme-53307>, <https://www.crisis.org.uk/ending-homelessness/homelessness-knowledge-hub/housing-models-and-access/housing-first-feasibility-study-for-liverpool-city-region-2017/>

- 3.8 This profile will change shortly with both clients in TA moving on shortly. The positive move on will be in to social housing under the Care Leavers Protocol as one of the young people concerned has evidenced significant positive change since being supported by Housing First.
- 3.9 There is no intention to use Temporary Accommodation going forward. Better outcomes are evident in the other models used, including low need supported housing and social housing where teams are supportive and aligned with the model.
- 3.10 One client in supported is choosing to disengage with Housing First, he feels the support he was offered has allowed him to make better use of supported accommodation than in the past and he is now able to positively engage with a high support model (he had previously had multiple evictions from hostel services). Another client in supported accommodation is in a low support service via Brighton YMCA specifically delivered to Housing First. This has proved to be a successful model for the client and they are well engaged, managing interpersonal relationships well, including ending a domestically violent relationship, engaging with Victim Support and the police to support criminal charges.

3.11 Aggregate Figures for Evictions/Abandonments Experienced by the Current Cohort

Evictions/Abandonments in the year prior to going into Housing First	Evictions in year 1 in Housing First	Evictions & Abandonment in year 2 in Housing First
14	2	2

3.12 Failures/Breakdowns

Three clients have been evicted whilst accommodated by Housing First and 1 has abandoned their accommodation.

3.13 Clients

The initial cohort was identified as the most entrenched at risk rough sleepers in the City in November 2013. Several clients had significant presenting needs including physical health and suspected mental capacity issues. Several clients expressed a desire for housing but no interest in the model or in engaging with support.

This has led to a change of entrance criteria; new clients need to have capacity to enter into a tenancy, and express a willingness to engage with the model. This does not mean that clients cannot be ambivalent about support, or hard to engage, but they do need to be willing to consider accepting support and recognise that they will be assertively engaged with.

3.14 Landlords

What has worked is when Landlords or Housing providers share the value base of Housing First, recognising housing/a home as a right and the basis for positive engagement, and be willing to joint work with St. Mungo's in a client centred positive risk management style, and adopting a strengths and asset based approach to working with clients.

3.15 **Positive Life Outcomes for clients as a result of engagement with Housing First**

- A baby has been prevented from entering the Care System as a Looked After Child – Mum was able to evidence effective parenting in contrast to her previous pregnancy where she lost her child to the care system
- The longest period of sustaining accommodation in a client's adult life achieved
- Reduction and abstinence from substance and alcohol misuse
- Ongoing engagement with education, voluntary work and training
- Client previously known to MARAC has disengaged from a violent relationship
- Reconnection with family and increased wellbeing recorded
- Huge reduction of engagement with the Anti-Social Behaviour services and Criminal Justice services
- Engagement with Health and Social Care resulting in;
 - Successful cancer treatment
 - Improved mobility due to engagement with health services for two clients
 - Capacity and Cognitive Assessments resulting in a diagnosis of dementia and placement in a suitable placement to best meet needs
 - Improved dental health
 - Improved physical health
 - Significant decline in attendances at A&E

National Research

3.16 There is no doubt that effective interventions to prevent homelessness are the most cost effective and minimises the human cost. Additional financial costs relating to repeat or long term homelessness will be borne by services such as homeless services, the criminal justice system and the NHS. The costs of homelessness⁴ and rough sleeping vary according to individual journeys and circumstances, but a male, rough sleeping for a year with deteriorating mental health and substance misuse issues then accessing supported accommodation for 12 weeks would cost £20,128, and this would rise to £100,000 over 5 years.

3.17 In 2003 and 2008, the New Economics Foundation estimated that a single homeless person, if they were homeless for one year, would cost the UK public purse between £24,500 and £26,000 more than other citizens⁵.

Local Research

3.18 In June 2017, the commissioning team started exploring research options to assess potential system savings. This work has now commenced.

⁴ At what cost? An estimation of the financial costs of single homelessness in the UK
Nicholas Pleace, Centre for Housing Policy, University of York July 2015

⁵ Cited in Department for Communities and Local Government (2012) Evidence review on the costs of homelessness. London: DCLG.

- 3.19 The University of Salford Sustainable Housing & Urban Studies Unit has been commissioned by St. Mungo's in partnership with Brighton & Hove City council and Westminster LBC to undertake a longitudinal study of the Housing First services provided by St Mungo's in both areas. The research will have two specific components, an impact assessment of the St Mungo's Brighton Housing First service, and a longitudinal study of the St Mungo's Housing First services in Brighton and Westminster.
- 3.20 The first stage of the study will focus on use of health, social care and criminal justice services by the participants in the Brighton and Hove service and how their use of these services altered as a result of their engagement with Housing First. The second focus will be a longitudinal study of the clients engaged across services, their journeys and the impact on them and others of their engagement with Housing First. This will include the comparative impact of the two services which differ in inclusion and approach.
- 3.21 The final report will be available in November 2018.
- 3.22 The council is also part of a research project commissioned by the DCLG to look at the impact of the housing first approach on mental health and substance misuse costs which is part the successful Social Impact Bond grant funding for entrenched rough sleepers.

4. CONCLUSION

- 4.1.1 The local Housing First service is a small commissioned service, funded by H&ASC which meets the needs of a number of revolving door clients with complex needs.
- 4.1.2 In 2018 the service will increase to 12 clients within existing resource.
- 4.1.3 This service links with Priority 5 Goal 10 of the Rough Sleepers Strategy and embodies the wider ethos and commitment of the document.

5 FINANCIAL & OTHER IMPLICATIONS:

Financial Implications:

- 5.1 The Housing First contract is included as part of the Housing Related Support budgets within Health & Adult Social Care. The 2017/18 net budget totals £5.169m and the Housing First contract value is £0.128m per annum.

As outlined in the report, there are potential savings that could be made across the council subject to the outcome of the report by the University of Salford in November 2018.

Finance Officer Consulted: Sophie Warburton

Date: 14/12/2017

Legal Implications:

- 5.2 As the Committee with overall responsibility for the council's housing functions, including homelessness, it is appropriate for the Housing and New Homes

Committee to receive this report. There are no significant legal implications to draw to members' attention arising from the report which is for noting.

Lawyer Consulted: Liz Woodley

Date: 8/1/18

5.3 Equalities Implications:

An EIA for the single homeless pathway remodelling has been carried out and this recognises that some groups of people have been excluded or have great difficulty accessing and maintaining accommodation in homeless services due their complex needs and that we require a flexible range of services to offer more personalised support, especially for people with complex needs.

Sustainability Implications:

- 5.4 Housing First is a sustainable way to move people from rough sleeping into accommodation and to support people to maintain their contact with services which are best meeting their needs.

Appendix 1

Crime & Disorder Implications:

- 1.1 Housing First can have a significant positive role in reducing the crime and disorder perpetrated by the individuals within its service and this has been evidenced by the Brighton & Hove pilot.

The service provider works closely with police, probation service and community safety colleagues to ensure services users are supported to reduce their involvement in crime and anti-social behaviour.

Public Health Implications:

- 1.2 The Housing First model has been effective at ensuring that clients access the services appropriate to their health and wellbeing needs, and is contributing to the reduction of health inequalities in relation to homeless people.

Corporate / Citywide Implications:

- 1.3 This service model reduces rough sleeping, which is a corporate priority.