

Homeless Watch 2005

A Snapshot Survey Of Homelessness in Nottinghamshire

19th September – 2nd October 2005



Rushcliffe Borough Council – Mini Report

HLG Resource Service
Feb 2006

Copies of this report are available on the Internet at
www.hlg.org.uk/homelesswatch.htm

Homeless Watch 2005: Rushcliffe Borough Council Mini Report

1. Background

The Nottinghamshire Homeless Watch Survey 2005 is the second County wide snapshot survey of people who present as homeless during a two week snapshot period, which ran from 19th September to the 2nd October 2005. The survey is co-ordinated by a steering group comprising representatives from the eight local authorities which make up the area, the Nottinghamshire Rural Community Council, the Supporting People Partnership For Nottinghamshire and Nottinghamshire County Council. Funding for the survey has been provided by the eight district authorities in the County and Nottinghamshire County Council's Social Services Department. The survey has been conducted on their behalf by HLG – a Nottinghamshire umbrella organisation for voluntary sector services working with homeless and other vulnerable people.

In addition to the main Homeless Watch report, which covers the results from the snapshot survey for the whole of Nottinghamshire, a series of eight mini reports have been produced, covering the main findings for the eight district authority areas in Nottinghamshire. The main report and the district report are all available for download from the Homeless Watch website at www.hlg.org.uk/homelesswatch.htm.

For the purposes of these mini district reports figures on the number of presentations and homeless people have been calculated using a different methodology than has been used for the area analysis in the main Nottinghamshire wide Homeless Watch report. Figures in this mini report for Rushcliffe are therefore based on presentations by those people who were either:

- Recorded by the Homeless Watch survey as receiving advice about their homelessness within the Rushcliffe area.
- Recorded as not seeking advice in Rushcliffe (i.e. they sought advice in another Nottinghamshire authority area), but were recorded as having a local connection with Rushcliffe. A local connection was defined as: family connection, residence in area for 6 of the last 12 months or 3 of the last 5 years, employment in the area.

This methodology is consistent with that used in some of the district based homelessness snapshot surveys which have taken place in previous years, notably the regular annual surveys which have been conducted in Ashfield.

2. Overall Numbers

74 presentations fitted the two categories detailed in the background section. This comprises 61 presentations which were made to agencies in Rushcliffe and 13 presentations by people who approached services outside Rushcliffe, but who indicated that they had a local connection with the Borough. 3 people presented two times during the survey period (all to agencies in Rushcliffe) and therefore the actual number of individuals recorded within, or with a connection with, Rushcliffe was 71. Duplicate presentations are identified when initials, gender and date of birth information are all matched. Given that data is occasionally missing for some questions, it is possible that

Homeless Watch 2005: Rushcliffe Borough Council Mini Report

the figures hide some additional duplicate presentations, although these will be small in number.

In addition to the 71 people who presented to agencies, the survey also recorded that some of these were family households, who between them had 9 dependent children. Again, this figure is calculated after removing any duplicates and takes account of the one case where both members of a couple presented and data about their child had been recorded twice.

Table One: Number Of Homeless People In Or With A Local Connection To Rushcliffe

Category	Number (Adjusted Figure To Take Account Of Duplicate Presentations)
Adults	71
Children	9
Total	80

3. Gender

The figures for Rushcliffe show a slightly higher proportion of men who presented as homeless compared to the findings for the whole of Nottinghamshire. 67% of the 71 people who presented (if we ignore those cases where no gender has been specified) are recorded as being male, compared to 60% male for the whole of Nottinghamshire. Please note that these figures are for adults only and do not include the 9 children who were part of a presenting family.

Table Two: Gender

Gender	Number	%
Male	46	65
Female	23	32
Not stated	2	3
Total	71	100

4. Age

In contrast for the figures for the County as a whole, the data for Rushcliffe shows that there are noticeable differences between the proportion of homeless people aged under and over 25. For Nottinghamshire, the survey found that 48% of homeless people were aged under 25, whereas the corresponding figure for Rushcliffe is just 17%, after we ignore those cases where no age data was supplied. It is of note that among the 16-24 year olds, women accounted for 55% of homeless people, although the actual numbers are very low.

Table Three: Age

Age Range	Male	Female	Gender Not Stated	Total
16 & 17 Years old	1	2	0	3
18 -24 Years Old	3	4	1	8
25 – 40 Years Old	21	8	0	29
41 - 59 Years Old	18	7	1	26
60 years old and over	0	0	0	0
No Date Of Birth Supplied	3	2	0	5
Total	46	23	2	71

5. Ethnic Origin

Table Four shows the number of people from each ethnic origin who were recorded as homeless. The figures have been adjusted to take account of duplicate presentations, although this has only been possible for two of the three duplicate presentations as different ethnic origins have been recorded in one instance for the same person. Both these ethnic origins (White: British and White: Irish) have been included in Table Four, which explains why the overall total is 72. The column for percentages has been calculated after excluding those cases where an ethnic origin was not stated. Using this method enables the data to be compared with the Census 2001 data for Rushcliffe. According to the Census 2001 data, 6.7% of the population of Rushcliffe are of a non White: British ethnic origin. By contrast the Homeless Watch survey returns for the Borough found that 11.4% of those who were homeless were not White: British. However, the actual number of people from specific minority ethnic groups is so low (usually one) that caution should be exercised in reaching any firm conclusions about homelessness among ethnic minorities in Rushcliffe. However, it is recommended that Rushcliffe Borough Council monitor levels of homelessness among Black & Minority Ethnic communities both through existing data collection (e.g. PIE returns) or establishing new mechanisms to collate this data, such as asking local services to record this data over a longer time period.

Table Four: Ethnic Origin

Ethnic Origin	Number	% (After Those Where No Data Has Been Supplied Are Excluded)
White: British	62	88.6
White: Other	3	4.3
White: Irish	1	1.4
Black/Black British: Caribbean	1	1.4
Black/Black British: African	1	1.4
Asian/Asian British: Pakistani	1	1.4
Other	1	1.4
Not Stated	2	N/A
Total	72	

6. Household Type

Table Five shows the household type and has been adjusted to take account of the three duplicate presentations. Compared to the findings for the whole of Nottinghamshire, the data for Rushcliffe shows a slightly higher proportion of single people (77% for the County) and a corresponding lower proportion of people from other household types, notably single parents, where the County wide percentage was 13%.

Table Five: Household Type

Household Type	Number	%
Single Person (No Kids)	59	83
Single Parent With Children	6	8
Childless Couple	3	4
Couple With Children	2	3
Not Stated	1	1
Total	71	100

7. Children

A total of 9 dependent children were recorded as being part of the adult households who presented as homeless. Table Six shows the breakdown of these children by age. 56% of children were in the 0-4 age range, and all of these were part of a single parent household.

Table Six: Age & Number Of Dependent Children

Age Of Children	Number Of Children In this Age Range
0 - 4 Years Old	5
5 -10 Years Old	0
11 – 15 Years Old	2
16 & 17 Years Old	0
18 years old and over	2
Total	9

8. Care Leavers

13 people (18%) are recorded as either having been in the care of the local authority as a young person or are still currently in the care of the local authority. Only one person who had a history of care was aged 21 or under.

Table Seven: Where People Were In Care

Local Authority Where Person Was In Care	Number
Nottingham City	6
Nottinghamshire	2
Out Of Notts	5
Total	13

9. Presenting Support Needs

Please note that more than one support need could be identified for each person and therefore the total in table eight is higher than the number of presentations. The figures on support needs for Rushcliffe clients contrast sharply in some respects from the data recorded for Nottinghamshire. 38% of presentations recorded alcohol as a support need, compared to 18% for Nottinghamshire. The reverse was true of support around drug abuse, with 18% of Rushcliffe clients identifying this, compared to 32% in the County. The proportion of Rushcliffe clients with support needs around offending behaviour, mental health and learning disabilities are consistent with the findings for the County as a whole. The proportion of people with a support need due to a physical disability was twice as high as for the County.

A separate question which asked whether a person had any support needs, shows that 21% (15 people) had no support needs.

Table Eight: Support Needs

Support Needs	Number	% Of Presentations Where This Support Need Is Identified
Alcohol Abuse	28	38
Ex-Offender	16	22
Mental Health	13	18
Drug Abuse	13	18
Physically Disabled	8	11
Learning Difficulties	6	8
Domestic Violence	5	7
Other	1	1
Total	90	100

10. Previous Night's Accommodation

As a person's accommodation circumstances could change during the course of the survey fortnight, table nine records data about where people spent the previous night based on all 74 presentations. For example a person may have spent the night in custody prior to presenting to an agency, but a few days later may have presented to another agency after spending the previous night staying with friends.

In common with the findings for the County, the most common situation in which people spent the previous night was sleeping rough. 27% of presentations in the County were from people sleeping rough but among Rushcliffe clients the corresponding figure is 34%. One person was recorded by two different agencies (one agency was in Nottingham and the other in Rushcliffe) as sleeping rough for both presentations. Four people are recorded as having a connection with Rushcliffe but presenting in other local authority areas, namely two in Nottingham City, one in Ashfield and one in Newark & Sherwood.

The proportion (22%) who spent the previous night with friends or with a parent or other relative (18%) was broadly in line with the County findings. The proportion that spent the previous night in their own home was slightly higher at 14% than for the County as a whole, which recorded 9%.

Table Nine: Previous Night

Where Person Spent The Previous Night	Number	%
Slept Rough	25	34
Friend's Home	16	22
Own Home	10	14
Parents' Home	8	11
Other Relative's Home	5	7
Hostel	3	4
Hospital	2	3
Partner's Home	1	1
B&B Lodgings	1	1
Not Stated	3	4
Total	74	100

11. Profile Of Rough Sleeping

Agencies were asked to record whether people sleeping rough, were sleeping in the open air, or in a building or structure not designed for human habitation. These categories are based on a definition of rough sleeping used by the ODPM. The figures show that most rough sleepers who either presented in Rushcliffe (or have a connection with Rushcliffe), were sleeping in the open air. The percentage who fell into this category at 72% is higher than was recorded for the County as a whole at 55%.

Agencies were also asked to record the approximate amount of time that a person had been sleeping rough and the summary of this data is shown in table eleven (see next page). The data indicates that a high proportion of Rushcliffe clients have been sleeping rough for an extended period, with 64% sleeping rough for longer than one month.

Table Ten: Type Of Rough Sleeping

Slept Rough Type	Number	%
Sleeping In Open Air	18	72
Building/Structure Not For Habitation	4	16
Don't Know	3	12
Total	25	100

Table Eleven: Time Spent Rough Sleeping

Time Rough Sleeping	Number Of People In This Category	%
1 night	1	4
More than a night up to 1 week	3	12
More than 1 week and up to 1 month	5	20
More than 1 mth and up to 3 mths	3	12
More Than 3 mths and up to 6 mths	4	16
More Than 6 mths and up to 12 mths	4	16
More than 12 mths	5	20
Not Stated	0	0
Total	25	100

12. Comparison Of Previous & Coming Nights Accommodation.

Table twelve (see next page) provides an indication of how a person's circumstances change as a result of contact with an agency, as well as showing the data for where people were expected to spend the night after the survey form had been completed. 19% (14 presentations) were expected to spend the coming night in a different accommodation situation from the previous night. Of these, 36% (5 presentations) were expected to be sleeping rough, although 2 people who were sleeping rough the previous night were expected to cease rough sleeping the coming night. One rough sleeper was expected to be in custody the coming night and the other was due to stay with friends. The net result of this, is that the number of people expected to be sleeping rough the coming night was higher (28) than the number sleeping rough the night prior to contact with an agency (25).

Table Twelve: Comparison Of Previous & Coming Night's Accommodation

		Where Person Is Sleeping the Night Following Contact With An Agency															
		B&B Lodgings	Custody	Emergency Bed	Friends Home	Grandparents	Hospital	Hostel	Other Relative	Own Home	Parents Home	Partner's Home	Sleeping Rough	Social Services	Other	No Data Supplied	Totals
Where Person Slept The Night Prior To Seeing Agency For Advice	B&B Lodgings	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	Custody	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Emergency Bed	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Friend's Home	0	0	0	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	16
	Grandparents	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Hospital	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2
	Hostel	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	3
	Other Relative	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
	Own Home	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	2	0	0	0	10
	Parents' Home	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	2	0	8
	Partner's Home	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
	Sleeping Rough	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	0	0	1	25
	Social Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	No Data Supplied	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	3
Totals:	1	1	0	15	0	0	2	5	8	6	1	28	0	4	3		