

Homeless Watch Report

A Snapshot Survey Of Homelessness in Nottinghamshire

20th September – 3rd October 2004



**Mark Kitney
HLG
Jan 2005**

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

Contents	Page
Executive Summary	2
Foreword.....	5
Nottinghamshire Homeless Watch Survey: Background	6
Survey Findings – Introduction.....	7
Section One: Survey Analysis For All Homeless Watch Returns	10
<i>Men And Women Presenting As Homeless, By Local Authority Of Origin.....</i>	<i>10</i>
<i>Age Of Men And Women Presenting As Homeless.....</i>	<i>11</i>
<i>Household Type Of Men And Women Presenting As Homeless</i>	<i>11</i>
<i>Number Of Children.....</i>	<i>12</i>
<i>Number Of Pregnant Women</i>	<i>12</i>
<i>Ethnic Origin Of People Presenting As Homeless:</i>	<i>13</i>
<i>Total Number Who Have Been In Care.</i>	<i>15</i>
<i>Age Of People Who Have Been In Care.....</i>	<i>15</i>
<i>Support Needs Identified By Men And Women</i>	<i>16</i>
<i>Homeless People With Multiple Support Needs</i>	<i>17</i>
<i>Where Men And Women Spent The Previous Night.....</i>	<i>19</i>
<i>Where Different Family Types Spent The Previous Night.....</i>	<i>20</i>
<i>Where People Are Willing To Live</i>	<i>22</i>
<i>Connection To the Area.....</i>	<i>22</i>
<i>Area Where People Had Their Last Settled Residence</i>	<i>23</i>
<i>Reasons For Being Homeless By Gender</i>	<i>24</i>
<i>Reasons For Being Homeless By Household Type.....</i>	<i>25</i>
<i>Type Of Accommodation Requested, By Gender.....</i>	<i>27</i>
<i>Type Of Accommodation Requested, By Household Type.....</i>	<i>27</i>
<i>Outcome Of Contact With Agency, By Gender.....</i>	<i>28</i>
<i>Outcome Of Contact With Agency, By Household Type.....</i>	<i>29</i>
<i>Whether Homelessness Was Resolved, By Gender.....</i>	<i>30</i>
<i>Whether Homelessness Was Resolved, By Household Type</i>	<i>30</i>
Section Two: Analysis Of Returns For Rough Sleepers	33
<i>Rough Sleepers Analysis: Introduction.....</i>	<i>33</i>
<i>The Numbers Rough Sleeping</i>	<i>33</i>
<i>The Local Authority Of Origin For Rough Sleepers.....</i>	<i>34</i>
<i>Location Of Agencies To Which Rough Sleepers Presented.....</i>	<i>34</i>
<i>Agencies To Which Rough Sleepers Presented.....</i>	<i>35</i>
<i>Type Of Rough Sleeping</i>	<i>36</i>
<i>Age Of Rough Sleepers.....</i>	<i>37</i>
<i>Ethnic Origin Of Rough Sleepers.....</i>	<i>38</i>
<i>Rough Sleepers Support Needs</i>	<i>39</i>
<i>Rough Sleepers: Number Of Support Needs.....</i>	<i>40</i>
<i>Where Rough Sleepers Would Be Willing To Live.....</i>	<i>41</i>
<i>Rough Sleepers Connection To The Areas In Which They Are Willing To Live....</i>	<i>42</i>
<i>Rough Sleepers Last Settled Area Of Residence</i>	<i>42</i>
<i>Reasons Why Rough Sleepers Became Homeless.....</i>	<i>43</i>
<i>Type Of Accommodation Requested By Rough Sleepers</i>	<i>44</i>
<i>Outcome Of Contact With Agency.....</i>	<i>45</i>
<i>Whether Rough Sleepers Homelessness Was Resolved.....</i>	<i>46</i>
Appendix One: Agencies Which Took Part In The Homeless Watch Survey....	48

Executive Summary

The Nottinghamshire Homeless Watch Survey 2004 aimed to record details of everyone who presented as homeless in the County, during a two week period spanning the end of September and the beginning of October. 691 survey forms from 81 agencies were returned for homeless households during this period. A further 37 agencies recorded that no-one presented as homeless during the fortnight.

Overall Findings

In terms of overall findings the survey found:

- 883 people presented as homeless, comprising of 654 adults and 229 children.
- 37 of those who presented were pregnant women.
- 55% of the adults were male, although women were more likely to be homeless among those aged 16 or 17.
- 75% (519 adults) of those presenting were single people, with the next most common household type being single parents, who made up just over 12% (84 people) of the survey total.
- 35 couples with children also presented as homeless.

Ethnic Profile

There is evidence from the survey that people from a non White: British ethnic are over-represented among the local homeless population when compared to the ethnic profile of the Nottinghamshire population. Just under 14% of the Homeless Watch clients were from a non White: British background, compared to 8.2% of the Nottinghamshire (including Nottingham City) population.

Support Needs

Around two-thirds of the people who were homeless identified one or more support needs. The main findings were:

- Just under one third (222 people) had a support need due to drug abuse, with 91 people also identifying support needs due to alcohol abuse.
- 132 people had support needs due to being an ex-offender.
- 107 people had support needs due to mental health issues.

Although the figures suggest that a third of people had no support needs the survey structure meant that it was not possible to differentiate between cases with no support needs and forms where the question had not been answered.

Accommodation Requested

The most commonly requested form of accommodation was a flat, favoured by 60% of people. However, unsurprisingly there were variations according to the household type, with families more likely to request a house. 13% of men requested lodgings, but this form of accommodation was much less popular with women. This pattern was replicated for supported housing, with a third of men requesting supported housing, compared to just over a fifth of women.

Previous Accommodation

In common with other local surveys and data, the survey found that significant numbers of people had spent the night prior to becoming homeless with friends or family. Some of the key findings were:

- 261 people (38%) had spent the night prior to becoming homeless being accommodated by family or friends. Within this figure, 147 people stayed with friends and 114 people with a family member.
- 57 people had spent the previous night in their own home.
- 56 people spent the previous night in a hostel or other type of supported housing.
- 20 people (after allowing for duplicate presentations) had been discharged from hospital to homelessness. Given the quick turnaround in bedspaces at most (especially acute) hospitals this could indicate that over the course of a year up to 520 people are discharged from hospital to homelessness in Nottinghamshire.

One of the most concerning findings from the survey is that **167 forms were returned for households who slept rough the night before presenting to an agency. After removing duplicate presentations the survey found that 184 people were sleeping rough in Nottinghamshire.** See below for further details about rough sleeping.

Reasons For Homelessness

A variety of reasons for becoming homeless were recorded, but the main findings were:

- 181 people were homeless due to parents, friends or other relatives being unable to continue to accommodate them.
- Women were 44% more likely to be homeless because parents were no longer willing to accommodate them.
- Women were also eight times more likely to be homeless due to violence from an associated person and 11 times more likely to be homeless due to violence from a partner.
- 108 people (74% of which were men) cited drug use affecting their ability to access accommodation as a reason for their homelessness.

Outcomes

Agencies were asked to record the outcome of any advice and support they offered to people who presented as homeless during the fortnight. The survey found that just under a quarter of homeless people secured some form of accommodation, comprising:

- 39 people who found emergency accommodation.
- 97 people who secured temporary accommodation.
- 33 people who secured permanent accommodation.

Only 15% of those who presented as homelessness are recorded as having their homelessness resolved after contact with an agency.

Rough Sleeping

The most significant finding of the survey was that 184 people were sleeping rough during the survey fortnight. This comprised 160 adults and 24 children,

although evidence suggests that not all of these children were part of the household at the time of rough sleeping. **The majority (71%) were sleeping rough in Nottingham City**, although it appears that fewer than half of the rough sleepers presenting to agencies in the City have a local connection with the City.

The survey also found:

- Rough sleepers presented to agencies in every local authority area, apart from Broxtowe.
- 22 adult rough sleepers were identified in Mansfield, with 11 in Rushcliffe.
- 25% of rough sleepers were reported as sleeping in the open air, with a further 17% sleeping in a building or other place not designed for habitation.
- Of those where an age was specified, 69% were aged 25 or over.

The data collected about people rough sleeping highlighted a number of areas where their problems and circumstances differed from the results for homeless people for the overall survey. These differences include:

- Rough sleepers were twice as likely to have a support need connected with drug abuse. Two thirds of rough sleepers identified this as a support need.
- Rough sleepers were also more likely to require support due to offending behaviour and alcohol abuse.
- Rough sleepers were more likely to be single men and have a greater number of support needs.
- The proportion of rough sleepers homeless as a result of leaving prison or custody was 70% higher than for all survey clients.
- The number who cited drug use preventing them from accessing housing as a reason for homelessness was twice the figure for all those in the survey.
- Those from non White: British backgrounds were less likely to be rough sleeping compared to the profile that would be expected by the UK Census of 2001.

Of particular concern is that rough sleepers were less likely to have had their homelessness resolved after contact with an agency compared to all survey clients. **Only 9 rough sleepers were recorded as having their homelessness resolved. This represents just 5% of all rough sleepers.**

Foreword

Homeless Watch provides a snapshot of the extent and nature of homelessness across the City and County and adds to information already available, such as homelessness reviews and rough sleeper counts. The survey has been of great benefit to the partner organisations involved, and we hope that its success can be repeated and built upon.

We would like to thank the Hostels Liaison Group (HLG) and Mark Kitney in particular for administering the survey so successfully and for writing the final report. We would also like to thank the numerous agencies and individual workers who participated in the survey, without which there would be no report. The final product is a cohesive whole and provides much useful information about local homelessness and its effects on homeless people.

As with any report the key issue is that its findings are acted upon. The chief vehicle for co-ordinating responses to the issues identified by this report will be the County wide Homeless Managers Group, who will use the document to help with the review of the homelessness strategies which exist for each local authority area. The findings will also be communicated and discussed with agencies in the statutory and independent sectors.

The steering group has learned much along the way not least the importance of Local Authorities and partner agencies working together in order to find out what is really happening! We intend that this joint working will continue in future surveys and in planning local and regional improvements to services for homeless people.

The Homeless Watch Steering Group

Nottinghamshire Homeless Watch Survey: Background

The Nottinghamshire Homeless Watch survey aimed to record details about anyone who presented as homeless in the Nottinghamshire area during a snapshot period of two weeks, from Monday 20th September 2004 to Sunday 3rd October 2004 inclusive. The survey built on the experience of a number of local partners who had been involved in previous homeless snapshot surveys covering different geographic areas in the County.

The survey was co-ordinated by a steering group comprising representatives from all of the local authorities in the County (including the unitary authority, Nottingham City Council), the Nottinghamshire Supporting People Team, the Nottinghamshire Rural Community Council, BSHAG (Broxtowe Single Homeless Action Group), Nottinghamshire County Council Social Services Department and HLG (Hostels Liaison Group).

The survey was financed by Nottingham City Council Housing Department and undertaken by HLG, under the guidance of the steering group. 553 agencies from the statutory, voluntary and private sectors were initially invited to take part in the survey, of which 118 responded positively. A list of the agencies which took part is listed at appendix one. Agencies were asked to complete a survey form for each person or household who presented as homeless to their agency during the survey period. A copy of the survey form and guidance notes can be downloaded from the Homeless Watch 2004 website at www.hlg.org.uk/homelesswatch.htm

The steering group would like to thank all those agencies who took the time to participate in this first ever Nottinghamshire wide homelessness snapshot survey.

Survey Findings – Introduction.

This report is split into two sections. The first section looks at the overall data collected from the people who presented as homeless during the Homeless Watch survey fortnight, which ran from 20th September 2004 to 3rd October 2004 inclusive. The second section examines the data from the survey which relates solely to people who were reported to be sleeping rough.

The report makes a number of recommendations about future surveys and these are highlighted by the use of bold text.

Where the survey has made particularly significant findings which may have implications for agencies commissioning or providing services to people affected by homelessness, these are highlighted by using the same format as this paragraph., i.e white text on a black background.

It should be noted that the primary purpose of this report is to collate and analyse the results of the survey, so that local agencies have a clearer understanding of the nature of homelessness in Nottinghamshire. The reasons for homelessness and the solutions are sometimes complex and involve action in a number of complementary areas. It is not intended that this report sits on a shelf, rather that commissioners, strategists and service providers use it to ensure that measures to prevent and alleviate homelessness are appropriately targeted. In particular, it is hoped that the scale of the homelessness problem in Nottinghamshire, as evidenced by this report, is reflected in a renewed commitment by all agencies to develop practical solutions to the homelessness faced by so many people in our local communities.

118 agencies took part in the survey, 81 of which had contact with one or more homeless people during the survey fortnight. The remaining 37 agencies returned forms to indicate that they had seen no homeless people during the survey period. A list of the agencies which took part in the survey is included in appendix one.

The 81 agencies which had contact with homeless people returned a total of 691 forms. Analysis of the initials, gender and date of birth on those 691 forms shows that four people presented to three agencies during the survey period and 29 people presented to two agencies. Therefore the actual number of adults who presented as homeless was 654. 144 of the 691 forms indicated that these adults were part of a family grouping who, after allowing again for duplicate presentations, had a total of 229 children. Therefore, the total number of people recorded as homeless in Nottinghamshire by the Homeless Watch survey was 883. As the circumstances of these individuals may have changed over the survey period the tables and commentary which follow are based on the 691 forms returned, unless stated otherwise.

Area Analysis

As with any piece of research there are always different ways of analysing data and different methodologies can indicate very different conclusions. One of the key issues for this survey has been the method used to establish connection between a client and a local authority area. Locally there is often much debate about the area to which people who are homeless have a connection and analysis of local connection is one of the key considerations made by local authorities when assessing homelessness applications under the Housing Act 1986 (as amended by

the Homelessness Act 2002). The Homeless Watch survey provides three different pieces of data which could link a client to a particular area. These are:

- The district/borough from where the person originated.
- The district/borough where the person had their last settled area of residence.
- The district/borough of the agency to which the person presented.

Unfortunately the question concerning the district/borough where the client had their last settled area of residence was not answered on nearly 40% of the forms and therefore this was not considered the most reliable way of connecting people with a local authority. The answer rate for the district/borough from where the person originated was much higher at just over 85% and therefore this method of establishing a connection between the client and a local authority area has been used for relevant questions. However, where appropriate, area analysis using the other methodologies is presented and discussed for comparison.

Section One

Survey Analysis For All Homeless Watch Returns

Section One: Survey Analysis For All Homeless Watch Returns

Men And Women Presenting As Homeless, By Local Authority Of Origin

As noted in the introduction, the survey provides three different methods for establishing a connection between clients and local authorities, but this question was aimed at identifying the district/borough from where the person originated. The term 'origin' was not defined in the guidance and anecdotal feedback from those who participated in the survey suggests that people may have interpreted this question in different ways. Some agencies have interpreted this as the place a person was born and others as the place with which the person said they had some other type of significant connection.

Table A1 summarises the findings from this question and shows that the majority of clients presenting as homeless are men (55% of the 691 people surveyed). However, the proportion of Homeless Watch clients for each gender varies notably according to the district/borough of origin of the client. Clients who originated from Bassetlaw, Gedling and Newark & Sherwood were more likely to be female than male, but the overall figures are tilted into a majority of male clients by the large number of homeless men originating from Nottingham, Mansfield and outside of the County. The higher proportion of female clients in the boroughs/districts mentioned has not been reflected in previous surveys in these locations. Firm conclusions cannot be made from this one survey and **it is recommended that future surveys monitor the male/female balance in clients originating from these areas to see if there is a trend for increasing numbers of homeless women.**

It is disappointing that data about the district/borough of origin of clients is missing from just over 14% (99) of the survey forms. The reasons for this are not clear and **it is recommended that further investigation of why agencies failed to answer this question is undertaken, to inform the design of future survey forms and guidance. In particular it is recommended that the term 'origin' is defined in any guidance notes to ensure that respondents answer the question consistently.**

Table A1: Gender of People Presenting As Homeless By Local Authority Of Origin

	Men		Women		Not Specified		All	
	(55%)		(41%)		(4%)			
	Num	%	Num	%	Num	%	Num	%
Ashfield	20	5	19	7	0	0	39	6
Bassetlaw	23	6	39	14	2	8	64	9
Broxtowe	15	4	14	5	1	4	30	4
Gedling	11	3	12	4	0	0	23	3
Mansfield	51	13	23	8	1	4	75	11
Newark & Sherwood	19	5	20	7	0	0	39	6
Nottingham City	118	31	85	30	5	19	208	30
Rushcliffe	14	4	13	5	0	0	27	4
Other (Outside Of Nottinghamshire)	57	15	25	9	5	19	87	13
Missing Data	51	13	36	13	12	46	99	14
Totals	379	100	286	102	26	100	691	100

Age Of Men And Women Presenting As Homeless

Table A2 analyses the age breakdown by gender among the 691 adults identified from the survey returns. The analysis shows that women were more highly represented in the youngest age category. Among 16 and 17 year olds, 65% were women and among the 18-24 age group the gender split was virtually 50/50. These findings are all the more marked when we take into account that there were nearly 25% fewer adult women than men recorded by the survey.

Conversely men were more likely to be aged 25 and over. In the 25-40 age group, men made up 68% of the survey sample and in the 41-59 year old category, 65% were men. Only two people were recorded as aged 60 or over, both of whom were women. The amount of missing data, 22% of the sample, is significant and means that some caution should be exercised interpreting the data available.

The over-representation of women aged 16 and 17, indicates that advice, prevention and mediation services should be particularly seeking to target this group to prevent a homelessness crisis developing.

Table A2: Age Of Men & Women Presenting As Homeless

	Men		Women		Gender Not Stated		Total	
	Num	%	Num	%	Num	%	Num	%
Under 16*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
16-17	29	4	53	8	0	0	82	12
18 – 24	92	13	91	13	9	1	192	28
25 – 40	135	20	61	9	4	1	200	29
41 – 59	41	5	22	3	0	0	63	9
60 and over	0	0	2	0.3	0	0	2	0
Missing Data	82	12	57	8	13	2	152	22
Totals	379	54	286	41	26	4	691	100

**No age data was collected for children who were part of a family, but 229 children were recorded by the survey.*

Household Type Of Men And Women Presenting As Homeless

Table A3 shows the household type among the survey group. In common with other local surveys the majority of clients who presented as homeless were single people (75%). Families (of all types) with children accounted for 17% of clients, with the remainder being either childless couples or where no data was recorded.

Following a recommendation from last year's Ashfield Homelessness Survey a separate category was included in the survey to identify single parents. This separation of family categories has been worthwhile, as single parents were the next largest household group in this survey, totalling 84 or 12% of the survey group.

Table A3: Breakdown By Household Type

Household Type	Num	%
Single Person	519	75
Single Parent With Children	84	12
Couple With Children	35	5
Childless Couple	28	4
Missing Data	25	4
Total	691	100

Number Of Children

From the returns, 144 families with a total of 233 children presented as homeless during the survey period. Official figures for homeless families recorded by local authorities for the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM) have shown a significant rise nationally in recent years, and these results show a high number of homeless families in Nottinghamshire. Analysis of the initials, gender and date of birth show four cases where families (all single parents with one child) had presented to more than one agency and therefore the total number of homeless children recorded by the survey was 229. There may also be further duplicates where both members of a couple with children presented to an agency, with both forms showing the children. It should be noted that there was an inconsistency between the data, with 32 forms for single people showing that they also had children. The analysis for this question has been based on those households with children, irrespective of the household type indicated and therefore the 32 single person households have been included in the figures in Table A4.

Table A4: Number Of Children

Number Of Children In Household	Households With This Number Of Children
1	95
2	29
3	7
4	7
5	5
6	1
Total Number Of Households With Children	144
Number Of Children (Minus Four Duplicate Presentations)	229

Number Of Pregnant Women

38 homeless households identified that a member was pregnant, representing 6% of the survey group. Analysis shows that 1 woman who was pregnant presented to more than one agency and originated from Bassetlaw. Therefore the total number of pregnant women presenting as homeless was 37 (5% of the sample). Of these 37, five women already had another child and a further two had two children.

Table A5 shows wide variations in the percentage of clients who were pregnant according to their area of origin, with Ashfield, Bassetlaw and Gedling over twice the average figure. However, the relatively small sample means that caution should be exercised in reaching any firm conclusions. It is of note that survey returns from local authorities for pregnant households comprised 39% of the total. Given this it is likely that the figure for pregnant households for people originating from Mansfield is an under-representation of the actual situation, as no survey returns were received from this authority.

An analysis of the age of women recorded as pregnant shows that 10 (27% of those in the survey) were aged 16 or 17.

Table A5: Pregnant Clients By Area Of Origin

District/Borough Of Origin	Number	%	% Of All Clients Originating From This Area
Ashfield	5	14	13
Bassetlaw	7	19	11
Broxtowe	2	5	7
Gedling	3	8	13
Mansfield	2	5	3
Newark & Sherwood	2	5	5
Nottingham City	9	24	4
Other (Out Of Nottinghamshire)	4	11	5
Missing Data	3	8	3
Total	37	100	N/A

Ethnic Origin Of People Presenting As Homeless:

Table A6 shows that 17.4% of those presenting as homeless were of a non White: British ethnic origin. This figure falls to 13.3% if we exclude those clients where no ethnic origin has been recorded. Using this method to calculate the percentage enables comparison with the breakdown of ethnic origin from the UK Census of 2001. The Census recorded that 8.2% of the population of Nottinghamshire (including Nottingham City) were from a non White: British ethnic group, suggesting that this group are over-represented among local homeless people.

Table A6: Ethnic Origin

Ethnic Origin	Homeless Watch Total		2001 Census For Notts
	Num	%	%
Asian/Asian British: Indian	6	0.9	1.1
Asian/Asian British: Other	1	0.1	0.2
Asian/Asian British: Pakistani	6	0.9	1.1
Black/Black British: African	7	1	0.2
Black/Black British: Caribbean	13	1.9	1.1
Black/Black British: Other	4	0.6	0.1
Mixed: Other	2	0.3	0.2
Mixed: White & Asian	3	0.4	0.3
Mixed: White & Black African	1	0.1	0.1
Mixed: White & Black Caribbean	16	2.3	0.8
White: British	571	82.6	91.8
White: Irish	4	0.6	0.8
White: Other	11	1.6	1.5
Other	18	2.7	N/A
Missing Data	28	4.1	N/A
Total:	691	100	N/A

Locally the proportion of people from non White: British backgrounds varies considerably from authority to authority, ranging from 18.9% in Nottingham City to 1.9% in Ashfield (*Source: 2001 UK Census*). Table A7 shows the numbers (and percentage) of people from non White:British backgrounds who presented as homeless by their district/borough of origin. The figure among the general population for this ethnic group from the 2001 Census is also shown for each authority. With the exception of Nottingham City, which also shows an over-representation of homeless people from non White:British ethnic origins, the numbers are very low and are insufficient to enable any firm conclusions to be made.

The overall finding that people from non White:British backgrounds are over-represented among those presenting as homeless during the survey is significant and this trend should be monitored in any future local surveys.

Table A7: Ethnic Origin By Clients District/Borough Of Origin

District/Borough Of Origin	Clients Of Non White: British Origin		Census Data
	Num	%	% Non White: British Ethnic Origin In This Area
Ashfield	1	2.6	1.9
Bassetlaw	2	3.3	2.7
Broxtowe	2	6.7	6.8
Gedling	6	26.1	6.1
Mansfield	1	1.4	3.1
Newark & Sherwood	1	2.8	3.1
Nottingham City	47	23.6	18.9
Rushcliffe	2	7.7	6.7
All Nottinghamshire Originating Clients	62	13.9	8.2
<i>Plus Clients Not Originating From Nottinghamshire or Not Stated</i>	30	16.1	N/A
Total Non White: British Clients From Survey	92	13.3	N/A

To further understand the over-representation of people from Non White: British ethnic groups an analysis has been undertaken to ascertain the agencies to which these people presented. Table A8 lists those agencies where there were *more than two* presentations by someone from a Non White: British background. With the exception of Roshni (Nottingham Asian Women's Aid), none of these agencies is solely aimed at an ethnic minority group, although HLG's Accommodation Access Team has a dedicated Refuge Worker and Karibu Foyer has traditionally had links with the African-Caribbean community and is part of the BME Registered Social Landlord, Tun Tum Housing Association. The five presentations shown for HOPE in Worksop were all for people who originated from Poland.

Table A8: Which Agencies Saw People From A Non White: British Ethnic Origin

Name Of Agency	Number Of People Presenting From A Non-White: British Ethnic Origin
HLG Accommodation Access Team	13
Nottingham Street Outreach Team	9
Housing Aid (Nottingham City Council)	8
HOPE	5
NACRO Housing - Vivian Avenue	4
Karibu House Foyer	4
Roshni-NAWA	3
Women's Aid Advice Centre	3
Framework HA - London Road Project	3
Emmanuel House Day Centre	3
COS South Nottingham	3

Total Number Who Have Been In Care.

Table A9 shows the number of clients who were recorded as either currently or previously in the care of a local authority. The guidelines for the survey asked agencies only to record cases where the person had been in local authority care up to the age of 18. Over a third of the survey forms returned had either missing data for this question or the answer was unknown. 76 people (11% of all forms returned) indicated that they had previously been in care.

Table A9: Clients Who Have Been In Care

Has the client been in care?	Num	%
Yes	76	11
No	350	51
Don't Know	226	33
Missing Data	39	6
Total	691	100

Age Of People Who Have Been In Care

Table A10 provides some further analysis of the age profile of those who have been in care. This shows that 50% of those who have been in care were aged between 16 and 24 inclusive, with a further third aged between 25 and 40. Nearly two-thirds of those who had been in care were men (63%), although women made up 54% of the 16 and 17 year olds with a care background. 12% (9 people) of those who had been in care were from a non White: British ethnic origin of which 7 were male. Male care leavers from a non-White: British ethnic origin therefore comprise 15% of all male care leavers. However, the small numbers mean that some caution should be exercised in reaching any firm conclusions about over-representation among non White: British care leavers, but **it is recommended that this is monitored in any future Nottinghamshire snapshot survey.**

The numbers of care leavers in the younger age ranges is a particular concern given the provisions of the Children Act and the Children (Leaving Care) Act. The findings may indicate the need to increase awareness among housing professionals about the duties of social services towards children looked after by the local authority and the operation of referral routes. However, it should be noted that a significant number of the care leavers were reported as being in care from areas outside of the County.

Table A10: Age Of People Who Have Been In Care

Age	Male		Female		Not Stated		Total	
	Num	%	Num	%	Num	%	Num	%
16 -17	6	13	7	27	0	0	13	17
18-24	15	31	10	38	0	0	25	33
25 – 40	21	44	5	19	2	100	28	37
41 – 59	2	4	1	4	0	0	3	4
60 and over	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Missing Data	4	8	3	12	0	0	7	9
Total:	48	100	26	100	2	100	76	100

Support Needs Identified By Men And Women

Agencies were asked to identify any support needs for the clients presenting as homeless during the survey period. Table A11 summarises these responses and is broken down into support needs by gender. Agencies were able to record as many client support needs as appropriate and this explains why the total number of support needs is more than the number of people surveyed. However, the percentages are calculated by comparing the number of people with that support problem, with the overall number of adults recorded by the survey (e.g 691, comprising 379 men, 286 women and 26 cases where the gender has not been specified – see Table A1).

The findings show that support for drug abuse was reported for 222 people or 32% of the survey group. Given the high number of people requesting support with drug misuse some further analysis has been undertaken, the main results of which are:

- 88% of those requesting support for drug abuse are single people.
- 90% are from a White: British ethnic background.
- 14% had their homelessness resolved, which is consistent with the findings for all those in the survey.

In terms of the age distribution of those requesting support for drug abuse the results were:

- 10 people aged 16 or 17.
- 45 people aged 18 to 24.
- 87 people aged 25 to 40.
- 9 people aged 41 to 59.
- The date of birth was missing from 71 cases.

After drug abuse, the second most commonly requested area for support was for issues connected with offending behaviour. 132 people (19%) had support needs

connected with offending behaviour. Many Nottinghamshire Probation Offices (notably the specialist housing and benefits team at Nottinghamshire Probation Headquarters) did not take part in the survey due to the pressure of work, so the high number of those with support needs due to their offending history is of particular note. Other common support needs were related to mental health (107 people) and alcohol abuse (91 people).

The high numbers of homeless people requiring support for alcohol problems, offending behaviour, mental health problems and especially drug abuse underlines the need for service providers and commissioners to ensure that services are accessible and responsive to the needs of homeless people with these problems.

Another notable finding was the high number of 'Other' support needs recorded. Survey participants were asked to record details where this category had been ticked and an analysis has been undertaken of the free text answers given to ascertain if these can be categorised. This shows 21 cases where support was needed due to domestic violence. 20 of these were women, with the remaining person being of an unspecified gender. Applying this figure to all women in the survey, means that 7% of the women identified support needs as a result of domestic violence. Grouping the other support needs into further definable categories was problematic, although there were 18 people who had various other health related support needs, including cancer and three people where debt/budgeting support needs were identified.

No support needs were stated for 231 clients, representing a third of those surveyed. However, given the data missing for other questions, it is very likely that for some of these 231 clients the question has not been answered, rather than this being an indication that all 231 have no support needs. Given this inability to distinguish between those cases where no answer has been given and those cases where the client has no support needs **it is recommended that any future surveys have a specific tick box to record those clients who have no support needs.**

Table A11: Support Needs By Gender

Support Needs	Male		Female		Gender Not Stated		Totals	
	Num	%	Num	%	Num	%	Num	%
Drug Abuse	169	45	44	15	9	35	222	32
Ex-Offender	110	29	16	6	6	23	132	19
Other	44	12	60	21	5	19	109	16
Mental Health	62	16	40	14	5	19	107	15
Alcohol Abuse	69	18	19	7	3	12	91	13
Learning Difficulties	24	6	13	5	2	8	39	6
Physically Disabled	15	4	8	3	0	0	23	3
Totals:	493	N/A	200	N/A	30	N/A	723	N/A
<i>No Support Needs Stated</i>	86	23	136	48	9	35	231	33

Homeless People With Multiple Support Needs

As noted, it was possible for more than one support need to be recorded for each client. Table A12 summarises the number of support needs recorded for each client

according to their gender. Among those who had support needs, 59% (271 people) had one support need. The remaining 41% (189 people or 27% of all clients in the survey) had two or more support needs.

If we include everyone in the survey, men were almost three times more likely (38% of all men) to have two or more support needs than women (13% of all women).

Table A12: Clients With Multiple Support Needs

Number Of Support Needs	Male		Female		No Gender Stated		Total	
	Num	%	Num	%	Num	%	Num	%
One	150	51	113	75	8	47	271	59
Two	96	33	29	19	7	41	132	29
Three	38	13	4	3	1	6	43	9
Four	8	3	3	2	0	0	11	2
Five	1	0.3	1	1	1	6	3	0.7
Totals	293	100	150	100	17	100	460	100

Where Men And Women Spent The Previous Night

Table A13 summarises where clients spent the previous night. Data was missing for just 34 of the forms. The most notable figures from Table A13 relate to those clients who were recorded as rough sleeping the night prior to making contact with the agency.

Nearly a quarter of those surveyed (167 people) were recorded as rough sleeping.

The agencies undertaking the survey were asked to record rough sleeping where it was in accordance with the ODPM definition of *“People sleeping, or bedded down, in the open air (such as on the streets, or in doorways, parks or bus shelters); people in buildings or other places not designed for habitation (such as barns, sheds, car parks, cars, derelict boats, stations, or ‘bashes’.”*

There is increasing evidence that the scale of rough sleeping in Nottinghamshire is very significant and that the rough sleeping is not confined to Nottingham City. The recent Nottingham City and Nottinghamshire County Supporting People Unmet Needs Survey recorded 228 instances of people sleeping rough during a week long survey period and although the number recorded by this survey is noticeably lower, taken together the figures provide strong evidence that Nottinghamshire has a significant problem with rough sleeping. Due to the large number of rough sleepers a fuller analysis of the characteristics of those reported as rough sleeping is contained in the second section of this report. For the purpose of this section it is notable that the table below shows that **men were over four times more likely to be rough sleeping than women.**

Other significant findings are the large numbers of people who were accommodated the previous night by friends; 147 households or 21% of those surveyed. If we combine those categories where family members provided the previous night's accommodation (grandparents, parents and other relatives), this again amounts to a significant number, namely 114 households or 17% of the survey. These figures demonstrate that the survey has been successful at recording significant amounts of 'hidden homelessness'.

Significant numbers are also recorded as previously spending the night in a hostel/supported housing (56 households) or their own home (57 households or 8%).

Recent surveys by the Social Services Department and Drug & Alcohol Liaison Nurses at Kings Mill Hospital in Ashfield have highlighted the numbers of people being discharged to homelessness. This survey has confirmed the trend, with 23 people having spent the previous night in hospital, although after allowing for duplicate presentations this number reduces to 20. Given the quick turnaround in bedspaces at most (especially acute) hospitals it is probable that this will be an on-going problem. **If the survey has recorded a typical pattern of hospital discharges to homelessness, the numbers over the course of a year could amount to 520.**

Table A13 is on the next page.

Table A13: Where Clients Spent The Previous Night

Previous Night	Male		Female		Gender Not Stated		Totals	
	Num	%	Num	%	Num	%	Num	%
Slept Rough	135	36	24	8	8	31	167	24
Friend's Home	88	23	59	21	0	0	147	21
Parents' Home	20	5	36	13	3	12	59	9
Own Home	18	5	39	14	0	0	57	8
Hostel/Supported Housing	29	8	25	9	2	8	56	8
Other Relative's Home	13	3	28	10	3	12	44	6
Other	14	4	14	5	4	15	32	5
Hospital	16	4	7	2	0	0	23	3
Partner's Home	10	3	9	3	1	4	20	3
B&B Lodgings	11	3	9	3	0	0	20	3
Grandparents' Home	3	1	8	3	0	0	11	2
Custody	5	1	1	0	2	8	8	1
Social Services	6	2	2	1	0	0	8	1
Emergency Bed	3	1	2	1	0	0	5	1
Not Stated	8	2	23	8	3	12	34	5
Totals	379	100	286	100	26	100	691	100

Where Different Family Types Spent The Previous Night

Table A14 analyses where people spent the previous night according to their household type. In many cases the distribution of results for previous night's accommodation is consistent for different household types. However there are some notable exceptions. Compared to single people, single parents and couples with children were significantly more likely to have spent the previous night in their own home. 25% of single parents and 34% of couples with children spent the previous night in their own home, compared to just 3% of single people. Conversely, single people were much more likely to have spent the previous night sleeping rough. Just under 30% of single people spent the previous night sleeping rough. Five families, consisting of three couples with children and two single parents, are also recorded as rough sleeping.

Table A14 is on the next page

Table A14: Previous Night By Household Type

Previous Night	Single		Childless Couple		Couple With Children		Single Parent With Children		Household Type Not Stated		Totals	
	Num	%	Num	%	Num	%	Num	%	Num	%	Num	%
Slept Rough	155	30	3	11	3	9	2	2	4	16	167	24
Friend's Home	122	24	4	14	4	11	15	18	2	8	147	21
Parents' Home	35	7	4	14	3	9	16	19	1	4	59	9
Own Home	18	3	3	11	12	34	21	25	3	12	57	8
Hostel/Supported Housing	44	8	5	18	4	11	3	4	0	0	56	8
Other Relative's Home	33	6	1	4	4	11	6	7	0	0	44	6
Other	20	4	3	11	2	6	7	8	0	0	32	5
Hospital	18	3	1	4	0	0	4	5	0	0	23	3
Partner's Home	13	3	2	7	2	6	2	2	1	4	20	3
B&B Lodgings	15	3	2	7	1	3	2	2	0	0	20	3
Grandparents' Home	10	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	11	2
Custody	8	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	1
Social Services	8	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	1
Emergency Bed	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4	5	1
Not Stated	17	3	0	0	0	0	4	5	13	52	34	5
Totals	519	100	28	100	35	100	84	100	25	100	691	100

Where People Are Willing To Live

The survey asked respondents to record details of the local authority areas where they would be willing to live. Clients could record as many areas as they wished, hence the total number is higher than the number of households responding to the survey. The last column in Table A15 shows the percentage of the 691 clients who have indicated that they would be willing to live in each local authority area. More people are willing to live in each of the eight local authority areas in Nottinghamshire than originated from those authorities, although these headline figures hide the fact that a significant 456 households (67%) stipulated that they would only live in one local authority.

Table A15: Areas Clients Are Willing To Live

Where client wants to live	Male		Female		Gender Not Stated		Totals		% Of Clients Willing To Live In This Area
	Num	%	Num	%	Num	%	Num	%	%
Ashfield	76	10	40	10	1	3	117	10	17
Bassetlaw	71	9	49	12	4	11	124	10	18
Broxtowe	56	7	24	6	3	9	83	7	12
Gedling	66	9	27	7	1	3	94	8	14
Mansfield	96	13	33	8	2	6	131	11	19
Newark & Sherwood	59	8	33	8	2	6	94	8	14
Nottingham City	216	28	105	27	10	29	331	28	48
Rushcliffe	64	8	25	6	0	0	89	7	13
Other/Outside Notts	43	6	20	5	2	6	65	5	9
Not Stated	15	2	38	9	10	29	63	5	N/A
Totals	762	100	394	100	35	100	1191	100	N/A

Connection To the Area

Question 15 on the Survey Form asked respondents to record how they were connected to the areas where they wanted to live. Respondents could give more than one answer, hence the total number of responses shown in Table A16 is greater than the number of clients. Over three quarters of respondents were connected to a local authority through either family (36%) or having lived in the area for more than six months (40%). Just 5% of people had a connection with their local authority of choice through living there for less than six months.

Table A16 is on the next page

Table A16: Client's Connection To Areas Requested

Client Connection	Men		Women		Gender Not Stated		Totals	
	Num	%	Num	%	Num	%	Num	%
Lived In Area (More than 6 mths)	194	42	119	38	9	32	322	40
Family	154	33	121	39	10	36	285	36
Other	56	12	45	14	4	14	105	13
Employment	24	5	14	4	2	7	40	5
Lived In Area (Less than 6 mths)	28	6	10	3	0	0	38	5
Not Stated	4	1	5	2	3	11	12	2
Totals	460	100	314	100	28	100	802	100

Area Where People Had Their Last Settled Residence

Unfortunately this question had not been completed on over a third of the forms and therefore any analysis must be treated with caution. If the missing data is excluded the percentage figures for last settled area of residence for each local authority are very similar to the figures in Table A1, which showed the person's area of origin. To assist with making this comparison the final column in Table A17 reproduces the client area of origin totals information from Table A1.

The number of clients whose last settled area of residence is outside of the County is high at 91, which represents over a fifth of those where this question had been answered. This figure is higher in both numerical and percentage terms than the number of clients who originated from outside of Nottinghamshire shown in Table A1, where the figures were 87 households representing 15% of those clients where an answer had been provided. In common with Table A1, people whose last settled area of residence was either Bassetlaw or Gedling were more likely to be women than men.

Table A17: Last Settled Area Of Residence

LA where last settled	Male		Female		Gender Not Stated		ALL		Originating From Area (Table A1 Data)
	Num	%	Num	%	Num	%	Num	%	%
Ashfield	15	6	14	8	0	0	29	7	7
Bassetlaw	15	6	22	13	1	10	38	9	11
Broxtowe	11	5	9	5	1	10	21	5	5
Gedling	7	3	8	5	0	0	15	4	4
Mansfield	27	11	13	8	1	10	41	10	13
Newark & Sherwood	15	6	15	9	0	0	30	7	7
Nottingham City	87	36	52	30	3	30	142	33	35
Rushcliffe	9	4	8	5	0	0	17	4	5
Other/Outside Notts	56	23	31	18	4	40	91	21	15
Total	242	100	172	100	10	100	424	100	100
Not Stated	137	36	114	40	16	62	267	39	N/A

Reasons For Being Homeless By Gender

Table A18 shows the reasons why people became homeless. More than one answer could be given to this question, hence the totals are more than the number of people covered by the survey. In many cases the proportion of men and women identifying a particular reason for homelessness is similar, but there are some notable exceptions. These are:

- Men were over twice as likely to be homeless due to drug misuse affecting their ability to access accommodation.
- Men were nearly seven times more likely to be homeless due to leaving prison.
- Women were 44% more likely to be homeless because parents were no longer willing to accommodate.
- Women were nearly eight times more likely to be homeless due to violence from an associated person.
- Women were almost eleven times more likely than men to be homeless due to violence from a partner.

Analysis of the overall totals shows that a large proportion of people become homeless when relatives or friends were unable to continue accommodating them. 181 households (26% of those surveyed) were homeless after parents were no longer willing to accommodate and a further 98 people (14% of those surveyed) cited friends or other relatives being unable to accommodate as the reason they became homeless. Some caution should be exercised in concluding that relatives and friends are making people homeless, as residing with friends or relatives may in itself be a temporary response to someone becoming homeless.

108 people, 74% of which are men, cited drug use affecting their ability to access accommodation as a reason for their homelessness.

Table A18 is on the next page

Table A18: Reasons For Being Homeless By Gender

Reason Homeless	Male		Female		Gender Not Specified		Totals	
	Num	%	Num	%	Num	%	Num	%
Assured Short-hold Termination	8	1	8	2	0	0	16	2
Drug Use Meaning Client Unable To Access Accommodation	80	13	22	6	6	15	108	11
Housing Association Rent Arrears	16	3	8	2	1	3	25	2
Local Authority Rent Arrears	29	5	11	3	2	5	42	4
Private Sector Rent Arrears	5	1	6	2	0	0	11	1
Mortgage Arrears	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Leaving Care	9	2	3	1	0	0	12	1
Leaving Hospital	13	2	5	1	0	0	18	2
Leaving Prison/custody	61	10	6	2	3	8	70	7
Required To Leave NASS accommodation	4	1	1	0	0	0	5	0
Parents No Longer Willing To Accommodate	89	15	86	22	6	15	181	18
Other Relatives/Friends No Longer Willing To Accommodate	54	9	41	10	3	8	98	10
Non-violent Breakdown Of Relationship With Partner	43	7	8	2	2	5	53	5
Violent Breakdown Of Relationship Involving Associated Persons	5	1	26	7	1	3	32	3
Violent Breakdown Of Relationship With Partner	7	1	50	13	2	5	59	6
Other forms of violence	20	3	18	5	1	3	39	4
Other harassment	21	4	14	4	3	8	38	4
Other reasons for less of tenancy	13	2	10	3	1	3	24	2
Other	92	16	50	13	4	10	146	14
Not Stated	23	4	23	6	5	13	51	5
Totals	593	100	396	100	40	100	1029	100

Reasons For Being Homeless By Household Type

Table A19 shows wide variations in the reasons for homelessness according to people's household type. Single people were more likely to cite drug use, leaving prison/custody and non violent breakdown of a relationship with a partner as reasons for homelessness. Childless couples were more likely than other household types to be homeless due to rent arrears with a local authority. Couples with children were more likely to be homeless following termination of an assured shorthold tenancy, although the numbers becoming homeless for this reason are small. Single parents were significantly more likely to be become homeless due to violence. 35% of single parents identified violence from either a partner or associated person as a reason for their homelessness.

Table A19: Reasons For Being Homeless By Household Type

Reason Homeless	Single		Childless Couple		Couple With Children		Single Parent		Household Not Specified		Totals	
	Num	%	Num	%	Num	%	Num	%	Num	%	Num	%
Assured Short-hold Termination	5	1	0	0	6	14	5	4	0	0	16	2
Drug Use Meaning Client Unable To Access Accommodation	97	12	3	7	2	5	3	3	3	11	108	11
Housing Association Rent Arrears	23	3	0	0	1	2	1	1	0	0	25	2
LA Rent Arrears	28	3	8	19	0	0	6	5	0	0	42	4
Private Sector Rent Arrears	8	1	0	0	2	5	1	1	0	0	11	1
Mortgage Arrears	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Leaving Care	12	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	1
Leaving Hospital	17	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	18	2
Leaving Prison/custody	67	8	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	4	70	7
Required To Leave NASS accommodation	3	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	1	4	5	0
Parents No Longer Willing To Accommodate	145	18	9	21	7	17	19	17	1	4	181	18
Other Relatives/Friends No Longer Willing To Accommodate	81	10	5	12	3	7	9	8	0	0	98	10
Non-violent Breakdown Of Relationship With Partner	46	6	1	2	0	0	4	4	2	7	53	5
Violent Breakdown Of Relationship Involving Associated Persons	18	2	0	0	3	7	10	9	1	4	32	3
Violent Breakdown Of Relationship With Partner	32	4	1	2	1	2	19	17	6	22	59	6
Other forms of violence	30	4	4	10	2	5	3	3	0	0	39	4
Other harassment	30	4	2	5	2	5	4	4	0	0	38	4
Other reasons for less of tenancy	16	2	0	0	3	7	4	4	1	4	24	2
Other	111	14	7	17	8	19	17	15	3	11	146	14
Not Stated	36	4	2	5	1	2	4	4	8	30	51	5
Totals	806	100	42	100	42	100	112	100	27	100	1029	100

Type Of Accommodation Requested, By Gender

As with the previous question, people could select more than one type of accommodation and just under 50% of those who gave an answer chose to do this, hence the high total numbers in table A20. Nearly 60% of people requested their own flat, 26% requested a bedsit and just over a third their own house. Lodgings were the least popular type of accommodation, although 13% of all men requested lodgings, compared to just 3% of women. Just over a third of all men requested supported housing (35%), but the percentage of women requesting the same type of accommodation was noticeably less at 21%.

Table A20: Accommodation Requested, By Gender

Accommodation Type Requested	Male		Female		Gender Not Stated		Totals	
	Num	%	Num	%	Num	%	Num	%
Own Flat	266	32	137	30	10	24	413	31
Own House	116	14	114	25	7	17	237	18
Supported Housing	132	16	61	13	7	17	200	15
Own Bedsit	135	16	41	9	5	12	181	14
Shared House	83	10	28	6	3	7	114	9
Other	31	4	42	9	0	0	73	5
Lodgings	51	6	9	2	2	5	62	5
Not Stated	23	3	25	5	7	17	55	4
Totals	837	100	457	100	41	100	1335	100

Type Of Accommodation Requested, By Household Type

Table A21 shows that there are significant differences in the type of accommodation requested depending on the composition of the household. Single parents and couples with children were, unsurprisingly, more likely to request their own house in preference to any other household type. By contrast single people were much more likely to request lodgings, a shared house or a bedsit compared to the other groups. Use of the private sector is often cited as one way in which to increase the amount of housing available for homeless people and it is therefore of note that 60 single people (12% of all single people) have requested lodgings.

The numbers requesting supported housing is also of note. Over a third of single people requested supported housing (35%) and just over a fifth of childless couples (21%). By contrast only 6% of couples with children and 5% of single parents requested supported housing.

Table A21 is on the next page

Table A21: Accommodation Requested, By Household Type

Type	Single		Childless Couple		Couple With Children		Single Parent		Household Type Not Stated		Totals	
	Num	%	Num	%	Num	%	Num	%	Num	%	Num	%
Own Flat	347	32	16	31	14	28	30	26	6	17	413	31
Own House	130	12	16	31	27	54	62	53	2	6	237	18
Supported Housing	184	17	6	12	2	4	4	3	4	11	200	15
Own Bedsit	167	15	7	13	1	2	4	3	2	6	181	14
Shared House	103	10	5	10	1	2	1	1	4	11	114	9
Other	51	5	1	2	2	4	8	7	11	31	73	5
Lodgings	60	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	3	62	5
Not Stated	39	4	1	2	3	6	7	6	5	14	55	4
Totals	1081	100	52	100	50	100	117	100	35	100	1335	100

Outcome Of Contact With Agency, By Gender

As part of the survey agencies were asked to identify any outcomes from their contact with homeless people during the survey period. More than one outcome could be recorded for each case. Table A22 summarises these outcomes according to the gender of the homeless person.

The first point of note is that accommodation of any sort was secured for 169 households, 24% of all those in the survey. This comprised 39 cases (6%) where emergency accommodation was secured, 97 cases (14%) where temporary accommodation was secured, and 33 households (5%) who secured permanent accommodation. This indicates that up to 522 people were still homeless after assistance from agencies, although there may be cases where the provision of advice or referral to other agencies led to the homelessness being resolved. 283 people (41% of all those surveyed) were recorded as receiving general advice and 116 people (17%) were referred to other agencies. In 102 cases agencies ticked 'other' and an analysis of any further information provided shows that in most cases the agency was intending to conduct further work to resolve the homelessness.

In terms of differences between genders, women are slightly more likely to have secured temporary accommodation than men. 16% of women secured temporary accommodation, compared to 12% of men. The slightly higher figure for women appears in part to be explained by the large percentage of women with children who secured temporary accommodation. 49% of the women who secured temporary accommodation had children, in sharp contrast to men where just 4% of those offered temporary accommodation were recorded as being part of a household with children. Conversely just under a third of women received general advice (31%), compared to nearly half of men (49%).

Table A22 is on the next page

Table A22: Outcome Of Contact With Agency, By Gender

Outcome	Male		Female		Gender Not Stated		Totals	
	Num	%	Num	%	Num	%	Num	%
Emergency Accommodation	23	5	14	4	2	7	39	5
Temporary Accommodation	45	10	47	14	5	17	97	12
Permanent Accommodation	20	4	12	4	1	3	33	4
Ref To Other Agency	66	14	50	15	0	0	116	14
General Advice	187	41	90	27	6	21	283	35
Other	44	10	58	17	0	0	102	12
Not Stated	72	16	63	19	15	52	150	18
Totals	457	100	334	100	29	100	820	100

Outcome Of Contact With Agency, By Household Type

Table A23 performs the same analysis as Table A22, but groups the results according to the person's household type. If we apply these figures to all people from these different household types, they show that single people are more likely than any other group to secure emergency accommodation but that household types with children are more likely to secure temporary accommodation. 6% of single people secured emergency accommodation compared to 4% for childless couples, 3% for couples with children and 2% for single parents. The figures for securing temporary accommodation are 13% for single people, 14% for childless couples, 20% for couples with children and 21% for single parents. There was little difference in the proportion of different household types securing permanent accommodation.

Table A23: Outcome Of Contact With Agency By Household Type

Outcome	Single		Childless Couple		Couple With Children		Single Parent		Household Type Not Specified		Totals	
	Num	%	Num	%	Num	%	Num	%	Num	%	Num	%
Emergency Accommodation	33	5	1	3	2	5	2	2	1	4	39	5
Temporary Accommodation	67	11	4	12	7	17	18	19	1	4	97	12
Permanent Accommodation	25	4	2	6	1	3	4	4	1	4	33	4
General Advice	232	37	10	30	12	29	25	26	4	14	283	35
Refer To Other Agency	94	15	7	21	3	7	10	10	2	7	116	14
Other	62	10	4	12	7	17	18	19	11	39	102	12
Not Stated	107	17	6	18	10	24	19	20	8	29	150	18
Totals:	620	100	34	100	42	100	96	100	28	100	820	100

Whether Homelessness Was Resolved, By Gender

In addition to recording the outcome of their interventions with homeless people, agencies were asked to make a judgement as to whether or not the person's homelessness had been resolved. This judgement is of course open to interpretation and it could be argued that securing accommodation will resolve a person's homelessness. In practice relying on the accommodation secured answers is problematic. Emergency accommodation may only be secured for a night or a few days, such as the service offered by a Nightstop, and temporary accommodation may also mean only a temporary relief from homelessness. This may in part explain why the percentage of people whose homelessness has been resolved, shown in Table A24, at 15% (103) is less than the 24% (169 people) identified as having secured accommodation in Tables A22 and A23. The high percentage of missing data, just under a quarter may also distort the figures, although even if these are removed from the analysis the percentage of people who had their homelessness resolved using the remaining 'valid' data is still only 20%. **However the figures are interpreted, the number of people whose homelessness was unresolved is very high and the available statistics suggest that it is likely to be 75% of the survey or higher.**

If we consider the differences between genders, women were slightly more likely to have had their homelessness resolved compared to men. In common with the figures for outcomes, a significant proportion of the women who had their homelessness resolved were identified as having children, 45% compared to just 8% of men. However, the large amount of missing data (which was nearly a third for women) means that the results for homelessness resolved should be treated with a little caution.

Table A24: Whether Homelessness Was Resolved, By Gender

Homelessness Resolved?	Male		Female		Gender Not Stated		All	
Yes	53	14	47	16	3	12	103	15
No	255	67	152	53	14	54	421	61
Not Stated	71	19	87	30	9	35	167	24
Totals	379	100	286	100	26	100	691	100

Whether Homelessness Was Resolved, By Household Type

As noted for Table A24, the amount of data missing for this question is significant. However, the remaining data (see Table A25) does suggest that single people were significantly less likely to have their homelessness resolved compared to other household types. Homelessness was resolved for 32% of childless couples, 26% of couples with children, and 20% of single parents. **Just 12% of single people were judged as having had their homelessness resolved.**

Table A25 is on the next page

Table A25: Whether Homelessness Was Resolved, By Household Type

Outcome	Single		Childless Couple		Couple With Children		Single Parent		Household Type Not Specified		Totals	
	Num	%	Num	%	Num	%	Num	%	Num	%	Num	%
Yes	64	12	9	32	9	26	17	20	4	16	103	15
No	347	67	11	39	14	40	43	51	6	24	421	61
Not Stated	108	21	8	29	12	34	24	29	15	60	167	24
Totals:	519	100	28	100	35	100	84	100	25	100	691	100

Section Two

Analysis Of Returns For Rough Sleepers

Section Two: Analysis Of Returns For Rough Sleepers

Rough Sleepers Analysis: Introduction

The issue of rough sleeping in Nottinghamshire has attracted attention over recent months, as evidence has indicated that the level is increasing. Anecdotally some agencies have reported increasing numbers of rough sleepers in most areas of Nottinghamshire and there has also been statistical evidence that the number of rough sleepers locally is significant. Last year's snapshot survey of homelessness in Ashfield recorded 27 people sleeping rough, up from 15 in 2002. The Nottinghamshire Supporting People Unmet Needs Survey conducted during a snapshot week at the end of June 2004, identified 228 people as rough sleeping throughout the County (including Nottingham City). The Homeless Watch survey has confirmed the high level of rough sleeping in Nottinghamshire. Given the high level of rough sleeping this section has been added to the report to analyse in more detail the survey results relating to rough sleepers. It should be noted that whilst the Homeless Watch survey gathered some useful and significant data about the circumstances of rough sleepers, it was not intended to comprehensively analyse all facets of a person's rough sleeping. In particular the survey recorded no details about the length of time a person had been rough sleeping.

The Numbers Rough Sleeping

As shown in Table A13 in the first section of this report, agencies recorded 167 households as rough sleeping during the two week survey period. For this section further analysis has been undertaken to remove any duplicates created by rough sleepers presenting to more than one agency. Analysis of the initials, date of birth and gender of those recorded as rough sleeping shows that three rough sleepers presented to two agencies during the survey period and a further two rough sleepers presented to three agencies. Therefore the actual number of rough sleeping adults identified by the survey was 160. In addition to the adults a total of 24 children were identified as being part of a household which had spent the previous night sleeping rough, bringing the overall number of rough sleepers to 184. Two rough sleepers were also pregnant at the time of the survey, both of whom were from a White: British background and originated from Nottingham City. One of these women was aged 16 and the other 38.

There is a mismatch in some of the data supplied by the agencies taking part in the survey, in that eight of the rough sleeping clients identified as having children were also recorded as being single people. A specific category for single parent with children was included on the form and this raises the question that some agencies may have recorded children who were not actually living with the person rough sleeping. However, three couples with children and two single parents were also recorded as rough sleeping. Analysis of the additional information provided by the agencies to whom these families presented shows that all three of the rough sleeping couples with children were sleeping in a squat and originated from the Mansfield area. The two rough sleeping single parents were recorded as sleeping in a tent and the other in an allotment shed. Both these single parents were men.

The Local Authority Of Origin For Rough Sleepers

Table B1 summarises the local authority of origin of the rough sleepers identified by the survey. The same question was asked as part of the June 2004 Supporting People Unmet Needs Survey and therefore the final column (in bold text) of this table includes the Supporting People figures for rough sleepers originating from each district for comparative purposes. The Homeless Watch returns show that just over a third (59 adults) of those rough sleeping originated from Nottingham City. Significant numbers were also recorded as originating from Mansfield (25 people or 15% of all rough sleepers) and from outside Nottinghamshire (35 people or 21%). Rough sleepers were recorded as originating from every local authority area in Nottinghamshire, although as can be seen from the table the numbers originating from the remaining Nottinghamshire local authorities were much lower.

With the exception of clients originating from Mansfield or outside of the County, the figures from the Homeless Watch survey are noticeably lower than recorded by the SP survey. The SP survey shows six times as many people originating from Bassetlaw and Broxtowe as sleeping rough, and for Gedling three times as many. Other areas also show more rough sleepers, although the overall numbers in Ashfield, Broxtowe, Gedling, Rushcliffe and to some extent Newark & Sherwood are some way behind the widely differing numbers recorded by each survey for Bassetlaw and Nottingham City. **Whatever methodology is used to count rough sleepers it is clear that it is a significant problem in the County and requires urgent and co-ordinated action by all agencies involved in preventing and alleviating homelessness.**

Table B1: Rough Sleepers By Local Authority Of Origin

District/Borough	Men		Female		Gender Not Stated		All		2004 SP Unmet Needs Survey Number
	Num	%	Num	%	Num	%	Num	%	
Ashfield	4	3	0	0	0	0	4	2	6
Bassetlaw	4	3	0	0	0	0	4	2	24
Broxtowe	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	6
Gedling	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	3
Mansfield	20	15	5	21	0	0	25	15	24
Newark & Sherwood	4	3	1	4	0	0	5	3	9
Nottingham City	46	34	10	42	3	38	59	35	85
Rushcliffe	3	2	1	4	0	0	4	2	6
Other/Outside Nottinghamshire	31	23	2	8	2	25	35	21	36
Not Stated	21	16	5	21	3	38	29	17	29
Total:	135	100	24	100	8	100	167	100	228

Location Of Agencies To Which Rough Sleepers Presented

As mentioned in the introduction to this report, the survey provided three different ways of linking clients to a local authority area. It is interesting to note that in the case of rough sleepers, an analysis of the location of the agencies to which they presented produces very different results to the analysis by area of origin. Table B2 below summarises the analysis by the agency location and to aid the comparison the final column shows the overall results for each local authority from table B1. Please

note that this column excludes the figures from Table B1 for clients originating outside Nottinghamshire or where no area of origin had been stated, which is why the numbers do not equal 167, and why the percentages do not add to 100.

The contrast between the two methods is largely neutral for Ashfield, Bassetlaw, Broxtowe, Gedling, Mansfield and Newark & Sherwood. However, the number of rough sleepers presenting to agencies in Rushcliffe is over two and half times greater than the number of rough sleepers originating from the borough (11 people compared to 4). The most dramatic change is in the figures for Nottingham City. 59 rough sleepers were identified as originating from Nottingham City, but presentations of rough sleepers to agencies based in Nottingham totalled 119 or 71% of all rough sleepers. It should be noted that the analysis in Table B2 is not the same as stating the number of people sleeping rough in a particular local authority area. For example, someone may present to a day centre in Rushcliffe but be sleeping rough in Nottingham or vice versa. However in the majority of cases there is likely to be a strong correlation between location of the agency and the area where the person is rough sleeping. To ensure that more accurate data is collected in any future survey, it is recommended that a question is included to record the local authority in which the person is currently homeless or sleeping rough.

Table B2: Rough Sleepers By Location Of Agency To Which They Presented

Borough Of Service	Male		Female		Not Stated		Totals		Figures From Table B1: Rough Sleeper's LA Of Origin	
	Num	%	Num	%	Num	%	Num	%	Num	%
Ashfield	4	3	1	4	0	0	5	3	4	2
Bassetlaw	5	4	0	0	0	0	5	3	4	2
Broxtowe	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Gedling	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
Mansfield	18	13	4	17	0	0	22	13	25	15
Newark & Sherwood	3	2	0	0	1	13	4	2	5	3
Nottingham City	94	70	18	75	7	88	119	71	59	35
Rushcliffe	10	7	1	4	0	0	11	7	4	2
Totals	135	100	24	100	8	100	167	100	N/A	N/A

Agencies To Which Rough Sleepers Presented

There were presentations by rough sleepers to 35 agencies, the names of which are listed in Table B3. As may be expected the Nottingham Rough Sleepers Contact and Assessment Team saw a significant percentage of the rough sleepers, but it is of note that 43% of the agencies who saw homeless people during the survey period had contact with at least one person rough sleeping.

Table B3 Is On The Next Page

Table B3: Agencies to Which Rough Sleepers Presented

Agency Name	Number Of Rough Sleepers Presenting
Nottingham Contact and Assessment Team	54
Emmanuel House Day Centre	14
Nottingham Health Team for Homeless People	13
North Notts Drug Service - Needle Exchange	10
HLG Mental Health Support Team For Homeless People	10
Base 51	8
Friary Drop-in	8
Framework HA - London Road Project	8
Shelter- NHAS: Nottingham	4
Shelter- NHAS: Mansfield	4
Mansfield Young Person's Day Centre	4
Framework HA - Vine Terrace	2
Youth Offending Team	2
Framework HA - Tenancy Support (Drug Scheme)	2
Nottingham Community Housing Association	2
Rushcliffe Borough Council - Housing Services	2
Nottingham City Council	2
Connexions (Gedling)	1
Emergency Accommodation for Women	1
EMHA - Rock Court Project	1
Connexions (Mansfield)	1
Connexions	1
Bassetlaw District Council	1
Ashfield District Council (Homelessness Dept)	1
HOPE	1
Alcohol Problems Advisory Service (APAS)	1
NACRO Housing - Vivian Avenue Housing Scheme	1
Newark & Sherwood District Council	1
Newark Emmaus Trust	1
Outlet, c/o Interchange	1
Rushcliffe Homes	1
EAW – Outreach Service	1
Notts Social Services (Aftercare)	1
SORTED	1
Kirkby Youth Housing Trust	1
Total	167

Type Of Rough Sleeping

Agencies taking part in the Homeless Watch survey were asked to provide further information about the type of rough sleeping. Guidelines for the survey asked people to classify rough sleepers according to one of two types defined by the Office Of The Deputy Prime Minister. These are:

- People sleeping, or bedded down, in the open air (such as on the streets, or in doorways, parks or bus shelters)
- OR
- People in buildings or other places not designed for habitation (such as barns, sheds, car parks, cars, derelict boats, stations, or ‘bashes’.

In many cases respondents did not use these definitions, but using the answers supplied the data was categorised wherever possible to one of these two types. Unfortunately this data was missing from 97 of the rough sleepers’ forms, but for those where data was available the results are shown in Table B4. This shows that the majority were sleeping in the open air (42 people or 60% of those where valid data was available), with the remaining 40% (28 people) sleeping in a building or place not designed for habitation.

Table B4: Type Of Rough Sleeping

Slept Rough Type	Male		Female		Gender Not Stated		Totals	
	Num	%	Num	%	Num	%	Num	%
Building Or Other Place Not Designed For Habitation	24	18	3	13	1	13	28	17
Sleeping Or Bedded Down In The Open Air	33	24	7	29	2	25	42	25
Not Stated	78	58	14	58	5	63	97	58
Totals	135	100	24	100	8	100	167	100

Age Of Rough Sleepers

As noted in Section One of this report, male rough sleepers considerably outnumber female rough sleepers and table B5 shows that this applies at all age ranges. Over 50% of the male rough sleepers were aged 25 and over, with the majority of these being in the 25-40 year old age bracket. Just under a third (29%) of the female rough sleepers were also in this age bracket. The date of birth data was missing from just under a third of the returns.

Table B5: Age Of Rough Sleepers

Age	Men		Women		Gender Not Stated		Total	
	Num	%	Num	%	Num	%	Num	%
16-17	7	5	3	13	0	0	10	6
18 – 24	18	13	4	17	3	38	25	15
25 – 40	55	41	7	29	1	13	63	38
41 – 59	13	10	2	8	0	0	15	9
60 and over	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Missing Data	42	31	8	33	4	50	54	32
Totals	135	100	24	100	8	100	167	100

Ethnic Origin Of Rough Sleepers

The analysis of ethnic origin in Section One of this report concluded that people from a non-White: British ethnic group were over-represented among the survey group compared to the profile from the 2001 UK Census. The ethnic profile of rough sleepers does not replicate this trend, and if we exclude the three cases where data was missing the percentage of rough sleepers from a White: British ethnic group is 93.3%, slightly higher than the Census profile for Nottinghamshire of 91.8%. If the ethnic profile for the whole survey had been replicated among the rough sleepers we would have expected to see 138 rough sleepers from a White British background, rather than 153.

The numbers of rough sleepers among other ethnic groups is lower than the profile which would be expected given the results for all survey clients. The exception to this is those from either a Black/Black British Other or White: Irish ethnic origin, although the numbers are so small that no firm conclusions should be made. Rough sleepers from a Mixed White & Black Caribbean ethnic background comprised 19% of all those from this ethnic background recorded by the survey. This appears high but the actual number is still slightly below what would have been expected, given that rough sleepers make up 24% of the survey clients. However, **it is recommended that the ethnic origin pattern of rough sleepers is monitored in any future homelessness surveys and in particular that the ethnic profile of rough sleepers is compared to the rates for homeless clients as a whole.**

Table B6: Ethnic Origin Of Rough Sleepers

Ethnic Origin	Male		Female		Gender Not Stated		Homeless Watch Total		2001 Census For All Notts (incl City)
	Num	%	Num	%	Num	%	Num	%	%
Asian/Asian British: Indian	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.1
Asian/Asian British: Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.2
Asian/Asian British: Pakistani	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.1
Black/Black British: African	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.2
Black/Black British: Caribbean	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.1
Black/Black British: Other	1	0.7	0	0	0	0	1	0.6	0.1
Mixed: Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.2
Mixed: White & Asian	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.3
Mixed: White & Black African	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.1
Mixed: White & Black Caribbean	3	2.2	0	0	0	0	3	1.8	0.8
White: British	124	91.9	22	91.7	7	87.5	153	91.6	91.8
White: Irish	1	0.7	0	0	1	12.5	2	1.2	0.8
White: Other	3	2.2	0	0	0	0	3	1.8	1.5
Other	2	1.5	0	0	0	0	2	1.2	N/A
Missing Data	1	0.7	2	8.3	0	0	3	1.8	N/A
Total:	135	100	24	100	8	100	167	100	N/A

Rough Sleepers: History Of Being In Care

Table B7 shows that 25 of the people sleeping rough have had a previous history of being in the care of a local authority. The expected figure from the profile of all survey clients is given in the final column of the table. This shows that 18 rather than 25 rough sleepers with a history of being of care would have been expected from this analysis, so people with a history of care are over-represented. However, this over-representation is mainly accounted for by people in the 25-40 age range, when social services have no on-going 'looked after' duties.

Table B7: Rough Sleepers Who Have Been In Care By Age

Age	Male		Female		Not Stated		Total		Expected Numbers Given Profile For All HW Returns Number
	Num	%	Num	%	Num	%	Num	%	
16 -17	1	5	1	17	0	0	2	8	3
18-24	4	21	1	17	0	0	5	20	6
25 – 40	11	58	1	17	0	0	12	48	7
41 – 59	1	5	0	0	0	0	1	4	1
60 and over	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Missing Data	2	11	3	50	0	0	5	20	2
Total:	19	100	6	100	0	N/A	25	100	18

Rough Sleepers Support Needs

The profile of support needs for those sleeping rough differs widely from the profile of support needs for all clients captured by the survey. Table B8 summarises the support needs of rough sleepers and includes an additional column at the end of the table which shows the percentage of all clients requiring a particular type of support so that a comparison can be made. With the exception of support due to a physical disability, rough sleepers were more likely than other survey respondents to have support needs in every area.

The most dramatic difference relates to support for drug abuse, with rough sleepers being more than twice as likely to need support with this area. This finding is consistent with the rough sleepers recorded by the Supporting People Unmet Needs Survey, which found that 68% of rough sleepers had drug problems. Last year's Snapshot Survey of homelessness in Ashfield also recorded that rough sleepers were more likely to have drug abuse support needs.

In common with drug needs there is a close correlation between the figures for support needs identified in the Supporting People Unmet Needs Survey and the Homeless Watch survey. The relevant figures from the SP Survey are:

- Drug Abuse, 68%
- Ex-Offender, 31% (this also included people at risk of offending)
- Alcohol Abuse, 23%
- Mental Health, 18%
- Learning Disabilities, 5%
- Physical Disability, 4%

Taken together these figures provide clear evidence that rough sleepers are more likely to require support than other homeless people and this is reinforced by the small percentage of rough sleepers who are shown as having no support needs, namely 8% compared to over a third of all Homeless Watch clients (although please note the caveat to the data on no support needs on page 17).

Table B8: Rough Sleepers' Support Needs

Support Needs	Male		Female		Gender Not Stated		Totals		Expected % From Profile For All HW Returns
	Num	%	Num	%	Num	%	Num	%	Number
Drug Abuse	91	67	11	46	6	75	108	65	32%
Ex-Offender	49	36	1	4	4	50	54	32	19%
Mental Health	28	21	6	25	2	25	36	22	15%
Alcohol Abuse	30	22	5	21	0	0	35	21	13%
Other	12	9	2	8	1	13	15	9	16%
Learning Difficulties	6	4	4	17	2	25	12	7	6%
Physically Disabled	1	1	1	4	0	0	2	1	3%
Totals:	217	N/A	30	N/A	15	N/A	262	N/A	
<i>No Support Needs Stated</i>	10	7	3	13	1	13	14	8	33%

Rough Sleepers: Number Of Support Needs.

Given the analysis from Table B8, we may expect to find a greater number of multiple support needs among rough sleepers. Table B9 shows the frequency by gender of rough sleepers with one or more support needs. For comparative purposes the final column in the table shows the numbers that would be expected if the profile from all survey clients was replicated among rough sleepers. The table shows that rough sleepers are more likely to have multiple support needs than a 'typical' survey person, although the number of rough sleepers with four or more support needs was low and not inconsistent with the frequency among all survey clients. In common with the analysis for all clients, male rough sleepers were more likely to have multiple support needs than women.

Table B9 is on the next page

Table B9: Multiple Support Needs Among Rough Sleepers

Number Of Support Needs	Male		Female		No Gender Stated		Total		Expected Numbers From Profile For All HW Returns
	Num	%	Num	%	Num	%	Num	%	Number
One	58	46	14	67	3	43	75	49	66
Two	45	36	6	29	2	29	53	35	32
Three	19	15	0	0	1	14	20	13	10
Four	3	2	1	5	0	0	4	3	3
Five	0	0	0	0	1	14	1	1	1
Totals	125	100	21	100	7	100	153	100	112

Where Rough Sleepers Would Be Willing To Live

The responses by people rough sleeping to the question of where they would be willing to live shows some differences to the responses for survey clients as a whole. The figures for Ashfield and Bassetlaw, Broxtowe, Newark & Sherwood and Outside Nottinghamshire are within 3.5% of the figures for rough sleepers. However, the percentages for rough sleepers willing to live in Mansfield and Rushcliffe are 10% and 9% higher respectively. Once again the most dramatic difference relates to Nottingham City. **The percentage of rough sleepers willing to live in Nottingham City, is 22% higher than for Homeless Watch clients as a whole.** The very high figure for rough sleepers willing to live in Nottingham City (70%) provides some further evidence to support the analysis in Table B2 which concluded that 71% of rough sleepers were based in Nottingham City

Table B10: Where Rough Sleepers Would Be Willing To Live

Where client wants to live	Male		Female		Gender Not Stated		Totals		% Of Rough Sleepers Willing To Live In This Area
	Num	%	Num	%	Num	%	Num	%	%
Ashfield	23	8	7	10	1	8	31	8	19
Bassetlaw	24	8	4	6	1	8	29	8	17
Broxtowe	18	6	6	9	1	8	25	7	15
Gedling	27	9	7	10	1	8	35	9	21
Mansfield	38	13	10	15	0	0	48	13	29
Newark & Sherwood	23	7	4	6	1	8	28	7	17
Nottingham City	96	32	18	27	3	23	117	31	70
Rushcliffe	29	10	7	10	0	0	36	9	22
Other/Outside Notts	18	6	2	3	1	8	21	6	13
Not Stated	6	2	2	3	4	31	12	3	7
Totals	302	100	67	100	13	100	382	100	N/A

Rough Sleepers Connection To The Areas In Which They Are Willing To Live

Table B10 shows the ways in which people who were rough sleeping were connected to the areas they requested to live. More than one answer could be given to this question hence the higher total than the number of rough sleepers. Compared to all survey clients the overall percentages are very similar. The only notable variation was that rough sleepers were 6% more likely to have lived in the area they requested for six months or more when compared to all those in the survey.

Table B10: Rough Sleepers Connection To Areas In Which They Are Willing To Live

Client Connection	Men		Women		Gender Not Stated		Totals	
	Num	%	Num	%	Num	%	Num	%
Employment	5	3	2	7	0	0	7	4
Family	49	31	12	41	4	36	65	33
Lived In Area (Less than 6 mths)	8	5	2	7	0	0	10	5
Lived In Area (More than 6 mths)	79	49	9	31	4	36	92	46
Other	18	11	3	10	3	27	24	12
Not Stated	1	1	1	3	0	0	2	1
Totals	160	100	29	100	11	100	200	100

Rough Sleepers Last Settled Area Of Residence

In common with the responses to this question for all Homeless Watch respondents in Section One, a significant amount of data was missing. 39% of the forms for rough sleepers failed to record their last settled area of residence meaning that any analysis of this data is problematic.

Table B11: Rough Sleepers Last Settled Area Of Residence

Local Authority Where Client Was Last Settled	Male		Female		Not Stated		Totals		Figures From Table B1: Rough Sleeper's LA Of Origin	
	Num	%	Num	%	Num	%	Num	%	Num	%
Ashfield	3	2	0	0	0	0	3	2	4	2
Bassetlaw	4	3	0	0	0	0	4	2	4	2
Broxtowe	2	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	1
Gedling	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
Mansfield	10	7	2	8	0	0	12	7	25	15
Newark & Sherwood	6	4	0	0	0	0	6	4	5	3
Nottingham City	37	27	9	38	2	25	48	29	59	35
Rushcliffe	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	2
Other/Outside Nottinghamshire	19	14	6	25	1	13	26	16	35	21
Not Stated	52	39	7	29	5	63	64	38	29	17
Totals	135	100	24	100	8	100	167	100	167	100

Reasons Why Rough Sleepers Became Homeless

Table B12 lists the reasons cited by people sleeping rough for becoming homeless. Once again the final column of this table shows the expected numbers if the pattern for all survey clients was replicated for rough sleepers. Using this method shows that the people sleeping rough are more than twice as likely to be homeless due to drug use affecting their ability to access accommodation and are also 70% more likely to have become homeless as a result of leaving prison or custody. 30% of rough sleepers cited at least one of these two reasons for becoming homeless, compared to 17% of all Homeless Watch clients. Indeed drug use meaning the person could not access accommodation was the most common reason for homelessness cited by rough sleepers. It is interesting to note that these two areas (drug use and leaving prison/custody) correlate with the higher than expected figures for support to rough sleepers for their drug abuse and offending behaviour, identified in table B8.

Conversely homelessness due to the violent breakdown of a relationship with an associated person or partner is significantly below what would be expected, and this is almost certainly due to the fact that the majority of rough sleepers are men. As noted in Section One, women were significantly more likely to be homeless for these reasons compared to men. However, the 15 rough sleepers who cited becoming homeless because of 'other forms of violence' was two-thirds higher than would be expected given the frequency for all survey clients.

In common with all those in the survey, parents, relatives and friends being no longer willing to accommodate people was a common reason for homelessness for rough sleepers. Together these circumstances led to homelessness for 22% of rough sleepers. 23 rough sleepers (8%) cited rent arrears from a local authority, housing association or private sector tenancy as a reason for their homelessness.

Table B12 is on the next page.

Table: B12: Reasons Why Rough Sleepers Became Homeless

Reason Homeless	Male		Female		Gender Not Specified		Totals		Expected Numbers From Profile For All HW Returns Number
	Num	%	Num	%	Num	%	Num	%	
Assured Short-hold Termination	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4
Drug Use Meaning Client Unable To Access Accommodation	47	20	7	16	4	27	58	20	26
Housing Association Rent Arrears	7	3	1	2	1	7	9	3	6
Local Authority Rent Arrears	10	4	1	2	0	0	11	4	10
Private Sector Rent Arrears	2	1	1	2	0	0	3	1	3
Mortgage Arrears	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Leaving Care	2	1	1	2	0	0	3	1	3
Leaving Hospital	3	1	1	2	0	0	4	1	4
Leaving Prison/custody	28	12	1	2	0	0	29	10	17
Required To Leave NASS accommodation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Parents No Longer Willing To Accommodate	34	14	9	21	3	20	46	16	44
Other Relatives/Friends No Longer Willing To Accommodate	12	5	5	12	1	7	18	6	24
Non-violent Breakdown Of Relationship With Partner	16	7	0	0	0	0	16	6	13
Violent Breakdown Of Relationship Involving Associated Persons	1	0	3	7	0	0	1	0	8
Violent Breakdown Of Relationship With Partner	4	2	3	7	1	7	8	3	14
Other forms of violence	13	6	2	5	0	0	15	5	9
Other harassment	9	4	1	2	1	7	11	4	9
Other reasons for less of tenancy	6	3	1	2	0	0	7	2	6
Other	33	14	4	9	2	13	39	13	35
Not Stated	7	3	2	5	2	13	11	4	12
Totals	235	100	43	100	15	100	290	100	249

Type Of Accommodation Requested By Rough Sleepers

Table B13 summarises the type of accommodation requested by rough sleepers and again includes an additional column to show the expected results if the pattern for all clients was replicated for rough sleepers. Please note that clients could choose more than one type of accommodation. **The figures for rough sleepers requesting lodgings is twice that which would be expected, and rough sleepers made up just under 50% of all clients willing to live in lodgings.** Rough Sleepers were also more likely to request accommodation in a bedsit, flat, shared house or supported housing

than all Homeless Watch clients. Given that most rough sleepers are single people the profile of the accommodation requested is not inconsistent with what would be expected.

Table B13: Type Of Accommodation Requested By Rough Sleepers

Accommodation Type Requested	Male		Female		Gender Not Specified		Totals		Expected Numbers From Profile For All HW Returns Number
	Num	%	Num	%	Num	%	Num	%	
Own Flat	98	30	17	30	6	32	121	30	100
Own Bedsit	59	18	9	16	3	16	71	17	44
Supported Housing	55	17	10	18	2	11	67	17	48
Shared House	39	12	7	13	2	11	48	12	28
Own House	34	10	6	11	1	5	41	10	57
Lodgings	25	8	3	5	2	11	30	7	15
Other	13	4	3	5	0	0	16	4	18
Not Stated	8	2	1	2	3	16	12	3	13
Totals	331	100	56	100	19	100	406	100	323

Outcome Of Contact With Agency

The outcome of contact by rough sleepers with the agencies who participated in the Homeless Watch survey shows significant differences compared to the results for all Homeless Watch clients. As with the previous survey question, more than one outcome could be recorded and these are summarised in table B14. If we consider accommodation outcomes first, we can see that compared to the profile suggested by the results for all Homeless Watch clients, **people rough sleeping were more likely to secure emergency accommodation, but less likely to secure temporary or permanent housing.** In total, 16% of rough sleepers secured some form of accommodation, compared to 24% of all Homeless Watch clients. Over 55% of all rough sleepers were given 'general advice' by the agencies they contacted, compared to just over 40% of all Homeless Watch clients.

Table B14 is on the next page.

Table B14: Outcome Of Interview With Agency

Outcome	Male		Female		Gender Not Stated		Totals		Expected Numbers From Profile For All HW Returns
	Num	%	Num	%	Num	%	Num	%	
Emergency Accommodation	9	6.08	3	10.71	1	10	13	6.99	9
Temporary Accommodation	7	4.73	2	7.14	2	20	11	5.91	23
Permanent Accommodation	3	2.03	0	0	0	0	3	1.61	8
Ref To Other Agency	15	10.14	5	17.86	0	0	20	10.75	28
General Advice	76	51.35	15	53.57	2	20	93	50	68
Other	10	6.76	0	0	0	0	10	5.38	25
Not Stated	28	18.92	3	10.71	5	50	36	19.35	36
Totals	148	100	28	100	10	100	186	100	197

Whether Rough Sleepers Homelessness Was Resolved

Given the lower numbers of rough sleepers securing any form of accommodation we would expect that the figures for resolving homelessness would be lower than for all Homeless Watch clients, and this is the case. The final column in table B15 shows the expected figures if the pattern from all Homeless Watch returns was replicated for rough sleepers. The agencies which completed the forms judged that **homelessness was resolved for 9 male rough sleepers and no female rough sleepers – only 5% of the total.** This compares to homelessness being resolved for 15% of all Homeless Watch clients.

Table B15: Homelessness Resolved

Homelessness Resolved?	Male		Female		Gender Not Stated		All		Expected Numbers From Profile For All HW Returns
	Num	%	Num	%	Num	%	Num	%	
Yes	9	7	0	0	0	0	9	5	25
No	106	79	20	83	6	75	132	79	102
Not Stated	20	15	4	17	2	25	26	16	40
Totals	135	100	24	100	8	100	167	100	167

January 2005

Appendix One

Agencies Which Participated In The Homeless Watch Survey

Appendix One: Agencies Which Took Part In The Homeless Watch Survey

The following agencies made one or more returns for people who presented as homeless during the survey. Agencies which recorded 'Nil Returns', are listed on the following page.

Agencies Which Made Returns For Homeless People	
Actions (Sneinton Health Centre)	HOPE
Aftercare CJIT & Arrest Referral (Worksop)	Hucknall and District Voluntary Advice Centre
Alcohol Liaison Nurse (Kings Mill Hospital)	Hucknall Nightstop
Alcohol Problems Advisory Service (APAS)	Karibu House Foyer
Amber House	Kirkby Youth Housing Trust
Ashfield CAB	Mansfield Young Person's Day Centre
Ashfield District Council (Homelessness Sec)	NACRO Housing - Vivian Avenue Housing Scheme
Ashfield Homes Ltd, Council Offices	National Probation Service Nottinghamshire
Ashwood Trust (Kirkby In Ashfield)	Nene Housing Society Ltd
Base 51	New Roots Housing Project
Bassetlaw District Council	Newark & Sherwood District Council
Bassetlaw Women's Aid	Newark and Sherwood Foyer
Broxtowe Borough Council	Newark Emmaus Trust
Broxtowe Borough Council - Eastwood Office	Nottingham City Council (Housing Choice)
Broxtowe Borough Mediation Service	Nottingham Community Housing Association
Broxtowe CMHT - The Hope Centre	Nottingham Contact and Assessment Team
Building Blocks Solutions	Nottingham Health Team for Homeless People
Central Women's Aid	Nottingham Rough Sleepers Outreach Team
Connexions (Eastwood)	Nottinghamshire Social Services - Bassetlaw
Connexions (Gedling)	Nottinghamshire Social Services - Newark
Connexions (Mansfield)	Notts County Council - Social Services (Aftercare)
Connexions (Nottingham)	Notts County Council Social Services (Aftercare)
Connexions (South Broxtowe Team)	Notts County Council Social Services (Kings Mill Hospital).
Connexions (Worksop)	Notts Rural Community Council
COS East	Outlet, c/o Interchange
COS South	Ozanam House
Department of Psychological Medicine (QMC)	Retford Action Centre
EAW Outreach	Roshni - Nottingham Asian Women's Aid
Emergency Accommodation for Women	Rushcliffe Borough Council - Housing Services
EMHA - Rock Court Project	Rushcliffe Homes
Emmanuel House Day Centre	Shelter NHAS (Mansfield)
Forensic Community Team	Shelter NHAS (Nottingham)
Framework HA - London Road Project	SORTED
Framework HA - Noelle House	Step Forward Single Homeless Project
Framework HA - One Stop Shop	Stepping Stones (Eastwood)
Framework HA - Potter St Project	Stonham Housing Association
Framework HA - Tenancy Support (Drug Scheme)	The Maltings (North Notts Drug Service)
Framework HA - Vine Terrace	Women's Aid Advice Centre
Framework-Handel Street Day Centre	Youth Offending Team
Friary Drop-in	
Gedling Borough Council	
HLG Accommodation Access Team	
HLG Mental Health Support Team	

Agencies Which Indicated They Did Not See Any Homeless People During The Survey Fortnight
Acorn (Lifeskills) Project
Action Housing Association
Arnold Police Station
Ashfield Links Forum
Ashfield Women's Centre
Bassetlaw Community Mental Health Service
Bestwood Advice Centre
Broxtowe Women's Project
Bulwell Advice Centre
Clifton Advice Centre
Clifton District Housing Office
Connexions (Hucknall)
Dr Woods MJ & Partners
Framework HA - Colville House
Framework HA - Park House Project
Framework HA - Somerville House Project
HLG Resettlement Team
Holy Trinity Church, Nottingham
Jobcentre Plus - Hucknall
Learning Support, Sutton Centre Community College
Longhurst Housing Association
Mansfield & Ashfield Women's Aid
Midlands Women's Aid
Moveahead
Notts County Council County Contact Point
NCH - Number 28 Child & Family Counselling Service
Newark Women's Aid
North Notts Community Forensic Team
Nottingham Alcohol and Drug Team
Nottingham Community HA – Head Office
Nottingham Community HA - Dale Street
Nottingham East & Carlton Mental Health Team
Nottingham South & West Community Mental Health Team
Ollerton and District CAB
Patient and Advocacy Liaison Services
The Langold Centre
Tuxford Mine of Information