



SURVEY OF NEEDS AND PROVISION

EAST MIDLANDS

2010

INTRODUCTION

BACKGROUND TO SURVEY

Major progress has been made in tackling homelessness over the past two decades. Successive governments have given priority to the issue and developed strategies and initiatives to address it. Partnership working with local authorities and the voluntary sector has ensured that change has happened on the ground. The homelessness sector has come on in leaps and bounds since the late 1980s and early 1990s and is working with the most socially excluded to motivate and support them into moving on to lead fulfilling lives. The challenge for the next decade is to build on this progress and for the next government, local authorities, the voluntary sector and homeless people themselves to work together to end all forms of homelessness once and for all.

A fundamental cornerstone for ending homelessness and rough sleeping is the Places of Change programme and approach. This encapsulates the ethos and approach of the sector in the 21st century. It provides welcoming, high quality-buildings; motivated staff, empowering services and the involvement of the people using the service. This, combined with the recent ending rough sleeping by 2012 target, places us in an ideal position to succeed in our challenge of ending homelessness.

The Survey of Needs and Provision (SNAP) provides us with the facts and figures to chart the changes happening to the sector, organisations and to individuals becoming homeless.

Homeless Link published the first SNAP in February 2008, followed by the second in 2009. This 2010 report provides an updated picture of the extent and nature of specific services for single homeless people and couples without dependent children in England, and the clients that use them.

The report is based on the findings of a telephone survey of homelessness provider organisations conducted on behalf of Homeless Link in November and December 2009 and on information taken from the Homeless UK (HUK) database. This year, the findings have been condensed to provide this summary report.

WHAT CAN THE SURVEY DO FOR YOU?

SNAP allows service providers, local authorities, commissioners and policy makers to see where services fit into the national picture. It provides key evidence on the characteristics of homeless people and their service needs. Information in SNAP can be used in the following ways:

- As supporting evidence in proposals for service provision
- To inform strategies for homelessness policy and services
- To help determine decisions about awards of contracts for service provision
- To complement other evidence as to the needs and background of homeless people
- To begin to benchmark your service against wider provision.

SCOPE

SNAP covers homelessness services in England provided to single homeless people and couples without dependent children. Services for families were excluded from the analysis.

The report covers three types of services – day centres, direct access hostels and second stage accommodation projects. Services primarily listed according to other definitions, such as advice agencies, were not included. It does not cover outreach services or floating support.

Day centres provide services primarily for single people and couples who are homeless, insecurely housed or in temporary accommodation. Alongside food, drink and practical help,

these projects often provide support and advice services around substance misuse, housing, mental health, health, employment and education. Direct Access Hostels are projects that are open all year round for single homeless people and couples without dependent children, who are rough sleepers or in immediate or emergency need of accommodation. These usually accommodate people on a short-term basis. Second stage accommodation projects provide longer-term accommodation for homeless people, often to people moving on from direct access hostels.

Where a project provides more than one type of service, for example where a building managed by an organisation contains a day centre and a hostel, questions have been asked about one type of service only. In addition, where a project did not agree with the category they were listed as under HUK, the survey has been completed using the respondent's self-definition of the project.

DATA

The data source for all tables and charts in this report derives from the Homeless Link telephone survey, unless otherwise stated.

Telephone Survey

This year's telephone survey is similar to the previous two years' surveys although the wording of some questions has been improved, a few questions have been added, and some questions have been removed. In addition, it was possible to complete a pilot survey with 50 projects to refine the wording of questions as well as answer options available to survey respondents. This year, 500 projects were surveyed, representing almost a third of applicable projects on the HUK database. The survey was conducted on behalf of Homeless Link by a private research company, Vision Twentyone. The survey took approximately 50 minutes to complete per respondent.

Homeless UK data

This data source was established in 2005 by Resource Information Service (RIS) funded by CLG. RIS, which researches and publishes information about homelessness and other services to improve referrals and access to provision, has now merged with Homeless Link.

Homeless UK data is classified according to service type and covers some services that are not exclusively for homeless people (e.g. Citizens Advice Bureaux). This report uses data on day centres, direct access hostels and second stage accommodation. Projects are defined by their referral route, so sometimes one project may have more than one geographical location (i.e. a series of shared houses with one central referral system). Big organisations (e.g. Salvation Army) are likely to have a number of projects.

The data on day centres and direct access hostels on Homeless UK has been researched and built up over many years. Coverage checking helps ensure that data is as comprehensive as possible, subject to inevitable issues around boundaries relating to varying definitions of services. Data on second stage accommodation on Homeless UK is particularly subject to varying definitions and boundary issues (eg projects that serve both homeless people and other client groups).

SURVEY METHOD

The sample

Using the November 2009 HUK data as the population, a sample of 28 services was selected in the East Midlands region which represents 6% of the total national sample.

The sample was selected at random from the HUK database. When projects were contacted, the hostel or project manager was asked to complete the survey, rather than chief executives or other staff. Where an interview was not successfully secured, an alternative, randomly

selected, contact was used until the required 'quota' of services of each type (day centres, direct access hostels and second stage accommodation projects) was reached.

The questionnaire

As stated, the questionnaire used in last year's survey was amended – a few questions were added, some were dropped, and the wording of others was changed. The questionnaire used can be accessed on the Homeless Link SNAP webpage¹.

¹ <http://www.homeless.org.uk/snap>

THE SECTOR

In this chapter, data from both the telephone survey and the HUK database has been used to give information on the sector within this region. As well as the number of projects in the survey sample, and the sector as a whole, this section will be looking at whether projects have any empty beds on an average night, the number of rooms for couples, and the number of clients day centres see on an average day.

In addition, this section will be looking at funding in the sector, what projects' primary funding streams are and how the funding amounts they receive from each source compare to the previous year's amounts.

HOMELESS UK DATA MARCH 2010

When looking at the size of the sector, only day centres, direct access hostels and 2nd stage accommodation projects have been included. These figures do not incorporate specialist services, outreach teams or floating support teams. In addition, the figures refer to projects listed on Homeless UK (HUK), meaning that any changes in numbers may be due to the database becoming more complete, rather than more projects actually opening.

Type of project	In the sample	On HUK
Day centres	7	21
Direct access hostels	6	23
2 nd stage accommodation projects	15	105
TOTAL	28	149

ROOMS FOR COUPLES

A new question was included in this year's survey to provide us with some information on how many rooms specifically for couples are available in accommodation based projects. In the East Midlands:

- 10% of accommodation-based projects have rooms for couples (2)
- The 2 projects both reported have 2 rooms for couples

PEOPLE ACCESSING DAY CENTRES

The 7 day centres in the survey reported seeing an average of 60 people per day, with answers ranging from 30 to 100.

EMPTY BEDS

In order to get a sense of how high demand for services is, and also where there is spare capacity, we asked projects whether they had empty beds on an average night. Caution should be taken in looking at these figures as some projects will have some specialist provision and so may have an empty bed whilst waiting for someone with the relevant support needs to be referred:

- 90% of the 21 accommodation-based projects reported never having any empty beds, and for the 10% that do, answers ranged from 1 to 2 beds on average night.

FUNDING

Primary Funding Stream by service type

Respondents were asked to identify their current primary funding stream:

Funding stream	Day centres		Hostels		2 nd stage accommodation projects		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Supporting people	1	14	5	83	13	87	19	68
Fundraising	4	57	0	0	0	0	4	14
Don't know/can't say	1	14	0	0	0	0	1	4
Benefit payments	0	0	0	0	1	7	1	4
Other local authority funding (local grant etc.)	1	14	1	17	0	0	2	7
Other	0	0	0	0	1	7	1	4
Rent & service charges	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Social services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Health	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
LAA/LSP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	7		6		15		28	

Funding Sources compared to previous year

In addition to asking projects about their primary funding stream, projects were given a list of funding sources and asked whether they received any funding from that source, and whether the amount received had increased or decreased.

	Funding source ²		New		Increase since last year		Decrease since last year		Same as last year		Don't know	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Supporting people	20	71	0	0	2	7	5	18	13	46	2	7
Social services	3	11	0	0	1	4	0	0	2	7	2	7
Other local authority funding	8	29	0	0	1	4	1	4	6	21	4	14
LAA/LSP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	21
Criminal justice	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	2	7
Substance misuse services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	7
Health	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	3	11
Employment and education	1	4	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	2	7

² % calculated by deducting number of projects answering 'don't know' or 'not a funding source'

	Funding source ²		New		Increase since last year		Decrease since last year		Same as last year		Don't know	
Rent & service charges	14	67	0	0	6	29	0	0	8	38	2	10
Benefit payments	18	86	0	0	12	57	0	0	6	29	1	5
Fundraising	16	57	0	0	3	11	2	7	11	39	5	18
Legal services commission	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	7
Places of change	2	7	1	4	0	0	1	4	0	0	2	7
Other	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	0	0

ORGANISATIONS

Alongside more concrete data on whether projects refuse clients and why, this chapter explores what project managers feel are the most pressing issues and biggest service provision gaps in their area. As well as data on refusals, this chapter provides figures for local connection policies.

BIGGEST GAP IN SERVICES

Respondents were asked what they felt the biggest gap in service provision in their area is. This was a new question for this survey. This was also an open question with no specified answer options for the respondents. This means that only one gap per respondent was recorded without them being prompted in any way.

29% of projects in the East Midlands reported that move-on was the biggest gap in service provision, including accommodation for young people and single men. A further 21% reported mental health services to be the biggest gap in services for clients, including counselling and self-harm coping strategies. Other answers included services for Eastern Europeans, older homeless people and drug and alcohol services.

List of answers given:

- A more accessible counselling service.
- Adult counselling.
- No direct access hostels available locally in our area.
- At the moment the urgent need is the need for translation for people in Eastern Europe so we can deliver in-depth support. Also, we need to be able to have sufficient information about their background so we can know who is genuine and what their past experiences are. Accessibility of private information is a big issue.
- Direct access to accommodation, move on accommodation for specific groups.
- Drug and alcohol services.
- Enough beds for people to sleep in, providing the life skills/aftercare for care leavers.
- Hard to get their community care grant for when they move on- it takes too long.
- Lack of affordable housing.
- Lack of move-on accommodation, lack of transport to get to college.
- Lack of social or affordable housing. And maybe suitable day time activities also.
- Learning disabilities e.g. ADHD/Asperger's have very little support.
- Low level counselling/anger management etc.
- Mental health services - poor access and poor support.
- Mental health services - they might get treated at a mental health institute but then they are released straight onto the street. So then it's down to us to try helping them.
- Move-on accommodation.
- Move-on accommodation for young people.
- Not too sure, big gaps for housing for young people.
- Prison leavers' accommodation, gaps in mental health, drink or drug issues, generally lack of homeless accommodation in area.
- Providing accommodation for homeless people over the age of 25.
- Services aimed at people struggling with alcohol problems.

- Services helping people with problems related to alcohol.
- Sorting out housing benefits for residents when they first move in.
- Specialist mental health, particularly self harm coping strategies.
- Teenage parents.
- The single male adults' emergency housing.
- The young people have difficulty accessing suitable activities and because of the location of colleges the youngsters find it very of putting to travel such long distances, also transport is very expensive from our location to the colleges.
- Younger people and older people services.

TOP ISSUE FACING PROJECTS

Project managers were also asked what the top 3 issues facing their projects were. The following analysis given is based on the top issue given only, as some projects did not provide a 2nd or 3rd issue. Again, this question was unprompted, and respondents were not given a set list of choices.

The issues that projects reported ranged from inadequate services for drug users and Eastern European clients to high demand and a lack of move on accommodation. The most common answer given was funding (54%).

List of answers given:

- Accessing specialist health services.
- Demand is outstripping supply.
- Drugs and alcohol.
- Drugs and alcohol.
- Effectively moving people on - sometimes have people coming back as they found that they weren't ready to move on - we needed to prepare them better.
- Funding affects everything, trying to secure it for future.
- Funding cuts.
- Funding for supporting people.
- Funding streams.
- Funding. (x8)
- Lack of client motivation.
- Loss of premises.
- Move-on accommodation.
- Need more move-on accommodation
- No local job centre for clients.
- People from Eastern Europe and supporting them.
- Relationships with families.
- Security of funding.
- Space to expand the premises.
- Supporting people changes and change in government, ring fencing, funding.
- Wider range of referrals.

REFUSALS

Refusal reason	% of projects (N) refusing access
Did not meet project criteria	36 (10)
History of arson	29 (8)
Sexual Offence	18 (5)
Project is full	18 (5)
Intoxicated by alcohol/drugs	18 (5)
Previously banned	14 (4)
Never refuse access	7 (2)
Mental health problem	7 (2)
No recourse to public funds	0 (0)
No local connection	0 (0)
Other	39 (11)
Total N	28

Other refusal reasons:

- Depends on their support needs and referrals.
- If clients are in another hostel we would deny them our service.
- If pose a significant risk, active criminal, extreme arson or violence, problematic drug and alcohol users, would depend on their referrals.
- If their behaviour is inappropriate.
- If they have been excluded before or have history of extreme violence.
- If too high needs or risk.
- Risk assessment.
- Risk issues.
- To high risk to others.
- Unmanageable risk, someone who can't be managed by loan worker.
- We refuse violent offenders and people with serious personality disorders.
- Would be down to the referrals.

Projects were asked how many people were refused in an average week. 16 projects gave an estimate, with the most common answer being 0 (8 projects). Answers ranged from 1 to 20. 12 projects did not give an answer.

LOCAL CONNECTION

Homeless people often have, or want, to leave the area they are from for a number of reasons, meaning that issues can arise when trying to access services in another area. Many agencies think there is no point referring clients to services if they do not have a 'local connection', such as having lived or worked in the area for a substantial time period.

86% of projects in the East Midlands sample accept clients from outside the borough or district (24), with the most common split of clients in projects that do being 90% from within and 10% from outside the borough or district. The average split that was reported is 82%/18%.

ACCESS TO SERVICES

Type of service	Service available ³		Deliver in-house, by own staff		Deliver in-house, in partnership with external agency		Can refer clients to an external service	
	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)
Drug services								
Structured treatment – residential detox/rehab	96	(27)	7	(2)	7	(2)	93	(26)
Structured treatment – day programmes	96	(27)	7	(2)	7	(2)	86	(24)
Harm minimisation	100	(28)	25	(7)	14	(4)	75	(21)
Needle exchange	100	(28)	11	(3)	4	(1)	89	(25)
Blood borne virus screening/ vaccination	100	(28)	0	(0)	7	(2)	96	(27)
Alcohol services								
Structured treatment – residential detox/rehab	93	(26)	7	(2)	0	(0)	93	(26)
Structured treatment – day programmes	93	(26)	11	(3)	0	(0)	89	(25)
Harm minimisation	96	(27)	21	(6)	7	(2)	82	(23)
Mental health services								
CMHT services	100	(28)	4	(1)	18	(5)	93	(26)
Other talking therapies	96	(27)	29	(8)	11	(3)	82	(23)
Other anger management courses	96	(27)	18	(5)	11	(3)	89	(25)
Other mediation/ relationship counselling	96	(27)	25	(7)	18	(5)	82	(23)
Other	18	(5)	4	(1)	4	(1)	11	(3)
Physical health services								
Nursing care	96	(27)	0	(0)	21	(6)	86	(24)
General Practitioner	100	(28)	0	(0)	21	(6)	89	(25)
Dental care	96	(27)	0	(0)	0	(0)	96	(27)
Alternative therapies	96	(27)	11	(3)	7	(2)	93	(26)
Eye care	96	(27)	0	(0)	4	(1)	93	(26)
Foot care	96	(27)	4	(1)	4	(1)	89	(25)
TB screening/contact with TB clinic	96	(27)	0	(0)	7	(2)	93	(26)
Sexual health services	100	(28)	18	(5)	18	(5)	86	(24)
Meaningful activity								
Sports/Outward Bound [®] activities	89	(25)	57	(16)	14	(4)	54	(15)
Gardening, farming or environmental projects	93	(26)	50	(14)	7	(2)	54	(15)
Arts, music and cultural projects	93	(26)	64	(18)	11	(3)	46	(13)
Other	25	(7)	25	(7)	0	(0)	0	(0)
Education, training and employment (ETE)								
IT services, computer skills training	100	(28)	39	(11)	25	(7)	61	(17)
Literacy/numeracy courses	100	(28)	32	(9)	25	(7)	61	(17)
Into work training e.g. personal skills development,	100	(28)	39	(11)	21	(6)	64	(18)

³ The number of projects that ticked at least one method of providing the service.

Type of service	Service available ³		Deliver in-house, by own staff		Deliver in-house, in partnership with external agency		Can refer clients to an external service	
	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)
employment training & advice								
Life skills e.g. cooking/budgeting	100	(28)	75	(21)	18	(5)	32	(9)
Accredited courses e.g. NVQ	96	(27)	21	(6)	18	(5)	82	(23)
General informal adult learning	86	(24)	36	(10)	21	(6)	43	(12)
Advice								
Benefits	100	(28)	93	(26)	4	(1)	54	(15)
Debt/financial	100	(28)	89	(25)	7	(2)	61	(17)
Legal	100	(28)	25	(7)	4	(1)	96	(27)
Housing	100	(28)	89	(25)	4	(1)	61	(17)
Resettlement								
Rent deposit scheme	96	(27)	36	(10)	11	(3)	61	(17)
Resettlement/move on scheme	100	(28)	57	(16)	7	(2)	46	(13)

INDIVIDUALS

This section focuses on the clients accessing the projects that were surveyed. As well as asking project managers to give an estimate of the proportions of clients from certain backgrounds, information on client issues and client outcomes was recorded. In addition, managers were asked where their clients move onto.

CLIENT RECORDING SYSTEM

96% of projects use a client recording system (27).

CLIENT BACKGROUND

Survey respondents were asked to estimate the proportion of clients⁴ from certain background groups that they see in their projects

What proportion of your clients are:

Client background	Over 75% N (%)	50-75% N (%)	25-49% N (%)	15-24% N (%)	10-14% N (%)	5-9% N (%)	Less than 5% N (%)	None (no demand) N (%)	Don't provide service for this group N (%)	Don't know N (%)
Young people (16-25)	14 (50)	4 (14)	3 (11)	1 (4)	2 (7)	2 (7)	2 (7)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Older people (over 50)	0 (0)	1 (4)	2 (7)	4 (14)	5 (18)	1 (4)	0 (0)	1 (4)	13 (46)	1 (4)
Men	15 (54)	11 (39)	1 (4)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (4)	0 (0)
Women	1 (4)	3 (11)	8 (29)	6 (21)	4 (14)	1 (4)	3 (11)	0 (0)	2 (7)	0 (0)
Couples	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	3 (11)	1 (4)	5 (18)	5 (18)	14 (50)	0 (0)
Ex-service personnel	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	3 (11)	2 (7)	3 (11)	3 (11)	15 (54)	2 (7)	0 (0)
Prison leavers	1 (4)	2 (7)	4 (14)	5 (18)	3 (11)	1 (4)	7 (25)	4 (14)	0 (0)	1 (4)
Care leavers	0 (0)	1 (4)	5 (18)	8 (29)	2 (7)	0 (0)	5 (18)	6 (21)	0 (0)	1 (4)
Victims of domestic violence	0 (0)	2 (7)	5 (18)	1 (4)	6 (21)	4 (14)	4 (14)	5 (18)	0 (0)	1 (4)
Refugees	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (4)	0 (0)	1 (4)	2 (7)	5 (18)	17 (61)	0 (0)	2 (7)
Asylum seekers	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (4)	0 (0)	1 (4)	3 (11)	6 (21)	16 (57)	0 (0)	1 (4)
Eastern European	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (7)	1 (4)	2 (7)	5 (18)	17 (61)	0 (0)	1 (4)

⁴ Please note that any of the questions asking respondents to give a proportion of client issues/background/outcomes are based on their estimates and therefore are not exact figures.

Client background	Over 75% N (%)	50-75 % N (%)	25-49% N (%)	15-24% N (%)	10-14% N (%)	5-9% N (%)	Less than 5% N (%)	None (no demand) N (%)	Don't provide service for this group N (%)	Don't know N (%)
migrants										
Irregular migrants	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (4)	2 (7)	2 (7)	5 (18)	16 (57)	0 (0)	2 (7)
Sex workers	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (4)	2 (7)	2 (7)	5 (18)	16 (57)	0 (0)	2 (7)
Rough sleepers	5 (18)	2 (7)	4 (14)	2 (7)	5 (18)	2 (7)	3 (11)	5 (18)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Disabled people	0 (0)	1 (4)	2 (7)	3 (11)	1 (4)	4 (14)	9 (32)	7 (25)	1 (4)	0 (0)
Black and minority ethnic (BME)	0 (0)	2 (7)	3 (11)	5 (18)	2 (7)	5 (18)	7 (25)	4 (14)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT)	0 (0)	1 (4)	1 (4)	2 (7)	2 (7)	5 (18)	8 (29)	5 (18)	0 (0)	4 (14)
People with mental health issues	2 (7)	8 (29)	6 (21)	5 (18)	0 (0)	2 (8)	3 (11)	1 (4)	1 (4)	0 (0)
People with learning disabilities	0 (0)	2 (7)	7 (25)	3 (11)	5 (18)	1 (4)	6 (21)	3 (11)	0 (0)	1 (4)
ASBO/ABC	0 (0)	1 (4)	0 (0)	1 (4)	3 (11)	2 (7)	1 (4)	20 (71)	0 (0)	0 (0)

Other client backgrounds:

- Ex drug/alcohol users

CLIENT ISSUES

Issues affecting clients	Over 75% N (%)	50 to 75% N (%)	25 to 49% N (%)	Under 25% N (%)	None N (%)	Total that have some clients affected by issue	Don't know N (%)
Drug problems	6 (21)	3 (11)	9 (32)	7 (25)	1 (4)	25 (89)	2 (7)
Alcohol problems	6 (21)	6 (21)	7 (25)	8 (29)	0 (0)	27 (96)	1 (4)
Mental health problems	3 (11)	10 (36)	8 (29)	5 (18)	1 (4)	26 (93)	1 (4)
Physical health	2 (7)	2 (7)	8 (29)	14 (50)	2 (7)	26 (93)	0 (0)

Issues affecting clients	Over 75% N (%)	50 to 75% N (%)	25 to 49% N (%)	Under 25% N (%)	None N (%)	Total that have some clients affected by issue	Don't know N (%)
problems							
Personality disorders	1 (4)	1 (4)	3 (11)	16 (57)	7 (25)	21 (75)	0 (0)
Borderline learning difficulties	1 (4)	2 (7)	5 (18)	17 (61)	2 (7)	25 (89)	1 (4)
Offending behaviour	5 (18)	3 (11)	11 (39)	6 (21)	3 (11)	25 (89)	0 (0)
Gambling problems	0 (0)	0 (0)	3 (11)	13 (46)	10 (36)	16 (57)	2 (7)
Debt problems	7 (25)	9 (32)	3 (11)	8 (29)	0 (0)	27 (96)	1 (4)
Benefits problems	7 (25)	5 (18)	10 (36)	6 (21)	0 (0)	28 (100)	0 (0)
Eviction	0 (0)	4 (14)	2 (7)	16 (57)	5 (18)	22 (79)	1 (4)
Repossession	0 (0)	1 (4)	1 (4)	10 (36)	16 (57)	12 (43)	0 (0)
Multiple needs	6 (21)	9 (32)	6 (21)	6 (21)	1 (4)	27 (96)	0 (0)
Other	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	22 (79)	0 (0)	6 (21)

CLIENT MOVE-ON

What proportion of your clients move-on to the following:

	% (N=28)		
	Over 75%	Under 25%	At least some clients
Social housing	21	25	93
Sheltered housing	0	25	32
Private rented sector	0	64	86
Direct access hostel ⁵	0	29	57
2 nd stage, less support	4	46	71
2 nd stage, more support	0	43	50
Long term residential care	0	29	32
Prison	0	53	57
Residential drug/alcohol treatment	0	39	43

Other move-on:

- Back to parents
- Return to family

⁵ Please note, this year, only day centres were asked what proportion of clients moved into direct access hostels, whereas last year all project types were asked this question

KEY POINTS

From comparing the East Midlands data with the findings of the national survey we can see that:

- There are fewer older people who are service users in the East Midlands region compared to the national average.
- The data also suggests that there are fewer female clients and more male clients in the region, with only 15% of projects reporting that more than 50% of their clients are women, compared to 33% of projects nationally.
- More projects report having demand for services from disabled clients.
- More projects in this region report seeing clients who are experiencing problems with benefits.

The data presented in this report is taken from the Survey of Needs and Provision 2010 which can be accessed via <http://www.homeless.org.uk/snap-2010>.