



SURVEY OF NEEDS AND PROVISION

LONDON

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 63 services was selected in the London region which represents 13% 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	13	48
Direct access hostels	12	46
2 nd stage accommodation projects	38	195
TOTAL	63	289

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 London:

- 4% of projects have rooms for couples (2)
- One of the projects has 1 room, and the other has 7 rooms

PEOPLE ACCESSING DAY CENTRES

The 13 day centres in the survey reported seeing an average of 113 people per day, with 5 centres giving an estimate of 200, and answers ranging from 5 to 200.

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:

80% of the 50 accommodation based projects reported never having any empty beds, 7 reported having 1 empty bed on average and a further 3 projects reported having 2 empty beds per 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	0	0	11	92	32	85	43	68
Fundraising	4	31	0	0	0	0	4	6
Don't know/can't say	2	15	0	0	2	5	4	6
Benefit payments	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other local authority funding (local grant etc.)	4	31	0	0	2	5	6	10
Other	2	15	1	8	0	0	3	5
Rent & service charges	0	0	0	0	2	5	2	3
Social services	1	8	0	0	0	0	1	2
Health	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
LAA/LSP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	13		12		38		63	

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	%		
Supporting people	41	65	2	3	3	5	10	16	26	41	10	16
Social services	8	13	1	2	1	2	2	3	4	6	10	16
Other local authority funding	11	17	0	0	1	2	2	3	8	13	10	16
LAA/LSP	3	5	0	0	1	2	0	0	2	3	10	16
Criminal justice	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	14
Substance misuse services	3	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	3	9	14
Health	5	8	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	6	9	14
Employment and	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	10	16

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

education												
Rent & service charges	29	58	1	2	16	32	0	0	12	24	5	10
Benefit payments	34	68	2	4	20	40	2	4	10	20	5	10
Fundraising	31	49	2	3	8	13	5	8	16	25	12	19
Legal services commission	62	98	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	11
Places of change	2	3	1	2	0	0	1	2	0	0	9	14
Other	4	6	2	3	1	2	1	2	0	0	57	91

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.

Projects reported a range of gaps in service provision, including health services, gambling support, benefit advice, and employment and training. 44% of projects reported move-on and resettlement as the biggest gap, and a further 21% reported mental health services to be the biggest gap in provision.

List of answers given:

- Access to a good move on scheme.
- Access to low-level mental health services.
- An adequate resettlement programme
- Coordination mental health services, there doesn't seem to be enough people working in these services for the level of people in a bad way.
- Drug treatment.
- Employment training, complete lack of this type of services, how can people gain work without experience.
- Gambling service provision.
- General support for service users.
- Helping women with no recourse to public funds and cannot claim housing benefits, thus meaning we cannot help them.
- Homeless people cant afford to move on.
- Housing.
- I would say that I don't think there is much assistance with drug issues.
- Insufficient available mental health services and limited support provided.
- Insufficient high support services for young people if complex needs.
- Lack move on supported semi-independent accommodation.
- Lack of affordable housing.
- Lack of direct access, lack of move-on accommodation.
- Lack of hostels.
- Lack of housing options.
- Lack of move on options for clients.
- Lack of permanent accommodation for move on.
- Lack of suitable move on accommodation.
- Lack of supported accommodation.
- Laundry is a problem we need more provision. Funding for activities is hard to find. Lack

of staff.

- Mental health and sign posting young clients to benefits advisors. There needs to be specialist 16-18 benefit advisors.
- Mental health it's very difficult to get a referral - no provision or funding for 16 to 18 year olds.
- Mental health provision.
- Mental health, access and funding.
- Mental health, in terms of our clients being able to access mental health day centres/services. Sometimes even get turned away when they have severe problems and issues.
- More move on provision, although this issue is being tackled by local housing and obvious problem being in London.
- Move on accommodation for young people.
- Move on accommodation. (4 projects)
- Move on housing, low cost permanent housing for young single people.
- Move on options, jobs and accommodation.
- Move on scheme.
- Move on schemes.
- No housing for people that don't want to go rehab that don't want to live in a hostel, very black and white. No housing for over 30s as well.
- Not many things for over 21's or for young men.
- Problems with mental health issues and referring people to hospitals.
- Provision for 16/17 year olds to access specialist services.
- Provision for general needs single homeless.
- Provision with people with mental health problems.
- Rent deposit scheme, council houses are few and farther between nowadays, and if they have to go into private housing, it's harder to find the deposit schemes.
- Resettlement, very difficult to move our people on. No suitable accommodation for older people with drinking problems.
- Service provision for A10s.
- Services to deal with anti social behaviour, more activities aimed at young people.
- Social services support for young people, mental health care and move on accommodation.
- Some specialist support with people with mental health issues, homelessness and gambling needs more intensive support to help people keep their accommodation.
- Suitable move on scheme for continuing drug users.
- There's quite a big gap in training in regards to physical and sexual health.
- Those who have multiple needs.
- Training for clients, benefits restrictions limit this.
- Very limited accommodation for A10s.
- Waiting time for services such as drugs alcohol or mental health.
- We lack semi independent accommodation to go in-between us and move on accommodation for people that need to progress. Stunts the development and move on of some clients.
- We need more advice and support for parents, too many people wanting the service -

only so far out services can go.

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 services for drug users and Eastern Europeans to a lack of space or voids being caused by referral systems. The most common answer given was funding (38%), followed by move-on accommodation and support (32%).

List of answers given:

- Adequate move-on scheme, including a second stage option with less support than our own service - an adequate "step down".
- Apathy on the part of the young people. Making them engage.
- Capacity, designated as a children's centre. We don't have the physical space for the services they need.
- Debt.
- Drugs issues preventing move on.
- Drugs.
- Dual diagnosis.
- Finding employment.
- Finding suitable accommodation to move on to.
- Funding is always a problem.
- Funding is never enough.
- Funding stream issues
- Funding. (x10)
- Homelessness.
- Improve governance.
- Increasing client demand.
- Lack of affordable housing for clients to move into.
- Lack of appropriate and effective move on scheme in the area.
- Lack of available and realistic move-on.
- Lack of funding, joint commissioning etc.
- Lack of funding. (x2)
- Lack of move on accommodation.
- Lack of options for Eastern Europeans.
- Lack of private rented move on scheme. Insufficient funds to provide a full scheme.
- Lack of single move on options for clients.
- Lack of space.
- Mental health issues.
- Money - future funding.
- More affordable housing.
- More funding.

- Move on accommodation. (x2)
- Move on options becoming less available.
- Move on scheme.
- Move on.
- Move onto accommodation.
- Moving them on to accommodation.
- Not enough space in our building.
- Reduced supporting people grant.
- Resettlement.
- Staffing - need more staff.
- Staffing issues (due to funding).
- Staffing.
- Support needs (drugs/alcohol).
- Sustaining employment.
- The financial cut backs this is a real problem.
- The new tendering process.
- There isn't any move on which results in relapse in drug and offending behaviour.
- There's not always enough move on for the residents.
- Voids being caused by having to hold beds for council but not giving them the referrals.

REFUSALS

Refusal reason	% of projects (N) refusing access
Did not meet project criteria	38 (24)
History of arson	29 (18)
Sexual Offence	22 (14)
Intoxicated by alcohol/drugs	19 (12)
Project is full	13 (8)
Previously banned	13 (8)
Never refuse access	13 (8)
Mental health problem	6 (4)
No local connection	3 (2)
No recourse to public funds	3 (2)
Other	29 (18)
Total N	63

Other refusal reasons:

- Age related.
- Anyone with high level support needs.
- Dealing drugs, violent, abusive.
- Ex-offenders if under a probation order.
- If highly dependant on drugs or alcohol.
- If needs are too high.
- If support needs are too high (2 projects)
- If their support needs are too low.
- If they have very high support needs.
- If very high risk, i.e. High dependence mental health or drug use.

- Mental health issues that may cause violence.
- People who are very violent, people who need 24 hour care.
- Require supported needs.
- Support needs being too difficult.
- Too high needs.
- Violent behaviour.
- Violent criminal record or violence on file, also high drug support needs.

Projects were asked how many people were refused on an average week, 36 projects gave an estimate, with the most common answer being 0 (25 projects), and answers ranging from 0 to 12. 27 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.

68% of projects accept clients from outside the borough or district (43), with the most common split of clients in projects that do being 75% from within and 25% from outside the borough or district. The average split that was reported is 71%/29%.

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	92	(58)	10	(6)	5	(3)	86	(54)
Structured treatment – day programmes	94	(59)	11	(7)	8	(5)	83	(52)
Harm minimisation	92	(58)	27	(17)	10	(6)	71	(45)
Needle exchange	87	(55)	13	(8)	3	(2)	71	(45)
Blood borne virus screening/ vaccination	91	(57)	6	(4)	14	(9)	75	(47)
Alcohol services								
Structured treatment – residential detox/rehab	95	(60)	5	(3)	5	(3)	91	(57)
Structured treatment – day programmes	97	(61)	10	(6)	3	(2)	87	(55)
Harm minimisation	95	(60)	30	(19)	5	(3)	76	(48)
Mental health services								
CMHT services								
CMHT services	94	(59)	5	(3)	19	(12)	81	(51)
Other talking therapies	95	(60)	30	(19)	14	(9)	73	(46)
Other anger management courses	95	(60)	16	(10)	11	(7)	83	(52)
Other mediation/ relationship counselling	97	(61)	29	(18)	13	(8)	76	(48)

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)
Other	8	(5)	2	(1)	2	(1)	5	(3)
Physical health services								
Nursing care	98	(62)	6	(4)	18	(11)	79	(50)
General Practitioner	98	(62)	3	(2)	13	(8)	86	(54)
Dental care	97	(61)	2	(1)	5	(3)	92	(58)
Alternative therapies	95	(60)	13	(8)	6	(4)	87	(55)
Eye care	98	(62)	3	(2)	13	(8)	89	(56)
Foot care	98	(62)	2	(1)	8	(5)	92	(58)
TB screening/contact with TB clinic	98	(62)	6	(4)	19	(12)	81	(51)
Sexual health services	97	(61)	14	(9)	21	(13)	86	(54)
Meaningful activity								
Sports/Outward Bound [®] activities	95	(60)	59	(37)	8	(5)	56	(35)
Gardening, farming or environmental projects	87	(55)	51	(32)	8	(5)	46	(29)
Arts, music and cultural projects	98	(62)	62	(39)	6	(4)	48	(30)
Other	18	(11)	16	(10)	2	(1)	3	(2)
Education, training and employment (ETE)								
IT services, computer skills training	98	(62)	65	(41)	8	(5)	57	(36)
Literacy/numeracy courses	100	(63)	46	(29)	10	(6)	70	(44)
Into work training e.g. personal skills development, employment training & advice	98	(62)	64	(40)	14	(9)	60	(38)
Life skills e.g. cooking/budgeting	98	(62)	83	(52)	6	(4)	35	(22)
Accredited courses e.g. NVQ	92	(58)	27	(17)	3	(2)	79	(50)
General informal adult learning	95	(60)	65	(41)	3	(2)	51	(32)
Advice								
Benefits	100	(63)	92	(58)	16	(10)	30	(19)
Debt/financial	100	(63)	78	(49)	16	(10)	51	(32)
Legal	100	(63)	22	(14)	14	(9)	78	(49)
Housing	100	(63)	92	(58)	11	(7)	43	(27)
Resettlement								
Rent deposit scheme	84	(53)	29	(18)	6	(4)	59	(37)
Resettlement/move on scheme	92	(58)	49	(31)	10	(6)	49	(31)

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. Projects that indicated seeing some clients from a particular client background group were also asked whether they provide targeted services for this group.

In addition, managers were asked to asking projects where their clients move onto, a new question in this year's survey explored the proportions of clients achieving other positive outcomes such as good health or paid work.

CLIENT RECORDING SYSTEM

89% of projects use a client recording system (56).

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)	25 (40)	4 (6)	7 (11)	5 (8)	4 (6)	6 (10)	4 (6)	2 (3)	4 (6)	2 (3)
Older people (over 50)	1 (2)	2 (3)	7 (11)	8 (13)	8 (13)	4 (6)	4 (6)	6 (10)	20 (32)	3 (5)
Men	30 (48)	20 (32)	5 (8)	0 (0)	2 (3)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (3)	4 (6)	0 (0)
Women	7 (11)	12 (19)	13 (21)	9 (14)	8 (13)	2 (3)	1 (2)	2 (3)	9 (14)	0 (0)
Couples	1 (2)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (2)	0 (0)	3 (5)	10 (16)	11 (18)	36 (57)	1 (2)
Ex-service personnel	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (2)	0 (0)	2 (3)	4 (6)	17 (27)	31 (49)	4 (6)	4 (6)
Prison leavers	2 (3)	4 (6)	6 (10)	6 (10)	13 (21)	7 (11)	13 (21)	10 (16)	0 (0)	2 (3)
Care leavers	0 (0)	3 (5)	8 (13)	7 (11)	9 (14)	3 (5)	8 (13)	20 (32)	2 (3)	3 (5)
Victims of domestic violence	1 (2)	1 (2)	7 (11)	9 (14)	8 (13)	4 (6)	11 (18)	17 (27)	0 (0)	5 (8)
Refugees	2 (3)	2 (3)	4 (6)	6 (10)	9 (14)	5 (8)	7 (11)	24 (28)	0 (0)	4 (6)

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 (%)
Asylum seekers	1 (2)	0 (0)	2 (3)	2 (3)	6 (10)	4 (6)	11 (18)	30 (48)	3 (5)	4 (6)
Eastern European migrants	0 (0)	1 (2)	4 (6)	1 (2)	3 (5)	6 (10)	7 (11)	36 (57)	1 (2)	4 (6)
Irregular migrants	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (2)	0 (0)	4 (6)	4 (6)	8 (13)	35 (56)	5 (8)	6 (10)
Sex workers	0 (0)	1 (2)	1 (2)	1 (2)	3 (5)	4 (6)	15 (24)	33 (52)	2 (3)	3 (5)
Rough sleepers	9 (14)	11 (18)	9 (14)	6 (10)	5 (8)	3 (5)	6 (10)	12 (19)	1 (2)	1 (2)
Disabled people	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (2)	5 (8)	8 (13)	19 (30)	28 (44)	0 (0)	2 (3)
Black and minority ethnic (BME)	12 (19)	17 (27)	13 (21)	7 (11)	8 (13)	1 (2)	1 (2)	4 (6)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT)	1 (2)	1 (2)	1 (2)	3 (5)	10 (16)	7 (11)	16 (25)	12 (19)	0 (0)	12 (19)
People with mental health issues	6 (10)	3 (5)	13 (21)	8 (13)	6 (10)	3 (5)	11 (18)	8 (13)	0 (0)	5 (8)
People with learning disabilities	0 (0)	1 (2)	5 (8)	6 (10)	9 (14)	12 (19)	9 (14)	14 (22)	0 (0)	7 (11)
ASBO/ABC	1 (2)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (2)	3 (5)	4 (6)	11 (18)	35 (56)	0 (0)	8 (13)

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	7 (11)	9 (14)	14 (22)	23 (37)	7 (11)	53 (84)	3 (5)
Alcohol problems	6 (10)	6 (10)	14 (22)	24 (38)	11 (18)	50 (79)	2 (3)
Mental health problems	6 (10)	4 (6)	18 (29)	22 (35)	8 (13)	50 (79)	5 (8)
Physical health	2 (3)	3 (5)	7 (11)	32 (51)	16 (25)	44 (70)	3 (5)

problems							
Personality disorders	0 (0)	2 (3)	6 (10)	29 (46)	21 (33)	37 (59)	5 (8)
Borderline learning difficulties	0 (0)	0 (0)	3 (5)	40 (64)	15 (24)	43 (68)	5 (8)
Offending behaviour	2 (3)	6 (10)	11 (18)	32 (51)	9 (14)	51 (81)	3 (5)
Gambling problems	0 (0)	2 (3)	1 (2)	21 (33)	31 (49)	24 (38)	8 (13)
Debt problems	11 (18)	7 (11)	16 (25)	21 (33)	4 (6)	55 (87)	4 (6)
Benefits problems	15 (24)	13 (21)	10 (16)	17 (27)	5 (8)	55 (87)	3 (5)
Eviction	2 (3)	7 (11)	9 (14)	29 (46)	10 (16)	47 (75)	6 (10)
Repossession	0 (0)	1 (2)	1 (2)	21 (33)	30 (48)	23 (37)	10 (16)
Multiple needs	9 (14)	16 (25)	9 (14)	16 (25)	10 (16)	50 (79)	3 (5)
Other	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	55 (87)	0 (0)	8 (13)

CLIENT MOVE-ON

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

	% (N=63)		
	Over 75%	Under 25%	At least some clients
Social housing	19	35	79
Sheltered housing	0	32	41
Private rented sector	3	43	78
Direct access hostel⁵	0	31	54
2nd stage, less support	6	35	54
2nd stage, more support	0	44	51
Long term residential care	2	21	22
Prison	0	56	56
Residential drug/alcohol treatment	0	44	46

Other move-on:

- | |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Back to family (x3) |
|---|

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 this survey with the results of the national survey we can see that in London:

- There are fewer projects accepting clients from outside the borough or district- with 68% compared to 79% nationally.
- There are more projects with clients who are refugees in London compared to the national average, with only 28% of projects in London reporting having no demand from refugees compared to 58% of projects nationally.
- There are also more projects with clients who are black minority ethnic (BME), with 6% of projects in London reporting no demand from BME clients compared to 24% nationally.

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>.