



**SURVEY OF  
NEEDS AND  
PROVISION  
SOUTH WEST  
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 57 services was selected in the South West region which represents 11% 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 webpage<sup>1</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> <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 2<sup>nd</sup> 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	23
Direct access hostels	10	29
2 <sup>nd</sup> stage accommodation projects	40	161
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>213</b>

### 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 South West region

- 2% of accommodation-based projects have rooms for couples (1)
- The project has 5 rooms that are specifically for couples

### PEOPLE ACCESSING DAY CENTRES

The 7 day centres in the survey reported seeing an average of 45 people per day, with answers ranging from 5 to 80.

### 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:

- 76% of the 50 accommodation based projects reported never having any empty beds,
- For the 24% that do, the average is 2 beds, with answers ranging from 1 to 5.

## FUNDING

### Primary Funding Stream by service type

Respondents were asked to identify their current primary funding stream:

Funding stream	Day centres		Hostels		2 <sup>nd</sup> stage accommodation projects		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Supporting people	2	29	9	90	31	78	42	74
Fundraising	1	14	1	10	1	3	3	5
Don't know/can't say	1	14	0	0	2	5	3	5
Benefit payments	0	0	0	0	2	5	2	4
Other local authority funding (local grant etc.)	2	29	0	0	0	0	2	4
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rent & service charges	0	0	0	0	2	5	2	4
Social services	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	2
Health	1	14	0	0	0	0	1	2
LAA/LSP	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	2
<b>Total</b>	7		10		40		57	

### 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 <sup>2</sup>	New		Increase since last year		Decrease since last year		Same as last year		Don't know			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
Supporting people	45	79	0	0	7	12	16	28	22	39	7	12
Social services	9	16	0	0	3	5	2	4	4	7	4	7
Other local authority funding	9	16	1	2	1	2	1	2	6	11	5	8
LAA/LSP	5	9	0	0	1	2	0	0	4	7	6	11
Criminal justice	2	4	0	0	1	2	0	0	1	2	2	4
Substance misuse services	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	2	4
Health	6	11	0	0	1	2	0	0	5	9	4	7
Employment and	6	11	0	0	0	0	2	4	4	7	3	5

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

<b>education</b>												
<b>Rent &amp; service charges</b>	31	62	0	0	21	42	3	6	7	14	3	6
<b>Benefit payments</b>	33	66	0	0	19	38	3	6	11	22	5	10
<b>Fundraising</b>	24	42	0	0	9	16	3	5	12	21	13	23
<b>Legal services commission</b>	1	2	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	2	4
<b>Places of change</b>	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	2	4
<b>Other</b>	5	8	0	0	1	2	2	4	2	4	1	2

# 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.

19% of projects in the South West reported that move-on housing was the biggest gap in services, followed by 18% of projects reporting that access to mental health services was the biggest gap. A further 9% reported a lack of accommodation for multiple or complex needs clients. Other answers included accommodation for young people and women, services for ex-offenders and services for clients with learning difficulties.

### List of answers given:

- Access to free legal services has got increasingly difficult, as have housing young people after their stay here.
- Accommodation for people with multiple needs, accommodation available in area but sometimes has to 'fit into box'.
- Accommodation of long term drinkers. Women's accommodation. Other services for long term street drinkers.
- Accommodation.
- Affordable accommodation.
- Affordable housing for young people.
- Affordable housing, finding full time employment, finding cheap activities that will help young people develop social skills.
- Alcohol services for adults. It seems to be very distant for waiting times and referrals. It is because of the different agencies that provide it. There is no consistency between services and agencies that provide and also a massive difference between areas and also between young people other services. (Young person services are good, older people have worse service).
- Alcohol services.
- Availability of move-on accommodation.
- Being able to re house the younger people, and landlords that will accept benefits. Worrying about people who get turned down.
- Clients have difficulty accessing mental health services (including counselling).
- Clients have difficulty accessing mental health services due to a cut in funding.
- Complex needs, not enough provision is put into normal system.
- Direct access hostel.
- Drug alcohol detox and rehab. Shortage of move on accommodation.
- Drug and mental health issues combined, hard to get beneficial meaningful treatment if

using drugs and alcohol.

- Emergency accommodation - so direct access.
- Employment, mental health and drug and alcohol blaming each other and refusing to act.
- Ex-offenders have got nowhere to go or live/ life skills.
- For anti social behaviour- sometimes the link with the PSCO could be better. Working with the young people rather than putting them on the programme and telling them they have done something wrong.
- Gaps in finding move on accommodation. Not building housing at the moment due to lack of funding. For clients in rural areas accessing services.
- High need/risk under 25 year olds - not enough staff to cope with the high number.
- Hostels - need to be in places that are a bit more safe.
- If client isn't eligible for resettlement scheme or move on, if they are ineligible they have to save up and stay with us until they can get deposit money together.
- Lack of a range of services for people at different stages - gap in-between hostels and independent living.
- Lack of accommodation for women and couples. Dual diagnosis is an also issue as well as people with pets.
- Lack of accommodation, social housing in rural areas and transport issues.
- Lack of higher supported accommodation, looking after higher need clients, we cant take higher needs clients as we are not staffed 24/7.
- Lack of modern apprenticeships.
- Lack of service provisions for prison leavers.
- Lack of staffing and investment.
- Meaningful activities free of charge/ sport.
- Medium supported accommodation and the move on from here.
- Mental health problems.
- Mental health services.
- Mental health. (x2)
- Mental health. It is very hard to get a referral to the right place with mental health services. There is also a lack of move on accommodation and a lack of private landlords who are willing to take people under the age of 25.
- More services for young people 16-25, mental health services in this area are hard to receive the support needed.
- Move on accommodation. If a young person is given notice from out accommodation there is nowhere for the young people to go. They end up moving back to the troubled home they came from or back on the street.
- Moving people on into permanent accommodation.
- Multiple needs, housing people with multiple needs, mental health, drinking, drugs etc., chaotic people, downward spiral, these people need places to go but the services are inadequate.
- Need more services aimed at learning difficulties and asperger's.
- Not enough people learning English, hard to get them motivated when they can't speak English. And lack of funding for tenancies trying to help people move on.
- Out of hours mental health.

- People with mental health issues have problems with access - they have to prioritise the most serious cases.
- People with very low learning difficulties struggle to access the right service at the right level.
- Problems with move on scheme, moving clients into council housing.
- Resettling.
- The accommodation for people with mental health issues is inadequate. Services for couples are also very inadequate. We are the only project that can take on couples and provide move on flats for couples. There is also a need for accommodation for people with dogs.
- Transport links - difficult to get out of town to a city.
- Transport to get clients to external services; move-on opportunities.
- We need more services for people unable to give up alcohol and/or drugs. Housing them in our project can be a distraction to people trying to give up.
- Within this area there's not enough for young homeless girls and emergency access.
- Youth children services-need more stimulating activities e.g. Youth centres are hard to come by.

## 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 2<sup>nd</sup> or 3<sup>rd</sup> issue. Again, this question was unprompted, and respondents were not given a set list of choices.

The issues that projects reported ranged from a lack of beds to client motivation and from a lack of volunteers to problems accessing training and employment opportunities. The most common answer given was funding and resources (51%), followed by move-on accommodation and support (12%), and drug and alcohol use (11%).

### List of answers given:

- A current re-structure that is causing uncertainty.
- Accessing mental health services- professional help and support.
- Addiction.
- Anti social youth, they see our clients as venerable and target them, for drugs and encourage crime. They use the clients' houses as places to 'hang'. Any problems we've had are usually down to 'visitors' abusing the situation of the clients.
- Decrease of funding will have knock on effect to services.
- Drugs and alcohol. (x2)
- Drugs.
- Employment and training.
- Engagement. (x2)
- Finance and funding.
- Financial, looking to take 2 other houses on but financial problems set back.
- Funding cuts.
- Funding streams.

- Funding. (x15)
- Future funding cuts.
- Housing.
- Lack of funding, may lose Local Authority funding.
- Lack of funding.
- Lack of local employment opportunities.
- Lack of move on accommodation. (x3)
- Large numbers substance misuse.
- Misuse of drugs.
- Money, lack of it, we need more funding.
- Move on accommodation for our young people.
- Move on accommodation.
- New social housing.
- Not enough beds.
- Not sure.
- Resettlement service may be losing its funding in March, if that happens will create a huge problem for us.
- Resources.
- Retendering process. Upheaval and organisation of the retendering and disruption.
- Service users having problems accessing benefits.
- Some buildings being used are very old and need replacing and updating so they are fit for purpose.
- The uncertainty around funding.
- Threat of funding being cut.
- We are refurbishing.
- We need to recruit more volunteers.
- We receive service users from high support agencies and they sometimes have little regard for house rules.
- Young homelessness getting out of hand.

## REFUSALS

Refusal reason	% of projects (N) refusing access
History of arson	30 (17)
Sexual Offence	21 (12)
Intoxicated by alcohol/drugs	21 (12)
Did not meet project criteria	16 (9)
Previously banned	14 (8)
Project is full	14 (8)
Never refuse access	9 (5)
No local connection	7 (4)
Mental health problem	2 (1)
No recourse to public funds	0 (0)
Other	47 (27)
Total N	57

**Other refusal reasons:**

- Based on risk.
- Case by case. If they cause harm to other residents.
- Claiming rent somewhere else.
- Client that have committed an offence against the person (ABH, GBH etc).
- Crimes against young people.
- Depends on context of what they have done in the past, would look at how long ago and risks to other users, active drug users if not looking for help wouldn't be able to support them. All down to individual clients needs and sup
- Discretion with needs and other clients taken into consideration.
- Do a risk assessment on the clients' needs and see if the can be managed by us.
- History of extreme violence.
- If a person had high support needs, we would have to refer them elsewhere.
- If deemed very high risk.
- If have debt with project that they are not prepared to redress.
- If needs are too high or low.
- If support needs not met.
- If the needs are too high or they have a history of drug addiction or violence.
- If the support needs are too high or if the support needs are too high.
- If their support needs are too high or they are very high risk.
- If their support needs are too high.
- If they are likely to be a risk to staff or other users.
- If they don't meet our service definition.
- If they failed a risks and needs assessment. If they had a completely chaotic lifestyle.
- May suspend 3 or 6 months application if too high support.
- Methadone programme.
- Schedule 1 offences.
- Serious history of violence.
- Some referrals more suited to other accommodation such as active drug issues, or may not need supported housing accommodation and just seeking cheap rent so dependant on needs.
- We do in depth risk assessments to see whether we can take this person on and also consider the current clients we have.
- We make a general decision on a range of our own factors.
- Would depend on their support needs.
- Would do a risk assessment to see how we could manage the client. Would only refuse if their support needs were higher than what we can cope with.

Projects were asked how many people were refused in an average week, 28 projects gave an estimate, with the most common answer being 0 (22 projects). Answers ranged from 0 to 10 and for the projects that gave an estimate higher than 0, the average number of people refused is 3 per week. 29 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.

67% of projects accept clients from outside the borough or district (38), 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 84%/16%.

## ACCESS TO SERVICES

Type of service	Service available <sup>3</sup>		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)
<b>Drug services</b>								
Structured treatment – residential detox/rehab	98	(56)	4	(2)	9	(5)	95	(54)
Structured treatment – day programmes	97	(55)	7	(4)	16	(9)	86	(49)
Harm minimisation	97	(55)	26	(15)	21	(12)	68	(39)
Needle exchange	91	(52)	9	(5)	12	(7)	77	(44)
Blood borne virus screening/ vaccination	95	(54)	5	(3)	18	(10)	75	(43)
<b>Alcohol services</b>								
Structured treatment – residential detox/rehab	98	(56)	4	(2)	14	(8)	95	(54)
Structured treatment – day programmes	97	(55)	11	(6)	12	(7)	88	(50)
Harm minimisation	97	(55)	26	(15)	23	(13)	68	(39)
<b>Mental health services</b>								
<b>CMHT services</b>	100	(57)	5	(3)	28	(16)	81	(46)
Other talking therapies	95	(54)	23	(13)	19	(11)	70	(40)
Other anger management courses	95	(54)	16	(9)	18	(10)	72	(41)
Other mediation/ relationship counselling	98	(56)	32	(18)	18	(10)	75	(43)
Other	11	(6)	4	(2)	0	(0)	7	(4)
<b>Physical health services</b>								
<b>Nursing care</b>	98	(56)	4	(2)	11	(6)	91	(52)
General Practitioner	100	(57)	4	(2)	12	(7)	93	(53)
Dental care	100	(57)	2	(1)	7	(4)	97	(55)
Alternative therapies	91	(52)	5	(3)	12	(7)	84	(48)
Eye care	98	(56)	2	(1)	2	(1)	97	(55)
Foot care	98	(56)	7	(4)	5	(3)	91	(52)
TB screening/contact with TB clinic	97	(55)	4	(2)	2	(1)	93	(53)
Sexual health services	98	(56)	19	(11)	21	(12)	83	(47)
<b>Meaningful activity</b>								
Sports/Outward Bound® activities	95	(54)	58	(33)	11	(6)	51	(29)

<sup>3</sup> The number of projects that ticked at least one method of providing the service.

Type of service	Service available <sup>3</sup>		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)
Gardening, farming or environmental projects	91	(52)	51	(29)	9	(5)	54	(31)
Arts, music and cultural projects	95	(54)	53	(30)	12	(7)	54	(31)
Other	23	(13)	18	(10)	0	(0)	9	(5)
<b>Education, training and employment (ETE)</b>								
IT services, computer skills training	98	(56)	42	(24)	16	(9)	67	(38)
Literacy/numeracy courses	98	(56)	28	(16)	18	(10)	70	(40)
Into work training e.g. personal skills development, employment training & advice	98	(56)	51	(29)	21	(12)	65	(37)
Life skills e.g. cooking/budgeting	98	(56)	81	(46)	9	(5)	37	(21)
Accredited courses e.g. NVQ	98	(56)	35	(20)	12	(7)	68	(39)
General informal adult learning	97	(55)	56	(32)	14	(8)	51	(29)
<b>Advice</b>								
Benefits	100	(57)	95	(54)	5	(3)	42	(24)
Debt/financial	100	(57)	79	(45)	11	(6)	61	(35)
Legal	100	(57)	26	(15)	11	(6)	83	(47)
Housing	98	(56)	86	(49)	7	(4)	51	(29)
<b>Resettlement</b>								
Rent deposit scheme	90	(51)	35	(20)	14	(8)	54	(31)
Resettlement/move on scheme	95	(54)	61	(35)	18	(10)	47	(27)

# 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

95% of projects use a client recording system (54).

## CLIENT BACKGROUND

Survey respondents were asked to estimate the proportion of clients<sup>4</sup> 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 (44)	4 (7)	10 (18)	7 (12)	3 (5)	5 (9)	0 (0)	2 (4)	1 (2)	0 (0)
Older people (over 50)	0 (0)	2 (4)	4 (7)	5 (9)	9 (16)	3 (5)	4 (7)	11 (19)	19 (33)	0 (0)
Men	24 (42)	25 (44)	6 (11)	1 (2)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (2)	0 (0)
Women	1 (2)	12 (21)	18 (32)	8 (14)	7 (12)	4 (7)	1 (2)	3 (5)	3 (5)	0 (0)
Couples	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (2)	2 (4)	6 (11)	14 (25)	34 (60)	0 (0)
Ex-service personnel	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (2)	1 (2)	4 (7)	4 (7)	14 (25)	27 (47)	2 (4)	4 (7)
Prison leavers	1 (2)	4 (7)	6 (11)	5 (9)	7 (12)	6 (11)	11 (19)	14 (25)	1 (2)	2 (4)
Care leavers	0 (0)	1 (2)	7 (12)	10 (18)	7 (12)	8 (14)	11 (19)	10 (18)	0 (0)	3 (5)
Victims of domestic violence	3 (5)	0 (0)	2 (4)	7 (12)	7 (12)	10 (18)	9 (16)	12 (21)	0 (0)	7 (12)
Refugees	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (4)	4 (7)	0 (0)	9 (16)	38 (67)	3 (5)	1 (2)

<sup>4</sup> 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	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (2)	2 (4)	2 (4)	9 (16)	38 (67)	3 (5)	2 (4)
Eastern European migrants	0 (0)	1 (2)	1 (2)	1 (2)	2 (4)	0 (0)	10 (18)	38 (67)	3 (5)	1 (2)
Irregular migrants	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (2)	0 (0)	2 (4)	7 (12)	40 (70)	5 (9)	2 (4)
Sex workers	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (2)	0 (0)	1 (2)	2 (4)	11 (19)	39 (68)	0 (0)	3 (5)
Rough sleepers	7 (12)	7 (12)	12 (21)	5 (9)	3 (5)	4 (7)	9 (16)	8 (14)	1 (2)	1 (2)
Disabled people	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (2)	3 (5)	9 (16)	4 (7)	13 (23)	24 (42)	2 (4)	1 (2)
Black and minority ethnic (BME)	2 (4)	1 (2)	2 (4)	6 (11)	8 (14)	5 (9)	16 (28)	17 (30)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (2)	1 (2)	7 (12)	7 (12)	15 (26)	11 (19)	0 (0)	15 (26)
People with mental health issues	5 (9)	13 (23)	14 (25)	11 (19)	7 (12)	4 (7)	1 (2)	1 (2)	0 (0)	1 (2)
People with learning disabilities	1 (2)	3 (5)	8 (14)	10 (18)	8 (14)	9 (16)	8 (14)	6 (11)	0 (0)	4 (7)
ASBO/ABC	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (2)	7 (12)	3 (5)	4 (7)	8 (14)	32 (56)	0 (0)	2 (4)

**Other client backgrounds:**

- Teenage mums/teenage pregnancies.
- Victims of childhood abuse.

## 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	8 (14)	18 (32)	14 (25)	14 (25)	3 (5)	54 (95)	0 (0)
Alcohol problems	6 (11)	18 (32)	15 (26)	12 (21)	5 (9)	51 (89)	1 (2)
Mental health problems	1 (2)	14 (24)	17 (30)	23 (40)	1 (2)	55 (96)	1 (2)
Physical health problems	3 (5)	3 (5)	9 (16)	33 (58)	8 (14)	48 (84)	1 (2)
Personality disorders	1 (2)	1 (2)	3 (5)	30 (53)	18 (32)	35 (61)	4 (7)
Borderline learning difficulties	3 (5)	3 (5)	5 (9)	38 (67)	4 (7)	49 (86)	4 (7)
Offending behaviour	4 (7)	13 (23)	11 (19)	17 (30)	9 (16)	45 (79)	3 (5)
Gambling problems	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (2)	25 (44)	23 (40)	26 (46)	8 (14)
Debt problems	12 (21)	11 (19)	12 (21)	13 (23)	5 (9)	48 (84)	4 (7)
Benefits problems	18 (32)	6 (11)	10 (18)	15 (26)	6 (11)	49 (86)	2 (4)
Eviction	5 (9)	6 (11)	10 (18)	15 (26)	14 (25)	39 (68)	4 (7)
Repossession	1 (2)	0 (0)	2 (4)	16 (28)	33 (58)	19 (33)	5 (9)
Multiple needs	14 (25)	10 (18)	11 (19)	15 (26)	5 (9)	50 (88)	2 (4)
Other	0 (0)	2 (4)	1 (2)	1 (2)	46 (81)	4 (7)	7 (12)

### Other client issues:

- Childhood abuse.
- Dual-diagnosis.
- Family relationship problems.
- Violence and anger management.

## CLIENT MOVE-ON

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

	% (N=57)		
	Over 75%	Under 25%	At least some clients
Social housing	30	33	89
Sheltered housing	2	40	46
Private rented sector	9	61	86
Direct access hostel <sup>5</sup>	14	14	43
2 <sup>nd</sup> stage, less support	2	53	63
2 <sup>nd</sup> stage, more support	2	44	51
Long term residential care	0	19	19
Prison	0	61	63
Residential drug/alcohol treatment	0	39	39

### Other move-on:

- Back to family.
- Back to rough sleeping.
- Back to the family home, particularly young people.
- Death.
- Hospital, sleeping rough, passing away.
- Return to friends and family.
- Returning to family.

<sup>5</sup> 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 data with the findings of the national survey we can see that in the South West region:

- There are fewer projects accepting clients from outside of the borough or district with 67% compared to 79% nationally.
- There are fewer projects refusing clients because they do not meet the project criteria (13%) compared to the national average (31%).

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>.