



# SURVEY OF NEEDS AND PROVISION

# YORKSHIRE & HUMBERSIDE

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 (e.g. 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 52 services was selected in the Yorkshire and Humberside region which represents 10% 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 which 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	3	14
Direct access hostels	9	30
2 <sup>nd</sup> stage accommodation projects	40	93
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>137</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 Yorkshire and Humberside region

- 12% of accommodation-based projects have rooms for couples (6)
- The 6 projects have a total of 145 rooms for couples, and answered ranged from 1 room to 68 rooms

### PEOPLE ACCESSING DAY CENTRES

The 3 day centres in the survey reported seeing an average of 72 people per day, with answers ranging from 60 to 86.

### 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:

- 82% of the 49 accommodation based projects reported never having any empty beds,
- For the 18% that do, the average is 5 beds, with answers ranging from 1 to 17.

## 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	0	0	6	67	34	85	40	77
Fundraising	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	2
Don't know/can't say	0	0	2	22	1	3	3	6
Benefit payments	0	0	1	11	3	8	4	8
Other local authority funding (local grant etc.)	1	33	0	0	0	0	1	2
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rent & service charges	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	2
Social services	2	67	0	0	0	0	2	4
Health	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
LAA/LSP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	3		9		40		52	

### 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	40	77	0	0	7	14	8	15	25	48	6	12
Social services	5	10	0	0	1	2	0	0	4	8	2	4
Other local authority funding	10	19	0	0	4	8	2	4	4	8	5	10
LAA/LSP	4	8	1	2	0	0	1	2	2	4	5	10
Criminal justice	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4
Substance misuse services	1	2	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	2	4
Health	4	8	1	2	0	0	1	2	2	4	3	6
Employment and education	4	8	0	0	1	2	1	2	2	4	2	4

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

<b>Rent &amp; service charges</b>	27	55	0	0	11	22	2	4	14	29	5	10
<b>Benefit payments</b>	36	73	0	0	12	24	2	4	22	45	4	8
<b>Fundraising</b>	21	40	1	2	7	14	8	15	5	10	8	15
<b>Legal services commission</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4
<b>Places of change</b>	1	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	8
<b>Other</b>	5	10	0	0	3	6	0	0	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.

44% of projects in Yorkshire and Humberside reported that move-on accommodation and housing was the biggest gap in services. This included housing for young people and a lack of social housing. Access to mental health services was the biggest gap in service provision for a further 23% of projects, and 10% of projects reported alcohol and drug services to be the biggest gap. Other answers included a lack of funding for meaningful activities, services for young people and a lack of care services.

### List of answers given:

- Accommodation, providing enough to meet demand.
- Alcohol and drug treatment.
- Alternative accommodation for move on for our clients sometimes can involve a bond/deposit which can create a massive barrier to move on.
- Biggest gap is resettlement through the council and other agencies; resettlement (halfway housing) is poorly funded.
- Care services.
- Cultural, sports and meaningful activities are externally expensive, not enough of those types of services available.
- Difficult to say at the moment.
- Drug rehab - detox available on demand. Waiting list makes clients conditions deteriorate.
- Drugs rehab.
- Find suitable properties for fewer than 18s to move on to. Good links but such a lack of suitable accommodation.
- Getting clients housed can be difficult with some housing associations.
- Help and support post 19, for education and training.
- Homeless shelter in area
- I would say support for 16 - 18 year olds in terms of a safe guardian. 16 year olds are sometimes classed as adults - so there is a lack of provision.
- I would say that for us it is finding appropriate and affordable accommodation for single people.
- Information for external social groups and options for clients.
- It has changed over the last few weeks. Firstly there is a problem with mental health support for people that are homeless. Also the services for Eastern European clients are inadequate. The Eastern European clients do not speak any English and need to

access services but do not have any rights to access basic services. In result this is draining our services.

- Lack of accommodation.
- Lack of services for under 18s, lack of access for people with personality disorders and complex needs/behavioural issues. (Additional services).
- Lack of single people move-on properties.
- Lack of suitable accommodation.
- Lack of young people (16-18) services. Young women's services. There are not many schemes in area for these people.
- Mental health - difficult for initial access.
- Mental health and alcohol provision, and need a good rent deposit scheme/move on scheme, try to funnel tenants into the poorer areas of Wakefield, choice of areas of accommodation are limited.
- Mental health I think there's a huge gap between when a need is identified to when a clients needs are dealt with or if they fit mental health criteria.
- Mental health services, general lack of provision for Mental Health patients who need help and can't live independently. Not a good standard for these people know need support.
- Mental health services.
- Mental health, move on accommodation, possibly alcohol support.
- Mental health, specifically for young people, one worker for whole city.
- Mental health. (x3)
- Move on accommodation. (x2)
- Move on housing.
- Move on housing. Quite difficult to get them into independent housing. Longer waiting, no houses are available anymore.
- Move on service.
- Move-on schemes for service users.
- Need for more single housing, for the people trying to move on from second stage accommodation. People with learning disability expect all sorts of different packages for them to enable them to live independently. Not funded enough to provide these specialist services for them.
- Re-housing.
- Resettlement & resources to enable them to do cooking etc.
- Residential treatment for drug and alcohol users.
- Resources, access to rehab, better support after rehab, better rehousing options and more on-going long term support services.
- Services specific for homeless young pregnant women.
- Social housing for them to move into.
- Struggle finding move on accommodation with the local housing authority.
- Suitable, affordable housing for young people.
- The number of move ons - lack of accommodation.
- The provisions for housing deposit schemes is not adequate for young people.
- There isn't an adequate move-on scheme.
- We need more mental health 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 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 teenage pregnancies to alcohol and drug services and the benefit system. The most common answer given was funding and resources (54%), followed by move-on accommodation and support (12%).

### List of answers given:

- Accommodation - move on - cannot stress this enough.
- Accommodation.
- Affordable move on accommodation.
- Alcohol misuse.
- Anti social behaviour.
- Being tendered - might lose funding.
- Continuing contracts.
- Drugs.
- External access to our services.
- Funding uncertainty.
- Funding- they change the goal posts all the time. They don't understand how frontline works. They forever change remit, so some people we help can't come back to us if they face problems again because the remit has changed.
- Funding, charges regarding funding streams.
- Funding, future funding worries.
- Funding, securing our funding from supporting people.
- Funding. (x8)
- Homelessness.
- Housing benefit - won't pay overlap for us if our clients find work, makes it hard for them and us.
- Instability in the market.
- Keeping benefits in place.
- Lack of accommodation. We get a lot more referrals than we have places available.
- Lack of funding means that we've had to reduce pay and work longer hours - makes it hard to recruit quality staff.
- Lack of funding.
- Lack of learning/job opportunities.
- Lack of work for EU migrants.
- Long term funding.
- Mental health problems.
- Money-funding issues.
- Money, lack of public funding.
- More beds needed to accommodate under 18's.

- Move on support.
- NHS is reluctant to grasp what we do and take our clients, they don't seem to be listening to our needs or understanding our service and what we provide.
- Nothing.
- People working 16-25, can only partial claim housing, council tax benefit, therefore cannot afford to stay in accommodation.
- Policy changes on funding for services - i.e. providers having to bid in order to run services.
- Rent arrears.
- Rising number of teenage pregnancies.
- Short length of contract- difficulty of planning for the future.
- Staffing levels due to restructure and funding (especially management).
- Substance misuse.
- Sustainable funding.
- Tender - don't know what's happening with the reviews. The unknown of what will happen to funding and structure.
- The lack of funding.
- Uncertainty of funding.
- Under 18's.

## REFUSALS

Refusal reason	% of projects (N) refusing access
History of arson	37 (19)
Did not meet project criteria	31 (16)
Sexual Offence	19 (10)
Previously banned	14 (7)
Never refuse access	14 (7)
Project is full	14 (7)
Intoxicated by alcohol/drugs	8 (4)
No local connection	2 (1)
No recourse to public funds	0 (0)
Mental health problem	0 (0)
Other	35 (18)
Total N	52

### Other refusal reasons:

- Assessed as a risk to others.
- Do risk assessment, if we can manage their needs they are welcome.
- Done on case by case basis, we would do a risk and needs assessment.
- Evidence of extreme violence and sex offenders, and how recent it was. All down to a referral interview.
- Extreme bad behaviour.
- High level drug use when young people are not addressing issue recent serious assault.
- If a client failed an internal risk assessment.
- If don't fit homelessness criteria.
- If not suitable for project.

- If risk management too high.
- If support needs too great.
- If they are a serious risk to other tenants.
- If they have history of violence.
- If we can't meet their needs or they are a risk to others.
- N.B. Not blanket refusal, depends on case, also violence.
- Risk assessment and level of service are considered.
- Support needs too high.
- Vulnerability of clients and already housed clients.
- We may refuse clients based on our own internal risk criteria.
- We need to be able to meet their support needs.
- Will not take people who are using drugs.
- Would also depend on assessment we do to assess their support needs.
- Would turn down referrals if did not feel appropriate and better served elsewhere but no specific exclusion policy.

Projects were asked how many people were refused in an average week, 27 projects gave an estimate, with the most common answer being 0 (19 projects). Answers ranged from 0 to 15 and for the projects that gave an estimate higher than 0, the average number of people refused is 3 per week. 25 projects did not give an answer.

## LOCAL CONNECTION

89% of projects accept clients from outside the borough or district (46), with the most common split of clients in projects that do being 95% from within and 5% from outside the borough or district. The average split that was reported is 86%/14%.

## 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	94	(49)	4	(2)	4	(2)	90	(47)
Structured treatment – day programmes	98	(51)	4	(2)	10	(5)	89	(46)
Harm minimisation	98	(51)	25	(13)	14	(7)	69	(36)
Needle exchange	94	(49)	6	(3)	8	(4)	87	(45)
Blood borne virus screening/ vaccination	92	(48)	2	(1)	6	(3)	90	(47)
<b>Alcohol services</b>								
Structured treatment – residential detox/rehab	94	(49)	2	(1)	4	(2)	90	(47)
Structured treatment – day programmes	98	(51)	0	(0)	6	(3)	92	(48)
Harm minimisation	100	(52)	25	(13)	10	(5)	73	(38)

<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)
<b>Mental health services</b>								
CMHT services	94	(49)	2	(1)	6	(3)	90	(47)
Other talking therapies	94	(49)	10	(5)	10	(5)	92	(48)
Other anger management courses	96	(50)	6	(3)	12	(6)	85	(44)
Other mediation/ relationship counselling	96	(50)	14	(7)	10	(5)	89	(46)
Other	10	(5)	2	(1)	4	(2)	4	(2)
<b>Physical health services</b>								
Nursing care	98	(51)	4	(2)	10	(5)	94	(49)
General Practitioner	100	(52)	2	(1)	8	(4)	98	(51)
Dental care	100	(52)	2	(1)	8	(4)	96	(50)
Alternative therapies			6	(3)	2	(1)	94	(49)
Eye care	98	(51)	2	(1)	0	(0)	98	(51)
Foot care	100	(52)	4	(2)	0	(0)	98	(51)
TB screening/contact with TB clinic	100	(52)	2	(1)	0	(0)	100	(52)
Sexual health services	100	(52)	14	(7)	14	(7)	90	(47)
<b>Meaningful activity</b>								
Sports/Outward Bound <sup>®</sup> activities	94	(49)	50	(26)	10	(5)	46	(24)
Gardening, farming or environmental projects	92	(48)	44	(23)	8	(4)	46	(24)
Arts, music and cultural projects	94	(49)	58	(30)	10	(5)	48	(25)
Other	17	(9)	15	(8)	2	(1)	4	(2)
<b>Education, training and employment (ETE)</b>								
IT services, computer skills training	100	(52)	35	(18)	21	(11)	69	(36)
Literacy/numeracy courses	100	(52)	23	(12)	15	(8)	73	(38)
Into work training e.g. personal skills development, employment training & advice	98	(51)	37	(19)	17	(9)	62	(32)
Life skills e.g. cooking/budgeting	100	(52)	77	(40)	6	(3)	31	(16)
Accredited courses e.g. NVQ	96	(50)	23	(12)	12	(6)	77	(40)
General informal adult learning	96	(50)	56	(29)	6	(3)	56	(29)
<b>Advice</b>								
Benefits	98	(51)	90	(47)	6	(3)	40	(21)
Debt/financial	98	(51)	81	(42)	6	(3)	54	(28)
Legal	98	(51)	21	(11)	0	(0)	85	(44)
Housing	98	(51)	87	(45)	2	(1)	40	(21)
<b>Resettlement</b>								
Rent deposit scheme	87	(45)	25	(13)	14	(7)	52	(27)
Resettlement/move on scheme	98	(51)	62	(32)	15	(8)	35	(18)

# 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

92% of projects use a client recording system (48).

## 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 (48)	6 (12)	7 (14)	5 (10)	2 (4)	4 (8)	1 (2)	1 (2)	1 (2)	0 (0)
Older people (over 50)	0 (0)	0 (0)	4 (8)	5 (10)	5 (10)	6 (12)	4 (8)	9 (17)	19 (37)	0 (0)
Men	17 (33)	19 (37)	5 (10)	3 (6)	1 (2)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (2)	6 (12)	0 (0)
Women	9 (17)	16 (31)	12 (23)	7 (14)	2 (4)	1 (2)	2 (4)	1 (2)	2 (4)	0 (0)
Couples	0 (0)	1 (20)	0 (0)	2 (4)	3 (6)	4 (8)	3 (6)	14 (27)	25 (48)	0 (0)
Ex-service personnel	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (2)	5 (10)	8 (15)	5 (10)	29 (56)	2 (4)	2 (4)
Prison leavers	1 (2)	3 (6)	8 (15)	4 (8)	3 (6)	9 (17)	10 (19)	12 (23)	1 (2)	1 (2)
Care leavers	0 (0)	4 (8)	4 (8)	8 (15)	6 (12)	7 (14)	7 (14)	14 (27)	0 (0)	2 (4)
Victims of domestic violence	1 (2)	4 (8)	1 (2)	4 (8)	12 (23)	8 (15)	10 (19)	10 (19)	0 (0)	2 (4)
Refugees	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (2)	3 (6)	10 (19)	4 (8)	4 (8)	28 (54)	1 (2)	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)	2 (4)	3 (6)	4 (8)	4 (8)	32 (62)	6 (12)	1 (2)
Eastern European migrants	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (4)	5 (10)	5 (10)	5 (10)	31 (60)	3 (6)	1 (2)
Irregular migrants	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (2)	2 (4)	3 (6)	37 (71)	6 (12)	3 (6)
Sex workers	1 (2)	1 (2)	0 (0)	1 (2)	3 (6)	4 (8)	13 (25)	26 (50)	0 (0)	3 (6)
Rough sleepers	5 (10)	2 (4)	5 (10)	5 (10)	4 (8)	6 (12)	11 (21)	12 (23)	1 (2)	1 (2)
Disabled people	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (4)	2 (4)	5 (10)	1 (2)	15 (29)	27 (52)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Black and minority ethnic (BME)	0 (0)	1 (2)	7 (14)	10 (19)	5 (10)	4 (8)	11 (21)	14 (27)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (2)	7 (14)	2 (4)	7 (14)	11 (21)	10 (19)	0 (0)	14 (27)
People with mental health issues	4 (8)	6 (12)	14 (27)	11 (21)	3 (6)	2 (4)	3 (6)	8 (15)	1 (2)	0 (0)
People with learning disabilities	0 (0)	3 (6)	6 (12)	6 (12)	8 (15)	7 (14)	9 (17)	12 (23)	0 (0)	1 (2)
ASBO/ABC	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (4)	3 (6)	4 (8)	5 (10)	35 (67)	0 (0)	3 (6)

**Other client backgrounds:**

- Young women who are victims of sexual exploitation.

## 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 (15)	10 (19)	15 (29)	18 (35)	1 (2)	51 (98)	0 (0)
Alcohol problems	4 (8)	19 (37)	12 (23)	15 (29)	2 (4)	50 (96)	0 (0)
Mental health problems	5 (10)	8 (15)	11 (21)	25 (48)	3 (6)	49 (94)	0 (0)
Physical health problems	1 (2)	5 (10)	11 (21)	27 (52)	7 (14)	44 (85)	1 (2)
Personality disorders	0 (0)	3 (6)	4 (8)	26 (50)	17 (33)	33 (63)	2 (4)
Borderline learning difficulties	0 (0)	7 (14)	6 (12)	28 (54)	8 (15)	41 (79)	3 (6)
Offending behaviour	5 (10)	11 (21)	7 (14)	22 (42)	7 (14)	45 (87)	0 (0)
Gambling problems	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	19 (37)	25 (48)	19 (37)	8 (15)
Debt problems	13 (25)	6 (12)	15 (29)	15 (29)	2 (4)	49 (94)	1 (2)
Benefits problems	15 (29)	10 (19)	10 (19)	12 (23)	4 (8)	47 (90)	1 (2)
Eviction	3 (6)	5 (10)	10 (19)	23 (44)	8 (15)	41 (79)	3 (6)
Repossession	0 (0)	0 (0)	5 (10)	12 (23)	32 (62)	17 (33)	3 (6)
Multiple needs	12 (23)	10 (19)	9 (17)	12 (23)	8 (16)	43 (83)	1 (2)

### Other client issues:

- Family relationship problems.
- Heating i.e. come in to make warm.
- Sexual health issues.
- Young women who are sexually exploited.

## CLIENT MOVE-ON

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

	% (N=48)		
	Over 75%	Under 25%	At least some clients
Social housing	35	25	98
Sheltered housing	0	35	38
Private rented sector	0	65	90
Direct access hostel <sup>5</sup>	0	0	67
2 <sup>nd</sup> stage, less support	2	52	69
2 <sup>nd</sup> stage, more support	2	48	52
Long term residential care	0	19	19
Prison	0	52	56
Residential drug/alcohol treatment	0	31	35

### Other move-on:

- Back to family.
- Back to parents home.
- Move back in the family.
- Moving back with family.
- Return to family.
- Returning to family. Moving in with partners, friends.

<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 national findings we can see that in the Yorkshire and Humberside region:

- There is more demand for services from clients who are couples, with 20% of projects reporting more than 50% of clients to be couples compared to 1% nationally.
- There is more demand for services from sex workers in this region compared to the national average, with 41% of projects reporting between 1% and 25% of clients to be from this group compared to 29% 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>.