

Housing Related Support Services for Young People

To: Children and Young People's Committee

Meeting Date: 9 March 2021

From: Executive Director: People and Communities

Electoral division(s): All

Forward Plan ref: KD2021/020

Key decision: Yes

Outcome: To provide Committee with an understanding of the approach that will be taken to procure future Housing Related Support Services for Young People.

To provide Committee with information on the timescales for the planned procurement.

To seek approval from Committee to proceed with the proposed procurement approach.

Recommendation: The Committee is recommended to:

- a) Agree the proposed Procurement Approach.
- b) Approve the recommissioning of Housing Related Support services for young people for a contract period of seven years and total value of £11,253,935.
- c) Agree to delegate the responsibility to award the contract to the Executive Director of People and Communities, in consultation with the Chair of the Children and Young People Committee.

Officer contact:

Name: Lisa Sparks
Post: Commissioner – Housing Related Support
Email: lisa.sparks@cambridgeshire.gov.uk
Tel: 07900 163590

Member contact:

Names: Cllr Simon Bywater
Role: Chair
Email: simon.bywater@cambridgeshire.gov.uk
Tel: 01223 706398 (office)

1. Background

- 1.1 Housing Related Support (HRS) services provide dedicated support staff who are able to deliver specialist support to individuals to enable them to develop independent living skills and maintain their accommodation. The support provided is tailored to meet the specific needs of each person with key examples including support to develop life skills and/or manage issues such as addiction, mental health issues and emotional wellbeing.
- 1.2 Costs relating to accommodation, such as rent and service charges, are not covered by this funding.
- 1.3 The services do not deliver any statutory homelessness function. The statutory duty for homelessness sits with the District Councils. The funding provided by Cambridgeshire County Council ensures that there are support services available for those who have become homeless as a result of their support needs, and therefore require more than just a roof over their head to resolve the situation.
- 1.4 A review of Housing Related Support (HRS) services was completed in 2018. One of the key recommendations from this was a need to consider redesigning current support services for homeless young people and adults. This recommendation did generate some public interest, including a petition from supporters of Whitworth House which was submitted to the Children and Young People Committee on 21 May 2019.
- 1.5 The Housing Related Support Strategy developed sets out the aim to commission services to meet the following requirements:
- Redesigning services to enable them to meet some of the gaps identified by the HRS Review and arc4 Research – these included lack of ‘step down’ / transition support, accommodation and support for those with complex needs, need for services that prevent rough sleeping and access to move-on accommodation
 - Moving away from reliance of the traditional ‘hostel’ based model and adopting innovative and good practice service delivery models
 - Ensuring services are as accessible as possible and that pathways work for customers and professionals
 - Ensuring that new services are designed flexibly to enable them to respond to changing needs and demands
 - Allowing opportunities for services to evolve during the contract period in order to maximise service potential and opportunities for development and innovation
 - Adopting more innovative approaches to commissioning

2. Main Issues

Current Services

- 2.1 The table below details the HRS services currently being commissioned;

Service	Provider	District	Units
Wisbech Foyer	Axiom Housing	Fenland	19

Service	Provider	District	Units
Paines Mill Foyer	Axiom Housing	Hunts	25
Railway House	CHS Group	Cambridge	12
Ely Young People's Project	CHS Group	East Cambs	15
The Staithe	CHS Group	Fenland	21
Young Parents Project	CHS Group	Cambridge	8
Whitworth House	Orwell Housing Association	Cambridge	13
Castle Project	Richmond Fellowship	Cambridge	14
Cambridge Youth Foyer	Riverside Group	Cambridge	32
Kings Ripton Court	Salvation Army	Hunts	36
Queen Anne House	YMCA Trinity	Cambridge	78

- 2.2 All of these services have been in place for many years and have been commissioned as individual services rather than viewed as a system working together to achieve the best possible outcomes for an individual.
- 2.3 With the exception of the Castle Project, all of these services are based around medium (15 to 20 units) to large (30+ units) accommodation sites with staff support delivered on site.
- 2.4 Whilst the current provision delivers good outcomes for many clients, it does not cater for those who are not suited to a hostel environment, and offers no community based move-on or step down support options for clients who need a more gradual transition towards fully independent living.

Proposed New Model

- 2.5 The new model seeks to move away from the current model of delivery which is focused on using 'hostel' type accommodation towards a more placed based, person centred approach able to meet a range of needs and requirements. Through adopting a 'Hub and Spoke' model instead, the Council will aim to achieve more localised solutions which are able to achieve more sustainable outcomes. Services would focus on providing a range of accommodation options which range from larger units through to smaller units within local communities such as 'shared houses'. (Please see Appendices A and B for further information about the model and service specification).
- 2.6 These smaller units can then be used flexibly as both an alternative to 'hostel' accommodation and to provide 'move-on/step-down' opportunities for people on their journey out of homelessness.
- 2.7 The proposed model has been outlined in the Housing Related support Strategy endorsed by all relevant committees. The model reflects elements of national best practice identified within the St. Basil's Pathway, which identifies a need for a range of accommodation and support provision to be available to support young people. This good practice has been incorporated into the new model to enhance and develop existing services for Young People.
- 2.8 By procuring services which deliver support through a Hub and Spoke model, we will be able to;
- Meet some of the gaps identified by the HRS Review and arc4 Research

- Move away from reliance on the traditional 'hostel' based model and adopt and innovative and good practice service delivery models
- Ensure services are as accessible as possible and that pathways work for customers and professionals
- Ensure that new services are designed flexibly to enable them to respond to changing needs and demands
- Allow opportunities for services to evolve during the contract period in order to maximise service potential and opportunities for development and innovation
- Adopt more innovative approaches to commissioning

2.9 Commissioner have also explored the likely outcomes if the current delivery model is maintained. There are a number of factors that mean that this would be a less preferable option:

- Services would retain a fixed number of accommodation units with support on site
- Provision based almost entirely around larger hostel sites
- Fixed accommodation locations
- Individual referral to a service resulting in duplication and people having to tell their story multiple times
- No community-based units to support step down/move-on

Procurement Approach

2.10 In addressing the requirements of the HRS Strategy, the procurement process provides us with the opportunity to work with the provider market collaboratively to come up with a solution that meets the needs of service users and provides value for money. It tests the market in order to improve on what we already have in place and is an opportunity for all providers, including those already delivering services, to demonstrate how they can provide the best service possible. A significant amount of work has already taken place with the market to date and officers have seen good engagement throughout.

2.11 Re-commissioning should also take account of the learning from the Covid 19 Pandemic and infection control protocols. The pandemic highlighted the particular challenges around large units with shared facilities, and therefore the County would seek to ensure that at least 50% of any larger units commissioned offer en-suite bathroom facilities.

2.12 The commissioning process would ensure that there is an agreed timeframe for embedding the changes to delivery models.

2.13 Given the level of change we are seeking through commissioning the new model of provision, our preferred procurement approach would be a 'Light Touch Dialogue' process. This was selected over an 'Open Procurement' or use of 'Alliance Contracting' for the following key reasons;

- Gives bidders the opportunity to develop a model that meets the need, is innovative and includes robust partnership arrangements - bidders that have participated in similar processes have fed back that they appreciated the opportunity to have in depth discussions with the Authority as part of the procurement process.
- Helps to mitigate particular areas of risk as these can be explored in more detail through the dialogue – e.g. robust partnership arrangements, availability/reliability of accommodation
- In-house skills and experience available to support process

- 2.14 This approach gives bidders the opportunity to have in depth discussions with the Council as part of the procurement process through delivering a 3 stage process;
- Stage 1 – Invitation to submit an initial tender - Bidders submit their response to the Selection Questionnaire (SQ) and an initial tender response.
 - Stage 2 - Dialogue - A series of questions/topics can be sent to bidders in advance and then discussed during the dialogue sessions. Each dialogue is individual to the bidder and is focused around the areas of development that are needed for their submission.
 - Stage 3 – Invitation to submit a final tender - Providers that participated in dialogue are invited to submit a final tender, amending their responses based on the dialogue.
- 2.15 The recommended quality to price ratio for this tender would be 70% quality to 30% price. By giving this greater weighting to quality we can incentivise providers to develop the best possible solution, while ensuring price is also given appropriate consideration.
- 2.16 The process will also include questions written and evaluated by people with lived experience. The evaluation of these will represent 10% of the quality score.
- 2.17 We want to ensure that the new model is delivered consistently across each area, with a joined up approach delivering all elements of the model to enable the best possible outcomes for the individual client.
- 2.18 Providers or partnerships of providers will be able to bid for a District area. This means that there will be 1 contract awarded for each area, rather than the current approach of having multiple contracts with different providers, who all deliver services in a different way and require clients to complete separate application for each service they wish to be considered for.
- 2.19 Through the work undertaken with providers and partners to redesign services, we have encouraged all existing providers to consider a 'partnership' approach to delivering the models, and in several areas providers are already having discussions about how they might deliver the model jointly.
- 2.20 To recognise the commitment required from the successful bidders in delivering the new model, we will be seeking a longer contract period of up to 7 years (including extensions) to enable providers to implement, embed, adapt and develop the new model.
- 2.21 The table below shows the proposed budgets for each geographical area. This is based on current levels of funding attached to the services currently commissioned (as per para 2.1) and will be reviewed in line with demand trends over the life of the contract;

District area	Annual Value	Contract Value (7yrs)
Cambridge City & South Cambridgeshire	£874,629	£6,122,403
East Cambridgeshire	£102,466	£717,262
Fenland	£281,622	£1,971,354
Huntingdonshire	£348,988	£2,442,916

Timetable:

2.22 The proposed timetable for the Procurement is shown below;

Activity:	Date:
Tender goes live	May 2021
Initial Tenders Submissions	June 2021
Final Tender Submissions	August 2021
Contract Award	October 2021
Contract Start Date	1 st January 2022

Implementation

2.23 Given the scale of the change we are expecting the new models to deliver, a significant transition period will be required. On award of contract a transition plan will also be agreed with clear milestones for implementation. This will be monitored and managed using the contract.

3. Alignment with corporate priorities

3.1 A good quality of life for everyone

In redesigning services we are seeking to commission a more flexible service that can meet the needs of a greater range of people.

3.2 Thriving places for people to live

There are no significant implications for this priority.

3.3 The best start for Cambridgeshire's children

There are no significant implications for this priority.

3.4 Net zero carbon emissions for Cambridgeshire by 2050

There are no significant implications for this priority.

4. Significant Implications

4.1 Resource Implications

The resource implications are set out in paragraph 2.23

4.2 Procurement/Contractual/Council Contract Procedure Rules Implications

The Procurement and contractual implications are set out in paragraphs 2.11 to 2.22

4.3 Statutory, Legal and Risk Implications

There are no significant implications within this category.

4.4 Equality and Diversity Implications

A more flexible model which includes smaller shared units of community based accommodation would enable clients with specific needs or characteristics to be accommodated together if this was their preference.

4.5 Engagement and Communications Implications

There are no significant implications within this category.

4.6 Localism and Local Member Involvement

There are no significant implications within this category.

4.7 Public Health Implications

There are no significant implications within this category.

4.8 Environment and Climate Change Implications on Priority Areas:

4.8.1 Implication 1: Energy efficient, low carbon buildings.

Status: Neutral

Explanation:

4.8.2 Implication 2: Low carbon transport.

Status: Neutral

Explanation: No impact

4.8.3 Implication 3: Green spaces, peatland, afforestation, habitats and land management.

Status: Neutral

Explanation: No impact

4.8.4 Implication 4: Waste Management and Tackling Plastic Pollution.

Status: Neutral

Explanation: No impact

4.8.5 Implication 5: Water use, availability and management:

Status: Neutral

Explanation: No impact

4.8.6 Implication 6: Air Pollution.

Status: Neutral

Explanation: No impact

4.8.7 Implication 7: Resilience of our services and infrastructure, and supporting vulnerable people to cope with climate change.

Status: Potentially positive

Explanation: Place based/localised solutions mean less travel & easier access to services, which improves access should (for example) extreme weather events occur making travel more challenging.

Have the resource implications been cleared by Finance? Yes

Name of Financial Officer: Stephen Howarth

Have the procurement/contractual/ Council Contract Procedure Rules implications been cleared by the LGSS Head of Procurement? Yes

Name of Officer: Gus da Silva

Has the impact on statutory, legal and risk implications been cleared by the Council's Monitoring Officer or LGSS Law? Yes

Name of Legal Officer: Fiona McMillan

Have the equality and diversity implications been cleared by your Service Contact?

Yes

Name of Officer: Will Patten

Have any engagement and communication implications been cleared by Communications?

No response

Have any localism and Local Member involvement issues been cleared by your Service Contact? Yes

Name of Officer: Will Patten

Have any Public Health implications been cleared by Public Health?

No response

If a Key decision, have any Environment and Climate Change implications been cleared by the Climate Change Officer?

Yes

Name of Officer: Emily Bolton

5. Source documents

5.1 [Report to the Children and Young People Committee and petition - 21 May 2019](#)