

HOUSING RELATED SUPPORT SERVICES

To: **Children's & Young People Committee**

Meeting Date: **21ST May 2019**

From: **Adrian Chapman, Service Director: Communities and Safety**

Electoral division(s): **All**

Forward Plan ref: **2019/037** *Key decision:* **Yes**

Purpose: **The Committee is asked to consider the approach being taken to reviewing Housing Related Support (HRS) services.**

Recommendation: **The Committee is being asked to:**

- a) Review and approve the approach being taken to review Housing Related Support services;**
- b) Consider and approve the extension to a number of young people's-related commissioned services, as described in sections 2.24 and 2.25;**
- c) agree to receive a further report on the detailed progress in Autumn 2019.**

<i>Officer contact:</i>		<i>Member contacts:</i>	
Name:	Lisa Sparks	Names:	Councillors Simon Bywater
Post:	Commissioner - HRS	Post:	Chair, Children and Young People Committee
Email:	lisa.sparks@cambridgeshire.gov.uk	Email:	simon.bywater@cambridgeshire.gov.uk
Tel:	01223 699277 / 07900 163590	Tel:	01223 706398 (office)

1.	BACKGROUND
1.1	Cambridgeshire County Council's Housing Related Support (HRS) budget, currently £7.4m, funds a range of services which support more than 1,500 vulnerable people, including those at risk of homelessness, domestic violence, alcoholism, substance abuse and mental health problems.
1.2	Of this £7.4m, £1.76m is presently spent on services for young people.
1.3	This funding was originally part of a ring-fenced grant allocation to the County Council under the government's former Supporting People Programme, which aimed to enable vulnerable people who were homeless or at risk of homelessness to maintain or to achieve independence through the provision of housing related support.
1.4	Despite the fact that there is no statutory requirement for the County Council to provide these services, the Council recognises the potential they have to contribute to the prevention agenda and has continued to invest in these services, even though the majority of those using the services would not ordinarily be eligible for care or support from adult's or children's services.
1.5	The Housing Related Support budget pays for dedicated support staff who are able to deliver specialist support to meet the specific needs of each person. Costs relating to accommodation, such as rent and service charges, are not covered by this funding.
1.6	To ensure that people accessing Housing Related Support services get the best outcome possible, the Council is exploring new models of delivery that promote best practice. These will enable the service users to receive a support service which can meet their changing needs in a positive and flexible way. In addition to improving outcomes, this transformation work will also help the council to meet its savings targets by finding more effective methods that develop people's independence and therefore reduce their dependency on services.
1.7	Initially, there was an expectation that savings of £1m for Cambridgeshire would be identified through this process by March 2019. However, as a result of a more detailed analysis of activity, this target has been reduced to an initial target of £683k, and it has been proposed that these savings are achieved over a two year period from 2019 – 2021 rather than over a single year.
1.8	£100k of the £683k target has already been realised without any impact on service provision, leaving £583k to be realised.
1.9	Information for this analysis was gathered using the following approaches: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All services were asked to complete a 'Data Collection Tool' which captured information on services and clients, as well as providing an opportunity for providers to give feedback (this Tool can be made available on request) • Key stakeholders and partners were asked to complete a questionnaire to provide their views and feedback on Housing Related Support and the services being reviewed • Two workshops were held with providers and stakeholders to share details

	<p>about the analysis and gather feedback</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Feedback on the approach was sought from the Sub Regional Housing Board through attendance at Board meetings• Discussions were held with commissioned providers• Contract monitoring reports were analysed <p>We have continued to have an active dialogue with all providers whilst potential proposals are being explored. Our recommendations take full account of discussions to date.</p> <p>Currently the total Housing Related Support (HRS) budget funds the following categories of services:</p> <table><tr><th>Number of Services</th><th>Client Group</th><th>Total Spend</th></tr><tr><td>10</td><td>Rough Sleepers & Single Homeless</td><td>£1,507,000</td></tr><tr><td>10</td><td>Homeless Young People</td><td>£1,653,000</td></tr><tr><td>3</td><td>Teenage Parents</td><td>£112,000</td></tr><tr><td>6</td><td>People with Mental Health problems</td><td>£1,151,000</td></tr><tr><td>24</td><td>Older People (incl. Almshouses)</td><td>£1,207,000</td></tr><tr><td>2</td><td>Travellers</td><td>£66,000</td></tr><tr><td>1</td><td>Learning Disability / Physical Disability</td><td>£233,500</td></tr><tr><td>3</td><td>Victims of Domestic Abuse</td><td>£265,000</td></tr><tr><td>1</td><td>People with Alcohol Problems</td><td>£79,000</td></tr><tr><td>2</td><td>Offenders</td><td>£157,000</td></tr><tr><td>1</td><td>Generic Floating Support</td><td>£896,388¹</td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td>£7,327,000</td></tr></table>	Number of Services	Client Group	Total Spend	10	Rough Sleepers & Single Homeless	£1,507,000	10	Homeless Young People	£1,653,000	3	Teenage Parents	£112,000	6	People with Mental Health problems	£1,151,000	24	Older People (incl. Almshouses)	£1,207,000	2	Travellers	£66,000	1	Learning Disability / Physical Disability	£233,500	3	Victims of Domestic Abuse	£265,000	1	People with Alcohol Problems	£79,000	2	Offenders	£157,000	1	Generic Floating Support	£896,388 ¹			£7,327,000
Number of Services	Client Group	Total Spend																																						
10	Rough Sleepers & Single Homeless	£1,507,000																																						
10	Homeless Young People	£1,653,000																																						
3	Teenage Parents	£112,000																																						
6	People with Mental Health problems	£1,151,000																																						
24	Older People (incl. Almshouses)	£1,207,000																																						
2	Travellers	£66,000																																						
1	Learning Disability / Physical Disability	£233,500																																						
3	Victims of Domestic Abuse	£265,000																																						
1	People with Alcohol Problems	£79,000																																						
2	Offenders	£157,000																																						
1	Generic Floating Support	£896,388 ¹																																						
		£7,327,000																																						
1.10	The HRS review sits alongside a much larger piece of work to look at the approach to tackling homelessness across Cambridgeshire and Peterborough. This work is being taken forward in partnership with all District Councils and other partners, and is focussed on opportunities for system redesign work in relation to homelessness prevention, building on the work of the Homelessness Trailblazer to which the County Council continues to contribute funding. To support this approach, it is important that we complement the work of our District Council partners, supporting them to deliver their existing strategies and plans.																																							
1.11	This system redesign work will enable the whole partnership to maximise the growing national and international evidence base about what works in preventing homelessness and sustaining people in long term homes.																																							
2.	MAIN ISSUES																																							
2.1	Summary of Initial Analysis of Housing Related Support Services																																							
2.1.1	The analysis of all commissioned Housing Related Support (HRS) services sought to: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• provide an understanding of the needs of clients being supported• understand the Strategic Relevance of all services, by which is meant:																																							

¹ This service operates across Cambridgeshire and Peterborough but the spend shown is for Cambridgeshire only.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Demand for service ○ Need for service ○ Use of service ○ Length of time people remain in services ○ Whether people move on in a positive way ○ Level of need they are targeted at and level of need they are actually supporting ○ Identification of any specialist services ● identify opportunities for transformation of supported housing and consider new / innovative approaches to service delivery ● identify opportunities for joint commissioning ● determine the best procurement option for services i.e. tender and contract or grant award or spot purchase ● ensure that commissioned services are providing best value ● identify areas where savings could be achieved across CCC HRS services ● gather the views of providers and partners ● understand what outcomes services are achieving for clients
2.1.2	<p>The analysis identified a number of key points which can be summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The majority of services being commissioned are being well utilised, are moving people on in a planned way and are contributing positively towards the priorities of the Council and other statutory partners. However it did also highlight a number of issues which indicate that current services are not delivering the key outcomes we are aiming for, which is for people to be able to live independently, be economically active and to be able to positively participate in day to day community life. ii. Both providers and partners strongly emphasised the contribution that HRS services make to the prevention agenda, but whilst they valued current services, most felt that changes were needed to ensure commissioned services are providing the right support for clients, including those with multiple complex needs. It was felt that a variety of service delivery models are needed to ensure this, including both accommodation based services and floating / visiting support. iii. Whilst most services demonstrated a broadly comparable range of hourly rates, there were some notable outliers showing either exceedingly high or exceedingly low hourly rates. The reasons for this need to be examined in more detail and a 'value for money methodology' developed which can be applied to all HRS services. iv. Throughput data showed that short or medium term services are supporting a significant number of clients to achieve a planned exit from their services. However, the individual planned exit rates for services do vary dramatically. Whilst there will be distinct factors which impact on whether someone 'moves on' from a service in a planned and positive way, such as the client group or level of needs the service supports, the low level of planned 'move on' rates for a small number of services does suggest that they are not achieving good outcomes for clients, or good value for money, and therefore any continued

	<p>commissioning of these services needs to be carefully considered.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> v. The client needs data collected does indicate that many services are supporting a significant number of people with quite complex needs. The data also suggests that the majority of those moving on from services will need some ongoing support at the point of move on, and that for some the identified need was for longer term, rather than transitional, support. In contrast to this, only 13% of clients are expected to require no ongoing support when they move-on from their current service. vi. Whilst those entering short term services also have an immediate need for accommodation, their homelessness will usually be as a result of the other issues they are presenting with - therefore addressing their accommodation need will only be one element of the support they need to enable them to move on to independent or less supported accommodation. This accords with the experiences of providers who seem to be receiving an increasing number of referrals for clients with higher or more complex needs, for whom more intensive support interventions are often required. vii. This increasing need profile of clients will also be contributing to the fact that clients are remaining in short term services beyond the expected 2 year maximum stay. viii. The challenge of accessing, timely, appropriate and affordable move-on is also having an impact on the length of stay at services. The issue around move-on is affecting all areas of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough, though is more acutely felt in areas such as Cambridge City, where house rental prices are much higher and there is less affordable accommodation available. ix. Delays in moving people on are also having an adverse effect on throughput so that those in need of services are waiting longer for vacancies, which can also have a detrimental effect on their needs and willingness or ability to engage. x. The analysis suggests that there are a significant number of clients moving between different supported housing/hostel services, rather than moving on to independent living. xi. Discussions with different providers also suggest that a number of clients also return to homeless services as a result of losing the accommodation they moved in to. Whilst there is no specific evidence to suggest the reasons for this, it is probable that this could in part be as a result of clients transitioning from high to very low, or no, support, when they move-on from supported housing/hostel services. This links with the perceived gap around 'step down' support for those moving on but still not ready for fully independent living. It also strongly suggests that the services we are commissioning may inadvertently be locking many people into a cycle of homelessness rather than enabling them to address their needs in a sustainable way so they can move forward.
2.1.3	In summary, the review concluded that there is a strong case for change in the current system of service provision, not least to meet the changing pattern of demand and

	need.
2.2	Service Redesign and Savings
2.2.1	<p>We acknowledge that many of the current HRS services are providing support to clients, however, a number of these services have remained fairly unchanged since the implementation of Supporting People in 2003. This means that we have not explored the opportunity to introduce other, evidenced good practice models which have been proven to deliver better outcomes for clients in other areas, notably the Housing First model for adults and the St. Basil's Positive Pathway for young people. The links below provide some additional information on these models;</p> <p>Housing First https://hfe.homeless.org.uk/about-housing-first</p> <p>St. Basil' Positive Pathway https://stbasils.org.uk/news-resources/news/positive-pathway-remodelled-to-reflect-new-national-policy-changes/</p>
2.2.2	<p>We believe that pursuing alternative tried and tested models will enable us to make significant savings, whilst also ensuring that we are commissioning services that are able to respond much more effectively to current and future client needs in a more systemic way, and will deliver better outcomes for clients.</p>
2.2.3	<p>In order to implement these new models, significant changes need to be made to existing provision, in a managed way. For young people's services the focus will initially be in Cambridge City where there is a larger concentration of provision. By adopting the St. Basil's approach we can ensure that we have a clear point of access for services and a broader, more flexible range of HRS options available, which include accommodation based solutions as well as community support. We have established a working group to look at service redesign, which will include a range of relevant local providers and partners. This group will be able to influence and comment on the proposed new model for Cambridge. Client feedback will also be sought. Learning from the Cambridge redesign work will also be used to inform commissioning of services in other areas.</p>
2.2.4	<p>The intention is to develop the new model for a young people's pathway by Summer 2019, so that we can then undertake a competitive tender process for the new service to start in April 2020. To enable this to happen we need to seek an 18 month extension on a number of existing contracts to align contract end dates with the implementation of the new approach, and ensure there is time to fully explore opportunities for change in re-commissioning services which may be impacted by the service redesign. Based on the findings of the initial analysis highlighted above, the contracts which we are seeking to extend are shown below.</p>

SERVICE	PROVIDER	VALUE	START DATE	CURRENT END DATE
Cambridge Youth Foyer	Riverside Group	£178,600	01/07/2016	30/06/2019
Queen Anne House	YMCA Trinity	£380,000	01/07/2016	30/06/2019
Wisbech Foyer	Axiom Housing	£110,382	01/07/2016	30/06/2019
Paines Mill Foyer	Axiom Housing	£110,796	01/07/2016	30/06/2019
Kings Ripton Court	Salvation Army	£238,192	01/07/2016	30/06/2019
Castle Project	Richmond Fellowship	£170,000	01/12/2011	30/06/2019
Young Parents / Peter Maitland Court	Cambridge Housing Society	£79,761	01/12/2011	30/06/2019
Whitworth House	Orwell Housing Association	£65,753	01/12/2011	30/06/2019
Railway House	Cambridge Housing Society	£112,891	01/12/2011	30/06/2019
Ely Young People's Project	Cambridge Housing Society	£114,842	01/12/2011	30/06/2019
The Staithe	Cambridge Housing Society	£171,240	01/04/2012	30/05/2019

2.2.5

Changes are also being proposed to Teenage and Young parent services in Huntingdonshire and Fenland. As these services currently provide visiting support to residents, efficiencies could be realised by delivering these services through the countywide floating support service instead. In order to investigate this possibility in more detail and then instigate any change, we need to seek a 6 month contract extension for the two services listed below;

SERVICE	PROVIDER	VALUE	START DATE	CURRENT END DATE
Teenage Parent Project	Luminus	£11,336	01/07/2016	30/06/2019
Fenland Young Parent Project	Ormiston Families	£20,805	01/07/2016	30/06/2019

2.2.6

There is also the potential to generate savings by implementing proposals put forward by two current providers. Axiom (Longhurst Group) intend to move to a shared manger across both of their Foyer schemes to deliver a voluntary saving in year and CHS Group are looking to adopt a change across two of their young people's services from night support staff to night time concierge which can be funded in a different way. Again this would generate an in year saving.

2.3	Next Steps
2.3.1	If the contracts described in this report are approved to be extended, the work to develop the young person's pathway will be undertaken, with partners, up to Summer 2019, before being presented to the Children's and Young People's Committee later this year for discussion and approval.
2.3.2	Any resultant changes to commissioned arrangements will then be developed and brought back to this Committee for discussion and approval prior to being implemented.
2.3.3	Individual reviews of all other commissioned services will be undertaken, with any resultant recommendations being presented to the Adult's Committee for discussion and approval before being implemented.
2.3.4	Work will also commence on the development of a Cambridgeshire and Peterborough HRS Commissioning Strategy, which will be presented to both the Adults and Children and Young People's Committee for approval.
3.	ALIGNMENT WITH CORPORATE PRIORITIES
3.1	A good quality of life for everyone
	The report above sets out the implications for this priority in sections 1 and 2.
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.
4.	SIGNIFICANT IMPLICATIONS
4.1	Resource Implications
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The HRS budget is reducing and this will impact on what can be delivered in future • Moving to new delivery models which reflect best practice may require short term investment from the Transformation funding allocated to the HRS review • If any of the proposed savings are not agreed either partially or in full then an alternative saving would need to be considered if the full saving target were still to be met • Any decision to maintain a service beyond the proposed savings realisation date will result in a reduced saving within that financial year
4.2	Procurement/Contractual/Council Contract Procedure Rules Implications
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To enable the proposals and services changes to be implemented in a managed and timely way, exemptions are being sought on the contracts identified within the report

4.3	Statutory, Legal and Risk Implications
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The services are non-statutory so are not subject to any statutory guidance The changes are expected to generate ongoing media attention There could be TUPE implications as a result of the changes if any staff are LGPS members
4.4	Equality and Diversity Implications
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The redesign of young person services will establish a single point of access for services ensuring that services are more easily accessible and that those in greatest need can be prioritised for services Due regard has been given to the Council's Equalities duties under the Equality Act 2010 and Community (Equality) Impact Assessment s have been completed for all proposals
4.5	Engagement and Communications Implications
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The review included opportunities for colleagues, partners and providers to provide feedback and share their view Savings proposals were shared across directorates prior to discussions with providers Workshops were held for all HRS service providers
4.6	Localism and Local Member Involvement
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A briefing paper has been shared with all members and a briefing session held on the HRS review
4.7	Public Health Implications
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> By redesigning services we will be promoting easier access to services for those who need them and enabling access to prioritised for those most in need

Implications	Officer Clearance
Have the resource implications been cleared by Finance?	Yes Name of Financial Officer: Martin Wade
Have the procurement/contractual/ Council Contract Procedure Rules implications been cleared by the LGSS Head of Procurement?	Yes or No Name of Officer:
Has the impact on statutory, legal and risk implications been cleared by LGSS Law?	Yes Name of Legal Officer: Fiona McMillian
Have the equality and diversity implications been cleared by your Service Contact?	Yes Name of Officer: Adrian Chapman

Have any engagement and communication implications been cleared by Communications?	Yes Name of Officer: Jo Dickson
Have any localism and Local Member involvement issues been cleared by your Service Contact?	Yes Name of Officer: Adrian Chapman
Have any Public Health implications been cleared by Public Health	Yes Name of Officer: Tess Campbell

Source Documents	Location
n/a	

Appendix A - Housing Related Support Services by District

Service	Provider	No. Units	Location
Cambridge Youth Foyer	Riverside Group	32	City
Queen Anne House	YMCA Trinity	78	City
Whitworth House	Orwell Housing	15	City
Castle Project	Richmond Fellowship	17	City
Young Parents / Peter Maitland Court	CHS	7	City
Railway House	CHS	19	City
Cambridge Refuge	Cambridge Women's Aid	11	City
Older Persons Visiting Support Service	Cambridge City	variable	City
Controlled Drinkers Project	Jimmy's	6	City
Jimmys Assessment Centre	Jimmy's	20	City
222 Victoria Road	Riverside Group	54	City
Willow Walk	Riverside Group	20	City
Mental Health Accommodation support service	Metropolitan - The Haven		City
Grant Agreement for the Provision of Housing Support	Cambridge Cyrenians	45	City
Home and Community Support- Homeless	Cambridge Cyrenians	29	City
Abbey St Move On	Jimmy's	4	City
Accommodation support service	Sanctuary Housing	121	City
Vic Terrace	Sanctuary Housing	12	City
Corona House	CHS Group	6	City
Jubilee Project	Cambridge Cyrenians	10	City
An Lac House	Abbeyfield Cambridge Vietnamese	10	City
Storeys House	Foundation of Edward Storey	50	City
Russell Street	CHS Group	21	City
Extra Care	Multiple suppliers	variable	County-wide

FS City, South and Fenland	P3	variable	County-wide
Older Persons Visiting Support Service	Age UK	variable	ECDC / FDC / HDC
Ely Young People's Project	CHS	12	EDC
Wisbech Foyer	Axiom Housing	19	FDC
Young Parents	Ormiston	4	FDC
The Staithe	CHS	20	FDC
Fenland refuge	Refuge		FDC
Kirkgate (Wisbech)	Geneisis	9	FDC
Princes Walk (March)	Geneisis HA	9	FDC
The Ferry Project (Wisbech)	Luminus	36	FDC
almshouse	Wisbech Charities	21	FDC
Fenland Traveller Sites	FDC	64	FDC
Paines Mill Foyer	Axiom Housing	25	HDC
Young Parents	Luminus	2	HDC
Kings Ripton Court	Salvation Army	36	HDC
Hunts refuge	Refuge		HDC
Fern court	Sanctuary Housing	14	HDC
almshouse	Ramsey Welfare Charity	41	HDC
Gypsies/Traveller Support	Luminus	20	HDC
Offender Accommodation Service	Luminus Group	12	HDC and FDC
Older Persons Visiting Support Service	SCDC	variable	SDC
Green Road Project	Suffolk Mind	14	SDC