National strategies to fight homelessness and housing exclusion

United Kingdom

Rebecca Tunstall

European Commission

Social Europe

European Social Policy Network (ESPN)

ESPN Thematic Report on National strategies to fight homelessness and housing exclusion

United Kingdom

2019

Rebecca Tunstall

The European Social Policy Network (ESPN) was established in July 2014 on the initiative of the European Commission to provide high-quality and timely independent information, advice, analysis and expertise on social policy issues in the European Union and neighbouring countries.

The ESPN brings together into a single network the work that used to be carried out by the European Network of Independent Experts on Social Inclusion, the Network for the Analytical Support on the Socio-Economic Impact of Social Protection Reforms (ASISP) and the MISSOC (Mutual Information Systems on Social Protection) secretariat.

The ESPN is managed by the Luxembourg Institute of Socio-Economic Research (LISER) and APPLICA, together with the European Social Observatory (OSE).

For more information on the ESPN, see:
http:ec.europa.eusocialmain.jsp?catId=1135&langId=en

Contents

Summary

The UK has two main official definitions of homelessness: 'street homelessness/rough sleeping' (ETHOS light category 1)', and 'statutory homelessness' linked to a partial legal right to housing (which includes parts of ETHOS light categories 1, 2, 4, 5, 6). In 2018, street counts and estimates suggested a minimum of 5,711 people sleeping rough on any one night in the UK, or about 0.1 in a thousand people overall. In 2017/18, a total of 192,674 UK households applied to their local authorities as homeless or at risk of homelessness, amounting to seven per thousand households.

The UK has experienced a sharp increase in all types of homelessness over the past ten years, concentrated in England. Estimates of rough sleepers in England increased by 162% between 2010 and 2018. Numbers accepted as homeless and owed a main duty by their local authorities increased by 43% between 2009/10 (40,000 households) and 2017/18 (57,000 households). The increase by both measures in England over the 2010s contrasts with the fall in England over the 2000s, and with the fall in Scotland in the 2010s.

Most rough sleepers are men. Most are aged above 25. Large minorities - but by no means all - have problems with drugs, alcohol or mental or physical health. A substantial minority are non-UK nationals, although this is reducing. Rough sleeping has been concentrated in London but is spreading across the south of England. In contrast, in England most statutorily homeless households are families, because single people are largely excluded. However, in Scotland where the law changed in 2010, a majority of applicants are single people. Across the UK, large proportions of statutory homeless households have some support needs. Again, there is a concentration in London, but it is spreading.

The UK has an established statutory housing and welfare system of laws, guidance, funding and institutions to prevent and respond to homelessness. There is now substantial divergence in law between England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland. The UK system currently falls down on the provision of adequate funding. In 2008/09, English local authorities spent £2,800 million on homelessness services, but by 2017/18 this had fallen to £2,000 million. Capital expenditure on housing, expenditure on a range of public services, and the availability and amounts of housing allowances have all been significantly reduced over the past ten years.

Past UK governments achieved substantial reductions in rough sleeping through intensive programmes. In the 2017 UK general election, the winning Conservative Party promised to halve rough sleeping by 2022 and end it by 2027. In 2018, the UK government published a Rough Sleeping Strategy for England. However, new funds linked to the strategy in 2017/18 totalled just £37 million, albeit with further amounts for later years.

Collectively, UK agencies provide all main potential forms of services for people who are homeless or at risk of homelessness. The enforceable right to housing provided through the UK's homelessness legislation and right to prevention of homelessness in England and Wales are particularly distinctive. However, these services rely on the availability of private rented or social housing and housing benefits.

Services for rough sleepers are largely provided by the 1,600 national and local homelessness NGOs, working with a range of public sector bodies and diverse funding. Services for statutory homeless households are provided by local authorities, but largely funded by central government, and are often delivered through NGOs or the private sector.

The main weaknesses in homelessness policy and service in the UK are a lack of political will; lack of finance for homelessness prevention and support; rules which mean housing allowances do not meet the full costs of households on the lowest incomes, regardless of tenure or family size; and insufficient supply of affordable, good quality, secure housing.

1   The nature and extent of homelessness and housing exclusion

1.1   Official definitions of homelessness

The UK has two main 'official' definitions of homelessness for which official data are available (see Table A1 in Annex).

Street homelessness and rough sleeping: The terms 'street homelessness' and 'rough sleeping' are used widely and interchangeably by government, local authorities, NGOs, and the media and public. They match ETHOS light category 1 (Table A1). Since 2010, first 'experimental' and now 'official' estimates of numbers of people sleeping rough are produced annually, through a single night count in each local authority area in England every autumn, supplemented by information local authorities obtain from relevant local NGOs. A similar method is used in Wales and Northern Ireland. These statistics, however, are *"widely interpreted as substantially understating the scale of rough sleeping"* (Fitzpatrick et al 2018: 48). Some people sleeping in tents, a growing phenomenon, may be counted, but those sleeping in vehicles or on public transport are likely to be missed (Bramley 2017). Additional people may sleep rough on other nights, and the NGO data used to supplement counts to create estimates is patchy. In Scotland, there are no official statistics on rough sleeping (Fitzpatrick et al 2019).

Statutory homelessness: The UK has a series of related statutory definitions of 'homelessness'. They are used to determine which households local authorities must help and in what ways, and to monitor local authority activity. Rooted in the Housing (Homeless Persons) Act 1977 for England, the key concepts local authorities use are i) homelessness or risk of homelessness (within the next 56 days), but also ii) eligibility through a connection to the local area iii) being in the situation unintentionally, and iv) being in 'priority need', meaning having children or another special vulnerability, which excluded most single adults and couples. Households which fit all these criteria are owed a 'main duty' by local authorities, who must secure 'settled' accommodation for them. Households defined as 'statutorily homeless' rather messily make up part, but not all, of several ETHOS light categories (1, 2, 4, 5, 6). Households may be 'homeless' by the first part of the statutory definition, but not meet all the criteria for help. Of those who applied to local authorities in England as homeless in the financial year 2017/18, 23% were rejected because they were 'not homeless', 17% because they were homeless but not in 'priority need', and for 8% because their homelessness was deemed intentional (Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government [MHCLG] 2018b). There is some overlap between the relatively small numbers of people rough sleeping and the much larger numbers of households found to be statutorily homelessness. In the first quarter of 2018, only 6% of households accepted as homeless in England had a history of rough sleeping, and only 3% were sleeping rough at the time of the application. However, 49% were living with family or friends, of 'no fixed abode', in supported housing or hostels, or in temporary accommodation.

Administrative data on statutory homelessness have for many years been seen by government and researchers as the key measure of homelessness. However, they *"remain imperfect… since they are fundamentally a (service) supply measure rather than a demand indicator"* (Fitzpatrick et al 2018: 64). In addition, over the past decade, following devolution, there has been significant divergence in housing and homelessness policy between the nations of the UK (Bate 2017). In England, Scotland and Wales, preventative activities, often termed 'Housing Options', were encouraged from the early 2000s to pre-empt homelessness and applications to local authorities (Fitzpatrick et al 2018, 2019). In Scotland, the 'priority need' criterion was removed from the definition of statutory homelessness by 2010, meaning that local authorities were required to secure housing for many more single homeless people without special vulnerabilities (Fitzpatrick et al 2019). When it was first planned, this was described by the NGO Shelter as 'the best law in Europe' (Anon 2003). The Housing (Wales) Act 2014 meant that from 2015, Welsh local authorities had to provide services to prevent and relieve homelessness even for households that were 'intentionally' homeless or not in 'priority need'. Abbé

Pierre/FEANTSA commented that this made Wales "*the only region in Europe where local authorities are legally obliged to prevent homelessness*" (2018: 29). The Homelessness Reduction Act 2017 introduced similar rules for England in 2018.

The UK also has other terms for homelessness which do not have official status. 'Core homeless' is a new term developed by the NGO Crisis, to reflect concerns that the official definitions are too narrow (Bramley 2017). It includes rough sleeping, 'quasi rough sleeping' (people sleeping in tents, cars, vans, and on public transport), squatting (illegal or unlicensed occupation), people living in hostels, refuges, shelters, people in 'unsuitable' temporary accommodation provided by local authorities to people who have applied as homeless (bed and breakfast hotels, nightly-let non-self-contained places, and out-of-area placements), and 'sofa surfers' ('concealed' households living on a temporary basis with people who are not their immediate family and in overcrowded conditions). Thus it includes all of ETHOS categories 1, 2, 3, 5 and 6.

1.2   The extent of homelessness in the UK in 2018

The current level of homelessness (see Table A2 in Annex) has been described as *"a national crisis"* by the House of Commons Public Accounts Committee (House of Commons Public Accounts Committee 2017).

Street homelessness or rough sleeping (ETHOS light category 1): In 2018, street counts and estimates suggested that a minimum of 5,711 people were sleeping rough on any one night in the UK. This figure is made up of 4,677 people in England and 347 in Wales through street counts and NGO information (Fitzpatrick et al 2018, Welsh Government 2018). In 2018, about 27 rough sleepers were found through street counts in the two largest cities in Northern Ireland (Northern Ireland Housing Executive 2018, Anon 2018). Estimates from the results of a 2014 survey suggested 660 people slept rough per night in Scotland (Fitzpatrick et al 2015). The figure of 5,711 amounts to about 0.1 in a thousand people overall. A supplementary method for counting rough sleeping, the Combined Homelessness and Information Network (CHAIN) method, in London has developed over the past two decades and is now managed by the St Mungo's NGO for the Greater London Authority. CHAIN data is based on contacts with named individuals by a large network of NGOs, and it counts people sleeping rough at any point in a year. While the official 2018 estimate for London was 1,283 (MHCLG 2018c), or about 0.2 in a thousand people on one night, CHAIN produced the much higher figure of 8,108 people at some point in 2018, or about one in a thousand of the London population. An academic compilation of data on rough sleeping using official estimates, CHAIN, and existing and new surveys, resulted in an estimated 9,000 rough sleepers across Great Britain (the UK excluding Northern Ireland) in 2016, markedly higher than the official number, and about 0.2 per thousand (Bramley 2017).

Statutory homelessness: In 2017/18, a total of 192,674 UK households applied to their local authorities as homeless, amounting to seven per thousand households in the country. This total was made up of 109,470 households in England, 34,972 in Scotland, 28,881 in Wales and 9,673 for the first six months of 2018/19 in Northern Ireland (MHCLG 2018b, Scottish Government 2019, Stats Wales 2019b, Northern Ireland Housing Executive 2018). A total of 151,715 UK households, or 78% of those who applied to their local authorities were accepted as homeless or at risk of homelessness, amounting to six per thousand. This is made up of 85,810 in England, 28,792 in Scotland, 24,303 in Wales and 6,405 for the first six months of 2018/19 in Northern Ireland (MHCLG 2018b, Scottish Government 2019, Stats Wales 2019b, Northern Ireland Housing Executive 2018). These figures do not include those who were homeless, but which not apply to local authorities, or who were defined as 'non-priority'. In England, Wales and Northern Ireland, where priority criteria remained, a total of 78,579 households or 50% of total applications were assessed as meeting all the criteria and were owed a 'main duty' (MHCLG 2018a, Scottish Government 2019, Stats Wales 2019b, Northern Ireland Housing Executive 2018). In England, data referring to the 2017

legislation have to date been categorised as 'experimental' rather than official statistics, as it is believed there is some undercounting (Wilson and Barton 2019a).

 'Core homelessness': In 2016, there were 143,000 'core homeless' households in England, or about six per thousand (Bramley 2017). These included 59,000 households 'sofa surfing', 38,500 in hostels, refuges and night shelters, 17,000 in unsuitable temporary accommodation, 11,500 squatting or in non-residential accommodation, 8,000 rough sleepers and 8,000 sleeping in tents, cars or on public transport.

These figures all refer to experiences of homelessness at one point in time. However, analysis of survey data suggested that in 2015, 80 in a thousand people in Scotland had been homeless at some point in their lives (Waugh et al 2018). Finally, despite the relative wealth of sources of data in the UK, it should be noted that in 2017, only a minority of local authority respondents thought that homeless statistics were 'very reliable' (Fitzpatrick et al 2018). The Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government itself said *"our knowledge of who sleeps rough and why is imperfect"* (MHCLG 2018b: 9).

1.3   Trends in homelessness over the last ten years

The UK has experienced a sharp increase in all types of homelessness over the past ten years, almost entirely due to increases in England. The increase in England over the 2010s contrasts with the fall in England over the 2000s, and with a fall in Scotland in the 2010s.

Rough sleeping: There has been a dramatic increase in street homeless in the UK over the past ten years, due to a big increase in England, as well as some signs of increases in Wales and Northern Ireland. Estimates of rough sleepers in England increased by 162% between 2010 and 2018, from 1,768 to 4,677 (MHCLG 2018c). Numbers of rough sleepers in London identified by the 'CHAIN' method, more than doubled from 2009/10 to 2016/17, from just under 4,000 identified at any point to just over 8,000 (Fitzpatrick et al 2018). Estimates of rough sleepers across Great Britain developed as part of estimates on 'core homelessness' grew by 49% between 2011 and 2016, from 6,100 to 9,100 (Bramley 2017). The increase in street homelessness is very obvious in the centres of all major cities and many small towns in the UK.

Statutory homelessness: Researchers have warned that changes in policy means that figures are not fully comparable over time and may underestimate the growth in homelessness (Fitzpatrick et al 2018). Similarly, figures in Scotland and Wales are no longer directly comparable with those from England and Northern Ireland. Nonetheless, there has undoubtedly been a large increase in households approaching local authorities and being assessed as homeless, driven by the situation in England. In England, numbers of households applying, assessed as homeless and assessed as owed a main duty by local authorities all increased. Acceptances increased by 43% between 2009/10 and 2017/18, from 40,000 to 57,000 households. The highest rates of statutory homelessness areas were in London and in the South East, but over the past few years, the fastest growth has been outside these areas, apparently reflecting the growing geographical spread of problems with housing affordability. In 2017, two thirds of respondents to a survey of local authorities in England thought homelessness had increased in their area in the past year (Fitzpatrick et al 2018).

Numbers also increased in Northern Ireland, although at a lower rate (Fitzpatrick et al 2016). In Wales, local authority opinion suggests increasing numbers of homeless households (Fitzpatrick et al 2017). The situation in Scotland appears very different. Numbers of applications and numbers of applicants accepted as homeless in Scotland (including those who would formerly have been assessed as non-priority) reduced from 2010 to 2014 and then stabilised at a lower rate (Fitzpatrick 2019). Fitzpatrick et al argued that this was *"wholly the result"* of the more preventive approach in Scotland (Fitzpatrick et al 2015: vii).

'Core homelessness': The number of 'core homeless' households in Great Britain grew by 33% from 2011 to 2016, from 119,900 to 159,000, due to sharp increases in numbers in 'unsuitable' temporary accommodation and increases in people sleeping in tents, cars or vans, and on public transport, particularly in England (Bramley 2017).

1.4 The profile of the homeless population in the UK

Rough sleeping: In 2017, 86% of rough sleepers in England were men, and 14% were women (Fitzpatrick et al 2018), although there is some evidence that women rough sleepers are undercounted (Bretherton 2017). In 2018, just 7% of estimated homeless people were under 25 (MHCLG 2018b). Many rough sleepers have limited qualifications and work experience (Jones 2019). Large minorities of rough sleepers - but by no means all - have problems with drugs, alcohol or mental or physical health or more than one issue (Fitzpatrick et al 2018). The term 'multiple exclusion homelessness' has been developed to refer to rough sleepers who also have experience of institutions (including care as children, prisons and the military) or who are involved in street activities including begging and drinking. They form a small minority of the total but who may need specialist, intensive support (Fitzpatrick et al 2011). In 2017, 78% of rough sleepers in England were UK nationals, 17% were EU nationals and 5% were of other nationality (Fitzpatrick et al 2018). By 2018, while over a quarter of all rough sleepers estimated by local authorities in England were in London, more than half were in other parts of the south of England (MHCLG 2018b). Rough sleepers in London have a different profile to those in other cities, with more non-UK nationals and less multiple exclusion homelessness. The proportion of rough sleepers from the EU in London rose to 31% in 2012, according to the CHAIN count (Regioplan Policy Research 2014). Nearly half of those counted by CHAIN at some point in 2016/17 had been counted at some point in the previous year, but most had not been (Fitzpatrick et al 2018). There is no data available on the profile of rough sleepers in Wales and Northern Ireland.

Statutory homelessness: In England, in the first quarter of 2018, the biggest group amongst those accepted as owed a prevention or relief duty (under the Homeless Prevention Act 2017 rules) was living with family or friends (33%), followed by private renting (30%), social renting (9%) and sleeping rough (3%) (MHCLG 2018b). There was a similar pattern for people assessed as homeless in Scotland in 2017/18 (Fitzpatrick et al 2019). In England, in the first quarter of 2018, the main reasons for homelessness amongst those accepted as owed a prevention or relief duty was the end of a tenancy in the private rented sector (24%), followed by being asked to leave by family and friends (22%) and relationship breakdown (15%). The reason for statutory homelessness which has increased fastest is 'section 21' eviction from private rented tenancies, for which landlords do not need a reason. People evicted in this way have grown from 11% of homeless acceptances in 2009/10 to 31% in 2016/17 (Fitzpatrick et al 2018). In Scotland, the Private Housing (Tenancies) (Scotland) Act 2016 ended landlords' ability to remove tenants who have not infringed the tenancy, and in 2018 the main reason for becoming homeless was relationship breakdown, followed by being asked to leave by family or friends (Fitzpatrick et al 2019).

In England, in 2017/18, of those accepted as homeless and owed a main duty, 64% of households were families with children. In contrast, in Scotland in 2017/18, 66% of applicants (not acceptances) were single adults (Scottish Government 2019), and in Northern Ireland, 32% of those accepted were families with children and the remainder were single people and couples (Northern Ireland Housing Executive 2019).

In England, in 2017/18, of those accepted as homeless and owned a main duty 62% of main applicants were of white ethnicity, 14% of Black ethnicity, and 9% were of Asian ethnicity (MHCLG 2018b). In Scotland, the main applicants are 55% male, 45% female, 26% under 25, 56% under 35, 86% under 50 (Scottish Government 2018).

In England, in the first quarter of 2018, 47% of households accepted as homeless had a support need, including physical or mental health problems or disability, being a care leaver, being aged under 18, or having experienced domestic or other abuse (MHCLG

2018b). In Scotland, in 2017-18, 47% of applicants who were assessed as homeless had at least one similar type of support need (which might before 2010 have granted them priority need status) (Scottish Government 2018).

2 Relevant strategies and policies tackling homelessness and housing exclusion

2.1 Characteristics of the UK homelessness prevention and alleviation system

The UK has an established statutory housing and welfare system of laws, guidance, funding and institutions to prevent and respond to homelessness. Overall, these have many of the characteristics recommended as essential parts of effective strategies on homelessness by FEANTSA (FEANTSA 2006).

Considering these elements one by one, the UK has **excellent data collection and monitoring** by central and national governments and by independent agencies (Stephens et al 2019, Fitzpatrick et al 2016a, 2016b, 2017, 2018, 2019). A recent review of evidence on ending rough sleeping identified 500 sources (Mackie et al 2017b). Established national and local homelessness and housing NGOs have links with national and local policy makers, and **some influence on policy development**. However, policy does not always respond to the available evidence (Mackie et al 2019).

The UK has **a partially 'right 'based' approach**, although this 'rights' language is not often used. In England, Wales and Northern Ireland, people in 'priority need' have an enforceable right to housing, through a duty on local authorities to secure housing for them, as do all homeless households in Scotland. However, the nature of the housing they have a right to and the terms on which it is delivered varies according to the local housing market, and have changed. In England statutorily homeless households can no longer expect to get along-term social housing tenancy.

The UK has a **comprehensive system of support** for **some homeless people**. Local authority and NGO support for rough sleepers is less developed outside London, where the greatest growth in numbers is taking place. Since the 2000s, there has been a shift in emphasis to prevention across the UK. Outside Scotland, the statutory system provides at most 'prevention' and 'relief' for people who do not fit into 'priority groups'.

The existence of an established framework for responding to homelessness and many elements of good practice is not the same as a medium term, proactive strategy to reduce homelessness, supported by political will, appropriate funding and suitable policy and practice. In addition, since 2010, there have been major reductions in central government, local government and voluntary sector funding for homelessness prevention and support, in eligibility and value of welfare benefits including housing benefits, and in other services which may indirectly prevent homelessness. This has led to concern that the UK's welfare and housing 'safety nets' are less comprehensive, less integrated, and less effective than in the past.

2.2 A rough-sleeping strategy for England, 2018

It is England that has generated the bulk of the increase in homelessness in the UK over the past ten years. Over this period, England has been without a homelessness strategy, although the National Audit Office (NAO), the House of Commons Public Accounts Committee and NGOs have called for one, and there have been strategies to tackle rough sleeping in the past (House of Commons Public Accounts Committee 2017, NAO 2017). In 2018, the NGO Crisis published an evidenced-based plan of its own on how to end homelessness in Great Britain (Downie et al 2018).

In the 2017 general election, all three main parties promised to end street homelessness in the UK. The Conservatives pledged to halve it by 2022 and end it by 2027. All main

parties promised a national strategy, and all proposed to support 'Housing First' services. None provided much. Since being re-elected in 2017, the Conservative Party government has developed a policy to meet its pledge through a series of steps.

The Homelessness Reduction Act 2017 was initially developed by an individual Member of Parliament, on the basis of NGO ideas, but was later adopted as part of government policy (The Conservative Party 2017, MHCLG 2018b). Notably, this law placed new obligations on local authorities but did not provide them with additional funding. At the end of 2017, several advisory and executive groups were set up, and the new housing minister granted £28 million to support three 'pilot' Housing First projects. At this point, there were already at least 30 Housing First projects in the UK and a substantial evidence base (Housing First England 2018, Bretherton and Pleace 2015, Pleace 2018), and the value of time-limited funding and further piloting has been questioned (Fitzpatrick et al 2018, Thunder and Bovill Rose 2019). In addition, researchers warn against seeing Housing First as 'the answer' or as 'a panacea' to rough sleeping (Pleace 2018, Housing First England 2018). Housing First services are intended to support people with 'multiple exclusion homelessness' (Fitzpatrick et al 2011), who form a small minority of all rough sleepers. Evidence suggests that the majority have been relatively well served by traditional approaches, where they are sufficient in scale and resources (Pleace 2018, Downie et al 2018).

In August 2018, the government published a Rough Sleeping Strategy for England (MHCLG 2018b). This announced a further £70 million over 2019/20-2020/21 for local authority activity and projects, and £50 million for new building specifically for ex-homeless people outside London, to match spending already in London. The strategy cancelled a proposed reduction in housing benefit available to users of relatively costly 'supporting people' services. These are housing with support or floating support services for people with special needs, including ex-homeless people and people vulnerable due to age, disabilities, substance problems, including some ex-homeless people. Many NGO providers of supporting people services had feared that the cuts would force them out of business. The strategy also acknowledged the *need to look beyond rough sleeping to ensure the entire system is working to prevent all forms of homelessness*" (MHCLG 2018b: 8), and repeated existing parts of broader housing policy, including attempts to increase the rate of new building, and to make private renting more affordable (The Conservative Party 2017).

2.3   The adequacy of funding

Revenue expenditure on housing and housing services: In 2008/09, English local authorities spent £2,800 million on all aspects of homelessness services, but by 2017/18 this had fallen to £2,000 million, a reduction of 27% (at current prices) (Thunder and Bovill Rise 2019). The main component of the reduction was reduced spending on the largest budget area, so-called 'Supporting People' services. From 2003 to 2009, 'Supporting People' represented a specific central government fund for local authorities to provide or commission housing with support or floating support services for people with special needs. The term 'supporting people' is still used, even though there is no long a ring-fenced funding scheme. The budget for these services started reducing in 2010/11, from about £1,500 million in real terms to £500 million in 2017/18. Spending on temporary accommodation increased particularly from 2013/14. Spending on other services remained stable (Thunder and Bovill Rose 2019). There was very little real terms change in spending on statutory homelessness, despite rising numbers of homeless households and increasing use of expensive temporary housing (Thunder and Bovill Rose 2019). The various funding announcements made since 2017 are 'dwarfed' by the cuts (Thunder and Bovill Rose 2019). Existing local authority homelessness budgets were £750 million lower in 2017/18 than 2008/09, while new funds available to local authorities in 2017/18 totalled £37 million.

After initial efficiency savings, evidence from local authorities suggests *there is little doubt that further reductions have led to reduced services"* (Thunder and Bovill Rose

2019: 12). For example, the number of beds provided for single homeless people by NGOs fell almost 30% between 2008 and 2017, from 50,000 to 35,000 (Thunder and Bovill Rose 2019). Two thirds of local authorities in England responding to a survey in 2017 thought they or their areas needed more money or other resources to address rough sleeping, through more emergency accommodation or more support services (Fitzpatrick et al 2018). There have been concerns that the new prevention and relief duties for English local authorities from 2018 were not going to be fully funded (Wilson and Barton 2019a). In addition, the expenditure that does take place is not always of the most effective. For example, the UK and London local authorities in particular spend a large amount on sometimes-unsatisfactory temporary accommodation (Abbé Pierre Foundation/FEANTSA 2018). Homelessness NGOs have commented that cuts to other parts of the public sector, such as in drug treatment and prisons, have also affected their work. There is evidence that reduced funding for other local authority services also has led to increased homelessness. Each 10% cut in general local authority spending in England in the 2010-2015 period was associated with an increase of 0.83 in the number of statutory homelessness applications per thousand households (against a national average of about six in a thousand) (Loopstra et al 2016). Some EU funding has been used to support NGO action on homelessness support, but it makes up a small proportion of the total. It is likely to come to an end at some point if the UK leaves the EU.

Capital expenditure: There is widespread consensus that the UK's housing stock has been growing slower than required by growth in household numbers, and even neutral House of Commons researchers state that *"Homelessness is the most visible manifestation of the long-term failure of successive Governments to build enough housing to meet growing need"* (Wilson and Barton 2019a: 10). Efforts to increase the rate of new housing development since 2010 have paid off to some extent but did not reach targets or achieve a 'step change'. At the same time, central government funding for the Department of Communities and Local Government (the predecessor to MHCLG) was cut by at least 41% in real terms between 2009/10 and 2014/15 (Tunstall 2016). Government funding for housing has shifted from capital for renting to capital for owning, and from capital to consumer subsidy via housing benefit (Stephens et al 2019). The current government has made more positive statements about social housing than its predecessors (MHCLG 2018a). However, promoting market-rate home ownership remains government's main activity in financial terms, with £32,000 million devoted to it annually compared to £8,000 million for various types of 'affordable' housing (Wilcox et al 2017). From 2011, government subsidy could only be used to build 'Affordable Rent' homes to be let at 80% of market rent rather than traditional social rent of 50-60% of the market rate (Wilcox et al 2017). Across the UK, social renting fell behind private renting in 2013, and in 2017 housed 17% of households in England compared to 20% in the private rented sector (Tunstall and Pleace 2018).

Revenue expenditure on housing allowances and other benefits: In 2017, 3.1 million social renting households, including people in supported accommodation and temporary accommodation, and 1.3 million private renting households in Great Britain were claiming housing benefit to pay all or part of their rent (Department for Work and Pensions [DWP] 2017). Since 2010, cuts to welfare benefit including housing benefit have formed a central part of the austerity strategy of governments. Reductions in eligibility and value of housing benefits include limitation of private rented tenants claiming housing benefit to the cheapest 30% of the local market (or 'Local Housing Allowances'), and then freezing sums so the accessible segment reduced further, capping total benefits including housing benefit any one household could claim regardless of household size, and cutting amounts paid to social renters who had spare rooms (the 'bedroom tax'). The total number of claimants reduced by 16% from 5.0 million in 2012 to 4.2 million in 2018, and the average amount paid fell slightly - from £98 to £97 per week at 2018 prices (Department for Work and Pensions 2018). Again, House of Commons researchers noted that, *"numerous reports… have identified welfare reform… as a contributing factor to homelessness"* (Wilson and Barton 2019a: 34). The NAO said that changes to Local Housing Allowances (LHA) *"are… an element of the increase in homelessness"* (NAO 2017

para 11). Because of delays in payment and LHA caps, a majority of private landlords are reluctant to let to households on housing benefit (Clarke et al 2017). LHA restrictions make it more difficult for local authorities to find private rented accommodation for homeless households.

Abbé Pierre/FEANTSA commented, *"the reform of housing allowances in England is a good example of bad financial management of the tools for promoting access to housing for the most vulnerable"* (Abbé Pierre/FEANTSA: 2018 25). The Public Accounts Committee called on the Department of Communities and Local Government to work with the Department of Work and Pensions to explore the relationship between welfare reform and homelessness (PAC 2017). The Scottish government has chosen to use its own funding mitigate the impact of the 'bedroom tax', which affects fewer than the other reforms but has had a high political profile.

2.4   The effectiveness of implementation and monitoring of national strategy for England

Many observers of the UK would argue that on past experience, goal to halve and then end rough sleeping in England by 2027 is realistic. Prime Minister Major's government's Rough Sleepers Initiative 1990-1999 reduced rough sleeping in London by more than half in its first three years (Wilson 2015). Prime Minister Blair's government's pledge to reduce rough sleeping nationwide by two thirds between 1998 and 2002 was largely achieved (Wilson and Barton 2019b). However, many would also argue that the current target is unlikely to be achieved given present funding and policy.

Plans for implementing and monitoring the English national rough sleeping strategy are as yet unclear. Government has not provided intermediate milestones towards ending rough sleeping (Thunder and Bovill Rose 2019). Two thirds of English local authorities questioned in 2017 thought that a national strategy would not be useful, at least unless it included extra money (Fitzpatrick et al 2018). In fact, instead of predicting progress towards the national strategy target, a large majority of local authority survey respondents in England though that homelessness would increase 'significantly'. This was due to planned policy including reduction in the benefit cap, removal of housing benefit for people under 22 and problems associated with the gradual introduction of the new Universal Credit to replace five existing benefits including housing benefit (Fitzpatrick et al 2018). Similarly, estimates of 'core homelessness' predicted an increase by 33% between 2011 and 2016, with further increases thereafter (Bramley 2017).

The NGO Crisis argued that what is needed to end homelessness is well understood, but requires a considerably more ambitious and expensive strategy than what is underway:

- A strategic approach by government across all relevant departments and at national and local level;

- Regulation and monitoring of local authority homelessness and homelessness prevention activity to ensure sufficient and high-quality services;

- Funding for intensive support to people at transitions such as a move into their own home;

- Increasing local authority duties by extending abolition of 'priority need' in Scotland to the rest of the UK;

- Building 100,000 new social rented homes annually over 15 years;

- Restoring housing benefit that covers all the rent for all renters on low incomes (Downie et al 2018).

Bramley has modelled the effects of potential policy changes on future levels of core homelessness, rather than rough sleeping. The most promising was for all local authorities to carry out 'prevention activities' at the same levels as the best performer, as Crisis recommended. This would lead to a reduction in core homelessness of 22%

between 2016 and 2021, removing half of the increase which occurred during the 2011-16 period. Either stopping welfare cuts planned in 2016, or a 60% increase in new housing supply including affordable housing would lead to a 7% reduction during the 2016-2021 period. Increasing rates of economic growth in slow growth regions would be slower to have effects but might achieve a 7% reduction by 2026 (Bramley 2017). Some of these ideas have support from at least some of the main political parties. In the 2017 General Election, all three parties promised a substantial increase in new housing development rates to 200-250,000 per year (compared to 140,000 in 2017/18). The Liberal Democrats promised a 'significant increase' in 'social and affordable' housing, and Labour said that social housing development would reach 100,000 per year by 2022 (The Conservative Party, The Liberal Democrat Party, The Labour Party 2018). Both Labour and Liberal Democrats promised to reverse the best known (if one of the smaller) housing benefit changes, the 'bedroom tax'. Scotland has demonstrated that ending 'priority need' is feasible, although the costs and benefits would be different outside that country.

3 Analysis of the current patterns of service provision and challenges in implementing the UK's responses to homelessness and housing exclusion

3.1 The main types of support service

An EU report noted, "*There is a vast array of schemes and services targeted at the homeless in the UK*" (Regioplan Policy Research 2014: 274). Some groups of homeless people are protected under statute and must have housing secured for them, and in England and Wales, all must receive prevention or relief support. For rough sleepers and others not fully helped by the law, "*a range of sophisticated interventions has been developed, often on an inter-agency basis, recognising… complex needs" (*Stephens et al 2010: 3). Collectively, UK agencies provide all main potential forms of services for people who are homeless or at risk of homelessness. These include:

- Local authority duty to provide prevention and relief services to homeless people (in England and Wales);

- Local authority duty to secure accommodation for homeless people (in Scotland) and some homeless people (elsewhere), with temporary accommodation provided by local authorities, housing associations and through leasing in the private rented sector, and permanent accommodation provided in social or private renting;

- NGO- provided services to rough sleepers, from food to day centres, advice, support and training and links to work, benefits and housing, and some specific education and health services;

- Local authority- and NGO-provided emergency and temporary accommodation, including refuges, and Local authority, housing association and NGO-provided supported housing, including shared or non-self-contained accommodation with support, and floating support services provided to general needs housing. These are intended for people with special needs, including ex-homeless people and people vulnerable due to age, disabilities, substance problems, including some ex-homeless people, including low intensity floating support, high intensity specialised support, and housing-led services specifically for ex-homeless people (on the Housing First model). They may be intended as 'move on accommodation' from emergency accommodation, or for the long-term;

- A regulated, general needs social housing with below-market rents;

- A lightly-regulated private rented sector;

- Some special local authority- and NGO schemes to improve access to the private rented sector for people on low incomes;

- A national system of housing benefit to help with rent for people on low incomes, and since 2012, local authority discretionary housing payments to supplement housing benefit after reductions;

- A national system of additional income benefits for people unable to work or find work or of pension age;

- Local authority- and NGO-provided housing advice;

- Nationally-funded legal aid for people on low incomes for some housing cases (Stephens et al 2010, Fitzpatrick et al 2018, Pleace 2018).

3.2   The main service providers and their roles

The power to legislate on housing policy is devolved to the nations of the UK. In England, national homelessness policy is principally the responsibility of the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (before 2017, known as the Department for Communities and Local Government), working with local government and NGOs, and parallel departments of the Scotland and Wales Governments. The Northern Ireland Assembly is suspended, so policy is currently the responsibility of the UK Minister for Northern Ireland and civil servants. However, housing benefits (housing allowances) which play a very significant role in preventing homelessness, are provided by the Department for Work and Pensions on very similar rules across the UK. Overall funding for government activities is controlled by the UK's HM Treasury. The National Audit Office (NAO) and House of Commons Public Accounts Committee have criticised central government for the lack of a strategic approach, and for failing to assess the impact of housing benefit changes on homelessness (House of Commons Public Accounts Committee 2017, NAO 2017).

District and unitary local authorities across the UK are the 'housing authorities' bodies with a duty to providers of prevention and relief services for people who are homeless or at risk of homelessness, and to secure housing for those with a right to it. In England, the growing body of elected city majors are trying to act through coordinating other bodies (Fitzpatrick et al 2018). Local authorities have some opportunity to make their own policy but are most influenced by the diverse nature of housing markets, supply and demand and costs between areas. Local authorities get most of their funding from central government.

Services for rough sleepers and people at risk of rough sleeping are mainly provided by large national, regional, and local NGOs and community groups. The NGO platform Homeless Link identified 1,567 organisations providing homelessness services in England alone in 2016 (Jones 2019). The largest organisations, such as Crisis and Shelter, carry out substantial research and lobbying activity in addition to service provision. Local authorities play a role in planning and coordinating services on a local scale, and there are well-developed networks of organisations in many areas. There is a particular concentration of NGOs providing hostels and support services to street homeless people in London and some other big cities. Bramley noted that the *"supply of specific accommodation (e.g. hostels) is largely determined by funding and local/voluntary initiative"* (Bramley 2017: 76).

Local authorities get most of their funding from central government. Local authorities, and to a lesser extent, national government, provide many services indirectly through NGOs including housing associations, and the private rented sector. Some larger NGOs and housing associations also commission services from smaller ones. Most NGOs receive some national or local government funding, as well as raising charitable support.

In addition, support to people at risk of homelessness is in effect provided by some mortgagors, who may offer forbearance on late payments, some private landlords (Clarke et al 2017), and housing associations which can provide a wide range of services.

It should be remembered that family and friends play a substantial role in preventing homelessness by providing long-term and temporary housing, money, support in kind and advice, and a minority of households who are accepted as owned a duty by their local authorities are ultimately housed by family and friends informally rather than by the local authority.

3.3   The effectiveness of existing services in prevention

Over the past two decades, in the UK there has been growing emphasis on prevention of homelessness, rather than responses to it. In England, local authorities were required to develop strategies to prevent homelessness from 2002, and this was followed by a marked reduction in numbers of people accepted as statutorily homeless. At the same time, there were several additions to the 'priority' categories, including 16- and 17-year olds, and vulnerable people leaving care, prison, the forces or domestic violence (Wilson and Barton 2019a). From 2000, when the abolition of the 'priority need' category in Scotland in 2010 was first announced, preventative activity increased, and after 2010, the number of applications and acceptances as homeless in Scotland reduced, which researchers argued was "*wholly the result*" of the more preventive approach in Scotland (Fitzpatrick et al 2015: vii). In 2015, the Housing (Wales) Act 2014 came into force, requiring local authorities to provide prevention and relief services for all households that applied to them and were found to be homeless or at risk of homelessness, including those not 'in priority need'. In 2018, the similar Homelessness Prevention Act 2017 came into force in England. These laws extended the definition of being at 'risk' of homelessness from homelessness likely within 28 days to 56 days, allowing more time for preventive assistance. Ironically, the impact of the new policies is difficult to monitor because changes in local authority duties have created breaks in the administrative data in Wales and England. In both cases there have been drops in the number of households accepted as statutorily homeless, but this could be at least partly due to deterrence as well as effective prevention. Northern Ireland currently has higher rates of statutory homelessness than the rest of the UK, which is thought to be due to its less developed prevention activity (Fitzpatrick et al 2016). On the other hand, early assessments have found the Welsh policy to be a "*conspicuous success*" (Fitzpatrick et al 2017: xv). There appears to have been a cultural shift in local authorities, a qualitative and quantitative change in preventative activity, and more help for single people (Bramley 2017, Fitzpatrick et al 2017, Mackie et al 2017a). Local authorities surveyed thought the law had promoted more effective prevention. Critically, additional resources were provided by the Welsh Government, and local authorities felt that they had sufficient resources to implement the new policy (Fitzpatrick et al 2017).

Over the preceding decade, given the sharp increase in homelessness, existing preventative services in England have evidently not proved sufficient and effective. The impact of the change of policy in England from 2018 is as yet unclear. The policy has been welcomed by local authorities and NGOs (Fitzpatrick et al 2018). 65% of local authorities surveyed thought the policy would have at least some beneficial effects for single homeless people, 50% for rough sleepers, and 43% for families, while substantial numbers of local authorities thought there would be no benefits (Fitzpatrick et al 2018). However, prospects appear less promising, because demands on some English local authorities are greater than those in Wales, and there is less confidence that English local authorities have sufficient funding to implement the preventative approach (Wilson and Barton 2019a). Even if local authorities succeed in providing greater numbers of individual and households receive preventative help, homelessness could still fail to reduce. There is some evidence that lower proportions of the total people at risk of rough sleeping and statutory homelessness are receiving sufficient, and timely preventive help. A study for NGOs said that ironically: "low *and medium-level support services have been particularly reduced, meaning that people are left to manage for themselves – and support is increasingly only available when someone reaches crisis point*" (Thunder and Bovill Rose 2019: 6).

3.4 The effectiveness of existing services in providing comprehensive and flexible support

A systematic review of literature has summarised what is known to work in reducing rough sleeping: being housing-led, providing person-centred support and choice, sensitive to needs, and effective interagency working (Mackie et al, 2017b). The popularity of Housing First models in many countries is partly a reaction to evidence that some services have lacked these qualities and were ineffective for that reason. However, a recent review of UK evidence argued that most housing and housing and support services intended for homeless people already follow good practice: *"flexible, tolerant and follow a consumer choice model, with an increasing emphasis on providing services that reflect the ideas of personalisation, co-production, and psychologically informed environments… Harm reduction has been mainstream policy and practice for decades…. the idea of enforcement… is, for the most part, outside the mainstream in the UK"* (Pleace 2018: 14).

Nonetheless, in terms of effectiveness and cost-effectiveness, Mackie et al identified *"a serious lack of data on the effectiveness of a number of widely used interventions in the UK [including]… hostels and shelters, supported accommodation, and reconnections"* (Mackie et al 2019: 56). Stephens et al noted that the effectiveness of even well-designed projects, *"depends on the quality of inter-agency co-operation"* (Stephens et al 2010: 3). Mackie et al argued that well-understood and evidenced good practice on support to rough sleepers was not always followed. In some cases, the collaboration between agencies and commissioning of services from NGOs by government bodies was ineffective. In addition, differences in needs between individual and subgroups were not always fully recognised (Mackie et al 2019). However, the key problems they identified were not generally that support provided was of the wrong type, but due to other issues related to the scale of services provided: insufficient political will, the lack of settled accommodation, lack of sufficient long-term funding and bureaucracy, and the fact that some people were not eligible for services on grounds of immigration status or local connection (Mackie et al 2019).

Services for people who are not rough sleeping but are homeless or at risk of homelessness are not comprehensive. In England, Wales, and Northern Ireland, only those homeless and 'priority need' will have housing secured for them by their local authorities. A third of people, mostly single adults, who started rough sleeping in London in 2017/18 had approached a local authority for housing help in the previous year, but this had failed to prevent their homelessness, probably largely due to failure to be assessed as in priority need (Wilson and Barton 2019a). Those assessed as owed a main duty by local authorities are not always well-served, which can result in homelessness, suffering in poor conditions or inefficient use of resources. A summary of recent research on English local authority performance on statutory homelessness, including mystery shopping, noted recurrent themes across studies:

"poor coordination and collaboration with other agencies, e.g. health services and social services… some applicants turned away without receiving a full assessment… inconsistent assessment of vulnerability and intentionality; and pressure on local authority resources… particularly the cost of temporary accommodation" (Wilson and Barton 2019a: 26).

Rising demand for local authority help with no significant additional housing supply or funding is likely to have affected the quality of services.

3.5 The effectiveness of existing services in providing access to permanent accommodation

The UK homelessness system has been relatively effective in providing rough sleepers, and statutorily homeless households and other homeless people with permanent accommodation and supporting them to sustain it. Even advocates of Housing First have argued that its potential benefits in the UK should not be exaggerated, as the way it

moves people quickly and unconditionally from rough sleeping to longer-term housing contrasts less with the main existing processes (Pleace 2018).

However, the decline of the two 'secure', 'permanent' tenures social renting and owner occupation, means that the housing system is becoming less effective at providing permit housing to households generally, whether or not they are current homeless or at risk of homelessness. In the UK, in contrast to most countries in the EU, private rented tenancies are generally of 6 months or one year, and outside Scotland, landlords can end tenancies without an infringement of the tenancy agreement. Arguably, therefore, private rented housing, while part of the mainstream housing system, does not constitute 'permanent housing'.

Prior to a move to 'permanent' accommodation, local authorities place statutorily homelessness households in temporary housing. At the end of 2018, 97,469 households (many containing more than one person) in the UK were in temporary accommodation organised by their local authority, about four households in a thousand, made up of 82,310 households in England and 10,955 in Scotland in September 2018, 2,139 in Wales in December 2018, and 2,065 in Northern Ireland in January 2019. In practice, 'temporary' accommodation is medium-term. In 2017/18 the most common length of stay in temporary accommodation was between six months and a year in England, six months in Scotland, and a year in Northern Ireland (MHCLG 2018b, Scottish Government 2018, Stats Wales 2019, Northern Ireland Housing Executive 2019).

After a wait in temporary accommodation, from 2012, the Localism Act 2011 allowed local authorities in England to discharge their duty to secure housing by securing a tenancy in the private rented sector. Finally, while social housing tenancies have been secure and indefinite since 1980, over the 2000s many social landlords started using 'introductory' year-long tenancies with new tenants before converting them to long term. Since 2011, local authorities have been able to issue time-limited contracts, usually of five years (Chartered Institute of Housing 2014), although many have recently decided to go back to indefinite tenancies to reduce costs.

3.6   The main systemic barriers to routes out of homelessness

The UK housing system has long-term structural problems, which contribute to the risk of homelessness, and may create competition for political effort and resources between them and others also experiencing housing problems. Almost 15 years ago, an assessment of the UK housing system found that the quality of housing was generally high, but there were a range of structural problems, including low rates of building, growing affordability problems, falling rates of home ownership, and the high cost of housing benefit (Stephens at al. 2005). These problems may have dated as far back as the 1970s (Whitehead and Williams 2012). Since the 2010 election, Coalition and Conservative government ministers have been describing the UK housing system as *"dysfunctional"* (HM Government 2011, The Conservative Party 2017). Since the Global Financial crisis, while unemployment has been low, wage and income growth has been very limited, and public spending across all services has been restricted.

The main barriers to routes out of rough sleeping in the UK are the large numbers of rough sleepers compared to the scale and funding of existing services, limits to legal rights of 'non priority' single people in England, Wales and Northern Ireland (compared to Scotland), problems getting access to support to find and sustain tenancies, the high cost and insecurity of private renting, the shortage of social renting, problems getting access to support for needs in addition to housing, and the complexity and slow administration of housing benefit. Routes in to homelessness are also very significant and need to be addressed: Routes into both rough sleeping and statutory homelessness include weak rights for private renters, limited choice for private renters claiming housing benefit, individual and households housed by family and friends which is not always suitable or sustainable, and ineffectiveness of at least some prevention and relief services.

The main weakness and gaps in homelessness policy and service in the UK are:

1. Lack of political will;

2. Lack of finance for homelessness prevention and support;

3. Lack of finance and rules which would allow housing allowances to meet the full costs of households on the lowest incomes, regardless of tenure or family size;

4. Insufficient supply of affordable, good quality, secure housing.

The main priorities for improvement are:

1. Better funding and monitoring local authority housing prevention and relief activities and monitoring for good practice;

2. Full or partially reversing changes made to housing allowances since 2012;

3. Developing more housing, particularly more affordable housing, particularly in areas of high demand;

4. Addressing other structural problems including poor rights for private renters, the tax treatment of housing property;

3.7   Recent innovations

The main recent innovations in the UK are Housing (Wales) Act 2014, and the Homelessness Prevention Act 2017 (for England). As in many other counties, one of the main conceptual innovations of recent years is Housing First, and Housing First-type projects are being expanded (Pleace 2018). Again, as in other countries, some housing developers are promoting 'tiny homes', which can be built more quickly and cheaply than others and have been promoted as suitable for single people including homeless people as well as frustrated buyers.

References

Abbé Pierre Foundation/FEANTSA. *Third overview of housing exclusion in Europe 2018,* Abbé Pierre Foundation/FEANTSA, Brussels, 2018.

Anon. "Best law in Europe' must be matched with action", *Inside Housing*, 11th March, 2003.

Anon. "Homeless charities in Derry raise concerns over a recent increase in the number of people sleeping rough in the city centre", *Derry now*, 2018. https://www.derrynow.com/news/homeless-charities-derry-raise-concerns-recent-increase-number-people-sleeping-rough-city-centre/257000, Last accessed April 2019.

Bate, A., *Comparison of homelessness duties in England, Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland,* House of Commons Library Briefing paper No.7201, 9th June, House of Commons Library, London, 2017.

Bramley, G., *Homelessness projections: Core homelessness in Great Britain,* Crisis, London, 2017.

Bretherton, J., 'Homelessness and gender reconsidered', *European Journal of Homelessness.* 2017, 11(2), p.1-22.

Bretherton, J. and Pleace, N., *Housing First in England: An evaluation of nine services,* Centre for Housing Policy, University of York, York, 2015.

Chartered Institute of Housing, *New approaches to fixed term tenancies*, Chartered Institute of Housing, Coventry, 2014.

Clarke, A.; Hamilton, C.; Jones, M. and Muir, K., *Poverty, eviction and forced moves*, JRF, York, 2017.

Department for Work and Pensions, *Housing Benefit caseload statistics*, *data to May 2018* 2018, https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/housing-benefit-caseload-statistics, Last accessed May 2019.

Downie, M. et al*., Everybody in: How to end homelessness in Great Britain*, Crisis, London, 2018.

FEANTSA, *Toolkit for developing an integrated homelessness strategy*, FEANTSA, Brussels, 2006.

Fitzpatrick, S.; Johnsen, S. and White, M., "Multiple exclusion homelessness: Key patterns and interactions", *Social Policy and Society,* 10(4), pp.501-512.

Fitzpatrick, S., Pawson, H., Bramley, G., Wilcox, S., Watts, B. and Wood, J., *The homelessness monitor: England 2018*, Crisis, London, 2018.

Fitzpatrick, S., Pawson H., Bramley G., Wilcox S., Watts, S., *The homelessness monitor Scotland 2015*, Crisis, London, 2015.

Fitzpatrick, S., Pawson, H., Bramley, G., Wilcox, S. and Watts, B., *The homelessness monitor: Northern Ireland 2016.* London: Crisis, London, 2016b.

Fitzpatrick, S., Pawson, H., Bramley, G., Wilcox, S. and Watts, B., *The Homelessness Monitor: Great Britain 2016*, London: Crisis, London, 2016a.

Fitzpatrick, S.; Pawson, H., Bramley, G.; Watts, B.; Wood, J.; Stephens, M. and Blenkinsopp, J., *The homelessness monitor: Scotland 2019*, Crisis, London, 2019.

Fitzpatrick, S.; Pawson, H.; Bramley, G.; Wilcox, S.; Watts, B. and Wood, J., *The homelessness monitor: Wales 2017*, Crisis, London, 2017.

HM Government, *Laying the foundations: A housing strategy for England*, Stationery Office, London, 2011.

House of Commons Communities and Local Government Committee, *Homelessness Third report of session 2016–17*, House of Commons, London, 2016.

House of Commons Public Accounts Committee, *Homeless households,* House of Commons, London, 2017.

Housing First England (2018) Housing First England FAQs, 2018. https://hfe.homeless.org.uk/sites/default/files/attachments/Housing%20Engl and%20FAQs.pdf, Last accessed May 2019.

Jones, K., "No strings attached: An exploration of employment support services offered by third sector homelessness organisations", pp91-118 in ed. Dwyer, P. *Dealing with welfare conditionality: Implementation and effect*, Policy Press, Bristol, 2018.

Loopstra, R.; Reeves, A.; Barr, B.; Taylor-Robinson, D.; McKee, M. and Stuckler, D., "The impact of economic downturns and budget cuts on homelessness claim rates across 323 local authorities in England, 2004–*12"*, *Journal of Public Health* 38, pp. 417-425.

Mackie, P.; Johnsen, S. and Wood, J., "Ending street homelessness: What works and why we don't do it", *European Journal of Homelessness,* 13(1), 2019, pp.49-60.

Mackie, P., Thomas, I. and Bibbings, J., "Homelessness prevention: reflecting on a year of pioneering Welsh legislation in practice", *European Journal of Homelessness*, 11(1), 2017a, pp. 81-107.

Mackie, P; Johnsen, S. and Wood, J., *Ending rough sleeping: What works? An international evidence review*, Crisis, London, 2017b.

MHCLG/Javid, S., "New government initiative to reduce rough sleeping", 30th March, 2018. https://www.gov.uk/government/news/new-government-initiative-to-reduce-rough-sleeping, Last accessed May 2019.

MHCLG, *A new deal for social housing*, Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government, London, 2018a.

MHCLG, *Rough sleeping in England: Autumn 2018* Tables 1, 2a, 2b, 32c, https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/rough-sleeping-in-england-autumn-2018, 2018c, Last accessed May 2019.

MHCLG, *Statutory homelessness and homelessness prevention and relief, England: January to March 2018 (Revised),* 2018b. https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/statutory-homelessness-and-homelessness-prevention-and-relief-england-january-to-march-2018, Last accessed May 2019.

National Audit Office, *Homelessness: A report by the Comptroller and Auditor General*, National Audit Office, London, 2017.

Northern Ireland Housing Executive, *Belfast homeless street count 2018 completed,* Press release, 15th November, 2019. https://www.nihe.gov.uk/Home/News/Belfast-homeless-street-count-2018-completed, Last accessed April 2019.

Northern Ireland Housing Executive, *Northern Ireland homelessness bulletin* April–September 2018,Department for Communities/Northern Ireland Statistics and Research Agency/Northern Ireland Housing Executive, Belfast, 2018.

Pleace, N., *Using Housing First in integrated homelessness strategies: A review of the evidence*, Centre for Housing Policy, University of York, York, 2018.

Regioplan Policy Research, *Study on mobility, migration and destitution in the European Union: Final report*, Directorate-General for Employment, Social Affairs and Inclusion European Community Programme for Employment and Social Solidarity, Brussels, 2014.

Scottish Government**,** *Homelessness in Scotland: Bi-annual update 1 April to 30 September 2018*, Scottish Government, Edinburgh, 2019.

Stats Wales (2019) 'Decisions taken by year and eligibility' https://statswales.gov.wales/Catalogue/Housing/Homelessness/Pre-April-2015/decisionstaken-by-year-eligibility, Last accessed April 2019.

Stats Wales, *Households for which assistance has been provided by outcome and household type, 2019b* https://statswales.gov.wales/Catalogue/Housing/Homelessness/Statutory-Homelessness-Prevention-and-Relief/householdsforwhichassistancehasbeenprovided-by-outcome-householdtype, Last accessed April 2019.

Stephens, M.; Fitzpatrick, S. and Wallace, A., *Study on housing exclusion: welfare policies, housing provision and labour markets: Country report for the United Kingdom*, Directorate-General for Employment, Social Affairs and Equal Opportunities of the European Commission, Brussels, 2010.

Stephens, M.; Perry, J.; Williams, P. and Young, G.,*UK Housing review 2019*,Chartered Institute of Housing, Coventry, 2019.

Stephens, M.; Whitehead, C.; Munro, M., Lessons from the past, challenges for the future for housing policy, Office of the Deputy Prime Minister, London, 2005.

The Conservative Party, *Forward together: The Conservative Manifesto*, The Conservative Party, London, 2017.

The Labour Party, *For the many, not the few: The Labour Party Manifesto 2017,* The Labour Party, London, 2017.

The Liberal Democrat Party, *Changing Britain's future: Liberal Democrat manifesto 2017*, Liberal Democrat Party, London, 2017.

Thunder, J. and Bovill Rose, C*., Local authority spending on homelessness: Understanding recent trends and their impact* London: Homeless Link/St Mungos, London, 2019.

Tunstall, R., "Housing" pp126-146 in eds. Lupton, R.; Burchardt, T.; Hills, J.; Stewart, K. and Vizard, P. Social policy in a cold climate: Policies and their consequences since the crisis, Policy Press, Bristol, 2016.

Tunstall, R. and Pleace, N., *Social housing: Evidence review*, Centre for Housing Policy, York, 2018.

Waugh A., Clarke A., Knowles J., Rowley, D., *Health and homelessness in Scotland*, Scottish Government, Edinburgh, 2018.

Welsh Government, *National rough sleeping count: November 2018, 2018.* https://gov.wales/national-rough-sleeping-count-november-2018, Last accessed April 2019.

Welsh Government (2019) *Homelessness: October to December 2018* https://gov.wales/homelessness-october-december-2018, Last accessed April 2019.

Whitehead, C. and Williams, P., "Causes and consequences? Exploring the shape and direction of the housing system in the UK post the financial crisis", Housing Studies 26(7-8), pp1157-1169.

Wilcox, S.; Perry, J.; Stephens, M. and Williams, P., *UK housing review 2017*, Chartered Institute of Housing, Coventry, 2017.

Wilson, W., *Mobile (Park) Homes,* House of Commons Library Briefing Paper Number 01080, 21 November, House of Commons Library, London, 2018.

Wilson, W. and Barton, C., *Statutory homelessness in England,* House of Commons Library Briefing Paper No. 01164, 1st February 2019,House of Commons Library, London, 2019a.

Wilson, W., *Rough Sleepers Initiative (RSI) 1990-1999,* House of Commons Library Standard Note SN07121, Housing of Commons Library, London, 2015.

Wilson, W. and Barton, C., *Households in temporary accommodation (England),* House of Commons Library Briefing Paper Number 02110, 19 March 2019, House of Commons Library, London, 2019b.

Annex

Table A1: ETHOS Light categories defined as homeless in the UK

	Operational category		Living situation	Definition	Defined as homeless in the UK
1	People living rough	1	Public space/ external space	Living in the streets or public spaces without a shelter that can be defined as living quarters	Yes, defined as 'street homeless'/ 'rough sleeping', and part of 'core' and 'wider' homeless (Bramley 2017). People sleeping rough <u>sometimes</u> meet the statutory definition of people who are 'homeless and (England, Wales, Northern Ireland) in priority need', who are owned a duty by their local authority, if they make an application to a local authority, depending on their needs (and to some extent on the pressure of demand locally). However, people who are living rough make up a very small proportion of people who are determined to be 'statutorily homeless' (MHCLG 2018c)
2	People in emergency accommodation	2	Overnight shelters	People with no place of usual residence who move frequently between various types of accommodation	People in emergency accommodation are not usually defined as or included in counts or estimates as 'street homeless'/'rough sleeping''. They are included in 'core' homelessness (Bramley 2017). People living in emergency accommodation <u>sometimes</u> meet the statutory definition of people who are 'homeless and in priority need' (England) and owed a duty by their local authority. if they i) make an application to a local authority, ii) are determined to be homeless iii) unintentionally so ad iv) (in England) in priority need' and iv) to some extent on the pressure of demand locally. However, they make up a very small proportion of people who are determined to be 'statutorily homeless' (MHCLG 2018b)
3	People living in accommodation for the homeless	3	Homeless hostels	Where the period of stay is time limited and no long-term housing is provided	People living is accommodation for the homeless may have arrived by direct access. They may have been placed there by local authorities, because they have made an application to be assessed by their local authority as 'homeless and in priority need' (England) which is being investigated. They may have been placed there because they i) made an application to a local authority, ii) have been determined to be homeless iii) unintentionally so and iv) (in England) in priority need. People in temporary accommodation, in particular, make up a large minority of people who are determined to be 'statutorily homeless' at any one time (MHCLG 2018b).The definition of 'core' homelessness includes hostels, shelter/refuges and 'unsatisfactory temporary accommodation' (Bramley 2017).
		4	Temporary accommodation		
		5	Transitional supported accommodation		
		6	Women's shelter or refuge accommodation		

4	People living in institutions	7 8	Healthcare institutions Penal institutions	Stay longer than needed due to lack of housing No housing available prior to release	Generally, people living in institutions are not usually defined as 'homeless' in terms of any of the major definitions. <u>Some</u> people leaving institutions with no home available may be defined as statutorily 'homeless and in priority need' if i) they make an application to a local authority, ii) if they are determined to homeless and iii) unintentionally so and iv) (in England) in 'priority need'. People leaving institutions make up a very small proportion of those determined to be 'statutorily homeless households'
5	People living in non-conventional dwellings due to lack of housing	9 10 11	Mobile homes Non-conventional building Temporary structures	Where the accommodation is used due to a lack of housing and is not the person's usual place of residence	Generally, no. People living in mobile homes, non-conventional dwellings and temporary structures are not usually defined as 'homeless' in terms of any of the major definitions. Some people these cases may be defined as statutorily 'homeless and in priority need' if i) they make an application to a council, ii) if they are determined to be homeless and iii) unintentionally so and iv) (England) in 'priority needs'. These people will make up a very small proportion of those determined to be 'statutorily homeless households'. The definition of 'core homeless' includes 'unsatisfactory temporary accommodation' (Bramley 2017).
6	Homeless people living temporarily in conventional housing with family and friends (due to lack of housing)	12	Conventional housing, but not the person's usual place of residence	Where the accommodation is used due to a lack of housing and is not the person's usual place of residence	Generally, no. <u>Some</u> people who are asked to leave accommodation with friends and family, whether it is long-term not temporary, or has been the person's usual place of residence, may be defined as statutorily 'homeless and in priority need' if i) they make an application to a local authority, ii) if they are determined to be homeless, iii) unintentionally so iv) (in England) in 'priority need' and iv) (to some extent) on the pressure of demand in the area. People asked to leave by family and friends make up a significant minority those determined to be 'statutorily homeless households'. 'Concealed' households living on a temporary basis with people who are not their immediate family and in overcrowded conditions) are included in the definition of 'core homelessness' (Bramley 2017).

Table A2: Latest available on the number of homeless in the UK

	Operational category		Living situation	Most recent number	Period covered	Source
1	People living rough	1	Public space/ external space	5,711	Street counts/estimates in Autumn 2018 (England, Wales and Northern Ireland) and 2014 estimate (Scotland)	Fitzpatrick et al 2018, Fitzpatrick et al 2015, NIHE 2018, Anon 2018
2	People in emergency accommodation	2	Overnight shelters	42,220 households	Estimates for hostels, refuges and shelters, Great Britain (excluding Northern Ireland) 2016	Bramley 2017
3	People living in accommodation for the homeless	3	Homeless hostels	LA-organised temporary accommodation: 97,469 households	Sept./Dec. 2018; Jan. 2019	MHCLG 2018b, Scottish Government 2018, Welsh Government 2019, Northern Ireland Housing Executive 2019
		4	Temporary accommodation			
		5	Transitional supported accommodation			
		6	Women's shelter or refuge accommodation			
4	People living in institutions	7	Healthcare institutions	NA	NA	NA
		8	Penal institutions			
5	People living in non-conventional dwellings due to lack of housing	9	Mobile homes	Park homes, one semi-mobile form of housing: 88,000 households in England and Scotland	2018	Wilson 2018
		10	Non-conventional building			
		11	Temporary structures	Temporary structures: 8,900 sleeping in tents and cars and on public transport	Some people living in tents and cars may be counted as 'rough sleepers' (above). People living in tents, cars and public transport in Great Britain, in addition to 'rough sleepers', (excluding Northern Ireland) 2016:	Bramley 2017
6	Homeless people living temporarily in conventional housing with	12	Conventional housing, but not the person's usual place of residence	68,300 households	Estimates of 'sofa surfers' for Great Britain (excluding people living with family and those	Bramley 2017

	family and friends (due to lack of housing)				not overcrowded, Northern Ireland) 2016	
	Other measures	Applications to local authorities as homeless				