

Appendix 1: At Risk Groups

The needs modelling for this project has been undertaken on the basis that there are two broad categories of people who experience homelessness or the risk of homelessness. We have coined the phrase *General Needs* to refer to people whose principal need relates to their housing situation, and *Additional Needs* to those who have a specific additional vulnerability that is on top of their pure housing need.

The Additional Needs therefore are specifically:

- Offending
- Substance Misuse
- People who were “looked after children”
- Vulnerable Young people
- Experiencing domestic abuse
- People who have Mental Health problems
- People with physical poor health
- People with learning disabilities
- Rough Sleepers

Within each of these broader additional needs groups we have identified the key junctures in people’s pathway where people may present a need, and this leads to the establishment of separate at-risk groups within some of the additional needs groups.

It was hoped to be able to categorise “offending”, “substance misuse” or “mental health” between those leaving institutional settings (prison, residential treatment or in-patient care) and those starting a period of community supervision or community treatment. However, this data was not made available in a way that enabled this to happen. For looked-after children the distinction lies between those in need at the point of leaving care and those who look for assistance while receiving after-care. A single at-risk group is retained for those experiencing domestic abuse.

For those within the General Needs at-risk group a distinction is made between those who are at risk of homelessness and those who are already homeless.

Estimating the size of these at-risk groups is the starting point of the modelling and the principle is that this should be based on published data i.e. something substantive. In many cases, this is currently missing or inadequate in some way. The validity of the conclusions will therefore be improved as the data collection improves. The recently implemented H-CLIC data has great potential to improve data availability and thereby feed locally-specific and up to date numbers into the model.

The first 6 months of H-CLIC data across the four district councils has been made available for the purposes of this research. The detail of how this data has been used to identify populations at risk is outlined in the table below. The data collection in this way is in its infancy and local councils are currently grappling with the interpretation and collection of the information. There may be issues of consistency when comparing one council’s data to another. Some of the data provided was incomplete. So, although there is great potential to utilise H-CLIC to report on homelessness in future for the moment **the results of the Modelling should be treated with caution. They provide informed guidance about the scale of need and the “direction of travel” but should not be treated as exact.**

All the subsequent algorithms applied to the *at-risk* populations to generate a projection of the level and types of service interventions needed by these “at-risk groups” are also estimates at the moment because they reflect things that are not currently measured or not currently recorded. These algorithms are explained in Appendix 2.

We set out below the size of all the at-risk groups that we have estimated, the data year to which this figure refers, and the basis upon which this has been calculated

| Population at Risk Groups | Who | Base Year | Description | Data |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------|---|---|
| Starting Probation Community Order / leaving prison without settled housing | NPS | 2017-18 | <p>NPS 196 (County wide) Apportioned across population Ashfield 16% = 31 Mansfield 19% = 37 N & S 16% = 31 (apportionment based on % of homeless or threatened homeless from H-CLIC) Data not made available by district or age</p> <p>CRC N&S 16 people homeless or in unsettled accommodation Mansfield and Ashfield 79 people homeless or in unsettled accommodation (Man41/Ash38)</p> <p>Total</p> | Ashfield = 69 Mansfield = 78 N&S = 47 |
| Homeless or at risk with support needs due to Learning Disability | H-CLIC data | April 2018-Sept 18 | <p>Number of people who are homeless or at risk of homelessness who have additional learning disability support need. Number for 6 months so needs to be doubled to get annualised figure</p> <p>Mansfield 4 x 2 = 8 Ashfield 5 x 2 = 10 Newark 7 x 2 = 14</p> | Mansfield 8 Ashfield 10 N&S 14 |
| Starting Sub Misuse community treatment without settled housing | Substance Misuse Service | 2017-18 | <p>the number of people starting a period of substance misuse treatment who were categorised as having a “housing problem” or an “urgent housing problem”</p> <p>“In relation to residential treatment, we have a clear criteria and it is really important</p> | Mansfield 83 Ashfield 39 N&S 35 |

| Population at Risk Groups | Who | Base Year | Description | Data |
|--|---------------------------------|--------------------|--|---|
| | | | that the person has a stable accommodation to return to post rehab. Pre-rehab there is an expectation that the person would have engaged with the service and be highly motivated. I can say for the past year no one has gone to rehab who hasn't been in settled accommodation prior to rehab." | |
| Homeless due to mental health | H-CLIC data | April 2018-Sept 18 | Number of people who are homeless or at risk of homelessness who have additional mental support need Mansfield 34 x 2 = 68 Ashfield 23 x 2 = 46 Newark 26 x 2 = 52 | Mansfield 68 Ashfield 46 N&S 52 |
| Homeless with support needs due to being a young person | H-CLIC data | April 2018-Sept 18 | Number of people who are homeless or at risk of homelessness who have additional young person need Mansfield 26 x 2 = 52 Ashfield 9 x 2 = 18 N&S 12 x 2 = 24 | Mansfield 52 Ashfield 18 N&S 24 |
| Homeless with support needs due to physical disability | H-CLIC data | April 2018-Sept 18 | Number of people who are homeless or at risk of homelessness who have additional physical health need Mansfield 19 x 2 = 38 Ashfield 32 x 2 = 64 N&S 21 x 2 = 42 | Mansfield 38 Ashfield 64 N&S 42 |
| Leaving LA care with a need for housing with support | County Council | Current | the current cohort of looked-after-children who are over 17, less those that it is anticipated will be "staying put" with foster carers once they turn 18. Data received from Wendy Rylands | MANS 12 ASH 23 NEW 12 |
| In contact with Leaving Care Team with unsuitable accommodation | County Council | Current | the number of young people (18-21) who are in contact with the Leaving Care Team and not in satisfactory accommodation | ASH 5 MANS 3 NEW 1 |
| People experiencing domestic abuse whose housing | District Council H-CLIC data | 2017-18 | Number of people who are homeless or at risk of homelessness who have | Ashfield 46 Mansfield 60 N & S 40 |

| Population at Risk Groups | Who | Base Year | Description | Data |
|---|----------------------------|--------------------|--|--|
| is not safe as a result | | | additional support need due to domestic abuse Ashfield 23 x 2 = 46 Mansfield 30 x 2 = 60 N & S 20 x 2 = 40 | |
| At risk of Homelessness without additional needs | H-CLIC data | April 2018-Sept 18 | People threatened with homelessness broken down by <u>no</u> additional Support Needs First 6 months Mansfield No Support Needs 71 = 142 Ashfield No Support Needs 104 = 208 N& S No Support Needs 70 = 140 | Mansfield 142 Ashfield 208 N&S 140 |
| Homeless without additional needs | H-CLIC data | April 2018-Sept 18 | Number of people who are homeless who have no support needs Mansfield No Support Needs 86 = 172 Ashfield No Support Needs 59 = 118 N & S No Support Needs 95 = 190 | Mansfield 172 Ashfield 118 N & S 190 |
| Rough Sleepers | Frame work Street Outreach | 2017/18 | Individual rough sleepers supported by Framework Rough Sleeper Data | Ashfield 50 Mansfield 122 N&S 24 |

Adjusting for Overlap

In any needs assessment where you are looking at multiple routes in to provision and therefore multiple separate cohorts over a fixed period there is obviously the danger that you are going to double-count the same person numerous times because they present in numerous places. To account for that we employ an “overlap deflator”.

In most cases this is based on a piece of research funded by Lankelly Chase on mapping severe and multiple disadvantage.¹ This calculated the overlap in the occurrence of aspects of disadvantage, substance misuse, offending, homelessness and mental health.

The main resulting overlap deflators are as follows:

| | |
|-----------------------------|-----|
| Offending at-PAR Groups | 56% |
| Substance Misuse PAR Groups | 62% |
| Mental Health PAR Groups | 96% |

¹ Bramley & Fitzpatrick (2015), *Hard Edges: Mapping severe and multiple disadvantage*, Lankelly Chase

| | |
|---------------------|-----|
| Homelessness Groups | 55% |
|---------------------|-----|

Additionally, an assumption is made that the overlap factor that should apply to domestic abuse is set at 90% and that which applies to Refugees is set at 80%. No overlap has been allowed for other at-risk groups.

The algorithm for the calculation of the Population at Risk totals is therefore

Initial PAR x Overlap Factor