

# Homelessness Reduction Act Survey 2018 - Survey Report

March 2019



To view more research from the Local Government Association Research and Information team please visit: <http://www.local.gov.uk/local-government-intelligence>

# Contents

- Contents..... 3
- Key Findings ..... 4
- Introduction ..... 7
- Methodology..... 7
- Survey Findings..... 8
  - Impact of the Act ..... 8
  - Funding of the Act .....13
  - Preparation and other issues .....16
  - Additional Comments .....20
  - Survey findings by population density group.....20
- Annex A .....36
  - Answers provided to open text questions .....36
- Annex B .....37
  - Survey form and notes of guidance .....37

## Key Findings

- **Homelessness presentations are increasing**

Almost all (83 per cent) of the councils which responded to the survey have seen an **increase** in homelessness presentations since the homelessness reduction act came into force. For 30 per cent of respondents, this increase was **significant**.

Over three quarters (78 per cent) of the councils where presentations have increased feel this is directly attributable to the introduction of the Act.

The Act has seen an increase in the number of presentations from people who weren't previously covered by statutory provisions – that is, current or recent rough sleepers, and people without local connections. However, presentations from people in priority need have also increased.

- **The use of temporary accommodation is increasing**

For most councils, the number of people in both temporary and emergency accommodation has **increased** as a result of the Act: 61 per cent of respondents have seen increases in the number of people in temporary accommodation, including 21 per cent for whom these increases were significant. Only eight per cent and six per cent of respondents say numbers in temporary and emergency accommodation respectively have decreased.

Similarly, the length of time spent by people in temporary and emergency accommodation has also **increased** for the majority of councils: 60 per cent of councils are seeing longer stays in temporary accommodation, and 68 per cent in emergency.

- **Housing people who are homeless remains difficult**

Councils have mixed views on whether the Act has affected their ability to house people via the main homelessness duty – 12 per cent say it's improved – largely due to increased prevention - whereas 11 per cent say it's worsened. For the majority, the Act has not changed the underlying issues relating to housing, which is a significant factor in councils' ability to support people.

For two-thirds (66 per cent) of respondents, access to housing in the Private Rental Sector (PRS) is having a great impact on their ability to meet needs. Access to social housing is less of a concern, although it still impacts 43 per cent of respondents to a great extent.

Related to this, affordability in the PRS is a great or moderate factor for 86 per cent of respondents. Social housing also presents significant affordability issues: 77 per cent of respondents cited this as a great or moderate factors in their ability to meet people's needs.

Respondents drew strong links between unaffordability and welfare reform, which in itself was cited by almost all (92 per cent) councils as affecting their

ability to meet people's needs. The local housing allowance and universal credit were singled out by the majority of respondents as creating shortfalls and delays in rent payments. Several councils have taken mitigating action against this, including using funding intended for homelessness prevention to cover gaps between welfare payments and rent.

- **Councils have reviewed and realigned services**

Councils feel they are **better able** to prevent and relieve homelessness for people who weren't previously covered by statutory provisions – i.e. single homeless people and people sleeping rough – as well as people in priority need. Respondents attribute this to more targeted support for people in these groups, along with increased prevention support.

More broadly, service provision has changed as a result of the Act: 60 per cent of respondents have commissioned or provided more services, including debt advice, help with accessing accommodation, and more general and specialised housing officers; almost three quarters (72 per cent) have developed a new homelessness strategy or reviewed their provision.

- **Costs of the Act**

Almost one third (29 per cent) of the respondents to the survey did not think they had been sufficiently resourced to deliver their new duties, with an average funding gap of £155,180, or 93 per cent of current HRA funding. In terms of staffing resources, the average shortfall was four full-time equivalent, although for one respondent this was as high as 15 FTE.

Increased casework was cited as the main cause of unfunded costs. To some extent, this is due to increased presentations: for 24 per cent of respondents, increased footfall was a significant driver.

However, for almost all (97 per cent) of respondents, changes in costs could be attributed to increased workload per applicant; for 67 per cent, this was a significant factor. Underlying this is increased casework – both for the prevention and relief duties – and, significantly, the administrative burden associated with the Act.

Councils expressed concerns that they were dependent on New Burdens and other time-limited funding to deliver the requirements of the Act, and could not guarantee this funding would be available in the longer-term.

- **Implementation challenges**

The most significant challenge for councils in the implementation of the Act – both prior to implementation and six months on – is H-CLIC. For 40 per cent of respondents, it presents “significant” issues relating to the lateness of the guidance and subsequent changes to reporting requirements, problems entering data into the system, and the amount of time needed to provide the required information.

Many councils (52 per cent) also highlighted IT systems as a barrier, alongside a shortage of experienced staff and difficulties caused by the lack of timely guidance and case law in relation to interpreting the act. Issues relating to funding and lack of housing were reiterated by respondents as continuing to present issues.

For some councils, difficulties were manifesting in staff wellbeing, recruitment and retention: of the 31 per cent of respondents who indicated an increase in sickness absence levels, increased workload and stress were most commonly cited as reasons. Similarly, workload issues and recruitment difficulties were commonly cited as reasons for increases in the staff vacancy rate, for the 38 per cent of councils where this rate had increased.

## Introduction

In November 2018 the LGA conducted a survey of councils to gather information on their experience of the Homelessness Reduction Act (HRA) since its implementation. The purpose was to enable the LGA to understand how well the Act is working on the ground, the areas where councils might be experiencing issues in relation to its implementation, and the extent of any funding gaps. A copy of the survey is shown in Annex B.

## Methodology

The survey was conducted online in November 2018 via a link sent to heads of housing services in all single tier and district councils in England. This was followed up with a reminder in December. Responses were received from 151 councils, giving a response rate of 48 per cent. A full breakdown of responses by type of council is shown in Table 1.

	<b>Number</b>	<b>Per cent</b>
Shire District	96	51
London Borough	17	52
Metropolitan District	11	31
Unitary Authority	27	49
Total	151	48

Base: 314 \*Note: where councils share services, they were sent just one survey.

It should be noted that some respondents did not answer all of the questions in the survey so within this report some of the findings are based on different numbers of respondents, this number (the base) is shown below all tables.

Where the response base is less than 50, figures can be skewed due to the small sample size and care should be taken when interpreting percentages, as small differences can seem magnified. Therefore, where this is the case, absolute numbers are reported alongside the percentage values.

Throughout the report percentages in figures and tables may add to more than 100 per cent due to rounding.

## Survey Findings

This section provides detailed aggregated results for each question contained within the survey.

### Impact of the Act

Respondents were asked how much the number of homelessness presentations to the council had changed since the Homelessness Reduction Act (HRA) came into force. Overall, 30 per cent said it had significantly increased, 24 per cent said it had somewhat increased and 29 per cent said it had slightly increased. Just one per cent of respondents said the number had somewhat decreased and two per cent reported that it had slightly decreased. A further 15 per cent of respondents reported that the number had stayed the same. These figures are shown in Table 2.

**Table 2: Change in homelessness presentations to the council since the Homelessness Reduction Act (HRA) came into force**

	Per cent
Significantly increased	30
Somewhat increased	24
Slightly increased	29
Stayed the same	15
Slightly decreased	2
Somewhat decreased	1
Significantly decreased	0
Not sure/don't know	0

Base: respondents who answered the question (149)

Following on from this the survey asked respondents to indicate the extent to which any change in the number of homelessness presentations could be attributed to the HRA in their view. Around half (47 per cent) felt that it could be significantly attributed to HRA, a further 23 per cent of respondents felt that the change could be somewhat attributed to the HRA while eight per cent felt the change could be slightly attributed to it. Only one in ten (10 per cent) respondents believed that the change could not be attributed to HRA at all. Table 3 shows a breakdown of these findings.

Respondents were asked to provide a brief explanation of their view. Among those who had seen increases in the number of homelessness presentations the three most commonly mentioned reasons were the broadened eligibility for support, the extent of the increase in numbers and the duty to refer. Respondents who had not seen an increase were unsure of whether their numbers had changed and whether any change they had seen could be attributed to HRA. A full list of all the answers provided is shown in the supplementary survey report.



**Table 3: Respondents' views of the extent to which the change in the number of homelessness presentations could be attributed to the HRA**

	Per cent
Significantly	47
Somewhat	23
Slightly	8
Not at all	10
Not sure/don't know	13

Base: all respondents (102)

The survey asked whether there had been a change in presentations from groups of applicants, from a list provided, as a proportion of total presentations. The groups most commonly identified as showing increases were those without local connections, for whom the proportion of presentations was reported as significantly higher by five per cent of respondents and somewhat higher by 46 per cent; and current or recent rough sleepers, whose presentations were significantly higher in 10 per cent of respondent councils and somewhat higher in 40 per cent.

Only a small number of respondents reported that the proportion of presentations were lower for any of the groups, with just eight per cent reporting significantly lower proportions for the intentionally homeless and three per cent reporting presentations from this group were somewhat lower. A full breakdown of these findings is shown in Table 4.

**Table 4: Whether there has been a change in presentations from different groups of applicants as a proportion of total presentations**

	Significantly higher	Somewhat higher	No change	Significantly lower	Somewhat lower	Not sure/ don't know
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>Per cent</b>					
Without local connections	5	46	40	1	0	8
Priority need	6	35	46	2	3	8
Intentionally homeless	3	12	62	8	3	12
With local connections	0	18	73	0	0	9
Current or recent rough sleepers	10	40	44	1	0	6

Base: all respondents (148)

When asked what effect the new duties had on their ability to prevent homelessness for people in the particular groups, the group which saw the most improvement was single homeless people with almost half (49 per cent) of respondents reporting it had somewhat improved and 11 per cent saying that it had significantly improved for this group. For all of the other groups the most common response was that there had been no change although some improvements were reported. A third (33 per cent) stated that it had somewhat improved for people in priority need with three per cent

reporting it had significantly improved, and for people sleeping rough, a quarter (25 per cent) said that their ability to prevent had somewhat improved and nine per cent said that it had significantly improved. For people with no recourse to public funds only nine per cent reported their ability had somewhat improved and just one per cent stated it had significantly improved.

Respondents' ability to relieve homelessness for these groups was most improved for single homeless people with 43 per cent reporting it had somewhat improved and nine per cent saying it had significantly improved. However, as with the ability to prevent homelessness, for all of the other groups the most common response was that there had been no change. However, 29 per cent said it had somewhat improved and two per cent that it had significantly improved for people in priority need, and 28 per cent stated it had somewhat improved and eight per cent that it had significantly improved in relation to people sleeping rough. People with no recourse to public funds saw the least improvement with seven per cent saying it had somewhat improved and one per cent that it had significantly improved. In relation to respondents' ability to house people via the main homelessness duty 11 per cent reported that it had somewhat improved and one per cent indicated it had significantly improved, a further eight per cent stated that it had somewhat worsened and three per cent reported that it had significantly worsened. A full breakdown of these findings is shown in Table 5.

**Table 5: The effect the new duties have had on respondents' support for people in the listed groups**

	Significantly improved	Somewhat improved	No change	Significantly worsened	Somewhat worsened	Not sure/ don't know
	Per cent					
<b>Ability to prevent homelessness for:</b>						
Single homeless people	11	49	35	3	1	1
People sleeping rough	9	25	61	4	1	1
People in priority need	3	33	57	5	1	1
People with no recourse to public funds	1	9	82	3	1	5
<b>Ability to relieve homelessness for:</b>						
Single homeless people	9	43	43	2	2	1
People sleeping rough	8	28	59	5	1	0
People in priority need	2	29	61	5	1	1
People with no recourse to public funds	1	7	83	3	1	5
The council's ability to house people via the main homelessness duty	1	11	74	8	3	4

Base: all respondents (150)

Respondents were asked to provide a brief explanation of the changes that the new duties have made to their councils ability to prevent and relieve homelessness. Among those reporting no change, just under half said that this was because they were already doing prevention work or providing support to non-priority applicants. Among the areas which had seen changes, more targeted support for both people

sleeping rough and single homeless people, and increased prevention support were the most commonly cited reasons for improvements while a lack of available housing was the reason most commonly given to explain why their ability had worsened. In relation to respondents' ability to house people via the main homelessness duty, delays caused by the introduction of prevention and relief duty were mentioned as a reason for this had worsened while higher prevention rates was cited as a reason for improvement. A full list of all the reasons given is shown in the supplementary survey report.

The survey asked about the impact of the Act on the number of people in temporary and emergency / interim accommodation. One in five (21 per cent) of respondents reported that the number in temporary accommodation had significantly increased, two in five (40 per cent) stated that it had somewhat increased and just under a third (31 per cent) said there had been no change in the number. Fewer than one in ten respondents reported it had decreased, five per cent somewhat and three per cent significantly.

For the numbers in emergency / interim accommodation, a quarter (25 per cent) of respondents said it had significantly increased, 46 per cent stated it had somewhat increased and one in five (21 per cent) reported there was no change. Just six per cent said that the numbers had decreased, three per cent somewhat and three per cent significantly. A breakdown of these findings is shown in Table 6.

**Table 6: Impact of the Act on the number of people in temporary and emergency / interim accommodation**

	Significantly increased	Somewhat increased	No change	Significantly decreased	Somewhat decreased	Not sure/ don't know
	Per cent					
Temporary Accommodation	21	40	31	5	3	1
Emergency / interim Accommodation	25	46	21	3	3	1

Base: all respondents (147)

Further to this, respondents were also asked what impact the Act was having on the length of time people spent in temporary and emergency/interim accommodation. A fifth (21 per cent) of respondents stated that the length of time spent in temporary accommodation had significantly increased, 39 per cent said that it had somewhat increased and 30 per cent reported no change. Only one per cent stated that it had significantly decreased while four per cent said that it had somewhat decreased.

A quarter (26 per cent) of respondents stated that the length of time people spent in emergency/interim accommodation had significantly increased, 42 per cent said that it had somewhat increased and a fifth (20 per cent) reported no change. A significant decrease was reported by only one per cent of respondents and five per cent stated it had somewhat decreased. A breakdown of the findings is shown in Table 7.

**Table 7: Impact of the Act on the length of time people spend in temporary and emergency/interim accommodation**

	Significantly increased	Somewhat increased	No change	Significantly decreased	Somewhat decreased	Not sure/ don't know
	Per cent					
Temporary Accommodation	21	39	30	4	1	5
Emergency / interim Accommodation	26	42	20	5	1	5

Base: all respondents (148)

Respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which factors, from a list provided, affected their council's ability to meet its clients' needs. The factors most commonly chosen as affecting respondents to more than a slight extent were welfare reform (59 per cent to a great extent and by 33 per cent to a moderate extent), followed by affordability of PRS housing which was selected by 64 per cent as affecting them to a great extent and 22 per cent to a moderate extent, and access to private rental sector (PRS) housing was picked by 66 per cent as a factor that affected them to a great extent and by 21 per cent as affecting them to a moderate extent.

The factors chosen by the fewest respondents as affecting their council's ability to meet its clients' needs were conditions and suitability of PRS housing, picked by nine per cent as affecting them to a great extent and 23 per cent citing a moderate extent, and partner engagement which eight per cent of respondents selected as affecting them to a great extent and 36 per cent picked as affecting them to a moderate extent. A full breakdown of these findings is shown in Table 8.

**Table 8: The extent to which particular factors affect respondents' ability to meet their clients' needs**

	To a great extent	A moderate extent	To a slight extent	To no extent	Don't know /not sure
	Per cent				
Welfare reform	59	33	5	1	1
Access to PRS housing	66	21	10	3	0
Affordability of PRS housing	64	22	11	3	1
Access to social housing	43	34	15	7	1
Administrative requirements of implementing the HRA	51	25	15	9	1
Availability of relevant support services	30	33	26	9	2
Clients' attitudes	22	37	32	7	2
Affordability of social housing	22	35	23	19	1
Security of PRS housing	23	27	31	17	3
Local Authority finance	22	27	26	20	5
Partner engagement	8	36	33	21	2
Staff retention and morale	15	28	32	24	1
Conditions and suitability of PRS housing	9	23	36	27	5

Base: all respondents (150)

The survey asked for brief details on how the listed factors had affected respondents' councils, and whether they had been able to mitigate their impact. The themes which emerged in relation to welfare reform were the gap between rents and the Local Housing Allowance (LHA), the benefit cap, delays in payments caused by the roll out of Universal Credit, and reluctance among landlords to take on Universal Credit (UC) clients as they no longer get direct payments for these tenants. Universal Credit was identified as a contributing factor to homelessness by most respondents. Mitigating actions taken by councils included use of discretionary housing payments (DHP) and other prevention funding to bridge any gaps to cover rent.

Comments received regarding the affordability and accessibility of social housing included the general lack of social housing, particularly in relation to single or large family units and the reluctance of landlords to take on tenants they believed were at risk of falling into rent arrears. Unaffordability was the main issue raised in relation to PRS housing, with councils bidding for access funding to mitigate against this issue, and as with social housing, a general lack of housing was highlighted.

The effect of budget cuts and insufficient New Burdens funding to implement HRA were mentioned in relation to local authority finance. Unrealistic expectations and a reluctance by clients to accept offers of PRS housing were cited as issues relating to clients' attitudes, and mixed views emerged regarding the perceived success of the Duty to Refer under partner engagement.

The administrative requirements of implementing the HRA were seen as burdensome by many respondents with a number stating that this had increased the time it took to deal with clients. The reporting requirements were also identified as burdensome and some were mitigating against this by implementing new IT systems. Related to this, it was reported that the increased workload was having an adverse effect on staff morale, with some staff leaving as a result; respondents were hiring additional staff to mitigate.

Access to mental health and drug and alcohol services were raised as an issue in relation to availability of relevant support services, and a number of respondents also stated that they were seeing more clients with complex needs. Comments were also received in relation to increased use of emergency and temporary accommodation. All of the comments received are shown in supplementary survey report.

## Funding of the Act

Respondents were asked whether their council had commissioned or provided more services as a result of HRA. A total of 60 per cent of respondents said they had, 39 per cent had not and one per cent did not know. Table 9 shows these findings.

When asked to provide details of the additional services they had commissioned or provided a large number stated they had employed additional staff resources, some in general housing roles and some to provide particular support such as prevention, tenancy, rough sleeping and private rental sector support. Other services that were provided or commissioned included debt advice, accommodation finding support and

single person support. Respondents also reported they had used their funding to acquire additional temporary and specialist accommodation, and to install new IT systems. A full list of all the answers provided is shown in the supplementary survey report.

**Table 9: Whether respondents had commissioned or provided more services as a result of the HRA**

	Per cent
Yes	60
No	39
Don't know	1

Base: all respondents (150)

Overall, 72 per cent of respondents said they had developed a new homelessness strategy or reviewed their service provision as a result of the HRA. These figures are shown in Table 10. Respondents were asked to provide details, most said that they were in the process of developing their new homelessness strategy or that they had already done so, a smaller number said that they had reviewed or were reviewing their service. A list of all of the answers provided can be found in the supplementary survey report.

**Table 10: Whether respondents had developed a new homelessness strategy or reviewed their service provision as a result of the HRA**

	Per cent
Yes	72
No	26
Don't know	1

Base: all respondents (149)

Just over half (54 per cent) of respondents felt they had been sufficiently resourced to deliver the new duties contained in the HRA, 29 per cent did not think they had and 17 per cent did not know. A breakdown of these figures is shown in Table 11.

**Table 11: Whether respondent councils felt they had been sufficiently resourced to deliver the new duties contained in the HRA**

	Per cent
Yes	54
No	29
Don't know	17

Base: all respondents (149)

The respondents who felt that they had not been sufficiently funded were asked to quantify the shortfall in terms of pounds per annum, as a percentage of their current HRA funding and the additional full-time equivalent staff resource required. Overall, the average funding gap was £155,180, with answers provided ranging from £30,000 to £680,000. When expressed as a percentage of current HRA funding, the average was 97 per cent while the lowest was 10 per cent and the highest was 388 per cent. In terms of staffing resources to implement the HRA, the average requirement was four full-time equivalents (fte), the lowest requirement was one fte and the highest was 15 fte. As the sample size is below 50 this also means that these figures should be treated with caution. There is a breakdown of these findings shown in Table 12.

**Table 12: The extent of the funding gap to implement the HRA**

	Average	Lowest	Highest	Sample size
The funding gap faced by respondents in implementing the HRA per year	£155,180	£30,000	£680,000	25
Funding gap as a percentage of respondents' current HRA funding (per cent)	97	10	388	21
Additional staff resource required to implement the HRA (full time equivalent)	4	1	15	28

Base: respondents who felt that they had not been sufficiently funded (43)

The survey asked respondents to identify particular elements which were generating new costs that were not adequately funded from a list provided. The options most commonly chosen as generating significant or somewhat high costs were prevention duty casework (21 and 28 per cent), relief duty casework (19 and 30 per cent) and advisory duty - assessments (17 and 28 per cent). A full breakdown of these findings can be seen in Table 13.

**Table 13: Elements of the HRA that are generating new costs not adequately funded**

	Significantly high costs	Somewhat high costs	Moderate costs	Somewhat low costs	Low costs	Don't know /not sure
	Per cent					
Advisory duty - initial contact and triage	12	30	26	10	9	12
Advisory duty - assessments	17	28	27	7	9	12
Prevention duty casework	21	28	23	6	9	13
Relief duty casework	19	30	24	7	7	13
Main homelessness duty	7	13	30	18	17	16
Reviews of decisions	1	8	29	16	27	18
Other	26	35	21	6	3	9

Base: all respondents (139)

Respondents who identified other elements as generating new costs which were not funded most commonly specified temporary accommodation and IT systems. A list of all the other elements identified by respondents is shown in Table A1 in Annex A.

The additional details provided by respondents in relation to new costs that were not adequately funded included taking on additional staff, increased use of temporary accommodation and an increase in the amount of time spent working on each case. A number of respondents mentioned that they were dependent on New Burdens and other time limited funding to deliver requirements of the HRA and expressed concern their ability to continue to do so in the longer term. All of the answers provided are listed in the supplementary survey report.

The survey then asked respondents to indicate the extent to which any new costs could be attributed to increased footfall as a result of the HRA, increased workload per applicant as a result of new duties, or any other reasons they wished to specify. A quarter (24 per cent) of respondents felt that that the change in costs could be significantly attributed to increased footfall, 35 per cent felt it could moderately be attributed to it and 21 per cent to a slight extent. A further 17 per cent didn't think that new costs could be attributed to increased footfall at all.

Two thirds of respondents (67 per cent) felt the change in costs could be attributed to the increased workload per applicant to a significant extent, 27 per cent felt this could be attributed to it to a moderate extent and two per cent felt the change could be slightly attributed to an increased workload. Just three per cent felt that this did not contribute to the change at all. A full breakdown of all of these findings is shown in Table 14.

Other factors which respondents felt attributed to the new costs included increased use of temporary accommodation, IT related issues, welfare reform and a lack of appropriate accommodation. A full list of the other factors specified is shown in Table A2 in Annex A.

	Significantly	Moderately	Slightly	Not at all	Not sure/ don't know
	Per cent				
Increased footfall as a result of the HRA	24	35	21	17	3
Increased workload per applicant as a result of new duties	67	27	2	3	0
Other	71	27	0	0	0

Base: all respondents (147)

## Preparation and other issues

Respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which their council had been given enough time to prepare for the HRA following the publication of the code of guidance from a list provided. In terms of overall preparation, 21 per cent of respondents said



they had somewhat less than enough time and a third (34 per cent) reported they had significantly less than enough, while a total of 44 per cent indicated they had been given enough time.

Looking at individual elements, the one mostly commonly chosen as an area where there had not been enough time was data recording for H-CLIC with 60 per cent indicating they had significantly less than enough time and 32 per cent feeling it was somewhat less than enough. This was followed by IT systems which 49 per cent of respondents felt they had significantly less than enough time to prepare and 30 per cent saying they had somewhat less than enough. Staff recruitment was cited by 21 per cent as an area where they had significantly less than enough time and by 28 per cent as somewhat less than enough. The findings for population density groups were broadly similar, a full breakdown of all figures are shown in Table 15.

Two respondents identified other elements for which they had significantly less than enough time to prepare for, these were specified as the duty to refer and legacy case issues.

**Table 15: The extent to which respondents had had enough time to prepare for the HRA following the publication of the code of guidance**

	Significantly more than enough	Somewhat more than enough	Enough	Significantly less than enough	Somewhat less than enough	Don't know /not sure
	Per cent (Number)					
Overall	3	3	38	34	21	1
Interpreting the duties in the Act	3	4	41	35	17	1
IT systems	1	1	18	30	49	1
Data recording for H-CLIC	1	0	5	32	60	1
Staff training	3	4	45	31	17	1
Staff recruitment	3	3	43	28	21	2
Partnership working	3	3	50	28	15	1
Organising services	3	3	49	28	15	2
Other	0	0	0	0	100	0

Base: all respondents (151)

When asked the extent to which elements from a list provided were still presenting issues relating to their delivery of the HRA the area chosen by most respondents was data recording for H-CLIC with 40 per cent indicating it was causing significant issues and 38 per cent saying it was doing so to somewhat of an extent. This was followed by IT systems, chosen by 22 per cent as presenting significant issues and 30 per cent as somewhat causing issues. The elements identified as presenting the fewest issues were staff recruitment with 42 per cent indicating it was causing them no issues at all and 26 per cent reporting that it was doing so only slightly. This was followed by organising services, with 36 per cent indicating this was causing them no issues at all and 43 per cent saying it was doing so only slightly. A full breakdown of these findings are shown in Table 16.

The other elements identified by respondents as still presenting issues were legacy case migration, a lack of PRS, customer engagement and funding, both in terms of support from upper tier councils and in relation to delivery of the HRA.

**Table 16: The extent to which the following elements are still presenting issues relating to respondents' delivery of the HRA**

	Significantly	Somewhat	Slightly	Not at all	Not sure/ don't know
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>Per cent</b>				
Interpreting the duties in the Act	7	18	48	27	0
IT systems	22	30	30	18	1
Data recording for H-CLIC	40	38	15	8	0
Staff training	3	21	48	27	0
Staff recruitment	13	17	26	42	2
Partnership working	5	19	41	33	1
Organising services	5	13	43	36	3
Other	80	20	0	0	0

Base: all respondents (151)

Respondents were asked to provide further details on this topic. Most related to H-CLIC with respondents citing the lateness of the guidance and subsequent changes to the reporting requirements, problems entering data into the Delta system and the amount of time that it takes to provide the required information. Other issues raised included problems ensuring IT systems were able to deal with the new requirements, a shortage of experienced staff and difficulties caused by the lack of timely guidance and case law in relation to interpreting the Act. A full list of all the answers provided is shown in the supplementary survey report.

The survey asked whether sickness absence levels in respondents' homelessness services had changed since 3 April 2018 according to their official in-house data. In 61 per cent of all respondent councils the levels had stayed the same, 18 per cent said it had increased slightly, eight per cent that it had increased somewhat and five per cent reported a significant increase. A further three per cent said that their levels had decreased slightly and one per cent reported that they had decreased somewhat. A full breakdown of these findings is shown in Table 17.

**Table 17: Whether sickness absence levels in respondents' homelessness services had changed since 3 April 2018**

	Per cent
Significantly increased	5
Somewhat increased	8
Slightly increased	18
Stayed the same	61
Slightly decreased	3
Somewhat decreased	1
Significantly decreased	0
Not sure/don't know	5

Base: all respondents (148)

Respondents were invited to provide comments in relation to their answer. Among those who reported an increase in their sickness absence levels increased workload and stress and were most commonly cited as the reason for the increase. A similar number felt that the increase was not related to the HRA. For those who reported a decrease the reasons given included good levels of staff morale and motivation. All the comments provided are shown in the supplementary survey report.

Following on from this, the survey asked whether staff vacancy rates had changed since 3 April 2018 according to respondents' official in-house data. Rates had stayed the same in 58 per cent of respondent councils overall, they had increased slightly in 26 per cent, they had somewhat increased in six per cent and significantly increased in six per cent. Only one per cent of respondents reported that their vacancy rates had somewhat decreased. These findings are shown in Table 18.

When asked to comment on this the reason provided for an increase in the vacancy rates included workload issues, staff changing roles and recruitment difficulties. A list of all the comments provided is shown in the supplementary survey report.

**Table 18: Whether staff vacancy rates had changed since 3 April 2018**

	Per cent
Significantly increased	6
Somewhat increased	6
Slightly increased	26
Stayed the same	58
Slightly decreased	0
Somewhat decreased	1
Significantly decreased	0
Not sure/don't know	3

Base: all respondents (148)

The final question of the survey asked respondents whether they felt adequately prepared for the implementation of the new Duty to Refer. Overall, half (50 per cent) of respondents indicated that they felt adequately prepared, 22 per cent said they felt somewhat well-prepared and 13 per cent reported feeling very well-prepared. Of the respondents who felt under-prepared 15 per cent were somewhat under-prepared and one per cent felt very under-prepared. Table 19 shows these findings.

**Table 19: Whether respondents felt adequately prepared for the implementation of the new Duty to Refer**

	Per cent
Very well-prepared	13
Somewhat well-prepared	22
Adequately prepared	50
Somewhat under-prepared	15
Very under-prepared	1
Not sure/don't know	1

Base: all respondents (148)

Respondents were asked to provide brief details about their preparedness for the implementation of the new Duty to Refer. Answers provided in relation to this included details of how respondents achieved this such as working with agencies, developing referral pathways and training. Among respondents who felt under-prepared the issues mentioned included a lack of awareness of the Duty among partner agencies and problems with IT. All the answers provided can be found in the supplementary survey report.

## Additional Comments

At the end of the survey respondents were given the opportunity to detail any other issues relating to the HRA they wished to raise. Among the main issues raised were the administrative burden of implementing the Act, concerns about funding and aspects of the Act which were problematic. A full list of all the responses provided is shown in the supplementary survey report.

## Survey findings by population density group

This section looks at the survey responses grouped by population density to identify where areas of the HRA is having a different effect on particular types of councils. The groups used for this analysis are based on the ONS urban rural classifications, however, due to the small number of respondents within the samples some of the categories have been merged. The groups are:

- Predominantly rural – this is a combination of the Mostly Rural (population 80 per cent and above) and Largely Rural (population 50 - 79 per cent rural) classifications
- Urban with significant rural (26 - 49 per cent rural including hub towns)
- Urban with city and town (population less than 26 per cent rural including hub towns)
- Urban with conurbation – this is a combination of the Urban with Minor Conurbation (population less than 26 per cent rural including hub towns) and Urban with Major Conurbation (population less than 26 per cent rural including hub towns)

All of the groups have response bases of less than 50, so figures can be skewed due to the small sample size and care should be taken when interpreting percentages as small differences can seem magnified. Therefore, throughout this section absolute numbers are reported alongside the percentage values.

In relation to changes in the number of homelessness presentations to the council since the Homelessness Reduction Act (HRA) the pattern was broadly the same among the population density groups as the overall findings. The main differences were that that a higher proportion councils in the urban with conurbation group (43

per cent) and a lower proportion of those in the predominantly rural group (18 per cent) reported that it had significantly increased. There was also variation among the proportion of groups reporting that presentations had somewhat increased with this ranging from 36 per cent for predominantly rural councils to 14 per cent for those in the urban with conurbation group. The differences were less pronounced for the proportion reporting presentations had slightly increased where the urban with significant rural group had the highest proportion at 39 per cent and the urban with conurbation had the lowest at 23 per cent. The proportions were the same or roughly the same for all other levels of change. These figures are shown in Table 20.

**Table 20: How much the number of homelessness presentations to the council have changed since the Homelessness Reduction Act (HRA) came into force**

	Predominantly rural	Urban with significant rural	Urban with city	Urban with conurbation
	<b>Per cent (Number)</b>			
Significantly increased	18 (8)	30 (7)	30 (14)	43 (15)
Somewhat increased	36 (16)	17 (4)	23 (11)	14 (5)
Slightly increased	30 (13)	39 (9)	28 (13)	23 (8)
Stayed the same	14 (6)	13 (3)	15 (7)	17 (6)
Slightly decreased	0 (0)	0 (0)	4 (2)	3 (1)
Somewhat decreased	2 (1)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Significantly decreased	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Not sure/don't know	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)

Base: predominantly rural (44); urban with significant rural (23); urban with city (47); urban with conurbation (35).

Respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which any change in the number of homelessness presentations could be attributed to the HRA in their view. Among the population groups the proportion who felt it could be significantly attributed to HRA ranged from 56 per cent of those in the urban with conurbation group to 36 per cent of urban with significant rural councils. As only a small number of respondents chose any of the other answers it would not be appropriate to highlight differences between the groups. Table 21 shows a full breakdown of the findings.

**Table 21: Respondents' views of the extent to which the change in the number of homelessness presentations could be attributed to the HRA**

	Predominantly rural	Urban with significant rural	Urban with city	Urban with conurbation
	<b>Per cent (Number)</b>			
Significantly	38 (11)	36 (5)	53 (17)	56 (15)
Somewhat	31 (9)	14 (2)	22 (7)	19 (5)
Slightly	7 (2)	14 (2)	6 (2)	7 (2)
Not at all	14 (4)	7 (1)	6 (2)	11 (3)
Not sure/don't know	10 (3)	29 (4)	13 (4)	7 (2)

Base: predominantly rural (29); urban with significant rural (14); urban with city (32); urban with conurbation (27).

There were some variations among respondents with different population densities in relation to whether there had been a change in presentations from different groups of applicants as a proportion of total presentations. A higher percentage of respondents from urban with city areas reported a somewhat higher proportion of presentations among those without a local connection at 63 per cent, and those who were current or recent rough sleepers at 53 per cent. While a greater percentage of those from urban with significant rural areas reported a lower proportion of presentations from the intentionally homeless, at 14 per cent. There is a full breakdown of these findings shown in Table 22.

**Table 22: Whether there has been a change in presentations from different groups of applicants as a proportion of total presentations**

	Significantly higher	Somewhat higher	No change	Significantly lower	Somewhat lower	Not sure/ don't know
<b>Predominantly rural</b>	<b>Per cent</b>					
Priority need	2 (1)	30 (13)	52 (23)	5 (2)	2 (1)	9 (4)
Intentionally homeless	2 (1)	7 (3)	65 (28)	9 (4)	5 (2)	12 (5)
With local connections	0 (0)	7 (3)	81 (35)	0 (0)	0 (0)	12 (5)
Without local connections	5 (2)	39 (17)	48 (21)	2 (1)	0 (0)	7 (3)
Current or recent rough sleepers	5 (2)	33 (14)	58 (25)	2 (1)	0 (0)	2 (1)
<b>Urban with significant rural</b>						
Priority need	5 (1)	45 (10)	45 (10)	0 (0)	0 (0)	5 (1)
Intentionally homeless	0 (0)	0 (0)	82 (18)	14 (3)	0 (0)	5 (1)
With local connections	0 (0)	15 (3)	80 (16)	0 (0)	0 (0)	5 (1)
Without local connections	0 (0)	45 (10)	50 (11)	0 (0)	0 (0)	5 (1)
Current or recent rough sleepers	18 (4)	41 (9)	36 (8)	0 (0)	0 (0)	5 (1)
<b>Urban with city</b>						
Priority need	11 (5)	30 (14)	46 (21)	0 (0)	4 (2)	9 (4)
Intentionally homeless	4 (2)	20 (9)	52 (24)	4 (2)	4 (2)	15 (7)
With local connections	0 (0)	27 (12)	67 (30)	0 (0)	0 (0)	7 (3)
Without local connections	4 (2)	63 (29)	22 (10)	2 (1)	0 (0)	9 (4)
Current or recent rough sleepers	9 (4)	53 (25)	32 (15)	0 (0)	0 (0)	6 (3)
<b>Urban with conurbation</b>						
Priority need	6 (2)	43 (15)	37 (13)	3 (1)	3 (1)	9 (3)
Intentionally homeless	3 (1)	18 (6)	59 (20)	6 (2)	3 (1)	12 (4)
With local connections	0 (0)	24 (8)	65 (22)	0 (0)	0 (0)	12 (4)
Without local connections	9 (3)	32 (11)	47 (16)	0 (0)	0 (0)	12 (4)
Current or recent rough sleepers	12 (4)	29 (10)	47 (16)	0 (0)	0 (0)	12 (4)

Base: Predominantly rural (44); urban with significant rural (22); urban with city (47); urban with conurbation (35).

When asked what effect the new duties had on their ability to prevent homelessness for people in the particular groups the proportions among respondents from different population density groups were similar with the exception of those from the urban with conurbation group in which 14 per reported their ability to prevent homelessness for people in priority need had somewhat worsened and 21 per cent stated that their

ability to relieve homelessness for this group had also somewhat worsened. Within the urban with conurbation group 18 per cent of respondents reported their council's ability to house people via the main homelessness duty had somewhat worsened. These findings are shown in Tables 23 - 26.

<b>Table 23: The effect the new duties have had on respondents' support for people in the listed groups - Predominantly rural</b>						
	Significantly improved	Somewhat improved	No change	Significantly worsened	Somewhat worsened	Not sure/ don't know
	Per cent (Number)					
<b>Ability to prevent homelessness for:</b>						
People sleeping rough	4 (2)	18 (8)	73 (33)	4 (2)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Single homeless people	7 (3)	51 (23)	40 (18)	2 (1)	0 (0)	0 (0)
People in priority need	0 (0)	33 (14)	67 (29)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
People with no recourse to public funds	0 (0)	11 (5)	78 (35)	4 (2)	0 (0)	7 (3)
<b>Ability to relieve homelessness for:</b>						
People sleeping rough	7 (3)	20 (9)	71 (32)	2 (1)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Single homeless people	4 (2)	49 (22)	42 (19)	2 (1)	2 (1)	0 (0)
People in priority need	0 (0)	24 (11)	73 (33)	0 (0)	2 (1)	0 (0)
People with no recourse to public funds	0 (0)	9 (4)	80 (35)	2 (1)	2 (1)	7 (3)
The council's ability to house people via the main homelessness duty	0 (0)	14 (6)	84 (37)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (1)

Base: predominantly rural respondents (45)

<b>Table 24: The effect the new duties have had on respondents' support for people in the listed groups - Urban with significant rural</b>						
	Significantly improved	Somewhat improved	No change	Significantly worsened	Somewhat worsened	Not sure/ don't know
	Per cent (Number)					
<b>Ability to prevent homelessness for:</b>						
People sleeping rough	9 (2)	26 (6)	61 (14)	0 (0)	4 (1)	0 (0)
Single homeless people	17 (4)	35 (8)	39 (9)	4 (1)	4 (1)	0 (0)
People in priority need	0 (0)	23 (5)	73 (16)	0 (0)	5 (1)	0 (0)
People with no recourse to public funds	0 (0)	4 (1)	87 (20)	0 (0)	4 (1)	4 (1)
<b>Ability to relieve homelessness for:</b>						
People sleeping rough	9 (2)	27 (6)	59 (13)	0 (0)	5 (1)	0 (0)
Single homeless people	13 (3)	39 (9)	43 (10)	0 (0)	4 (1)	0 (0)
People in priority need	0 (0)	23 (5)	73 (16)	0 (0)	5 (1)	0 (0)
People with no recourse to public funds	0 (0)	0 (0)	91 (21)	0 (0)	4 (1)	4 (1)
The council's ability to house people via the main homelessness duty	0 (0)	9 (2)	87 (20)	0 (0)	4 (1)	0 (0)

Base: urban with significant rural respondents (23)

**Table 25: The effect the new duties have had on respondents' support for people in the listed groups - Urban with city**

	Significantly improved	Somewhat improved	No change	Significantly worsened	Somewhat worsened	Not sure/ don't know
	Per cent (Number)					
<b>Ability to prevent homelessness for:</b>						
People sleeping rough	11 (5)	32 (15)	51 (24)	4 (2)	0 (0)	2 (1)
Single homeless people	15 (7)	55 (26)	28 (13)	2 (1)	0 (0)	0 (0)
People in priority need	6 (3)	36 (17)	51 (24)	4 (2)	0 (0)	2 (1)
People with no recourse to public funds	0 (0)	7 (3)	87 (40)	2 (1)	0 (0)	4 (2)
<b>Ability to relieve homelessness for:</b>						
People sleeping rough	9 (4)	30 (14)	57 (27)	4 (2)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Single homeless people	9 (4)	46 (21)	46 (21)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
People in priority need	4 (2)	38 (18)	53 (25)	2 (1)	0 (0)	2 (1)
People with no recourse to public funds	0 (0)	6 (3)	87 (41)	2 (1)	0 (0)	4 (2)
The council's ability to house people via the main homelessness duty	0 (0)	11 (5)	68 (32)	13 (6)	4 (2)	4 (2)

Base: urban with city respondents (47)

**Table 26: The effect the new duties have had on respondents' support for people in the listed groups - Urban with conurbation**

	Significantly improved	Somewhat improved	No change	Significantly worsened	Somewhat worsened	Not sure/ don't know
	Per cent (Number)					
<b>Ability to prevent homelessness for:</b>						
People sleeping rough	11 (4)	26 (9)	57 (20)	6 (2)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Single homeless people	9 (3)	47 (16)	35 (12)	6 (2)	0 (0)	3 (1)
People in priority need	3 (1)	37 (13)	43 (15)	14 (5)	0 (0)	3 (1)
People with no recourse to public funds	3 (1)	15 (5)	76 (26)	3 (1)	0 (0)	3 (1)
<b>Ability to relieve homelessness for:</b>						
People sleeping rough	9 (3)	35 (12)	44 (15)	12 (4)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Single homeless people	12 (4)	35 (12)	41 (14)	6 (2)	3 (1)	3 (1)
People in priority need	3 (1)	26 (9)	47 (16)	21 (7)	0 (0)	3 (1)
People with no recourse to public funds	3 (1)	9 (3)	76 (26)	6 (2)	0 (0)	6 (2)
The council's ability to house people via the main homelessness duty	3 (1)	9 (3)	59 (20)	18 (6)	3 (1)	9 (3)

Base: urban with conurbation respondents (35)



There were broadly similar findings among the population density groups in relation to the impact of the Act on the number of people in temporary and emergency / interim accommodation. A breakdown of the finding is shown in Table 27.

<b>Table 27: The impact of the Act on the number of people in temporary and emergency / interim accommodation</b>						
	Significantly increased	Somewhat increased	No change	Significantly decreased	Somewhat decreased	Not sure/ don't know
	<b>Per cent (Number)</b>					
<b>Predominantly rural</b>						
Temporary Accommodation	19 (8)	40 (17)	37 (16)	5 (2)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Emergency / interim Accommodation	23 (10)	51 (22)	21 (9)	5 (2)	0 (0)	0 (0)
<b>Urban with significant rural</b>						
Temporary Accommodation	24 (5)	19 (4)	38 (8)	10 (2)	10 (2)	0 (0)
Emergency / interim Accommodation	23 (5)	41 (9)	27 (6)	5 (1)	5 (1)	0 (0)
<b>Urban with city</b>						
Temporary Accommodation	17 (8)	51 (24)	28 (13)	4 (2)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Emergency / interim Accommodation	24 (11)	52 (24)	17 (8)	4 (2)	2 (1)	0 (0)
<b>Urban with conurbation</b>						
Temporary Accommodation	26 (9)	37 (13)	23 (8)	3 (1)	6 (2)	6 (2)
Emergency / interim Accommodation	29 (10)	34 (12)	23 (8)	0 (0)	9 (3)	6 (2)

Base: predominantly rural (43); urban with significant rural (22); urban with city (47); urban with conurbation (35).

Following on from this, respondents were asked what impact the Act was having on the length of time people spent in temporary and emergency/interim accommodation. There were no differences of note between the different population groups as shown in Table 28.

<b>Table 28: The impact of the Act on the length of time people spend in temporary and emergency/interim accommodation</b>						
	Significantly increased	Somewhat increased	No change	Significantly decreased	Somewhat decreased	Not sure/ don't know
	<b>Per cent (Number)</b>					
<b>Predominantly rural</b>						
Temporary Accommodation	25 (11)	48 (21)	25 (11)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (1)
Emergency / interim Accommodation	28 (12)	47 (20)	21 (9)	2 (1)	0 (0)	2 (1)

	Significantly increased	Somewhat increased	No change	Significantly decreased	Somewhat decreased	Not sure/ don't know
<b>Urban with significant rural</b>						
Temporary Accommodation	17 (4)	26 (6)	39 (9)	13 (3)	0 (0)	4 (1)
Emergency / interim Accommodation	13 (3)	48 (11)	26 (6)	13 (3)	0 (0)	0 (0)
<b>Urban with city</b>						
Temporary Accommodation	21 (10)	36 (17)	36 (17)	6 (3)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Emergency / interim Accommodation	34 (16)	34 (16)	23 (11)	9 (4)	0 (0)	0 (0)
<b>Urban with conurbation</b>						
Temporary Accommodation	18 (6)	41 (14)	21 (7)	0 (0)	3 (1)	18 (6)
Emergency / interim Accommodation	21 (7)	44 (15)	12 (4)	0 (0)	6 (2)	18 (6)

Base: predominantly rural (44); urban with significant rural (23); urban with city (47); urban with conurbation (34).

The findings in relation to the extent to which particular factors affected respondent council's ability to meet its clients' needs were broadly the same for all population density groups as can be seen in Tables 29 - 32.

<b>Table 29: The extent to which particular factors affect respondents' ability to meet their clients' needs - Predominantly rural</b>					
	To a great extent	A moderate extent	To a slight extent	To no extent	Don't know /not sure
	<b>Per cent (Number)</b>				
Welfare reform	42 (19)	49 (22)	7 (3)	0 (0)	2 (1)
Access to PRS housing	60 (27)	27 (12)	11 (5)	2 (1)	0 (0)
Affordability of PRS housing	53 (24)	29 (13)	18 (8)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Access to social housing	36 (16)	32 (14)	23 (10)	9 (4)	0 (0)
Administrative requirements of implementing the HRA	44 (20)	24 (11)	20 (9)	11 (5)	0 (0)
Availability of relevant support services	27 (12)	33 (15)	24 (11)	13 (6)	2 (1)
Clients' attitudes	20 (9)	25 (11)	43 (19)	9 (4)	2 (1)
Affordability of social housing	20 (9)	43 (19)	25 (11)	11 (5)	0 (0)
Security of PRS housing	25 (11)	25 (11)	27 (12)	18 (8)	5 (2)
Local Authority finance	11 (5)	20 (9)	24 (11)	40 (18)	4 (2)
Partner engagement	4 (2)	33 (15)	33 (15)	27 (12)	2 (1)
Staff retention and morale	11 (5)	25 (11)	32 (14)	32 (14)	0 (0)
Conditions and suitability of PRS housing	7 (3)	27 (12)	31 (14)	33 (15)	2 (1)

Base: predominantly rural respondents (45)

**Table 30: The extent to which particular factors affect respondents' ability to meet their clients' needs - Urban with significant rural**

	To a great extent	A moderate extent	To a slight extent	To no extent	Don't know /not sure
	Per cent (Number)				
Welfare reform	55 (12)	27 (6)	9 (2)	5 (1)	5 (1)
Access to PRS housing	70 (16)	13 (3)	17 (4)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Affordability of PRS housing	61 (14)	30 (7)	4 (1)	0 (0)	4 (1)
Access to social housing	35 (8)	43 (10)	9 (2)	4 (1)	9 (2)
Administrative requirements of implementing the HRA	26 (6)	17 (4)	35 (8)	17 (4)	4 (1)
Availability of relevant support services	30 (7)	30 (7)	26 (6)	9 (2)	4 (1)
Clients' attitudes	17 (4)	30 (7)	39 (9)	9 (2)	4 (1)
Affordability of social housing	17 (4)	30 (7)	30 (7)	17 (4)	4 (1)
Security of PRS housing	13 (3)	26 (6)	30 (7)	26 (6)	4 (1)
Local Authority finance	14 (3)	18 (4)	32 (7)	27 (6)	9 (2)
Partner engagement	9 (2)	39 (9)	22 (5)	22 (5)	9 (2)
Staff retention and morale	0 (0)	23 (5)	27 (6)	45 (10)	5 (1)
Conditions and suitability of PRS housing	4 (1)	13 (3)	30 (7)	48 (11)	4 (1)

Base: urban with significant rural respondents (23)

**Table 31: The extent to which particular factors affect respondents' ability to meet their clients' needs - Urban with city**

	To a great extent	A moderate extent	To a slight extent	To no extent	Don't know /not sure
	Per cent (Number)				
Welfare reform	68 (32)	30 (14)	2 (1)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Access to PRS housing	70 (33)	19 (9)	6 (3)	4 (2)	0 (0)
Affordability of PRS housing	68 (32)	19 (9)	6 (3)	6 (3)	0 (0)
Access to social housing	49 (23)	28 (13)	19 (9)	4 (2)	0 (0)
Administrative requirements of implementing the HRA	60 (28)	28 (13)	9 (4)	4 (2)	0 (0)
Availability of relevant support services	37 (17)	39 (18)	20 (9)	4 (2)	0 (0)
Clients' attitudes	23 (11)	40 (19)	28 (13)	6 (3)	2 (1)
Affordability of social housing	26 (12)	33 (15)	20 (9)	22 (10)	0 (0)
Security of PRS housing	28 (13)	28 (13)	32 (15)	13 (6)	0 (0)
Local Authority finance	30 (14)	30 (14)	23 (11)	11 (5)	6 (3)
Partner engagement	11 (5)	45 (21)	30 (14)	15 (7)	0 (0)
Staff retention and morale	15 (7)	26 (12)	41 (19)	17 (8)	0 (0)
Conditions and suitability of PRS housing	11 (5)	19 (9)	38 (18)	23 (11)	9 (4)

Base: urban with city respondents (47)

**Table 32: The extent to which particular factors affect respondents' ability to meet their clients' needs - Urban with conurbation**

	To a great extent	A moderate extent	To a slight extent	To no extent	Don't know /not sure
<b>Urban with conurbation</b>	<b>Per cent (Number)</b>				
Welfare reform	71 (24)	21 (7)	6 (2)	3 (1)	0 (0)
Access to PRS housing	68 (23)	21 (7)	9 (3)	3 (1)	0 (0)
Affordability of PRS housing	74 (26)	11 (4)	11 (4)	3 (1)	0 (0)
Access to social housing	49 (17)	40 (14)	3 (1)	9 (3)	0 (0)
Administrative requirements of implementing the HRA	63 (22)	26 (9)	6 (2)	6 (2)	0 (0)
Availability of relevant support services	24 (8)	26 (9)	38 (13)	9 (3)	3 (1)
Clients' attitudes	26 (9)	51 (18)	20 (7)	3 (1)	0 (0)
Affordability of social housing	23 (8)	31 (11)	20 (7)	26 (9)	0 (0)
Security of PRS housing	20 (7)	29 (10)	34 (12)	14 (5)	3 (1)
Local Authority finance	29 (10)	38 (13)	26 (9)	3 (1)	3 (1)
Partner engagement	9 (3)	26 (9)	46 (16)	20 (7)	0 (0)
Staff retention and morale	29 (10)	37 (13)	23 (8)	11 (4)	0 (0)
Conditions and suitability of PRS housing	11 (4)	31 (11)	43 (15)	11 (4)	3 (1)

Base: urban with conurbation respondents (35)

The pattern for whether respondents had commissioned or provided more services as a result of HRA was broadly the same for all population density groups as shown in Table 33.

**Table 33: Whether respondents had commissioned or provided more services as a result of the HRA**

	Predominantly rural	Urban with significant rural	Urban with city	Urban with conurbation
	<b>Per cent (Number)</b>			
Yes	69 (31)	61 (14)	55 (26)	54 (19)
No	31 (14)	39 (9)	43 (20)	43 (15)
Don't Know	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (1)	3 (1)

Base: predominantly rural (45); urban with significant rural (23); urban with city (47); urban with conurbation (35).

The proportion of respondents who had developed a new homelessness strategy or reviewed their service provision as a result of the HRA was highest among those within the urban with conurbation group at 89 per cent, and lowest among those from the urban with significant rural group at 55 per cent. A full breakdown of the figures is shown in Table 34.

**Table 34: Whether respondent councils had developed a new homelessness strategy or reviewed their service provision as a result of the HRA**

	Predominantly rural	Urban with significant rural	Urban with city	Urban with conurbation
	Per cent (Number)			
Yes	64 (29)	55 (12)	77 (36)	89 (31)
No	36 (16)	36 (8)	23 (11)	11 (4)
Don't Know	0 (0)	9 (2)	0 (0)	0 (0)

Base: predominantly rural (45); urban with significant rural (22); urban with city (47); urban with conurbation (35).

Among predominantly rural councils the proportion who agreed that they had been sufficiently resourced was highest at 66 per cent and it was lowest among urban with city councils at 43 per cent. A full breakdown of the figures is shown in Table 35.

**Table 35: Whether respondent councils felt they had been sufficiently resourced to deliver the new duties contained in the HRA**

	Predominantly rural	Urban with significant rural	Urban with city	Urban with conurbation
	Per cent (Number)			
Yes	66 (29)	48 (11)	43 (20)	57 (20)
No	16 (7)	26 (6)	38 (18)	34 (12)
Don't Know	18 (8)	26 (6)	19 (9)	9 (3)

Base: predominantly rural (44); urban with significant rural (23); urban with city (47); urban with conurbation (35).

In relation to elements of the HRA which were generating new costs that were not adequately funded a similar pattern was found among the population density groups as can be seen in Tables 36 to 39.

**Table 36: Elements of the HRA that are generating new costs not adequately funded**

	Significantly high costs	Somewhat high costs	Moderate costs	Somewhat low costs	Low costs	Don't know /not sure
Predominantly rural	Per cent (Number)					
Advisory duty - initial contact and triage	10 (4)	29 (12)	31 (13)	7 (3)	12 (5)	12 (5)
Advisory duty - assessments	12 (5)	21 (9)	38 (16)	7 (3)	10 (4)	12 (5)
Prevention duty casework	14 (6)	24 (10)	33 (14)	7 (3)	7 (3)	14 (6)
Relief duty casework	16 (7)	21 (9)	35 (15)	7 (3)	7 (3)	14 (6)
Main homelessness duty	5 (2)	7 (3)	40 (17)	14 (6)	14 (6)	19 (8)
Reviews of decisions	2 (1)	2 (1)	22 (9)	15 (6)	41 (17)	17 (7)
Other	0 (0)	38 (3)	50 (4)	0 (0)	0 (0)	13 (1)

Base: predominantly rural respondents (43)

**Table 37: Elements of the HRA that are generating new costs not adequately funded**

	Significantly high costs	Somewhat high costs	Moderate costs	Somewhat low costs	Low costs	Don't know /not sure
<b>Urban with significant rural</b>	<b>Per cent (Number)</b>					
Advisory duty - initial contact and triage	5 (1)	16 (3)	26 (5)	11 (2)	16 (3)	26 (5)
Advisory duty - assessments	0 (0)	26 (5)	26 (5)	5 (1)	16 (3)	26 (5)
Prevention duty casework	10 (2)	29 (6)	14 (3)	10 (2)	14 (3)	24 (5)
Relief duty casework	5 (1)	38 (8)	10 (2)	10 (2)	14 (3)	24 (5)
Main homelessness duty	0 (0)	11 (2)	11 (2)	11 (2)	39 (7)	28 (5)
Reviews of decisions	0 (0)	0 (0)	21 (4)	11 (2)	37 (7)	32 (6)
Other	50 (3)	17 (1)	0 (0)	17 (1)	0 (0)	17 (1)

Base: urban with significant rural respondents (21)

**Table 38: Elements of the HRA that are generating new costs not adequately funded**

	Significantly high costs	Somewhat high costs	Moderate costs	Somewhat low costs	Low costs	Don't know /not sure
<b>Urban with city</b>	<b>Per cent (Number)</b>					
Advisory duty - initial contact and triage	14 (6)	42 (18)	16 (7)	14 (6)	9 (4)	5 (2)
Advisory duty - assessments	23 (10)	35 (15)	19 (8)	7 (3)	12 (5)	5 (2)
Prevention duty casework	25 (11)	39 (17)	14 (6)	7 (3)	11 (5)	5 (2)
Relief duty casework	21 (9)	43 (18)	17 (7)	7 (3)	7 (3)	5 (2)
Main homelessness duty	7 (3)	24 (10)	24 (10)	21 (9)	19 (8)	5 (2)
Reviews of decisions	2 (1)	17 (7)	34 (14)	17 (7)	20 (8)	10 (4)
Other	9 (1)	55 (6)	18 (2)	0 (0)	9 (1)	9 (1)

Base: urban with city respondents (44)

**Table 39: Elements of the HRA that are generating new costs not adequately funded**

	Significantly high costs	Somewhat high costs	Moderate costs	Somewhat low costs	Low costs	Don't know /not sure
<b>Urban with conurbation</b>	<b>Per cent (Number)</b>					
Advisory duty - initial contact and triage	18 (6)	24 (8)	30 (10)	9 (3)	3 (1)	15 (5)
Advisory duty - assessments	24 (8)	27 (9)	24 (8)	6 (2)	3 (1)	15 (5)
Prevention duty casework	31 (10)	19 (6)	28 (9)	3 (1)	3 (1)	16 (5)
Relief duty casework	27 (9)	21 (7)	27 (9)	6 (2)	3 (1)	15 (5)
Main homelessness duty	12 (4)	9 (3)	33 (11)	21 (7)	6 (2)	18 (6)
Reviews of decisions	0 (0)	9 (3)	36 (12)	21 (7)	12 (4)	21 (7)
Other	56 (5)	22 (2)	11 (1)	11 (1)	0 (0)	0 (0)

Base: Urban with conurbation respondents (33)

The survey then asked respondents to indicate the extent to which any new costs could be attributed to increased footfall as a result of the HRA, increased workload per applicant as a result of new duties, or any other reasons they wished to specify. The findings were broadly similar among the population density groups with just one difference, that only 10 per cent of respondents within the urban with significant rural attributed the change to increased footfall to a significant degree. A full breakdown of all of the findings is shown in Table 40.

<b>Table 40: The extent to which this change could be attributed to particular reasons</b>					
	<b>Significantly</b>	<b>Moderately</b>	<b>Slightly</b>	<b>Not at all</b>	<b>Not sure/ don't know</b>
<b>Predominantly rural</b>					
Increased footfall as a result of the HRA	21 (9)	36 (15)	19 (8)	19 (8)	5 (2)
Increased workload per applicant as a result of new duties	61 (27)	32 (14)	2 (1)	5 (2)	0 (0)
Other	33 (1)	67 (2)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
<b>Urban with significant rural</b>					
Increased footfall as a result of the HRA	10 (2)	40 (8)	25 (5)	25 (5)	0 (0)
Increased workload per applicant as a result of new duties	55 (12)	32 (7)	9 (2)	5 (1)	0 (0)
Other	100 (3)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
<b>Urban with city</b>					
Increased footfall as a result of the HRA	30 (14)	35 (16)	24 (11)	9 (4)	2 (1)
Increased workload per applicant as a result of new duties	79 (37)	19 (9)	0 (0)	2 (1)	0 (0)
Other	82 (9)	17 (2)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
<b>Urban with conurbation</b>					
Increased footfall as a result of the HRA	27 (9)	33 (11)	15 (5)	21 (7)	3 (1)
Increased workload per applicant as a result of new duties	68 (23)	29 (10)	0 (0)	3 (1)	0 (0)
Other	50 (2)	50 (2)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)

Base: predominantly rural (44); urban with significant rural (22); urban with city (47); urban with conurbation (34). NB:

Respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which their council had been given enough time to prepare for the HRA following the publication of the code of guidance from a list provided. The findings for population density groups were broadly similar, a full breakdown of all the figures are shown in Table 41.

**Table 41: The extent to which respondents had had enough time to prepare for the HRA**

	Significantly more than enough	Somewhat more than enough	Enough	Significantly less than enough	Somewhat less than enough	Don't know /not sure
<b>Predominantly rural</b>						
	<b>Per cent (Number)</b>					
Overall	2 (1)	7 (3)	52 (23)	25 (11)	14 (6)	0 (0)
Interpreting the duties in the Act	5 (2)	7 (3)	48 (21)	27 (12)	14 (6)	0 (0)
IT systems	0 (0)	2 (1)	27 (12)	27 (12)	44 (20)	0 (0)
Data recording for H-CLIC	0 (0)	0 (0)	9 (4)	40 (18)	51 (23)	0 (0)
Staff training	2 (1)	7 (3)	53 (24)	24 (11)	13 (6)	0 (0)
Staff recruitment	2 (1)	2 (1)	57 (25)	23 (10)	16 (7)	0 (0)
Partnership working	2 (1)	5 (2)	65 (28)	16 (7)	12 (5)	0 (0)
Organising services	2 (1)	4 (2)	53 (24)	20 (9)	16 (7)	4 (2)
Other	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
<b>Urban with significant rural</b>						
Overall	5 (1)	0 (0)	52 (11)	24 (5)	19 (4)	0 (0)
Interpreting the duties in the Act	4 (1)	0 (0)	48 (11)	39 (9)	9 (2)	0 (0)
IT systems	4 (1)	0 (0)	26 (6)	48 (11)	22 (5)	0 (0)
Data recording for H-CLIC	4 (1)	0 (0)	26 (6)	48 (11)	22 (5)	0 (0)
Staff training	4 (1)	0 (0)	48 (11)	39 (9)	9 (2)	0 (0)
Staff recruitment	5 (1)	0 (0)	50 (11)	36 (8)	9 (2)	0 (0)
Partnership working	4 (1)	0 (0)	57 (13)	26 (6)	13 (3)	0 (0)
Organising services	4 (1)	0 (0)	57 (13)	30 (7)	9 (2)	0 (0)
Other	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
<b>Urban with city</b>						
Overall	2 (1)	4 (2)	24 (11)	39 (18)	28 (13)	2 (1)
Interpreting the duties in the Act	0 (0)	6 (3)	34 (16)	32 (15)	26 (12)	2 (1)
IT systems	2 (1)	0 (0)	13 (6)	23 (11)	60 (28)	2 (1)
Data recording for H-CLIC	2 (1)	0 (0)	2 (1)	21 (10)	70 (33)	4 (2)
Staff training	2 (1)	6 (3)	45 (21)	26 (12)	19 (9)	2 (1)
Staff recruitment	2 (1)	4 (2)	36 (17)	23 (11)	28 (13)	6 (3)
Partnership working	2 (1)	4 (2)	36 (17)	36 (17)	19 (9)	2 (1)
Organising services	2 (1)	4 (2)	43 (20)	28 (13)	20 (9)	2 (1)
Other	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
<b>Urban with conurbation</b>						
Overall	3 (1)	0 (0)	29 (10)	44 (15)	24 (8)	0 (0)
Interpreting the duties in the Act	3 (1)	0 (0)	36 (13)	44 (16)	17 (6)	0 (0)
IT systems	0 (0)	0 (0)	8 (3)	33 (12)	58 (21)	0 (0)
Data recording for H-CLIC	0 (0)	0 (0)	6 (2)	31 (11)	64 (23)	0 (0)
Staff training	3 (1)	0 (0)	33 (12)	42 (15)	22 (8)	0 (0)
Staff recruitment	3 (1)	3 (1)	31 (11)	36 (13)	28 (10)	0 (0)
Partnership working	6 (2)	0 (0)	44 (16)	33 (12)	17 (6)	0 (0)
Organising services	3 (1)	3 (1)	46 (16)	34 (12)	14 (5)	0 (0)
Other	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	100 (2)	0 (0)

Base: predominantly rural (45); urban with significant rural (23); urban with city (47); urban with conurbation (36).



When asked the extent to which elements from a list provided were still presenting issues relating to their delivery of the HRA the findings were roughly the same for all of the population density groups as shown in Table 42.

**Table 42: The extent to which the following elements are still presenting issues relating to respondents' delivery of the HRA**

	Significantly	Somewhat	Slightly	Not at all	Not sure/ don't know
<b>Predominantly rural</b>	<b>Per cent (Number)</b>				
Interpreting the duties in the Act	2 (1)	20 (9)	50 (22)	27 (12)	0 (0)
IT systems	14 (6)	23 (10)	43 (19)	20 (9)	0 (0)
Data recording for H-CLIC	24 (11)	47 (21)	16 (7)	13 (6)	0 (0)
Staff training	0 (0)	14 (6)	50 (22)	36 (16)	0 (0)
Staff recruitment	4 (2)	16 (7)	24 (11)	53 (24)	2 (1)
Partnership working	5 (2)	11 (5)	41 (18)	41 (18)	2 (1)
Organising services	2 (1)	9 (4)	36 (16)	44 (20)	9 (4)
Other	100 (1)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
<b>Urban with significant rural</b>					
Interpreting the duties in the Act	4 (1)	13 (3)	43 (10)	39 (9)	0 (0)
IT systems	9 (2)	26 (6)	43 (10)	22 (5)	0 (0)
Data recording for H-CLIC	26 (6)	52 (12)	13 (3)	9 (2)	0 (0)
Staff training	0 (0)	17 (4)	52 (12)	30 (7)	0 (0)
Staff recruitment	4 (1)	17 (4)	22 (5)	57 (13)	0 (0)
Partnership working	9 (2)	9 (2)	43 (10)	39 (9)	0 (0)
Organising services	4 (1)	4 (1)	43 (10)	48 (11)	0 (0)
Other	0 (0)	100 (1)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
<b>Urban with city</b>					
Interpreting the duties in the Act	13 (6)	15 (7)	49 (23)	23 (11)	0 (0)
IT systems	35 (16)	37 (17)	15 (7)	13 (6)	0 (0)
Data recording for H-CLIC	57 (27)	28 (13)	11 (5)	4 (2)	0 (0)
Staff training	9 (4)	19 (9)	45 (21)	28 (13)	0 (0)
Staff recruitment	15 (7)	19 (9)	23 (11)	40 (19)	2 (1)
Partnership working	4 (2)	28 (13)	40 (19)	28 (13)	0 (0)
Organising services	7 (3)	15 (7)	50 (23)	28 (13)	0 (0)
Other	100 (1)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
<b>Urban with conurbation</b>					
Interpreting the duties in the Act	9 (3)	23 (8)	46 (16)	23 (8)	0 (0)
IT systems	26 (9)	31 (11)	23 (8)	17 (6)	3 (1)
Data recording for H-CLIC	44 (16)	31 (11)	19 (7)	6 (2)	0 (0)
Staff training	3 (1)	36 (13)	47 (17)	14 (5)	0 (0)
Staff recruitment	25 (9)	14 (5)	36 (13)	22 (8)	3 (1)
Partnership working	3 (1)	25 (9)	42 (15)	28 (10)	3 (1)
Organising services	6 (2)	23 (8)	43 (15)	29 (10)	0 (0)
Other	100 (2)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)

Base: predominantly rural (45); urban with significant rural (23); urban with city (47); urban with conurbation (36).

The survey asked whether sickness absence levels in respondents' homelessness services had changed since 3 April 2018 according to their official in-house data.

There was a similar pattern among the population density groups, although a higher proportion of respondents from the urban with significant rural (74 per cent) reported that their sickness absence levels had remained the same. A full breakdown of the findings is shown in Table 43.

<b>Table 43: Whether sickness absence levels in respondents' homelessness services had changed since 3 April 2018</b>				
	<b>Predominantly rural</b>	<b>Urban with significant rural</b>	<b>Urban with city</b>	<b>Urban with conurbation</b>
	<b>Per cent (Number)</b>			
Significantly increased	2 (1)	4 (1)	11 (5)	0 (0)
Somewhat increased	11 (5)	4 (1)	0 (0)	17 (6)
Slightly increased	23 (10)	13 (3)	15 (7)	17 (6)
Stayed the same	57 (25)	74 (17)	65 (30)	54 (19)
Slightly decreased	5 (2)	0 (0)	2 (1)	3 (1)
Somewhat decreased	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	3 (1)
Significantly decreased	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Not sure/don't know	2 (1)	4 (1)	7 (3)	6 (2)

Base: predominantly rural (44); urban with significant rural (23); urban with city (46); urban with conurbation (35).

Following on from this, the survey asked whether staff vacancy rates had changed since 3 April 2018 according to respondents' official in-house data. The pattern was roughly the same for all population density groups. Table 44 shows a full breakdown of the findings.

<b>Table 44: Whether staff vacancy rates had changed since 3 April 2018</b>				
	<b>Predominantly rural</b>	<b>Urban with significant rural</b>	<b>Urban with city</b>	<b>Urban with conurbation</b>
	<b>Per cent (Number)</b>			
Significantly increased	4 (2)	4 (1)	9 (4)	6 (2)
Somewhat increased	4 (2)	9 (2)	7 (3)	6 (2)
Slightly increased	22 (10)	35 (8)	22 (10)	31 (11)
Stayed the same	64 (29)	48 (11)	61 (28)	53 (19)
Slightly decreased	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Somewhat decreased	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	6 (2)
Significantly decreased	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Not sure/don't know	4 (2)	4 (1)	2 (1)	0 (0)

Base: predominantly rural (45); urban with significant rural (23); urban with city (46); urban with conurbation (36).

The final question of the survey asked respondents whether they felt adequately prepared for the implementation of the new Duty to Refer. The pattern was broadly similar among the population density groups as can be seen in Table 45.

**Table 45: Whether respondents felt adequately prepared for the implementation of the new Duty to Refer**

	Predominantly rural	Urban with significant rural	Urban with city	Urban with conurbation
	Per cent (Number)			
Significantly increased	16 (7)	17 (4)	11 (5)	8 (3)
Somewhat increased	22 (10)	13 (3)	23 (11)	25 (9)
Slightly increased	42 (19)	61 (14)	51 (24)	50 (18)
Stayed the same	18 (8)	9 (2)	13 (6)	17 (6)
Slightly decreased	2 (1)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Somewhat decreased	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (1)	0 (0)
Significantly decreased	16 (7)	17 (4)	11 (5)	8 (3)
Not sure/don't know	22 (10)	13 (3)	23 (11)	25 (9)

Base: predominantly rural (45); urban with significant rural (23); urban with city (47); urban with conurbation (36).

## Annex A

### Answers provided to open text questions

<b>Table A1: Other elements of the HRA that are generating new costs not adequately funded</b>
IT costs (x 11)
Temporary accommodation (x 9)
Administration (x 5)
H-CLIC return (x 3)
Accommodation and support needs
Continuing evaluation of service
Floating support
Legacy cases
Ongoing software cost are much higher than previous system i.e. £8k no£ 1.5k per year
Personal Housing Plans -generating and reviews
Prevention Fund
Support and acquiring private rented property
Support for homeless households, access to PRS accommodation
The cost to our Customer Services Organisation, <Name>, of significantly higher numbers of phone calls and footfall are high. <Organisation name> has recorded an increase by 45% in their interactions with homeless people.
Training/Resources
Triage

<b>Table A2: Other factors which respondents felt attributed to the new costs</b>
IT/H-CLIC issues (x 4)
Temporary accommodation (x 4)
Welfare Reform (x 3)
Lack of suitable accommodation (x 3)
Administration (x 2)
Cuts to other services
High need applicants
Increase in costs for prevention/relief solutions
Intentionally homeless households
Morale
Support and accommodation

## Annex B

### Survey form and notes of guidance

#### HOMELESSNESS REDUCTION ACT SURVEY 2018

The LGA is undertaking research on local authorities' experience of the Homelessness Reduction Act, six months after its implementation.

The aim of this survey is to understand:

- how well the Act is working on the ground
- the areas in which councils might be experiencing issues in relation to its implementation
- the extent of any funding gaps.

Our findings will be used to contribute to our lobbying work in advance of the Act's review, and the wider 2019 Spending Review, by providing us with valuable information about any changes needed to the Act: Please help us by taking part.

We are seeking the views of senior managers, policy officers, or staff who have experience of the impact of the Homelessness Reduction Act on your services. If you are unable to respond, please pass this survey on to a relevant colleague.

Thank you for taking part in this survey.

- You can navigate through the questions using the buttons at the bottom of each page.
- Use the 'Previous' button if you wish to amend your response to an earlier question.
- If you stop before completing the survey, you can return to the survey using the link supplied in the e-mail and you will be able to continue from where you left off.
- To ensure your answers have been saved, click on the 'Next' button at the bottom of the page that you were working on before exiting.
- All information provided will be treated confidentially and no information about any individual authority will be published without prior permission.
- The survey will take about 10-15 minutes to complete, depending on the answers you provide.
- Please note that the survey link is unique to you, do not pass it on to anyone else as any answers they provide will overwrite anything you have submitted.

- All responses will be treated confidentially. Information will be aggregated, and no individual or authority will be identified in any publications without your consent. Identifiable information may be used internally within the LGA.

If you have any technical queries about the survey, please contact Helen Wilkinson on 020 7664 3181 or [helen.wilkinson@local.gov.uk](mailto:helen.wilkinson@local.gov.uk).

Please update the contact details below, so we know who to contact in case of enquiries about the data.

Name \_\_\_\_\_  
Job title \_\_\_\_\_  
Council \_\_\_\_\_  
Email \_\_\_\_\_

### Impact of Act

1. How has the number of homelessness presentations to your council changed since the Homelessness Reduction Act (HRA) came into force? Where possible, please base your answers on data.

- Significantly increased
- Somewhat increased
- Slightly increased
- Stayed the same
- Slightly decreased
- Somewhat decreased
- Significantly decreased
- Not sure/don't know

1a. In your view, to what extent can any change be attributed to the HRA?

- Significantly
- Somewhat
- Slightly
- Not at all
- Not sure/don't know

Please provide a brief explanation

2. Has there been a change in presentations from different groups of applicants as a proportion of total presentations?

*Where possible, please base your answers on data.*

	Significantly higher	Somewhat higher	No change	Significantly lower	Somewhat lower	Not sure /don't know
Priority need						
Intentionally homeless						
With local connections						
Without local connections						
Current or recent rough sleepers						

3. What effect have the new duties had on your council's support for people in the following groups?

*Where possible, please base your answers on data.*

	Significantly improved	Somewhat improved	No change	Somewhat worsened	Significantly worsened	Not sure/don't know
<b>Your council's ability to prevent homelessness for:</b>						
People sleeping rough						
Single homeless people						
People in priority need						
People with no recourse to public funds						
<b>Your council's ability to relieve homelessness for:</b>						
People sleeping rough						
Single homeless people						
People in priority need						
People with no recourse to public funds						
Your council's ability to house people via the main						

	Significantly improved	Somewhat improved	No change	Somewhat worsened	Significantly worsened	Not sure/don't know
homelessness duty?						

3a. Please provide a brief explanation of these changes

--

4. What has been the impact of the Homelessness Reduction Act on the number of people in the following?

*Where possible, please base your answers on data.*

	Significantly increased	Somewhat increased	No change	Somewhat decreased	Significantly decreased	Not sure/don't know
Temporary Accommodation						
Emergency / interim Accommodation						

5. What has been the impact of the Homelessness Reduction Act on the length of time people spend in the following?

*Where possible, please base your answers on data.*

	Significantly increased	Somewhat increased	No change	Somewhat decreased	Significantly decreased	Not sure/don't know
Temporary Accommodation						
Emergency / interim Accommodation						

6. To what extent do the following factors affect your council's ability to meet your clients' needs?

	To a great extent	To a moderate extent	To a slight extent	To no extent	Not sure/don't know
Welfare reform					
Affordability of social housing (including affordable rent)					
Access to social housing					
Affordability of PRS housing					



	To a great extent	To a moderate extent	To a slight extent	To no extent	Not sure/don't know
Access to PRS housing					
Conditions and suitability of PRS housing					
Security of PRS housing					
Local Authority finance					
Clients' attitudes					
Partner engagement					
Administrative requirements of implementing the HRA					
Staff retention and morale					
Availability of relevant support services (including in the voluntary sector)					

6a. Please provide brief details on how the above factors have affected your council, and whether you were able to mitigate their impact:

### Funding of the Act

7. Has your council commissioned or provided more services as a result of the HRA?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

7a. Please provide brief details

8. Has your council developed a new homelessness strategy or reviewed its service provision as a result of the HRA?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

8a. Please provide brief details

9. Have you been sufficiently resourced to deliver the new duties contained in the HRA?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

9a. If no, please specify:

Roughly what is the funding gap faced by your council in implementing the HRA per year (in £)?	
What percentage of your current HRA funding is this (in %)?	
How much additional staff resource would be required to implement the HRA (full time equivalent)?	

10. Are there particular elements of the HRA that are generating new costs not adequately funded?

	Significantly high costs	Somewhat high costs	Moderate costs	Somewhat low costs	Low costs	Not sure /don't know
Advisory duty – initial contact and triage						
Advisory duty - assessments						
Prevention duty casework						
Relief duty casework						
Main homelessness duty						
Reviews of decisions						
Other (please specify)						

10a. Please provide brief details relating to any new costs that are not adequately funded

--

11. To what extent can this change be attributed to the following reasons:

	Significantly	Moderately	Slightly	Not at all	Not sure /don't know
Increased footfall as a result of the HRA					

	Significantly	Moderately	Slightly	Not at all	Not sure /don't know
Increased workload per applicant as a result of new duties					
Other (please specify)					

### Preparation and other issues

12. To what extent did your council have enough time to prepare for the following elements of the HRA following the publication of the code of guidance?

	Significantly more than enough	Somewhat more than enough	Enough	Somewhat less than enough	Significantly less than enough	Not sure/don't know
Overall						
Interpreting the duties in the Act						
IT systems						
Data recording for H-CLIC						
Staff training						
Staff recruitment						
Partnership working						
Organising services						
Other (please specify)						

13. To what extent are these elements still presenting issues relating to your delivery of the HRA?

	Significantly	Somewhat	Slightly	Not at all	Not sure/don't know
Interpreting the duties in the Act					
IT systems					
Data recording for H-CLIC					
Staff training					
Staff recruitment					
Partnership working					
Organising services					

	Significantly	Somewhat	Slightly	Not at all	Not sure/don't know
Other (please specify)					

13a. Details

14. Have sickness absence levels in your homelessness service changed since 3 April 2018 according to your official in-house data?

- Significantly increased
- Somewhat increased
- Slightly increased
- Stayed the same
- Slightly decreased
- Somewhat decreased
- Significantly decreased
- Not sure/don't know

14a. Do you have any comments as to why this is the case?

15. Have staff vacancy rates changed since 3 April 2018 according to your official in-house data?

- Significantly increased
- Somewhat increased
- Slightly increased
- Stayed the same
- Slightly decreased
- Somewhat decreased
- Significantly decreased
- Not sure/don't know

15a. Do you have any comments as to why this is the case?

16. To what extent did your council feel adequately prepared for the implementation of the new Duty to Refer?

- Very well-prepared
- Somewhat well-prepared

- Adequately prepared
- Somewhat under-prepared
- Very under-prepared
- Not sure/don't know

16a. Please provide brief details

17. Please use this space to detail any other issues relating to the HRA which you would like to raise.

18. Would you be willing to participate in a telephone discussion with a view to creating a case study of your council's experience?

- Yes
- No

**Thank you very much for completing the survey.**



18 Smith Square  
London SW1P 3HZ

Telephone 020 7664 3000  
Fax 020 7664 3030  
Email [info@local.gov.uk](mailto:info@local.gov.uk)  
[www.local.gov.uk](http://www.local.gov.uk)

© Local Government Association, March 2019

For a copy in Braille, larger print or audio, please contact us on 020 7664 3000.

We consider requests on an individual basis.