



East London Housing Partnership New Leaf and New Routes – initial research project

Summary report

Prepared by Becky Rice and Christine
Spooner

November 2017

Headlines

- The East London Housing Partnership (ELHP) commissioned this research as part of the New Leaf and New Routes (NL/NR) projects, which work with a range of people at risk of homelessness or rough sleeping. The research is designed to ensure that existing data and the recent lived experience of local people are both central to the design of the NL/NR projects. The research consisted of a desktop review of existing information and 21 interviews with homeless people currently or recently living in temporary accommodation.
- For interviewees in households with dependants, the reasons for homelessness were eviction from a private rented sector (PRS) tenancy (by far the most common reason), being asked to leave the family home as a young pregnant woman, and fleeing domestic violence. For single people, the main reasons for homelessness were escalating health needs making the home unsuitable or unaffordable. Reasons for homelessness that applied to both single people and those with dependants were leaving asylum support accommodation and having to leave a hidden homeless situation (sofa-surfing) that became untenable.
- Most people with dependants sought assistance before they were homeless but this was not effective and interviewees were frustrated that they felt they had to be evicted from a property before they could get help. The most common place to seek help was Housing Options, followed by Citizens Advice. Single people interviewed did not tend to seek assistance at such an early stage and some did not know where to go for help. Citizens Advice was the most common destination for single people to go for help in the first instance.
- Key risk factors identified from the interviews and desktop review were affordability issues (including getting into debt, rent rises, rent arrears, and reduced income due to ill health); issues related to benefits including the benefits cap; having a variable income/irregular work; being a single mother with several children; being a young person and in particular a young Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual or Transgender (LGBT) person; recently leaving asylum support accommodation; bereavement; isolation and lack of social networks; being the victim of domestic violence; teenage/young pregnancy; overcrowding in the home or in a hidden homeless situation; extended periods of hidden homelessness; poor health; lack of knowledge of services available or the concept of being provided with assistance.
- Interviewees were grateful for temporary accommodation, but it was clear that this was a poor outcome with negative implications for mental health, relationships and social inclusion (including likelihood of sustaining employment). Interviewees commonly reported feeling disempowered, with no sense of a timeframe or clear pathway out of their situation.
- Interviewees were often fairly positive about their previous homes in the PRS, but attitudes hardened following the experience of becoming homeless due to a perceived risk of repeat homelessness.
- The report makes a range of recommendations about targeting at-risk groups, providing support, and developing a 'Predictive Model' of risk. This should be used to 'kick start' the identification of at-risk groups and the development of the service delivery models and monitoring and outcome frameworks.

1 Introduction

The East London Housing Partnership (ELHP) commissioned this research as part of the New Leaf and New Routes (NL/NR) projects. The projects are funded through the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) Homelessness Prevention Programme and work with a range of people at risk of homelessness or rough sleeping. This research is intended to inform the initial stages of each project's development. There were two elements to the research:

Primary research	21 interviews with homeless people living in temporary accommodation in the East London sub-region
Secondary data analysis	Desktop review of existing information including published statistics and research reports about homelessness in the sub-region

This small-scale study is intended to provide initial intelligence to 'kick start' the process of identifying at-risk groups and inform the development of a 'Predictive Model'.¹ The aims of the research were to:

- explore pathways to a housing crisis and the contributing factors
- identify people's points of contact with services at the time of a housing crisis
- start to identify at-risk groups and ways to reach people to prevent homelessness.

Detailed reports on the findings were provided to the ELHP. This public-facing summary report is intended to share relevant findings with people working to prevent homelessness.

2 Context – a brief description of New Leaf and New Routes

The NL/NR projects are being delivered across the eight local authorities in the ELHP: the London Boroughs (LB) of Barking and Dagenham, Hackney, Havering, Newham, Redbridge, Tower Hamlets, Waltham Forest and the City of London Corporation.

- **New Leaf** seeks to intervene at an early stage to prevent homelessness for households living in private rented sector (PRS) accommodation, regardless of priority need status.² Greater understanding of the early indications of a risk of homelessness will enable partners to target information, advice and support more effectively at at-risk groups.
- **New Routes** seeks to assist individuals and couples with low support needs who are at imminent risk of rough sleeping to access PRS accommodation via pre-tenancy training and a Personalised Housing Plan.

¹ ELHP aims to develop a robust predictive modelling product to understand clients' pathways to housing crisis, and the factors that have contributed to this. Data will be collected on last settled accommodation, protected characteristics, social income group and support needs. Predictive modelling will be used to identify people who may be at risk of homelessness and establish appropriate support at the earliest stage.

² 'Priority need': under the Housing Act 1996 local authorities have a duty to provide accommodation for applicants who are homeless and in priority need. Priority need groups include those who are "vulnerable as a result of old age, mental illness or handicap, or physical disability, or other special reason".

3 Research interviews with homeless households

3.1 Methods

Interviewees were recruited with the support of officers from the ELHP local authorities and a user group in one of the boroughs. Twelve were from Barking and Dagenham; seven Havering; one City of London; and one Redbridge. Interviews usually took place in temporary accommodation projects. People with low support needs were targeted for interviews, in line with the target groups of the NL/NR projects.

3.2 Interviewee profile

Sixteen of the households represented in the interviews had dependent children – most (13) were single-parent-headed households. For all households it was the mother who was interviewed. Collectively the interviewees had 43 dependent children. Five single people were interviewed (three men and two women).

The age profile of interviewees was between 18 and 61 years. The most common ethnicity was White British (just over half), followed by Black African. Five of those interviewed had a refugee background (two single people and three with dependent children).

Most of the women with dependent children who were interviewed were in good physical health overall, as were their children, and partners where applicable; however, there was a prevalence of stress, anxiety, increased blood pressure, and feelings of depression and hopelessness. One of the interviewees had complex health needs and two households had children with disabilities. The five single people interviewed all had serious physical and/or mental health problems, which closely interlinked with their housing situation. Interviewees reported no substance misuse issues.

Most interviewees were unemployed. Those who had worked while living in temporary accommodation had found this highly problematic, disrupting their housing benefit and resulting in rent arrears. All those interviewed were receiving welfare benefits, except one person who was waiting for their benefit payments to start.

3.3 Routes into homelessness – households with dependent children

Eviction

By far the most common cause of homelessness for those with dependants was the termination of a PRS tenancy. The majority of those who were evicted from PRS tenancies had been in the property for three or more years. Most people were fairly positive about their previous accommodation; however, this was by no means universal and some had faced serious challenges such as damp.

In four cases, the reason for the eviction was rent arrears; in the other cases a section 21 notice had been issued because the landlord was taking back possession of the property (to sell, use themselves, or due to bankruptcy). In the cases where a section 21 notice had been issued, there were often also underlying affordability issues for the tenants. For those evicted for arrears, the reasons cited included rent increases and the benefits cap. In this low support needs group antisocial behaviour was not a factor in their evictions.

Overall, there was a strong theme of good landlord-tenant relationships in the interviews. People commonly reported that their letting agency or landlord had given them a lot of notice or had 'given them time' to pay the rent when they were struggling.

In the period before being evicted, people who were in arrears or at risk of arrears took steps to cope financially. Examples given were getting credit cards and reducing spending on food by stopping school meals and using foodbanks.

There were two people who did not seek help from any organisation or agency, other than their landlord, until the day they were evicted. Others took the following approaches:

- **Keep the council informed:** The most common response to pending homelessness was to visit Housing Options
- **Ask the experts:** Several households sought assistance from Housing Options, but also sought advice from Citizens Advice and in one case Shelter's helpline. Citizens Advice tended to direct people to attend Housing Options.
- **Ask everyone:** Two households described a very proactive approach of seeking help and advice from every agency with which they were in contact, including their GP, social services, school and nursery. This was helpful in gaining evidence about their need for rehousing in a certain area or their needs once they were homeless, but was not helpful in preventing them from becoming homeless.

Interviewees were asked if they had explored the possibility of moving accommodation to avert homelessness. In some cases people had already moved to cheaper accommodation in the fairly recent past. Barriers to securing alternative PRS accommodation were: rent levels, lack of a deposit or guarantor, and landlords being unwilling to accept people on housing benefit.

Interviewees felt that the council could not assist them until the day they were evicted. This was a source of frustration and stress. The day of eviction was often reported to be traumatic affecting the whole family, typically including a long period waiting for emergency accommodation to be identified while sitting at Housing Options with their children and essential possessions. There was mixed feedback from the group on the experience of attending Housing Options. Several people commented on how helpful their officers had been, but others had negative perceptions of the service.

Hidden homelessness

Three households with dependent children had to leave sofa-surfing situations and became homeless, requiring assistance from the local authority, as a result. In two cases overcrowding was a factor and in one case the arrangement was unsuitable because the woman was about to have a baby. Two of the people above sought help only after a sustained period of sofa-surfing. All of these people contacted Citizens Advice for help, as well as the local authority.

Asked to leave the family home

Two younger interviewees became homeless when asked to leave their parents' or partner's parents' home when they were pregnant. Both couples felt that 'being homeless' was their only option given the barriers they faced

to securing a PRS tenancy. They felt they had no choice but to stay in temporary accommodation and wait to be offered social housing, despite having very negative experiences in temporary accommodation. Both these interviewees said they knew that they should attend Housing Options and both knew people who had done this previously.

Leaving asylum support accommodation

One interviewee with a dependant aged 11 months had become homeless on leaving asylum support accommodation. She was advised to seek assistance from the local authority when she was given notice to leave her asylum support accommodation.

Fleeing domestic violence

One interviewee had to leave the area she had lived in with her partner because of domestic violence. She was unable to secure a refuge place with her five children, which she felt was due to having a teenage son. She was familiar with the process of presenting as homeless because she had been homeless before and knew to attend Housing Options.

3.4 Routes into homelessness – single people

Ill health

In two cases deteriorating physical health played a major role in their homelessness and in one case mental health was a key factor. For example, for one man, the tipping point into homelessness was giving up work due to ill health on the advice of his consultant. The interviewee did this but without a clear plan around paying the rent or transitioning to benefits and managing without his income. Low levels of literacy and never previously having accessed benefits or support services compounded his situation. After a period of sofa-surfing and staying with friends and family, he was referred to the Macmillan advisor at Citizens Advice and was referred to Housing Options and made an application as homeless.

Leaving asylum support accommodation

Two young single men interviewed in Barking and Dagenham had both become homeless on leaving asylum support accommodation. In one case the interviewee had physical and mental health problems as a result of torture; in the other the interviewee had mental health problems, which were not discussed in full in the interview, and was also a victim of torture. One interviewee attended Housing Options on the day he had to leave the asylum support accommodation; the other attended three days before he had to leave.

3.5 Social networks (singles and households with dependants)

Some interviewees referred to receiving help from family and friends – for example, advice about where to get help, looking over letters and providing emotional support. Generally people were not able to access accommodation or financial support through their social networks. Several people commented that they did not know anyone with the resources required to be a guarantor for a PRS tenancy. Some of those interviewed, especially the single parents, were quite isolated and did not have a strong network – one person of a refugee background had become very isolated since being widowed and having to move away from her church.

3.6 Experiences of temporary accommodation

Generally interviewees expressed relief that the council had provided them with a place for them to stay in temporary accommodation; however, this initial feeling diminished after people had spent extended periods of time living in this accommodation. Families reported finding living in temporary accommodation very challenging. Issues included lack of privacy (this was a particular issue for families with teenage children); poor condition of communal facilities; noise; and managing on very little money, especially without access to a freezer or their own washing machine.

Families who had spent time in generic emergency accommodation primarily catering for adults had found this unsuitable and distressing – for example, because of drug use and violence among other residents. Those placed a long distance from their children's school and support networks had found this very hard. The specific accommodation for families in Barking and Dagenham was beneficial in providing a specialist service for families, being in a favourable location for most residents and having support on hand.

3.7 Routes out of homelessness

People were at different stages in their journeys out of homelessness. Some (four) were bidding on social housing properties; some were having their eligibility checked; and some were waiting for a decision on their homelessness application. Key themes relating to routes out of homelessness are outlined below:

- Many people described feeling disempowered. Interviewees commonly reported feeling trapped with no sense of a timeframe or a clear pathway out of their situation. Some commented that they had initially expected to be in their temporary accommodation for 'a few weeks', but then mentioned other residents who had been in the accommodation for years. Ending up on the streets was a grave concern for one of the single people interviewed.
- There was a feeling that, once their accommodation was sorted out, other things including employment and a more manageable financial situation would then become achievable. Those subject to or at risk of the benefits cap felt vulnerable to repeat homelessness.
- People bidding for social rented properties were hopeful that they would eventually get the social tenancy they wanted, but found the limited availability of properties disheartening. All their efforts were focused on the bidding process; people in this situation did not speak about any alternative options to waiting to secure social housing.
- Two people said they had refused offers of going to live a long distance outside London. Most wanted to stay in the East London area.
- Interviewees were generally fairly positive about their previous homes in the PRS, but attitudes hardened following the experience of becoming homeless and people often felt negative about this housing option, especially those with children. People perceived a risk of repeat homelessness if they went into PRS accommodation.

3.8 Initial model of reasons for homelessness, risk factors and prevention opportunities from interviews

Group	Reasons for homelessness	Risk factors emerging from the initial research	Recommended areas to explore prevention opportunities
Households with dependent children	Eviction from PRS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rent rises Those on low income who are only just managing to pay for/obtain essentials People getting into debt to pay for essentials Variable income/irregular work Rent arrears Living in area of rapidly increasing rents and housing values Being a single mother with several children Refugee background Those subject to benefits cap Complications with benefits in general resulting in rent arrears Bereavement Isolation and lack of social networks/family locally 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Providing tenancy rescue or tenancy move-on packages at earlier stage in the Housing Options journey (as opposed to waiting until day of eviction to provide assistance). Encouraging moves between PRS tenancies because once people become homeless their attitudes towards the PRS harden. Include exploring moving to other areas while this is still a choice. Working with Citizens Advice, which, along with Housing Options, are the main organisations informed about impending homelessness by clients. Both are key contact points. Expanding awareness of homelessness and housing problems among wider services including schools, foodbanks and doctors. Being clear on how professionals outside the housing sector should respond to reported risk of homelessness. Working with landlords and letting agencies to help identify those at risk. People had positive relationships with landlords who often provided them with a certain amount of 'grace' period.
	Fleeing violence/ domestic violence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Previous domestic violence situations Those for whom refuges are not available (large family, male teenagers) 	
	Asked to leave family home	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pregnancy Overcrowding in the home Tension in family relationships 	
Households with dependent children and single people (common risk factors across these groups)	Leaving asylum support accommodation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Claiming asylum in the UK and being placed in area of high housing costs Being given notice to leave asylum support accommodation Not working for sustained period in asylum support accommodation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Systematically signposting to advice at the point of initial eviction proceedings (possibly though links with landlords). Encouraging single homeless people to seek assistance at earlier stage when their home becomes unsuitable or they start spending down savings/getting into debt and arrears. Empowering people and helping them feel informed about the options open to them (for example, through Personalised Housing Plans).
	End of sofa-surfing situation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pregnancy and hidden homelessness Extended periods of hidden homelessness Overcrowding/strained relationships in sofa-surfing situation 	
Single people	Health needs making home unsuitable and or health problems resulting in loss of income/ unemployment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> People who are self-employed or in physical work that leaves them less protected/with fewer options when they fall ill Low literacy Lack of planning for retirement Lack of knowledge of services available or the concept of being provided with assistance Leaving asylum support accommodation with health problems that make employment unlikely in the medium term 	

4 Desktop review findings

4.1 Headlines from key data sources

Published statistics

- Data from CHAIN and DCLG Rough Sleeping in England Statistics show an increase in rough sleeping in the sub-region over recent years, highlighting the need for prevention work. The DCLG data, based on counts and estimates of rough sleeper numbers, shows that on a 'snapshot' of a typical autumn night (October/November) in 2016, 964 people were sleeping rough in the ELHP area. Outer London Boroughs of Havering, Newham and Waltham Forest saw the steepest rise in rough sleeping in the sub-region.
- PIE data is gathered by DCLG from local authorities. The most recent data shows that for Quarter 1, 2017 the main reason for homelessness acceptances across London (where the local authority accepts it has a duty to provide assistance) in the sub-region was 'End of assured shorthold tenancy', at 34 per cent of homelessness acceptances.

Local research reports

- Prevention Opportunities Mapping and Planning Toolkit (PrOMPT) is a practical resource, designed by Homeless Link, to help identify opportunities to prevent rough sleeping locally. In the PrOMPT exercise undertaken in the ELHP sub-region in 2011, the main reasons that people gave for leaving their last settled home were: relationship breakdown, rent arrears and significant life events such as bereavement. Advice services were not well used in the path towards a housing crisis. The report recommends that employment advice services, Housing Options, and family mediation services should be widely publicised and that floating support should be made more accessible and available for brief interventions. It also suggested closer working with other services such as Citizens Advice and Jobcentre Plus to identify those at risk of homelessness earlier.
- The East London Single Homelessness Project (ESHP) ran for three years between 2011 and 2014, providing rent deposits and tenancy sustainment for single homeless people with a local connection to East London. In that time, the scheme provided access to more than 300 tenancies. An unpublished scoping report for the project produced in 2014 by Crunch Consulting found that continued provision of ongoing tenancy support was critical to the scheme's success. Key risk factors identified by the project were relationship breakdown and domestic violence. A high proportion of LGBT people, especially those who were young, were likely to have support needs such as experience of domestic violence or mental health problems, and were less likely than other groups to approach Housing Options. Interpersonal violence, sometimes linked to gang activity, was also found to be a contributing factor towards homelessness for young people.
- The tri-borough No First Night Out (NFNO) interim report provides a typology of risk factors for single homeless people at risk of rough sleeping in Tower Hamlets, Hackney and the City of London.³ Those interviewed who had low levels of support needs included several people from a refugee background, people with low or reduced

³ Rice, B & Reed, L (2016) No First Night Out – Help for Single Homeless People: Interim Report, St Mungo's.

social networks, and those with a one off life event such as bereavement impacting on their housing situation. Three tipping points into homelessness were identified for those with low support needs: hidden homelessness situation becoming unsustainable, having to leave family home/partner's house, and eviction/pending eviction. People's housing benefit being suspended when subject to jobseeker's allowance sanctions was a recurring issue in the research.

- An unpublished evaluation of the East London Women's project (an ELHP project) produced in 2016 highlights the need for tenancy sustainment support for women at risk of homelessness and the need for tenancy work to be proactive (it should not be assumed that people are okay simply because they have not asked for help).

National and international research

- A recently published international research report on domestic abuse and homelessness concluded that domestic abuse is under-represented in statistics and identifies it as a leading cause of homelessness.⁴ The study highlights a need to ensure that housing providers take a trauma-informed approach.
- A Roof Over My Head reports on the findings from Sustain, a partnership research project by Crisis and Shelter that tracked 128 people who, after a period of homelessness, were resettled in PRS accommodation by statutory, voluntary or charity agencies.⁵ The study identified numerous challenges faced by interviewees including poor housing conditions, problems with repairs, affordability and financial hardship, anxiety and insecurity about tenancy end, and difficulties accessing support. Alongside national recommendations the report concludes that agencies moving people into the PRS should consider the individual needs of the client, support people for longer than six months, and that households should be placed in safe and suitable properties. For people who had been previously homeless, longer tenancies were beneficial.
- Citizens Advice conducted research in 2016 and 2017 in 18 areas where a full service universal credit had been rolled out.⁶ Themes from the research included long waiting times for payments leaving people with no money to live on, people getting into debt, and people unable to pay creditors. These are clear risk factors for homelessness.
- This recent report in *The Guardian* summarises findings of research carried out by the Refugee Council for the newspaper.⁷ It found that people who were granted asylum often slept rough or stayed in a night shelter or hostel after they were granted refugee status; sofa-surfing was also common.

4.2 Identification of at-risk groups from the review

The desktop review identified the following at-risk groups:

- people affected by welfare reform:

⁴ Burnet, G (2017) Winston Churchill Fellowship – Domestic Abuse and Housing: International Practice and Perspectives, Peabody.

⁵ Smith, M, et al (2014) A Roof Over My Head: the final report of the Sustain project, a longitudinal study of housing outcomes and wellbeing in private rented accommodation, Shelter and Crisis.

⁶ Drake, C (2017) Universal Credit and Debt: Evidence from Citizens Advice about how Universal Credit affects personal debt problems, Citizens Advice.

⁷ Lyons, K (2017) 'Destitution is Routine: refugees face homelessness even after gaining asylum', *The Guardian*. Available at: <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2017/sep/08/destitution-is-routine-refugees-face-homelessness-even-after-gaining-asylum>

- young people aged 18-21 years affected by loss of automatic eligibility for housing benefit/housing element of universal credit
- under 35s subject to the shared accommodation rate of local housing allowance (LHA)
- people who have recently claimed universal credit
- households affected by the benefit cap
- refugees
- people experiencing debt problems
- people who have experienced a one-off or unusual life event (for example, a bereavement or separation from a long-term partner)
- women who have experienced domestic violence
- people from BME or LGBT backgrounds who have experienced domestic violence, and may be harder to reach.

5 Recommendations

The research yielded detailed recommendations for the delivery of the NL/NR projects. Key themes are outlined below.

Overall recommendations

1. The NL/NR projects should use research findings to help shape initial work to identify people at risk of homelessness. Ongoing analysis of monitoring data should be undertaken to inform the development of the 'Predictive Model'. NL/NR should develop a monitoring and outcomes framework and put in place suitable systems for staff to record data.
2. The most common place for people to seek help was Housing Options. Working with Housing Options teams in the boroughs should be a priority for the NL/NR projects. Identifying and training champions or named link workers to the NL/NR services within Housing Options teams should be considered.
3. Citizens Advice services were the main destination for advice after Housing Options. The projects should explore partnerships with Citizens Advice with reference to the No First Night Out approach to such partnerships.
4. The projects should seek to increase awareness of housing and homelessness issues within a range of services – for example, health and Jobcentre Plus services. While these services may not be able to assist with accommodation directly, they can deliver a clear message about the importance of seeking help and assist in other ways, for example, the Jobcentre can offer 'easements' to the requirements placed on claimants of jobseeker's allowance and suggest applications for advance payments of Universal credit.
5. NL/NR staff should endeavour to create a 'community of practice', working closely with other statutory and voluntary agencies to promote a shared goal of prevention – a 'prevention culture' – and to ensure there is a wide network of agencies to refer clients to across the sub-region.
6. Training in trauma-informed care should be considered for the NL/NR team and awareness of issues such as LGBT homelessness, identifying domestic violence and access to social care and the Care Act and the Homelessness Reduction Act should also be actively raised in the team.
7. Information about the cost, quality and supply of PRS accommodation will also be crucial to service delivery and a strategy for compiling and updating this information should be developed.

Recommendations for New Leaf

(Service for people whose tenancies are at risk in the PRS – information, advice and support)

- Financial planning and income maximisation may save an existing tenancy; work around benefits is likely to be central to plans for tenancy rescue. Access to credit facilities – for example, through credit unions – should be explored by the project to help people avoid expensive credit options.
- The project should explore how well the PRS can respond to escalating health needs of clients; in some cases a move will be necessary within or out of the PRS.
- Ways to work with landlords should be explored. If possible, ways of systematically signposting people to advice at the point of initial eviction proceedings would be beneficial.
- It may be possible to undertake prevention work that relocates people to more affordable areas outside London as a positive choice; the team should explore these options with clients where appropriate.
- Prevention work should consider the overall needs of the family and take a personalised approach. For example options to enable children to remain in the same school are often favoured by families; for others, access to a good school in another area will be acceptable/preferable.
- The project should consider providing access to tenancy support for up to a year, including brief interventions, practical support and early referral to other agencies.
- New Leaf should seek to facilitate moves between PRS tenancies where it is unlikely that an existing tenancy can be rescued.

Recommendations for New Routes

(PRS access project for people with low support needs who are at imminent risk of rough sleeping)

- The project should explore ways to encourage single homeless people to seek help at an earlier stage in their housing journey.
- The project should develop specific policies about how they respond to people identified who have health needs – for example what triggers a referral to Housing Options or a request for an Adult Social Care assessment.
- Relationships with landlords should be sustained beyond the procurement stage to ensure the project is providing access to suitable, high-quality and sustainable homes.
- Mediation should be considered where appropriate; it is likely that this will often only be a short-term solution or prevent rough sleeping while a medium-term solution is being sought.
- Clients who secure a tenancy should be signposted to local charities and agencies that can help with furniture, household goods and setting up home.
- Staff should work closely with those supporting at-risk groups including refugee support agencies, organisations working with young people, and domestic violence organisations.

Acknowledgements

The ELHP and the researchers would like to thank all those who contributed to this research including the interviewees who shared their experiences of homelessness to help contribute to future solutions and officers from LB Redbridge, LB Barking and Dagenham and other boroughs who assisted with setting up interviews, including staff in temporary accommodation projects.