

Audit of accommodation provision for young people who offend

Summary report



Acknowledgements

The Youth Justice Board project team would like to thank Kate Broadhurst, Jon Adamson, Heather Human, Charlotte Lawson, Paul Pearson, Warren Goldie for their assistance and support.

We would like to thank the many Accommodation Officers who completed the online survey with special thanks to those who agreed to participate in the subsequent telephone interviews.

In particular, we would like to thank all the agencies and individuals involved in the five case studies for facilitating our visits at short notice. A special thanks also to the young people who took the time to share their experiences and thoughts with us and to Graham Fletcher for his advice, support and insight.

© Youth Justice Board for England and Wales 2010

The material featured in this publication is subject to copyright protection under UK Copyright Law unless otherwise indicated. Any person or organisation wishing to use YJB materials or products for commercial use must apply in writing to the YJB at ipr@yjb.gov.uk for a specific licence to be granted.

www.yjb.gov.uk

National Youth Agency
Eastgate House
19-23 Humberstone Road
Leicester
LE5 3GJ
Tel: +44 (0) 116 242 7350
Fax: +44 (0) 116 242 7444
www.nya.org.uk

Perpetuity Research & Consultancy International Ltd
148 Upper New Walk
Leicester
LE1 7QA
United Kingdom
Tel: +44 (0)116 222 5555
Fax: +44 (0)116 222 5551
www.perpetuitygroup.com
prci@perpetuitygroup.com

Table of contents

1. Introduction	3
2. Supply and demand of accommodation for young people	4
3. Role of YOT Accommodation Officer	5
4. Processes and performance	6
5. Systemic relationships and accountabilities	8
6. Feedback from service-users	10
7. Case study findings	11
8. Recommendations	13
Supply and demand of accommodation	13
Role of the YOT Accommodation Officer	14
Processes and performance	14
Systemic relationships and accountabilities	15
Feedback from service-users	15
Case studies	16

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The Youth Justice Board's priority in relation to accommodation is to ensure that more young people in the youth justice system have access to suitable and supported (where necessary) accommodation in order to improve their transition to adulthood.
- 1.2 As such, youth offending teams (YOTs) have several responsibilities in relation to housing issues for young people. The first is to appoint a nominated Accommodation Officer whose role would encompass mapping local provision, identifying gaps in services and providing information to planning forums about the needs of young people who offend.¹
- 1.3 Additionally, YOTs are required to ensure that all young people subject to community interventions or who are on release from the secure estate have suitable accommodation to go to and are required to submit information to the Youth Justice Board (YJB) on their performance in this respect.
- 1.4 Against this backdrop, Perpetuity Research² and the National Youth Agency³ were commissioned by the YJB in October 2009 to undertake an audit of accommodation provision for children and young people who offend (hereafter referred to as 'young people'). The audit offers an evidence base drawn from local practitioners across England. This work covers England only – in Wales, a similar piece of work has been commissioned focusing on current provision, good practice and current and potential developments.
- 1.5 The audit involved a three stages approach: a Rapid Evidence Assessment of the key literature, an online survey of YOT Accommodation Officers supported by more detailed telephone interviews and a series of case studies with five YOTs which included consultation with local stakeholders and young people.
- 1.6 This summary document presents the main findings of the audit with a summary of recommendations made.

¹ Advice note on vulnerable young people, Youth Justice Board, February 2001.

² Perpetuity is spin-out company of the University of Leicester that specialises in crime, community safety and security research and consultancy.

³ The National Youth Agency is a Leicester-based developmental agency, and registered charity, and the national expert and development organisation in youth policy and in youth work.

2. Supply and demand of accommodation for young people

- 2.1 Part of the problem in understanding the scale of any perceived shortfall in suitable accommodation for young people lies in a lack of data availability and inconsistent recording practices. Data on the demand for accommodation among young people is patchy at best and often data relating to young people, including the needs of young people, is omitted from the regular assessments of local housing needs being undertaken. There are also inconsistencies in reporting and recording practices that need addressing.
- 2.2 In order to try and fill the gap, respondents to the online survey were to provide data on the number of young people who had a housing need at the start and end of *Asset* within the last 12-month period. Of the 57 who responded, 61% were unable to provide the data because they did not have access to the figures, were unable to source them within the time available or because the YOIS or CareWorks system did not allow the data to be easily extracted. Many respondents expressed concern that the NI46 indicator did not give an accurate picture of accommodation needs among young people since it only reports on whether the young person is in suitable accommodation at the end of the disposal, which masks any earlier issues with accommodation.
- 2.3 Of the 21 who were able to respond, the percentage range for those with accommodation needs at the start of *Asset* varied from 0–30% with an average percentage of 12% and from 0–18.5% at the end of *Asset*, with an average percentage of 9%.
- 2.4 This was consistent with the respondents to the telephone interview, with the majority of respondents estimating that of the total YOT caseload those with accommodation needs fell somewhere between 4% and 18%.
- 2.5 Although these percentages are seemingly not high, the most common barrier to seeking suitable accommodation for young people was cited by 95% of respondents to the online survey as a lack of availability/supply. This was closely followed by the young person being deemed intentionally homeless, cited by 91% of respondents.
- 2.6 The most common reason for housing needs among young people cited in the online survey was a breakdown in relationships with family/relatives. Sofa surfing was also common, which again masked the true picture of homelessness among young people.
- 2.7 Although young people were recognised as often being classed as high risk, a lack of specialised accommodation support and provision was common and in some cases the difficulty in placing young people with high support needs was compounded because referral processes failed to prevent accommodation providers from ‘cherry picking’ the young people they took. This means that often those in need of higher levels of support were denied access to accommodation and placed in B&B accommodation that increases their vulnerability.

3. Role of YOT Accommodation Officer

- 3.1 Only a third of respondents to the online survey were full-time Accommodation Officers and the role is clearly not delivered in a universal way with a degree of variability in terms of how the role was fulfilled, with some employed directly by the YOT and others on secondment from another agency or part funded by other agencies.
- 3.2 Some YOTs had a single post holder with sole responsibility for accommodation issues; others had a number of workers covering different geographical locations or functions. For 41% of respondents the role is a bolt-on to other duties often related to bail, resettlement, courts and custody. For some, this clearly presents issues in terms of their ability to dedicate sufficient time to accommodation support and it was generally recognised by those areas without a full-time officer that such a post would be of benefit.
- 3.3 The majority of online survey respondents (60%) saw the role as a mix of operational and strategic duties and not having a strategic lead on housing within the YOT was seen as a barrier to effective practice.
- 3.4 There was a fairly even split among the respondents between those who came into the role with specialist knowledge on accommodation issues and those who came into the role with no prior knowledge, which marks a considerable increase in the number of people coming into post with specialist knowledge in housing/accommodation over the last two years, i.e. since the 2007 YJB-commissioned study which found that the majority of Accommodation Officers had no such background.
- 3.5 Most respondents to the telephone interview recognised that a background in housing and an understanding of the locality were two key success criteria to fulfilling the position. Where those without prior knowledge had succeeded, this was often as a result of working locally previously or building effective links to other agencies.
- 3.6 Of the range of tasks stipulated in the YJB role description, interestingly those that feature as less common duties are those that relate to undertaking a needs and supply analysis and liaising with housing and accommodation providers to explore options for meeting the demand and increasing the supply. This finding is supported by the findings in the Rapid Evidence Assessment of limited data availability on accommodation supply within local strategic housing market assessments but also in terms of the respondents' difficulty in responding to questions in the survey about levels of need.
- 3.7 As a more general point respondents to the telephone survey called for greater support from the YJB. Many found the role an isolating one and although the value of regional forums was recognised in terms of offer a place to share and exchange practice, many wanted to feel better supported and led by the YJB on this issue.

4. Processes and performance

- 4.1 Respondents to the online survey were asked to rate performance overall on accommodation provision and support for young people in their area. While around a half (47%) felt the performance was adequate, 41% felt that performance was less than adequate. Only 10% felt it was more than adequate.
- 4.2 It was recognised as important to have effective protocols in place to manage the referral and placement process in terms of ensuring the wheels turned smoothly and effective work with partners more broadly.
- 4.3 In terms of local processes, 40% of respondents to the online survey felt local referral and placement processes for young people in their area were less than adequate.
- 4.4 Barriers in the referral process that were commonly cited related to being unable to secure accommodation for those in custody until release – the frustration was clear among Accommodation Officers in YOTs and from across the Secure Estate.
- 4.5 Another barrier is posed by the local connections policy.⁴ While it was recognised that in some cases the policy was useful to ensure that the young person was not accommodated out of area and away from key links and relationships, at times this posed issues.
- 4.6 There were differences noted between those areas that had developed a single gateway process for accessing supported accommodation against those that had not. For those who had or were moving towards the single gateway model, the perceived benefits included a reduction in paperwork/applications and the reduction in the possibility of ‘cherry picking’ by providers.
- 4.7 In terms of exploring the relationship between local processes and performance those engaged in the telephone interviews felt that the national indicator (NI46) was an ineffective measure of their performance mainly because of the subjectivity of the term ‘suitable’ but also because it did not provide the YOT with a true or detailed picture of accommodation needs among the client group.
- 4.8 YOT performance in England against NI46 targets has increased year on year since 2006/7, which masks research evidence that suggests otherwise. The 2007 YJB study found the almost three quarters of YOTs indicated that the target presented significant challenges and noted shortages of accommodation relative to the level of need.
- 4.9 As such, there remains concern relating to the performance measure which continues to present an overly positive impression of supporting

⁴ A local connections policy dictates that in order to access certain social housing, it is necessary for the individual to have a local connection to the area e.g. existing family living there, etc.

young peoples' accommodation needs when practitioners report otherwise.

- 4.10 The definition⁵ fails to define 'suitability' for particular accommodation types but allows for a professional assessment by the individual practitioner. Moreover, the measure is a snapshot at a particular point in time and does not ask YOTs to specifically identify those in housing need or to relate the information to outcomes.

⁵ Whether the accommodation type is suitable is decided on a case by case basis as it is so dependent on level of support required. For example, a B&B may be unsuitable for a young person with high support needs but suitable for another able to live independently.

5. Systemic relationships and accountabilities

- 5.1 One of the criteria for success is solid relationships with key partner agencies – effective partnership working. That said, the challenges of bringing together key players to provide an integrated approach are recognised. Areas that felt they were performing well recognised the benefit of effective partnership arrangements and close links to other partner’s strategies and planning processes.
- 5.2 One would expect that having an accommodation strategy that reflects other agencies’ work on accommodation would enable the YOT to perform effectively on accommodation – however, not all YOTs have a strategy. Although over half of respondents to the online survey did, over a quarter did not. Interestingly the remaining 17% – around one-in-six – did not know.
- 5.3 Reasons given for not having a strategy in place varied. Some felt that there was no need for a separate plan because it was covered either within the Youth Justice Plan or plans of other services such as Children’s Services – this was notably the case in smaller YOTs. For others, a new or refreshed strategy was being written at the time of completing the survey, and others did not consider it a necessity because of sound existing working practices and relationships. For those in a part-time role or where accommodation was an additional responsibility, finding the time to produce a strategy was difficult. In some YOTs where no post holder was in place, the strategy was on hold.
- 5.4 As one would expect, those who had indicated that their role was strategic were most likely to affirm that their YOT had an accommodation strategy. Among those who did not know how to categorise their role, none indicated that their YOT had an accommodation strategy, which suggests a lack of clarity over the focus of their own role, therefore impacting on their awareness of the strategies in place and performance.
- 5.5 In those areas that had an accommodation strategy, just under half had been updated in the last 12 months and a similar number were considered by the respondent to be fit for purpose. Interestingly, a fifth of respondents felt the accommodation strategy was not fit for purpose.
- 5.6 By and large, feedback on partnership working with local authority housing options, homelessness team and Supporting People was positive but there were concerns about the impact of the move away from ring-fenced Supporting People funding. Comments on other services were less positive and the most common difficulty lay in working with Children’s Services.
- 5.7 Overall, the level of support given to young people on community disposals is rated better than that given to those leaving the secure estate.
- 5.8 Respondents to the online survey were asked about attendance and representation at key partnerships and strategic bodies. Representation

on local strategic housing bodies (55%), Supporting People core strategic group (57%), and local strategic partnership (59%) were all at a similar level. However, representation on the Supporting People commissioning body was less common (31%).

- 5.9 Representation on the local strategic bodies was most likely among those who had an accommodation strategy in place (73%). Only a quarter (25%) of those areas which did not have an accommodation strategy in place were represented at the local strategic housing bodies.
- 5.10 Another concern related to the fact that the YOT did not have a commissioning function on accommodation and as such was reliant on probation representation at the key meetings, which was not undertaken consistently.
- 5.11 The impact of the G vs. Southwark case is clearly affecting local partnership working – most notably between Children’s Services and Housing, which in some areas has prompted the need for clearer policies and strategies on accommodating offenders.
- 5.12 In terms of improving relations with the two key partners – housing and Children’s Services, the Southwark ruling is clearly impacting both positively and negatively but this differs by each locality. Some areas have responded well and have reviewed and revised protocols in light of the ruling which has clarified responsibility and process. In other areas the ruling appears to be ignored, or authorities are slow to react. In some cases there was evidence that heads of Children’s Services were even prepared to face judicial review before amending their practice.
- 5.13 Representation within the YOT at the various groups and bodies showed some links to overall performance. There appears to be some correlation between the overall performance of an area based on whether the local housing authority sits on the YOT management board. A greater proportion of those who indicated that the local housing authority sits on the YOT management board yielded adequate or more than adequate overall performance ratings than for those areas where this did not take place or where it was unknown.
- 5.14 There was some appetite for creative and innovative approaches to budget allocation and management. For example, where YOTs feel local community-based accommodation schemes effectively reduce the necessity to send the young person to custody, could the cost saving transfer to the YOT? Similarly, devolving custodial budgets to local authorities could concentrate the minds of people on getting appropriate and decent provision across a county or sub-region, probably for less than the prison budget.

6. Feedback from service-users

- 6.1 Some service-users disliked living in hostel accommodation as they did not agree with the rules in place and did not understand the reasons for them. For example, they disliked not being able to personalise the room they lived in. Some service-users disliked living in flats due to their size, location and feeling unsafe. Service-users want to live in a place where they have some independence but access to support when they need it. They think of 'home' as a place to relax, have their own space and feel safe and comfortable.
- 6.2 On the whole, service-users did not see sustaining their tenancy as problematic, although a few indicated they would like support, particularly around budgeting and 'life skills', e.g. cooking and cleaning. None of the service-users describe any problems in accessing the information and advice they wanted. All young people received support from their YOT worker and were positive about it. No single issue was more prevalent than another in terms of problems in finding accommodation.
- 6.3 The majority of service-users thought that there was a link between accommodation type/circumstances and their offending behaviour. In particular, hostel (and to a lesser extent B&B accommodation) was linked with an increased likelihood of more frequent and more serious offending behaviour. Service-users thought that if the type and location of accommodation they wanted was available to them, it would reduce their offending. Several young people wanted to have more of a say in their housing options and felt that their own specific circumstances were not listened to.

7. Case study findings

- 7.1 Within some case studies there was an over expectation on the Accommodation Officer to lead on the accommodation application process because YOT case managers do not necessarily have the level of understanding to manage the process. Where the post holder then goes on secondment, this leaves a gap within the YOT team.
- 7.2 The secondment of the Accommodation Officer post from a voluntary sector housing and support provider appears to work well in one area and could be replicated in others. However, a single Accommodation Officer post cannot cope with demand in large urban areas.
- 7.3 The placement of the two Housing Support Workers in one YOT, funded by Supporting People and employed by a leading local provider, provides a model that could be replicated in other areas.
- 7.4 There is also a need for YOT and other frontline staff in services for young people to be trained in basic housing knowledge.
- 7.5 In some areas, the lack of security in the future of the accommodation support project work was an issue that placed services under threat.
- 7.6 Moves towards single gateway systems are being welcomed locally but it is recognised that they need to be sufficiently flexible to meet the needs of high risk cases including serious and sexual offences. Some also wanted to see greater flexibility in the system to address individual needs.
- 7.7 There is evidence of a gap in partnership working relating to education and training providers who do not appear to be sufficiently tied in to accommodation providers. Similarly, it was felt by some that more could be done in relation to prevention through education and awareness raising early on.
- 7.8 Partnership working between the YOT and local voluntary sector provider agencies is extremely effective, as highlighted by the joint working between the YOT and the St. Basil's agency referred to throughout this report.
- 7.9 In terms of how central government supported local service providers, there was some concern that the centre was insufficiently joined up. From the Youth Justice Board there were also calls for greater support from the Accommodation Officer post.
- 7.10 A particular issue in two case studies to be addressed is that of gang affiliation and gang culture. In the London borough, involvement with gangs is an increasing issue for all young people and particularly for young people in housing difficulty. Involvement in gangs is problematic both for young people becoming involved in offending and also in increasing the difficulty of re-housing young people. In this area the two

largest providers are both situated at the boundary of the borough in areas of known significant gang activity.

- 7.11 Removing the stigma of a history of offending and the need for a strategic approach to dealing with gangs were raised as key issues which needed addressing as a priority to alleviate housing difficulty for young people.
- 7.12 The problem and solution of youth gang violence was thought to be directly related to accommodation. The YOT Manager cited John Pitt's research around 'Reluctant Gangsters'⁶ and the fact that most young people would leave gangs if they could but that this was very difficult because of where they lived. Anecdotally this was backed up by YOT workers' experience in this case study area and was thought to be the most significant challenge around housing young people.
- 7.13 This was also highlighted by the Accommodation Officer in the West Midlands case study as a particular barrier to enabling successful placements in supported accommodation and in securing suitable move-on options for young people.
- 7.14 Young people in particular are likely to have a range of complex needs and accommodation placements will not succeed if support services are not able to respond to them effectively. The availability of floating support or tenancy sustainment services is vital alongside a good supply of accommodation.
- 7.15 The engagement of private landlords in partnership working with the YOT and a local voluntary sector provider is proving helpful in meeting the accommodation and support needs of young people and could be developed in other areas to improve the supply of housing options.

⁶ Pitts, J (2007) Reluctant gangsters: Youth Gangs in Waltham Forest. University of Bedfordshire. <http://www.walthamforest.gov.uk/reluctant-gangsters.pdf>

8. Recommendations

Supply and demand of accommodation

- 8.1 Data on accommodation need is available from a number of local sources and it is recommended that strategically the local Integrated Youth Support Service takes a lead in pooling local data pertinent to young people. The YOT must be a key strategic partner in this process to ensure that the information collated is also relevant for young people, including those considered high-risk due to their previous offending. Useful information will include the YOTs' own data but also that held currently by Supporting People Client Records and Outcomes data, local authority homelessness data as well as data taken from local bespoke needs surveys and strategies produced by local housing associations/RSLs. Common reporting standards/definition need to be adopted, agreed and shared across agencies.
- 8.2 It is recommended that YJB work with YOTs nationally to explore current case management IT systems and ensure that they offer sufficient levels of functionality to facilitate data interrogation and analysis – at present it is not clear that YOIS and CareWorks offer this level of functionality.
- 8.3 There is some evidence that areas with a single gateway into accommodation services are better able to regulate accommodation placements and avoid providers cherry picking which young people they take. It is recommended that this is explored further with a view to providing guidance to YOTs and wider services on models of effective practice.
- 8.4 From 2010/2011 the ring fence has been removed from Supporting People funds which are now included in the local Area Based Grant. There is some concern among practitioners that the removal of the ring fence will mean a reduction in the supply of accommodation and support for young people, including offenders. It is recommended that the YJB seek regular feedback from YOTs to monitor whether this is the case.
- 8.5 Interestingly, it appears that one consequence of the G vs. Southwark ruling is that the use of B&B has increased – although because the placement into B&B is made by Children's Services this falls outside of the CLG target. It is recommended that the YJB lobby for the use of B&B as unsuitable to be a formal cross-governmental target.
- 8.6 The existing regional accommodation forums should be promoted as a means of providing support, building confidence and enhancing resettlement resilience. Opening the forums up to a wider number of stakeholders or at sub-regional level should be considered. This could take the form of an online forum which meets periodically (quarterly or six-monthly) to discuss common issues and good practice solutions. This could build on early learning from the YJB pilots running in the North West, South West and London.

Role of the YOT Accommodation Officer

- 8.7 While it is recognised that for smaller YOTs a full-time Accommodation Officer may be a luxury, it is recommended that the YJB highlight that effective practice in terms of fulfilling the role is to have at least a full-time post, preferably filled by someone with prior knowledge of housing and accommodation services and the local area/partnerships involved. Secondments from housing and homelessness teams and Supporting People (as it was) should be considered.
- 8.8 Because operational duties tend to often override the strategic it is essential that a nominated member of the YOT management team leads strategically on accommodation to ensure the Accommodation Officer is supported and effectively linked into local partnership working on accommodation.
- 8.9 The list of possible duties stipulated by the YJB, although comprehensive, is over-ambitious. It is recommended that the YJB consider giving priority to those they see as core duties of the post. It is essential that priority is given to undertaking a needs and supply analysis if issues relating to poor data availability and use are to be improved.
- 8.10 Training should be provided for YOT Accommodation Officers, both in a general sense around core duties and also at a specific, local level. Training should be accredited in some way and could be part of the Certificate in Effective Practice for YOT workers. The training pack could be developed through work with young service-users. Accommodation will form part of the new YJB led Youth Justice Interactive Learning Space which should help.
- 8.11 YJB should continue to support the development of regional learning networks for YOT Accommodation Officers to share good practice solutions. This should be tied in with better marketing and increased use of the YJB accommodation web forum already in existence where YOT Accommodation Officers can share practice and discuss current issues as part of a 'virtual national network'.

Processes and performance

- 8.12 It is recommended that the NI46 indicator is reviewed and replaced with a more meaningful indicator. At the least, awareness of the definition of 'suitability' specified in the Children Leaving Care Regulations needs to be promoted and monitored effectively. Measures need to be taken throughout the order to improve performance against this. Alternatives would be to amend the measure to record the number of times a young person moves on to other accommodation during an order.
- 8.13 Although evaluations of single gateway models have been undertaken, it is recommended that the YJB considers evaluating the impact on such a model on meeting the high support needs of young people.

Systemic relationships and accountabilities

- 8.14 It is recommended that where the housing authority is not represented at YOT board level that this is addressed locally.
- 8.15 Revised protocols and a genuine desire to work together were essential factors in the response to G vs. Southwark. It is recommended that the YJB offers some clear advice and support to YOT Accommodation Officers on the implications of the Southwark ruling for YOTs to enable them to facilitate revised working practices locally.
- 8.16 The tensions that exist in resettlement from the secure estate have already been noted and warrant further investigation, particularly given that the relationship between YOT Accommodation Officers and the secure estate received the highest proportion of good or very good responses across a range of partners worked with although this view was not consistently shared by those working in the secure estate.
- 8.17 The value of having a separate YOT accommodation strategy is unclear – those areas that do have a strategy in place appear to be better linked in to other strategic housing partnerships, but at present because of time and resource pressures not all YOTs have an up-to-date strategy in place that is fit for purpose. It should also be recognised that the presence of a YOT accommodation strategy could be a symptom of effective partnership working as much as a cause. Linked to earlier points it is essential that a member of the YOT management team leads strategically on accommodation to provide drive, commitment and support to the Accommodation Officer. It is recommended that it is of greater value to ensure that YOT targets on accommodation are reflected and locked into local strategies (including housing, homelessness and accommodation support) than to ensure that a separate YOT accommodation strategy is produced.
- 8.18 The YJB needs to consider using the conditions of the grant as a lever to improve Accommodation Officer provision. The research identified several areas that do not have a named Accommodation Officer and do not have anyone undertaking the operational or strategic functions outlined for accommodation despite this being a requirement of the grant. This needs to be enforced to raise the profile of the importance of this function.
- 8.19 Systematic relationships need to be reviewed in light of policy changes, in particular to consider the impact of the future devolution of custody budgets to local areas and the potential for commissioning of accommodation and the realignment of YOT with regards to Children's Trusts.

Feedback from service-users

- 8.20 YJB should oversee the production of guidelines for providers on involving service-users in ownership of provision and the rules, requirements and design of accommodation. This could lead to the development of a kite mark of what is good accommodation, developed by young service-users.

- 8.21 An inter-generational model of support (volunteering and mentoring) could be developed to support young service-users in securing and sustaining suitable accommodation. This could draw on existing networks – such as the 1,000 voluntary groups in the Beth Johnson Foundation or the 1,200 groups in Community Works – who are looking for voluntary opportunities working with young people and could provide support around common life skills such as budgeting and managing a home.

Case studies

- 8.22 It is recommended that the placement of the Housing Support Workers into the YOT, funded by Supporting People and employed by a leading local provider provides a model that could be replicated in other areas. Similarly the model of seconding an experienced Housing and Support worker from a voluntary sector provider into the YOT as Accommodation Officer could be replicated elsewhere where the post is hard to fill.
- 8.23 YOTs might seek to develop arrangements with suitable private landlords to help meet the demand for accommodation. To facilitate this, in some areas, the cost of deposits is met by the local authority housing function and the success of this model could be investigated further.
- 8.24 There should be an increased emphasis on the importance of ensuring support services are available to young people alongside suitable housing.
- 8.25 The YJB should consider how it can enable YOTs to have a more effective voice within local strategic forums. Access to a funding stream to contribute to or help ‘pump-prime’ housing and support developments would be helpful in this.
- 8.26 Nationally, further research is required to explore the relationship between problems of and solutions to youth gang violence and accommodation. Locally YOTs in areas where gang-related activity is an issue need to be fully involved in initiatives to help tackle gang affiliation to help overcome barriers to accommodation for young people.
- 8.27 A national strategic lead is required to deal with the increasing problem of housing young people fleeing gang-related activity. Links need to be made between local authorities in different parts of the country. A network of cities and metropolitan areas should be established whereby young people fleeing gang violence (and their families) can be housed in other parts of the country, with a reciprocal arrangement in place where necessary. It is not sufficient for adjoining boroughs/areas to forge an alliance as previous experience has shown that this does not work as the young people are still too close to previous networks.
- 8.28 It is recommended that greater emphasis should be placed on prevention work and sharing good practice of this. On the whole, the best situation for young service-users is to remain or return to the family home. One good example of practice found here was a respite scheme called ‘Time Out’. In this initiative the young person and their family enter into an agreement for the young person to live in supported accommodation for

12 weeks before returning to the family home. The young person receives training and support designed to develop a pathway into successful independent living (life skills, careers development, etc.). A mediator works with both the family and the young person on the specific areas of conflict likely to lead to the young person being in housing need. In some cases it is not possible or suitable for the young person to return to the family home and the mediator works on securing sustained contact between the young person and their family for ongoing support. This may, for example, include regular visits or weekend stays.

Stock code: D121