The homelessness monitor

The homelessness monitor is a longitudinal study providing an independent analysis of the homelessness impacts of recent economic and policy developments across the United Kingdom. Separate reports are produced for each of the UK nations.

This eighth annual report updates our account of how homelessness stands in England in 2019, or as close to 2019 as data availability allows. It also highlights emerging trends and forecasts some of the likely future changes, identifying the developments likely to have the most significant impacts on homelessness.
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Foreword

Everybody deserves a safe and stable home, to build a better life for themselves and their families.

The homelessness monitor England 2019 is the eighth instalment of an annual state-of-the-nation report looking at the impact of economic and policy developments on homelessness.

Drawing on statistical analysis, insights from a large scale survey with local authorities and in-depth interviews with key informants, this year’s monitor reveals the challenges facing councils as the combination of cumulative welfare reforms and increasing housing market pressures are making it even harder for low income households to find a place to live.

Nine out of 10 councils warn more and more people in their area on the lowest incomes will become homeless because the freeze on Local Housing Allowance (LHA) and other benefits means they can’t afford to pay their rents.

The research shows that councils are seeing more demand for their services yet are faced with an ever diminishing social housing supply and very few options in the private rented sector. The report highlights the growing pressure councils are under, with seven out of 10 reporting a rise in demand for their homelessness services in the last year alone. And the problem isn’t confined to London or the South; more than three quarters of councils in the North reported a rise in the need for their services, as well as over two thirds in the Midlands.

This year’s Homelessness Monitor is the first since the Homelessness Reduction Act (HRA) came into force. This research shows some positive signs that the Act is enabling councils to help more people in housing need.

Most local authorities reported that the HRA has enabled a more person-centred approach to managing homelessness in their area and two-thirds of authorities saw the Act as having positive impacts for single people. While this is a positive step forward, there remain pressing structural issues that if unresolved risk reversing the positive steps achieved by the HRA so far. The government needs to urgently address the issues underpinning homelessness by building more social housing and restoring LHA rates in Universal Credit to ensure they truly cover the cost of rent so that more people can afford private renting.

This year’s monitor explores all these issues in detail and gives the most up to date and authoritative overview of the state of homelessness in England today. It is invaluable tool for those interested in understanding homelessness and seeking to end it.

Jon Sparkes
Chief Executive, Crisis

Campbell Robb
Chief Executive, Joseph Rowntree Foundation

Executive summary

Key points

The Homelessness Monitor series is a longitudinal study providing an independent analysis of the homelessness impacts of recent economic and policy developments in England and elsewhere in the United Kingdom.¹ This eighth annual report for England updates our account of how homelessness stands in 2019, or as close to 2019 as data availability allows.

Key points to emerge from our latest analysis are as follows:

- Rough sleeping may have levelled off somewhat in England after rapid growth since 2010, with official estimates recording a 2 per cent decrease nationally, and a 19 per cent reduction in those areas targeted by the Rough Sleeping Initiative, between 2017 and 2018. However, there are still rising trends in three of England’s four broad regions, including London, in core cities including Birmingham and Manchester, and amongst Central and Eastern European migrants. The official 2018 total remains 165 per cent higher than in 2010.

- Consistent with these official estimates, London rough sleeping has been recently once more on a rising trend as measured by the Greater London Authority/St Mungo’s CHAIN system.² Having fallen back since 2015, total London rough sleeper numbers rose to a new high in Q4 2018, up 25 per cent over 12 months. This resulted largely from a renewed increase in rough sleepers of Polish and Romanian origin – up 69 per cent since Q4 2017. However, United Kingdom-origin rough sleepers were also 13 per cent more numerous in Q4 2018 than a year earlier and – like the all-nationality total – the highest on record.

- Three quarters of local authorities responding to this year’s survey (75%) considered rough sleeping a problem in their area, and for nearly one council in four (23%) it was said to be a “major problem”. The Rough Sleeping Strategy and Rough Sleeping Initiative were generally well received by local authorities and...
key informants. Concerns focussed mainly on the need to “scale up” and sustain funding for promising initiatives to tackle rooflessness.

- **Statutory homeless acceptances** fell slightly in 2017/18, although still remain 42 per cent above their 2009 low point. The extraordinary rise since 2010 in the number of households made homeless by the ending of private tenancies seems finally to have peaked. Homelessness temporary accommodation placements, however, have continued to rise, and now stand 71 per cent higher than in 2011, with a disproportionate rise in Bed & Breakfast use also ongoing. By mid-2018 some 85,000 homeless households were living in temporary accommodation, equating to over 200,000 people.

- Over the last decade there has been an increase of nearly 700,000 in the number (or 28% in the share) of 20-34 year olds living with their parents, with no less than 48 per cent increase in London and the South East. Around half of all concealed households would prefer to live separately, and these proportions have been increasing over the period 2008-16. Allowing for the 3.74 million adults in concealed households who would prefer to live separately, including nearly 300,000 couple/lone parent family groups. Consistent with this, the proportion of younger adults heading households has fallen markedly, particularly in London and the South East where rates are 32 per cent below those in the early 1990s.

- **Most local authorities (62%)** reported that the Homelessness Reduction Act 2009 and the South East where rates are 32 per cent below those in the early 1990s.

- The overall number of social lets continues to decline, as a result of the long-term impact of the right to buy and inadequate levels of new build. While the proportion of new social lets made to homeless households has recently risen (to 23%), this is still substantially lower than the proportion a decade ago (26%). This means that some 18,000 fewer social lets were made to homeless households in 2017/18 than in 2007/08, despite statutory homelessness having risen substantially over that period.

- **Very few local authority respondents** believed that existing social housing provision in their area is in sufficient to meet current demand. Many were at least equally concerned about the problematic profile of the local social housing stock portfolio, mismatched to need. The urban housing crisis has been compounded by widespread anxieties about ongoing changes to housing association tenancy allocation policies impeding local authorities’ ability to resolve homelessness. Two-thirds of local authorities – 64 per cent – reported that social landlord “housing affordability” or “financial capability” checks were making it increasingly difficult for homeless households to access tenancies.

- **Private rents seem to be falling in real terms across the country as a whole, but rising in London. Affordability in the sector as a whole appears to be improving, and repossessions falling.**

- **However, the growth in the private rented sector (only marginally reversed in the last year) has exposed many more low-income households to higher housing costs, a smaller proportion of which are protected through housing allowances in the benefit system.** These tenure-related increases in the risks of housing-related poverty, notably for younger families with children, highlight the deepening economic and social divisions in England between “insiders” (older owner occupiers) and “outsiders” (younger households without access to wealth or high-paying jobs).

- **The safety net once provided by Housing Benefit, whereby post-housing incomes were protected from erosion below basic benefit levels, has now effectively ended for the bulk of private tenants in receipt of benefit across the country, with young people under 35 particularly badly affected by reduced Local Housing Allowance rates and the working age benefit freeze.**

- **Hardship due to standard delays for initial Universal Credit payments is compounded by widespread system errors in housing benefit.** Housing Benefit, whereby post-housing incomes were protected from erosion below basic benefit levels, has now effectively ended for the bulk of private tenants in receipt of benefit across the country, with young people under 35 particularly badly affected by reduced Local Housing Allowance rates and the working age benefit freeze. New measures are needed to tackle payment delays and deductions and to fast-track rental assistance directly to landlords where appropriate.

- **Further tightening of the Benefit Cap means that it now affects almost 53,000 households as its impact has spread out from London.**

- **Almost three-quarters of affected households are headed by lone parents - the group least able to avoid the cap by moving into work or increasing their hours. The cap is enacted in the first instance by reducing housing support payments, and although this might be mitigated through Discretionary Housing Payments, the scale of the losses is such that the scope for mitigation is limited.**

- **Only around a third of local authorities reported that the Local Welfare Assistance scheme in their area played either a “very” or “some what” significant role in preventing or alleviating homelessness.** In all, 18 per cent of responding local authorities reported that they had no Local Welfare Assistance scheme at all any more in their area, including 38 per cent in the Midlands.

- **There are widespread anxieties about the likely homelessness impacts of future welfare reforms already programmed to take effect over the next two years.** Nearly two thirds of local authorities anticipate a “significant” increase in homelessness as a result of the full roll-out of Universal Credit, with a further 25 per cent expected some level of increase.

- **The economic outlook remains clouded by uncertainty surrounding Brexit, with future prospects dependent on the outcome.** A chaotic exit, for example, can be expected to lead to a severe economic downturn.

**Trends in homelessness**

**Rough sleeping**

The Autumn 2018 rough sleeper3 enumeration marked the first

---

3 People sleeping rough are defined as; people sleeping, about to bed down (sitting on/in or standing next to their bedding) or actually bedded down in the open air (such as on the streets, in tents, doorways, parks, bus shelters or encampments). People in buildings or other places not designed for habitation (such as stairwells, garages, sheds, car parks, cars, derelict boats, stations, or “bashes” which are makeshift shelters, often comprised of cardboard boxes). See Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (2018) Rough Sleeping Statistics Autumn 2018. England Online: MHCLG. https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/rough-sleeping-in-england-autumn-2018
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than the overall average reduction.\(^5\) The Sleeping Initiative in 2018 (-19%)
greater degree of reduction in 83 local
the Ministry for Housing, Communities
officially recorded level fell in the wider
UK substantially in the core cities of both
Manchester (by 31%) and Birmingham
(by 60%), where there have been
high-profile Mayoral pledges to
tackle the problem,\(^4\) albeit that the
officially recorded level fell in the wider
Manchester combined authority area.

Commenting on the 2018 statistics, the
Ministry for Housing, Communities
and Local Government noted a
greater degree of reduction in 83 local
together taking part in the Rough
Sleeping Initiative in 2018 (-13%)
that encompasses the overall average reduction.\(^3\) Several key informants, from both
the statutory and voluntary sector, directly
attributed these trends to the positive
impact of the Rough Sleeping Initiative in
targeted areas. However, the UK
Statistics Authority has recently cast
doubt on that interpretation.\(^2\)

The most robust and comprehensive
rough sleeper monitoring data in the
UK remains the Greater London
Authority’s CHAIN system managed by
St Mungo’s.\(^5\) The latest (Q4 2018)
CHAIN data appears fairly consistent
with the London borough rough
sleeper enumeration returns to
MHCLG in indicating a 25 per cent
annual increase for London. This
followed an apparent 2016 CHAIN-
enumerated rough sleeping peak. This
latest increase resulted substantially
from a strong reversal of the previous
decline in Central and Eastern
European rough sleeper numbers. Mainly
due to rising numbers of rough
sleepers of Polish and Romanian origin,
this cohort increased by 69 per cent
compared with Q4 2017 to stand
at its highest-ever recorded level.
Enumors for all persons born in
2013 and 2017; in comparison, in
the general population of England
and Wales in 2017, the mean age at
date was 76 years for men and 81 years
for women. Over half of all 2017 deaths
of homeless people were due to
drug poisoning, liver disease or suicide.

“Core homelessness”
In a parallel research report for
Crisis, Heriot-Watt University has
devolved the concept of “core homelessness”,
which focuses on people who are the
most extreme homeless situations.\(^10\)
This encompasses much more than
the single homeless population traditionally inadequately reflected in
statutory homelessness statistics, including people who are rough
camping, sofa sleeping, or “homeless sleeping” situations (such as sleeping in cars,
tents, public transport)\(^10\); but also
those: sleeping in cars, tents, public
transport (“quasi rough sleeping”),
squatting and occupation of non-
residential buildings; staying in hostels,
refuges and shelters; unsuitable
temporary accommodation (e.g. Bed
& Breakfast, non-self-contained, a
proportion of out of area placements);
and “sofa-surfing”, i.e. staying with
non-family, on a short-term basis, in
overcrowded conditions.

The overall level of core homelessness
in England (number homeless on a
typical night) has risen from 120,000
in 2010 to 153,000 in 2017, an increase
of 28 per cent over the period. The
overall annual rate of increase has
been fairly steady in this period.
However, the fastest-growing
component has been unsuitable
permanent accommodation (260% increase), reflecting the growing
pressure on local authorities as
increased demand has faced static
or falling supply of social lettings
and increasing difficulty in achieving
private rental placements. The largest
category of core homelessness is
sofa surfing, and this has grown by
26 per cent.

Statutory homelessness
Most of those participating in this
year’s LA survey (71%) reported
homelessness had been recently
increasing – in a quarter of areas to
a “significant” extent. Importantly,

---


\(^{7}\) Because this method enumerates people who have slept rough during a given period (financial year) the resulting figures cannot be directly compared with the ‘point in time’ snapshot numbers produced under the MHCLG national monitoring methodology as described above.


\(^{9}\) The meaning of homelessness in this statistical release is based on the scope of identification of homeless individuals in the death registration data. The records identified are mainly people sleeping rough, or using emergency accommodation such as homeless shelters and direct access hostels, at or around the time of death.


\(^{12}\) The declining supply of hostel places in England is documented in the annual Homeless Link reports on Support for Single Homeless People, from which it is clear that the reduction is due to funding restriction rather than any reduction in need or demand.
however, when asked about the change in Housing Options service demand over the previous year, respondents will have referenced the period from around October 2017 to September 2018. Half of this period (since April 2018) coincides with the early implementation of the Homelessness Reduction Act 2017 (see below), and many attributed recent increases to effects of the new legislation, particularly bringing forward more presentations from single people (see below). However, some argued that any “expressed demand” and impact arising from the new legislation needed to be seen within the context of longer-term trends associated with welfare reform and housing market factors that were at least as significant.

Nationally, 2017/18 saw a small drop in the recorded statutory homelessness caseload, as reflected by the total number of formal local authority assessment decisions and, within that, “homeless – main duty accepted” cases. The total number of main duty decisions fell by some 5 per cent to stand at 109,000 – or 23 per cent higher than the 2009/10 low point. Similarly, “homeless – main duty accepted” cases (households deemed unintentionally homeless and in priority need) fell back by 4 per cent in 2017/18 to stand at 56,600 – 42 per cent above their 2009/10 low point. By 2017/18, this was 46 per cent higher than the 2009/10 low point. The vast bulk of this increase resulted from the sharply rising numbers made homeless from the private rented sector with annual losses of Assured Shorthold Tenancies having quadrupled during the period – from less than 5,000 to over 18,000 (18,270) in 2016/17. In the latest year, however, whereas other “immediate causes” of homelessness remained more stable. This about turn in the trend in private tenancy termination-related acceptances may reflect the filtering through of a sharp reduction in the number of relevant repossessions since 2015, which may in turn reflect a contraction in the overall number of low-incomes and those managing to access the private rented sector with the assistance of the Local Housing Allowance (especially in central London).

Since bottoming out in 2010/11, homelessness placements in temporary accommodation have risen sharply, with the overall national total rising by 5 per cent in the year to 30 June 2018 to exceed 82,000 – up by 71 per cent from its low point seven years earlier. London continues to account for over two thirds of the total number of placements at any one point in time (57,000 as at 30 June 2018 – 69%). Since the published data also show that temporary placements as at 30 June 2018 involved some 124,000 children, it is clear that the number of people affected will have exceeded 200,000. Although accounting for only 8 per cent of the national temporary accommodation total as at 30 June 2018, B&B placements still accounted for 42% of temporary accommodation (6,890) in 2016/17. In the latest year, the number of placements was 6 per cent higher than a year previously. However, 26% per cent higher than in 2009. Signs of stress are also evident in the substantial levels of out-of-borough temporary accommodation. As at 30 June 2018 such placements numbered 23,640, most of these the responsibility of London boroughs. At 29 per cent of the national total this represented a large increase on the 11 per cent recorded in 2009/10. These forms of temporary accommodation (B&B and out of area placements) are counted in the “core homelessness” measure discussed above and are generally the most sensitive barometer of pressures within that.

The non-statutory homelessness prevention caseload remained far larger than the formal statutory homelessness cohort in the immediate pre-Homelessness Reduction Act period. Looked at in a longer-term perspective, the most striking homelessness prevention “growth activity” has involved debt advice and financial assistance which, in 2017/18, accounted for almost 60,000 prevention instances – up from only 16,000 in 2009/10. This would seem highly consistent with the impacts of “welfare reform” on those in precarious housing circumstances (see below).

The introduction of the Homelessness Reduction Act creates a major discontinuity in most of the official statistics relating to homelessness in England. As in Wales previously, where similar prevention-focused legislation was introduced in 2015, many more people (particularly single people) will be officially recorded as seeking assistance but initially most will be classified as ‘prevention’, ‘advice’ or “relief” cases. Only a proportion will in the end be accepted under the main local authority re-housing duty, and it is likely that this number will remain lower than in the past, thanks to the more comprehensive prevention activity as legally mandated under the new framework. At the time of writing, only one quarter’s data was available under the new regime, categorised as ‘experimental statistics’, and subject to many caveats as to its interpretation.

Wider forms or potential hidden homelessness

A number of large-scale data sets allow us to explore certain aspects of potential ‘hidden homelessness’ – that is, people who may be considered homeless but whose situation is not ‘visible’ either on the streets or in official statistics. This includes concealed households, sharing households and overcrowded households. Around half of all concealed households would prefer to live separately, and these proportions have been increasing over the period 2008-16. Allowing for this, there are 3.74

15 ‘Concealed households’ are family units or single adults living within other households, who may be regarded as potential separate households that may wish to form given appropriate opportunity.
16 ‘Sharing households’ are those households who live together in the same dwelling but who do not share either a living room or regular meals together. This is the standard Government and ONS definition of sharing households which is applied in the Census and in Household surveys. In practice, the distinction between ‘sharing’ households and ‘concealed’ households is a fluid one.
17 ‘Overcrowding’ is defined here according to the most widely used official standard – the ‘bedroom standard’. Essentially, this allocates one bedroom to each couple or lone parent, one to each pair of children under 10, one to each pair of children of the same sex over 10, with additional bedrooms for individual children over 10 of different sex and for additional adult household members.
millions of people experienced a pronounced decline in affordable housing in the 1990s and a slight further decline in the early/mid 2000s, followed by an apparent increase from 2008 to 2010, a sharp drop from 2010 to 2012, and a bounce back up in 2014-15. These fluctuations may reflect the financial crisis and subsequent recession and the expansion of private renting. It now appears that sharing has turned up significantly, being at its highest rate for 20 years. Overcrowding increased to quite a pronounced extent from 2003 to 2008, and broadly speaking has plateaued subsequently. On the most recent figures, 704,000 households (3.1%) were overcrowded in England. Overcrowding is less common and tending to decline in owner occupation (1.3%) but much more common in social renting (7.2%) and private renting (5.2%). The upward trend in overcrowding was primarily associated with the two rental tenures, with private rental overcrowding increasing strongly up to 2009; social renter crowding rose from 2004 to 2009, fell back a bit but has increased again from 2012 to 2016. As with the other housing pressure indicators considered here, there is a much higher incidence of crowding in London (across all tenures), with a rate of 7.3 per cent in 2014-16, although this has fallen slightly since 2008-10. Crowding tends to affect families particularly.

Economic and policy impacts on homelessness

The post-crisis economy has settled into a familiar pattern of low growth and high employment, but there have been recent signs of a pronounced decline in the early/mid 2000s, followed by an apparent increase from 2008 to 2010, a sharp drop from 2010 to 2012, and a bounce back up in 2014-15. These fluctuations may reflect the financial crisis and subsequent recession and the expansion of private renting. It now appears that sharing has turned up significantly, being at its highest rate for 20 years. Overcrowding increased to quite a pronounced extent from 2003 to 2008, and broadly speaking has plateaued subsequently. On the most recent figures, 704,000 households (3.1%) were overcrowded in England. Overcrowding is less common and tending to decline in owner occupation (1.3%) but much more common in social renting (7.2%) and private renting (5.2%). The upward trend in overcrowding was primarily associated with the two rental tenures, with private rental overcrowding increasing strongly up to 2009; social renter crowding rose from 2004 to 2009, fell back a bit but has increased again from 2012 to 2016. As with the other housing pressure indicators considered here, there is a much higher incidence of crowding in London (across all tenures), with a rate of 7.3 per cent in 2014-16, although this has fallen slightly since 2008-10. Crowding tends to affect families particularly.
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for around 6 months. Local authorities’ perceptions of these very early stages of the Act’s implementation paint a fairly encouraging picture. Most notably, well over half of LA respondents (62%) saw the Act as having enabled a “more person-centred approach”, with this response particularly common in London (79%). Less than a quarter of respondents (23%) saw the HRA as having had “little positive effect”.

Numerous councils reported that the new legislation had impacted positively on their organisational culture and service quality, with two-thirds (65%) viewing it as having benefited single homeless people, in particular.

However, opinion was more divided on certain specific aspects of the 2017 Act. Personal Housing Plans, for example, were viewed by some local authority respondents as a beneficial device in promoting a more person-centred approach, while others expressed frustration around attempts to engage applicants in self-help as envisaged under the model. Many key informants and local authorities called for the expansion of the new “Duty to Refer” to specify robust obligations for other public bodies to cooperate with local authorities in the prevention and resolution of homelessness.

There were also widespread concerns about the monitoring and record-keeping requirements embedded with the new legislation, including (but far from limited to) the new H-CLIC statistical return. Many felt that these bureaucratic burdens were seriously impeding their capacity to engage in the intensive casework with homeless applicants that was required by both the letter and the spirit of the 2017 Act.

The new Rough Sleeping Strategy published in Summer 2018 was generally well received by relevant local authorities and key informants (see above). Concerns focussed mainly on the need to “scale up” and sustain funding for promising initiatives to tackle rough sleeping and homelessness amongst people with complex support needs, including Housing First, local service “navigators”, and “Somewhere Safe to Stay” rapid assessment hubs.

Notwithstanding the dominant local authority view that the “New Burdens” funding provided alongside the 2017 Act was inadequately small, local authorities in England, currently around 23 per cent, has increased slightly in the past few years. Nonetheless, this proportion of (a declining absolute number) of social lets still remains considerably lower than in previous years. A decade ago the proportion was 26 per cent. This means that some 18,000 fewer social lets were made to homeless households in 2017/18 than in 2007/08, despite substantial homelessness having risen substantially over that period.

Exacerbating overarching supply concerns, ongoing shifts in housing association tenure allocation policies and practices are perceived by local authorities as increasingly impeding their ability to resolve homelessness. Nearly half of council respondents (47%) reported that problematic changes of this kind had reduced their lettings while amongst housing associations in their area. An even larger proportion (almost two-thirds - 64%) reported that social landlord “housing affordability” or “financial capability” checks (usually imposed by housing associations) were making it increasingly difficult for homeless households to access tenancies in their area.

This year’s Monitor took as one of its principal themes access to social housing for homeless people and those at risk of homelessness, which has continued to become more difficult as lets to new tenants fell sharply after 2015/16. The current level of lets to new tenants is 174,000 per year (2017/18) which is less than half of the level seen in the late 1990s. Moreover, there were 39,000 fewer new social lets in 2017/18 than five years earlier in 2012/13. The continued long-term decline in lettings is the inevitable consequence of lower levels of new build and the long-term impact of the right to buy. The proportion of social housing lets to new tenants allocated to homeless households in England, currently around 23 per cent, has increased slightly in the past few years. Nonetheless, this proportion of (a declining absolute number) of social lets still remains considerably lower than in previous years.

While relevant trends in the private rented sector are more complex than those in social housing, they are similarly encouraging from the perspective of homelessness prevention and alleviation. There has been a downturn in private renting and an upturn in ownership in 2017/18, which is likely to reflect the continuing cooling of the buy-to-let market in response to tax changes and the assistance given to home owners, including stamp duty exemptions. As indicated by Government survey data, the proportion of households renting privately fell from a peak of 20.3 per cent in 2016/17 to 19.5 per cent in 2017/18. This is the first recorded fall for almost two decades. Private rents appear to be falling in real terms across the country as a whole, but rising in London. Affordability in the sector as a whole appears to be improving.
However, arguably of greater significance in the context of the Homelessness Monitor is our finding this year that the medium-term shift towards private renting (only marginally reversed in the last year) has exposed many more low-income households to higher housing costs. Between 2002/03 and 2016/17, people in the bottom income quintile experienced a 47 per cent rise in mean housing costs.\(^{35}\) Whilst 17 per cent of this increase is attributable to rising private rents, 40 per cent of it arose from tenure change. The tenure change effect of 24 per cent is even greater for the second and lowest income quintile. Almost three-quarters (73%) of the 37 per centage increase in their housing costs is attributable to tenure change.\(^{15}\) These tenure-related changes in the risks of housing-related poverty, notably for younger families with children, reinforce the deepening divisions between housing market “insiders” (older owner occupiers) and “outsiders” (younger households without access to wealth or high-paying jobs).

At the same time as this tenure shift has exposed many more low-income households to higher housing costs, a smaller proportion are now protected through the benefit system, with the share of private tenants in receipt of help with housing costs being almost halved from around one-quarter in 2014/15 to around one-fifth in 2017/18 - bringing it back to the proportion last seen in 2008/09.\(^{17}\) Administrative data suggests that Local Housing Allowance claims (and subsequently claims for private tenants assisted through the housing cost element in Universal Credit) rose between 2010 and 2014 and fell back thereafter. Claims in London as a whole fell sharply between 2014 and 2016 and have remained virtually flat subsequently. In all other regions, with the exception of the North East, they have continued on a pronounced downward trajectory post 2016, with this being particularly true in southern England.

This pattern is consistent with the improved economy continuing to “pull” some private rented sector tenants out of reliance on benefit, especially in the more prosperous South, but also with the Local Housing Allowance caps and freezes “pushing” some low-income households out of the private rented sector more abruptly and sooner in the capital than elsewhere. The timing of this contraction in the number of private rented sector tenants in receipt of help with housing costs is also broadly in step with a sustained reduction in Assured Shorthold Tenancy evictions since 2015,\(^{18}\) and also with a more recent reversal in the upward trajectory in Assured Shorthold Tenancy - related homelessness acceptances (see above).

Many of these access issues with regard to the private rented sector, but also in the housing association sector, hinge of course on the fundamental weakening of mainstream welfare state protection that has taken place since 2010. The safety net once provided by Housing Benefit, whereby income to spend on other (non-housing) essentials was protected from being pushed below basic benefit levels, has now effectively ended in the bulk of the private rented sector across the country, with young people and those living in high value areas particularly badly affected by the Local Housing Allowance caps and the working age benefit freeze.

The reduction in the Benefit Cap means that it now affects almost 53,000 households as its impact has spread out from London. Almost three-quarters of affected households are headed by lone parents - the group least able to avoid the cap by moving into work or increasing their hours. The cap is enacted in the first instance by reducing Housing Benefit, and has left many families has exposed to afford social housing, let alone private rented housing, in large swathes of the country. The implications for homelessness risks are obvious.

As is well known, the delay for claimants in receiving their first Universal Credit payment is accompanied by high levels of errors in the system and is causing, alongside debt-related at-source deductions and benefits sanctions, acute hardship for many claimants. Recent concessions by Government in the design and implementation of Universal Credit are welcome, but there is a need to go further in tackling problems of payment delays and deductions, and in the payment of rental assistance directly to landlords, if the associated rent arrears and homelessness risks are to be reduced.

At the same time, our local authority survey indicates that emergency help from the state in the form of Local Welfare Assistance funds has entirely disappeared in around a fifth of all English local authorities (18%), including almost two-fifths (38%) of those in the Midlands. In many other places they are so depleted that they are viewed as playing only a marginal, if any, role in preventing or alleviating homelessness.

It is little wonder then that there are widespread anxieties about the likely homelessness impacts of future welfare reforms already programmed to take effect over the next two years. Nearly two thirds of local authorities anticipate a “significant” increase in homelessness as a result of the full roll-out of Universal Credit, with a further 25 per cent expected some level of increase. Around half of local authorities likewise expect that the freeze in Local Housing Allowance rates and other working age benefits, and the lowered benefit cap, will significantly increase homelessness in their area.

### Conclusion

For perhaps the first time since the Monitor series began, there is some good news on homelessness in England, at least with regard to policy developments. This year’s fieldwork has tapped into a modest – but palpable – level of relief among both local authorities and key informants, that central government was at last showing some leadership on homelessness and rough sleeping, and supporting councils in a more proactive and purposeful way. It is clear that the current Government has decided, implicitly at least, that the policy of Localism has not been a success with regard to homelessness; a position strongly supported by the evidence presented in this Monitor series back to 2011.

Homelessness-specific progressive measures have recently been enacted and implemented. However, these must be viewed in the very sobering broader context of a prolonged and still ongoing contraction in access to genuinely affordable housing for low-income households, and a much diminished welfare safety net that failed to protect around 1.5 million people in the United Kingdom from absolute destitution in 2017.\(^{39}\) We will continue to track the full range of economic and policy developments affecting homeless people and those at risk of homelessness over the coming year and beyond, until the end of the current Monitor series in 2022.

---
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