

Please leave blank for  
completion by DS  
officers

### EXECUTIVE DECISION RECORD

<b>A1</b> Service Area	Environment and Housing
<b>A2</b> Title	'Housing First' Rough Sleeping Intervention
<b>A3</b> Decision Taken By	Deputy Leader/ Chief Officer
<b>A4</b> Chief Officer	Please print name: SAC KHAN P [REDACTED]
<b>A5</b> Deputy Leader	Please print name: T.A. FAULKNER. Please [REDACTED]
<b>A6</b> Date of Decision	15 <sup>th</sup> July 2019

### Confidentiality

<b>A7</b> Is this Decision confidential by containing exempt information as described in Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972?	No
<b>A7.1</b> If yes, please state relevant paragraph from Schedule 12A LGA 1972.	Paragraph [ ]

### Scrutiny


<b>A8</b> Which Scrutiny Committee should this decision be submitted to?	(Please tick as appropriate) ✓
Scrutiny (Audit & Value for Money Council Services) Committee	<input type="checkbox"/>
Scrutiny (Economic Growth, Communities and Health) Committee	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

<b>B1</b> What is the Decision?	To award the contract to Trent & Dove HA for the delivery of a 12 month 'Housing First' <sup>1</sup> intervention offering 5 self-contained units of accommodation for entrenched rough sleepers. The revenue for this intervention has been secured from the MHCLG, the award letter is at Appendix A.
<b>B2</b> What are the reasons for the Decision?	At the count in 2018 11 rough sleepers were identified, some of whom have become entrenched. This intervention is new to East Staffordshire, and has a strong evidence base for succeeding with entrenched rough sleepers. <sup>2</sup>
<b>B3</b> What are the contributions to Corporate Priorities?	Environment and Health & Wellbeing
<b>B4</b> What are the Human Rights considerations?	There are no Human Rights issues arising from this decision.

### Financial Implications

<b>B5</b> What are the financial implications?	<p>The main financial issues arising from this decision are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The revenue has been received from the MHCLG pursuant to sections 31(3) and 31(4) of the Local Government Act 2003.</li> <li>• The revenue will be paid to the delivery partner, Trent &amp; Dove, upfront.</li> </ul>
--	---

Revenue	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Housing First Intervention Contract	£48k	N/A	N/A
MHCLG Grant	(£48k)	N/A	N/A
MTFS Impact	NIL	NIL	NIL

The finance section has been approved by the following member of the Financial Management Unit:	<p>Please print name:  <b>ANYA MURRAY</b></p> <p>Please </p>
---	--

<sup>1</sup> <https://hfe.homeless.org.uk/about-housing-first>

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.homeless.org.uk/sites/default/files/site-attachments/Evidence%20base%20-%20Sarah%20Johnson%20-%20London.pdf>

### Policy Framework

<b>B6</b> Is the Decision wholly in accordance with the Council's policy framework?	Yes
<b>B6.1</b> If No, does it fall within the urgency provisions (Part 3 of the Constitution)?	NA
<b>B6.2</b> Has it got the appropriate approvals under those provisions?	Yes
<b>B7</b> Is the Decision wholly in accordance with the Council's budget?	Yes
<b>B7.1</b> If No, does it fall within the urgency provisions (Part 3 of the Constitution)?	NA
<b>B7.2</b> Has it got the appropriate approvals under those provisions?	Yes

### Equalities Implications

<b>B8</b> What are the Equalities implications:
<p><b>B8.1</b> Positive (Opportunities/Benefits):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Through engagement with former rough sleepers residing in Housing First accommodation it is anticipated that the support worker can begin the process of reintegration for those that have become excluded, although this is likely to be a lengthy process in most cases.</li> </ul>
<p><b>B8.2</b> Negative (Threats):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None identified.</li> </ul>
<b>B8.3</b> The subject of this decision is a policy, strategy, function or service that is new or being revised. An equality impact assessment is attached as Appendix B.
<b>B8.4</b> The equality impact assessment identified the following actions to be carried out:

### Risk Assessment

<b>B9</b> What are the Risk Assessment implications:
<p><b>B9.1</b> Positive (Opportunities/Benefits):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support in delivering the intervention is provided by the MHCLG specialist advisors.</li> <li>This project if successful will make significantly reduce the local rough sleeping cohort, bringing a beneficial impact to the individuals and the wider community.</li> </ul>

**B9.2 Negative (Threats):**

- The rough sleepers are unwilling to accept the accommodation offered, and therefore the units are unoccupied.
- The rough sleepers accept the accommodation but their occupation is fraught with problems which means Trent & Dove have to terminate the tenancy.

**B9.3** The risks do not need to be entered in the Risk Register. Any financial implications to mitigate against these risks are considered above.

**Legal Considerations**

**B10** What are the Legal Considerations:

**B10.1** The main legal issues arising from this decision are as follows:

- The revenue has been provided by the MHCLG pursuant to sections 31(3) and 31(4) of the Local Government Act 2003.
- An exemption to contract procedure has been completed at Appendix C to facilitate the transfer of funds to the delivery partner Trent & Dove under a Grant Agreement.

This section has been approved by the following member of the Legal Team:

Please print name:

ANGELA WAKEFIELD

Please



**Sustainability Implications**

**B11** What are the Sustainability implications:

**B11.1** The proposal would not result in an overall positive effect in terms of sustainability (including climate change and change adaptation measures). The positive/negative impacts are set out below (please refer to guidance notes).

**B11.2** Positive (Opportunities/Benefits): NA

**B11.3** Negative (Threats): NA

## Health & Safety Implications

**B12** What are the Health & Safety implications:

**B12.1** A Risk Assessment has not been carried out and entered into Harriet for all significant hazards and risks because there are no significant hazards or risks arising from this decision.

## Key Decision

**B13** Is this a Key Decision?

No

**Note: A Key Executive Decision is one where:**

1. **REVENUE** – Any contract or proposal with an annual payment or saving of more than £100,000
2. **CAPITAL** – Any capital project with a value in excess of £150,000
3. **A decision which significantly affects communities living or working in an area comprising two or more wards.**

**B13.1** If this is a Key Decision, is this an urgent decision such that a delay caused by use of the Call-in Procedure would seriously prejudice the public interest?

NA

**B13.2** If yes, has the Mayor or in his/her absence the Deputy Mayor or in his/her absence the Chair of the relevant Scrutiny Committee agreed that the decision will be exempt from Call-in?

NA

**NOTE: If this decision is subject to the Call-in Procedure it will come into force, and may then be implemented, on the expiry of 3 working days after publication – unless 10 Members of the Council call in the decision.**

Please send the original signed document to [andrea.davies@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk](mailto:andrea.davies@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk)



Ministry of Housing,  
Communities &  
Local Government

Our Ref:

Your Ref:

30 May 2019

Dear Colleague,

**ROUGH SLEEPING INITIATIVE 2019-20 GRANT DETERMINATION (2018-19) [No. 31/3750]**

I am pleased to inform you that the Department is now able to issue a Grant Determination for the Rough Sleeping Initiative 2019-20.

I enclose a Determination made under section 31 of the Local Government Act 2003.

The grant is ring-fenced for 2019-20 and is to be used for Rough Sleeping Initiative interventions only. MHCLG has been in contact with you to confirm which of your interventions we have approved funding for.

If you have any immediate questions on the grant determination or the process more generally please contact the RSI team at [roughsleepinginitiative@communities.gov.uk](mailto:roughsleepinginitiative@communities.gov.uk)

Yours sincerely,

**John Hall**  
**Director of Homelessness and Rough Sleeping**

Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government  
Director of Homelessness and Rough Sleeping  
3 NW Fry Building  
2 Marsham Street  
London SW1P 4DF

Tel 030344 41687  
[John.Hall@communities.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:John.Hall@communities.gsi.gov.uk)

**ROUGH SLEEPING INITIATIVE 2019-20 GRANT DETERMINATION (2018-19) [No. 31/3750]**

The Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government ("the Secretary of State") in exercise of the powers conferred by section 31 of the Local Government Act 2003 hereby makes the following determination:-

**Citation**

- 1) This determination may be cited as the Rough Sleeping Initiative Grant Determination (2019-20) [No. 31/3750].

**Purpose of the grant**

- 2) The purpose of the grant is to provide support to local authorities in England towards expenditure lawfully incurred or to be incurred to reduce rough sleeping.

**Determination**

- 3) The Secretary of State determines that the grant be paid for 2019-20 to the following local authorities as shown in Annex B.

**Treasury consent**

- 4) Before making this determination in relation to local authorities in England, the Secretary of State obtained the consent of the Treasury

Signed by authority of the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government.

**John Hall**  
**Director of Homelessness and Rough Sleeping**

30 May 2019

## **Annex A – Grant Conditions**

1. Grant paid to a local authority under this determination may be used only to fund Rough Sleeping Initiative interventions that were approved by MHCLG for funding.
2. The authority must complete a progress report, provided by the MHCLG, at monthly or quarterly intervals, or at such other intervals as may be specified by the MHCLG. The report will be submitted by a date to be specified by the MHCLG and will provide details of progress against the outputs, activities, milestones and targets set out in the proposal agreed by MHCLG, alongside rough sleeping prevention and relief statistics.
3. The local authority will conduct rough sleeping counts in September, January and March. If the MHCLG agree it is not feasible for the local authority to conduct rough sleeping counts, the local authority will provide estimates of rough sleeping.
4. Grant will be paid according to the allocations attached at Annex B.



Annex B

**ROUGH SLEEPING INITIATIVE 2019-20 GRANT DETERMINATION (2018-19) [No. 31/3750]**

<b>Local Authority</b>	<b>Total</b>
Aylesbury Vale District Council	£208,867
Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council	£328,038
Basildon Borough Council	£233,863
Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council	£204,500
Bath and North East Somerset Council	£360,160
Bedford Council (Unitary)	£195,107
Birmingham City Council	£445,000
Blackpool Borough Council	£155,000
Bolton Metropolitan Borough Council	£40,000
Borough of Poole	£183,750
Boston Borough Council	£145,050
Bournemouth Borough Council	£349,250
Bracknell Forest Council	£120,000
Bradford Metropolitan District Council	£191,000
Breckland District Council	£40,000
Brighton and Hove City Council	£711,524
Bristol City Council	£517,773
Broadland District Council	£50,000
Bury Metropolitan Borough Council	£40,000
Calderdale Metropolitan Borough Council	£35,000
Cambridge City Council	£94,000

Canterbury City Council	£330,988
Carlisle City Council	£80,000
Central Bedfordshire Council	£120,000
Cherwell District Council	£136,000
Cheshire East Council (Unitary)	£388,303
Cheshire West and Chester Council	£185,180
City of Lincoln Council	£519,396
City of London	£245,234
City of Nottingham Council	£375,612
City of Westminster	£729,748
City of York Council	£251,234
Colchester Borough Council	£204,753
Corby Borough Council	£115,000
Cornwall Council (Unitary)	£625,009
Coventry City Council	£190,000
Dacorum Council	£200,000
Derby City Council	£343,000
Dover District Council	£175,000
Durham County Council	£700,000
East Hertfordshire District Council	£52,000
East Lindsey District Council	£142,813
East Staffordshire Borough Council	£48,000
East Suffolk Council	£202,150
Elmbridge Borough Council	£100,000
Erewash Borough Council	£250,000
Essex County Council	£180,000

Exeter City Council	£444,260
Fareham Borough Council	£59,850
Fenland District Council	£131,125
Gedling Borough Council	£450,000
Gloucester City Council	£108,430
Gravesham Borough Council	£150,000
Great Yarmouth Borough Council	£47,500
Greater London Authority	£2,990,998
Greater Manchester Combined Authority	£506,817
Guildford Borough Council	£120,000
Halton Borough Council	£47,000
Harlow Council	£231,000
Hastings Borough Council	£800,000
Havant Borough Council	£35,000
Herefordshire Council	£83,350
Hertsmere Borough Council	£26,580
Horsham District Council	£83,910
Ipswich Borough Council	£387,547
Isle of Wight Council	£175,000
Kettering Borough Council	£62,000
Kingston-upon-Hull City Council	£268,714
Kirklees Council	£131,250
Lancaster City Council	£40,000
Leeds City Council	£385,000
Leicester City Council	£349,688

Lichfield District Council	£50,000
Liverpool City Council	£185,695
London Borough of Barnet	£108,166.50
London Borough of Brent	£369,204
London Borough of Camden	£266,000
London Borough of Croydon	£468,504
London Borough of Ealing	£421,001
London Borough of Enfield	£220,000
London Borough of Hackney	£365,000
London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham	£120,000
London Borough of Haringey	£167,640
London Borough of Harrow	£125,000
London Borough of Havering	£135,000
London Borough of Hillingdon	£294,658
London Borough of Hounslow	£308,000
London Borough of Islington	£407,241
London Borough of Lambeth	£447,234
London Borough of Lewisham	£355,065
London Borough of Merton	£192,500
London Borough of Newham	£604,000
London Borough of Redbridge	£500,000
London Borough of Richmond upon Thames	£265,419
London Borough of Southwark	£597,500
London Borough of Sutton	£93,167
London Borough of Tower Hamlets	£323,198

London Borough of Waltham Forest	£400,019
London Borough of Wandsworth	£237,210
Luton Borough Council	£394,663
Maidstone Borough Council	£369,225
Manchester City Council	£250,023
Medway Council	£486,117
Mendip District Council	£220,400
Mid Devon District Council	£77,326
Milton Keynes	£360,000
New Forest District Council	£55,500
Newcastle-Under-Lyme District Council	£45,000
Newcastle-upon-Tyne City Council	£150,000
North Devon Council	£209,150
North East Lincolnshire Council	£288,450
North Lincolnshire Council	£80,000
North Norfolk District Council	£76,536
North Somerset Council	£164,372
Northampton Borough Council	£215,400
Norwich City Council	£339,929
Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Council	£150,000
Oldham Metropolitan Borough Council	£40,000
Oxford City Council	£511,543
Peterborough City Council	£121,968
Plymouth City Council	£335,865
Portsmouth City Council	£350,000

Preston City Council	£136,881
Reading Borough Council	£334,750
Rochdale Metropolitan Borough Council	£40,000
Rother District Council	£120,000
Royal Borough of Greenwich	£43,000
Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea	£257,740
Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames	£364,023
Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead	£88,000
Rugby Borough Council	£70,000
Ryedale District Council	£30,000
Salford City Council	£419,495
Scarborough Borough Council	£51,234
Sefton Metropolitan Borough Council	£124,582
Selby District Council	£30,000
Sevenoaks District Council	£53,949
Sheffield City Council	£412,926
Shropshire Council - Unitary	£178,000
Slough Borough Council	£339,568
Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council	£37,720
South Somerset District Council	£30,844
Southampton City Council	£334,700
Southend-on-Sea Borough Council	£513,738
Spelthorne Borough Council	£50,000

St Helens Metropolitan Borough Council	£100,000
Stafford Borough Council	£58,582
Stevenage Borough Council	£53,000
Stoke-on-Trent City Council	£196,292
Stratford-on-Avon District Council	£130,000
Surrey Heath Borough Council	£80,000
Swale Borough Council	£150,594
Swindon Borough Council	£255,125
Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council	£241,732
Taunton Deane Borough Council	£210,739
Teignbridge District Council	£96,000
Telford & Wrekin Council	£79,132
Tendring District Council	£29,210
Test Valley Borough Council	£45,000
Thanet District Council	£483,770
Thurrock Council	£70,000
Tonbridge and Malling Borough Council	£100,000
Torbay Council	£229,000
Torridge District Council	£50,662
Tunbridge Wells Borough Council	£170,718
Wakefield Metropolitan District Council	£20,000
Walsall Metropolitan Borough Council	£400,549
Warrington Borough Council	£137,000
Warwick District Council	£396,907
Watford Borough Council	£108,212

Wellingborough Borough Council	£68,355
West Berkshire Council	£261,820
West Suffolk Councils (formerly St Edmundsbury Borough Council)	£345,562
Weymouth and Portland Borough Council	£165,926
Wigan Metropolitan Borough Council	£467,278
Wiltshire Council (Unitary)	£298,549
Wirral Council	£127,409
Wolverhampton City Council	£257,000
Worcester City Council	£217,000
Worthing Borough Council	£340,378
Wycombe District Council	£165,000
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>£43,637,861</b>







**East Staffordshire Borough Council  
Equality and Health Impact Assessment (EHIA)**

This EHIA documents how you have taken into account health impacts and the requirements of the Public Sector Equality Duty in the decision making process for this function, policy or service.

<b>1</b>	<b>Title of function, policy or service to be assessed:</b> Rough Sleeping Initiative Fund – Housing First Pilot
<b>2</b>	<b>Date:</b> 5 July 2019
<b>3</b>	<b>Name of EHIA author:</b> Brett Atkinson
<b>4</b>	<b>EHIA team:</b> Brett Atkinson
<b>5</b>	<b>Head of Service:</b> Sal Khan
<b>6</b>	<b>Is the policy, function or service existing, new or being reviewed?</b> New
<b>7</b>	<p><b>State the aims, objectives and purpose of the function, policy or service and provide a summary of the service provided:</b></p> <p>To award the contract for the delivery of the 'Housing First' model for 5 entrenched rough sleepers. The 2018 count identified 11 rough sleepers, some of whom have become entrenched. This intervention is a well recognised means of driving solutions specifically for this cohort to markedly reduce the number of rough sleepers.</p>
<b>8</b>	<p><b>Are there any other functions, policies or services which might be linked with this one for the purpose of this EHIA?</b></p> <p>It is intended for this service to work closely with the Council's Housing Options team, the Council commissioned Rough Sleepers Outreach Team and other organisations offering services to this client group as appropriate.</p>
<b>9</b>	<p><b>Who is it intended to affect or benefit (the target population)?</b></p> <p>Entrenched rough sleepers who have cycled through much of the supported accommodation provision locally.</p>

**10 Equality impacts**

The Public Sector Equality Duty requires public bodies, in the exercise of their functions, to have due regard to the need to:

- Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act.
- Advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.
- Foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.

**Within this table, state whether the policy, function or service will have a positive or negative impact across the following protected characteristics and provide any comments.**

	Positive Impact	Negative Impact	Comments
Age	N	N	No impact identified.
Disability	Y	N	The Housing First model is tailored to the individual, and will take into account and attempt to provide for any additional needs.
Sex / gender reassignment / pregnancy or maternity	Y	N	As above at disability.
Race	N	N	No impact identified.
Religion or belief	Y	N	As above at disability.
Sexual orientation	Y	N	As above at disability.
Other	N	N	

**11. What evidence do you have for the statements made in question 10?**

The proposed service uses intensive, flexible and person-centred support alongside independent, stable housing as a platform to enable individuals with multiple and complex needs to begin recovery and move away from homelessness. Therefore an overall positive impact in a number of areas is anticipated.

12	<p><b>Consultation:</b> Describe what consultation has been undertaken on this function or policy, who was involved and the outcome.</p> <p>The Council has consulted with MHCLG Specialist Advisors as well as a variety of local statutory and third sector partners locally.</p>												
13	<p><b>Briefly explain how the policy, function or service contributes to community cohesion by answering the following questions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How will it provide equality of access to services, information and employment?</li> <li>• Does it or could it celebrate diversity?</li> <li>• Will it or could it promote good relationships within and between communities?</li> <li>• How will it help to prevent social exclusion?</li> <li>• Will it help to reintegrate those who have become excluded?</li> <li>• How will it provide good quality, inclusive services?</li> </ul> <p>Through engagement with residents of the Housing First accommodation it is anticipated that the service will assist reintegration for those that have become excluded, although this is likely to be a lengthy process in most cases.</p>												
14	<p><b>Health impacts – screening question</b> Will the subject of this EHIA:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="236 1256 1485 1986"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="236 1256 730 1395"></th> <th data-bbox="730 1256 1107 1395"><b>No</b> (provide a brief explanation of your response)</th> <th data-bbox="1107 1256 1485 1395"><b>Yes</b> (Is this impact positive or negative? provide a brief explanation of your response)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="236 1395 730 1581">Have a direct impact on health, mental health and wellbeing?</td> <td data-bbox="730 1395 1107 1581"></td> <td data-bbox="1107 1395 1485 1581">Positive - accommodation is provided to those likely to experience harm as a result of rough sleeping.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="236 1581 730 1731">Have an impact on social, economic and environmental living conditions that would indirectly affect health?</td> <td data-bbox="730 1581 1107 1731"></td> <td data-bbox="1107 1581 1485 1731">Positive – individuals accommodated would have their overall living conditions improved.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="236 1731 730 1986">Have an effect on an individual's ability to improve their own health and wellbeing?</td> <td data-bbox="730 1731 1107 1986"></td> <td data-bbox="1107 1731 1485 1986">Positive – staff will assertively engage with residents and encourage them to improve their own life skills and access mainstream services.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		<b>No</b> (provide a brief explanation of your response)	<b>Yes</b> (Is this impact positive or negative? provide a brief explanation of your response)	Have a direct impact on health, mental health and wellbeing?		Positive - accommodation is provided to those likely to experience harm as a result of rough sleeping.	Have an impact on social, economic and environmental living conditions that would indirectly affect health?		Positive – individuals accommodated would have their overall living conditions improved.	Have an effect on an individual's ability to improve their own health and wellbeing?		Positive – staff will assertively engage with residents and encourage them to improve their own life skills and access mainstream services.
	<b>No</b> (provide a brief explanation of your response)	<b>Yes</b> (Is this impact positive or negative? provide a brief explanation of your response)											
Have a direct impact on health, mental health and wellbeing?		Positive - accommodation is provided to those likely to experience harm as a result of rough sleeping.											
Have an impact on social, economic and environmental living conditions that would indirectly affect health?		Positive – individuals accommodated would have their overall living conditions improved.											
Have an effect on an individual's ability to improve their own health and wellbeing?		Positive – staff will assertively engage with residents and encourage them to improve their own life skills and access mainstream services.											

	Affect access to, and the quality of, health, mental health or wellbeing services?		Positive – improve access through personal support and encouragement.
Please refer to the EHIA guidance document. If you answer yes to any of these questions a health impact assessment is required, please complete section 16.			
15	<b>Head of Service signature:</b> I am satisfied with the results of this EHIA.		

**16. HEALTH IMPACT ASSESSMENT<sup>1</sup>**

To be completed if you have answered yes to any of the health impact screening questions.

<p><b>A. Describe the health impact(s). Please refer to the screening questions in Q14.</b></p>	<p><b>B. Answering yes to these questions indicates an important health impact. Be explicit and include the evidence that has been considered.</b></p>	<p><b>C. Are the health impacts significant?</b></p>
<p>Identify the health impact(s)</p>	<p>Will the health impacts be difficult to remedy or have an irreversible impact? Are they likely to cause public concern?</p>	<p>Does this health impact have a significant positive or negative impact? (based on your responses to section B)</p>
<p>Improve the health and wellbeing of Rough Sleepers.</p>	<p>Will the health impacts affect the whole population? Will it affect particular groups of people differently?</p> <p>The service is provided exclusively to those who are verified as rough sleeping.</p>	<p>Will the health impacts be medium to long term? Are they likely to create cumulative impacts?</p> <p>It is believed that many rough sleepers will experience a long term positive impact as they are accommodated in independent accommodation.</p> <p>No concerns identified as impact is positive.</p> <p>Significant Positive Impact.</p>









## Exemption to Contract Procedure Rules

### Notes:

- The questions contained in this questionnaire are not to be altered in any way. If you have any queries regarding the contents of this document, please contact the Programmes and Transformation Team.
- Depending on the value of the contract you may be required to complete an Executive Decision Record. You should seek guidance on this from the Programmes and Transformation Team.

### Service:

Environment and Housing

### What is the subject/contract?

Housing First' Rough Sleeping Intervention

### What is the length of the contract?

12 months

### What is the total value of the contract?

£48,000

### For what reason(s) should this contract be exempt from the Council's Contract Procedure Rules?

This intervention was originally intended to be carried out by NACRO as set out in EDR 984/19 however for a variety of reasons NACRO decided they were unable to proceed. As a result of this change the model has been revised.

The new proposed model bypasses temporary supported accommodation of the type NACRO provide and moves directly into settled independent living. This model carries significant risk for the social housing provider, and given the intense nature of the work they would need to have a local base from which to offer support and knowledge of local services.

Trent & Dove are based locally, and are the owners of approx. 80% of the social housing stock in the borough. They are in the best position to deliver the contract and mobilise quickly, with sufficient stock to make available suitable properties within the 12 month life of the contract.

**By whom was the Decision taken?**

Please print and sign the names of the Chief Officer and Leader/Deputy Leader and retain as part of your procurement records. The form must also be countersigned by the Section 151 Officer.

	<b>(Please mark with a *)</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Signed</b>
Leader/Deputy Leader			
Chief Officer			
Section 151 Officer			

**What date was the Decision made?**

**Is this Decision confidential by containing exempt information as described in Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972?**

Yes/No (please delete as appropriate)