



***Appendices:***  
**Submission to the CLG Committee Inquiry into  
the Supporting People Programme**

---

May 2009

## Contents

---

1 Detailed Report from Round table Events	3-11
2 Delivery against the Aims of “Independence and Opportunity”	12-14
3 List of Contributing Organisations	15-20

### Removal of Supporting People Ring Fence: Report on Regional Round Table Discussions Jan-Mar 2009

---

<b>Contents.</b>	<b>Page</b>
1. Introduction	2
2. Speaker Presentations	2
3. Main Themes from Discussions - summary	3
3.1 Local Issues	3
3.2 Regional Issues	5
3.3 National Issues	6
3.4 Data and Monitoring Issues	7
3.5 Personalisation	8
3.6 Getting the Message Across	8

## 1. Introduction

The Regional Roundtable events were organised by Sitra, with the support of the CLG, as part of the transition package to assist in managing the changes arising from the abolition of the Supporting People (SP) ring fence in April 2009<sup>1</sup>. A total of 18 events were held, 2 in each of the English regions. Each event was attended by an average of approximately 40 providers, commissioners and other stakeholders, and the whole programme represented a significant national debate on the impact of the changes and the future of housing related support and care.

Each event heard an introduction from the CLG on the changes and the reasons for them. There was also a presentation from a local Pathfinder authority<sup>2</sup> on their experience of life outside the ring fence. These presentations were followed by discussions in small groups (“round tables”) and then a Q&A with a panel consisting of the presentation speakers and local provider representative. These discussions were structured to ensure a constructive debate and a consistent framework to the outcomes. Groups were asked to identify two key opportunities or challenges arising from the changes locally, two key initiatives to be taken forward regionally or locally and two key issues to be taken forward nationally by Sitra or the CLG. Each group was asked to prioritise one issue for discussion with the Panel. The conclusions of these discussions were collated by Sitra and form the basis of this report.

## 2. Speaker Presentations

The full CLG presentation is appended to this report and covered core themes around the background to the removal of the ring fence, the transition period and a brief section on personalisation. Each of the regional events had presentations from one of the Pathfinder authorities, and as such these presentations reflected a variety of experiences. However, there were some consistent themes running through them. These included

- The importance of getting the governance right. Need to make sure that the SP team had good links into Local Strategic Partnership (LSP) decision making structures, ideally a senior manager with responsibility for SP on the LSP and the appropriate Partnership Board. The importance of provider representation on the LSP was also discussed, and some Pathfinder authorities had been instrumental in securing places of Housing Related Support providers.
- The ring fence may have protected SP but it also hid it (and its achievements) from view. The removal offered the opportunity to raise the profile of SP services locally.
- There was real scope for more flexibility in the design of services following the removal of SP eligibility criteria.
- There will be a battle for resources when SP becomes part of the overall pot of money available to the council as a whole, and supported housing will have to fight to keep its resources.
- Early indications from the Pathfinders was that they were able to present a convincing case for the retention of funding for HRS. Much of this success was attributed to the fact that SP is well ahead of most service areas in its ability to evidence its needs, service quality, value and outcomes. However, it is important to note that the

---

<sup>1</sup> From 1/4/09 Supporting People grant will be paid to local authorities as a named grant but without specific grant conditions. From 1/4/10 it will be completely absorbed into Area Based Grant (ABG).

<sup>2</sup> 15 local authorities, both unitary and two tier, from all the English regions, were identified as Pathfinders and piloted the removal of the ring fence during the year 2008/09. The aim was to assess the impact, compare experiences and to inform the decision of the CLG in respect of the national ring fence.

Pathfinders had only been in operation for less than a year, and there was significant variation as to how the Pathfinder status had been used locally.

- The programme needs to demonstrate strategic relevance – “mainstreaming”, and show how it contributes to wider priorities and value for money.

A number of examples were given of schemes which had been developed which would have been impossible within SP eligibility criteria. Examples included

- Older people - help with shopping and gardening
- Children’s worker in Domestic Violence refuges
- Advocacy service in court
- Counselling as part of an outreach service to sex workers
- Key safes (to enable carer’s access to vulnerable people’s homes without compromising security)
- Aids and adaptations which helped support independent living but which were not priorities under the housing capital programme

### **3. Main themes from discussions**

The discussions covered a huge arrange of local and national issues. However a few themes came though every event which could be summed up as

- SP has achieved a great deal in delivering services to vulnerable people and those otherwise in need of support, based on rigorous needs analysis, strategic planning, joined up commissioning, client involvement, and close monitoring of service standards, values and outcomes. It is critical that these achievements are preserved and built on.
- There is a will to seize the opportunities for more flexible service design and delivery
- There is widespread concern that the disappearance of a specific funding stream with eligibility criteria will lead to a loss of focus and expertise, particularly if SP teams are disbanded
- There is universal concern that incorporation into ABG (Area Based Grant) will lead to funding being diverted away from funding for Housing Related Support (particularly for the most socially excluded and least electorally influential groups) to other local priorities.
- If the opportunities are to be seized and the fears not realised the entire SP sector will need to demonstrate its importance for both individual clients and the wider community much more effectively.

The main issues are summarised in this report at local, regional and national level and we then touch on issues – personalisation, monitoring and getting the message across – that impact at all levels.

#### **3.1 Local Issues**

The role of Local Strategic Partnerships in setting service and spending priorities was a recurrent theme throughout the events, with comments from participants and commissioners creating a varied picture of understanding, awareness and involvement. The discussion around LSPs took two distinct strands.

##### ***Engagement-***

- How both providers and commissioners would access the LSP, either in a representative way, or to provide information. It was recognised that many providers,

particularly smaller organisations needed substantial support and capacity building to help them reach decision takers.

- Recognition of the need to raise the profile of Housing Related Support (HRS) with the LSP – thinking not only about who should make the case, but also, ensuring that the data and client or service specific histories which will help make the case are rigorously kept and widely known about.
- The need to link the impact of Housing Related Support to wider NI targets laid out in the LAA and to PSA 16
- Making the case to LSP partners and local authority budget holders for the financial value of early preventative support work – utilising the planned local cost benefits realisation model<sup>3</sup>

### **Governance**

- Recognition that within the different authorities there is a spectrum of maturity of governance, and also that within different authorities there are different levels of HRS integration into the governance arrangements. It will be essential that senior officers with an understanding of and responsibility for HRS are represented at the appropriate planning and decision taking levels
- SP Commissioning Boards generally represent good practice in strategic, needs-based, joint commissioning. It will be important to spread rather than dissipate or lose this if more generic commissioning and strategic planning models are adopted
- What will be the role of LSP governance in the service commissioning arrangements (ie who will really drive the allocation of resources) – and again recognition that there will be differences between authorities
- There are formal representation issues about who is represented and at what level. In particular the third sector is generally represented at LSPs by Councils for Voluntary Service with whom SP providers and RSLs do not have a history of engagement. This engagement will have to be developed, or alternative and more appropriate representation for providers developed.

There was also a recurrence of discussions which can be characterised as **“breaking down the barriers”**

- This is an opportunity for housing related support to show how it ties in with other community agendas – for example the Sustainable Communities Strategy
- The HRS sector needs to be raising the profile of the support provider with a wider range of partners i.e. adult social care
- There needs to be drive to break down barriers which will enable greater opportunities for partnership

A number of issues were raised around **commissioning**. The prominence of this issue did seem to link into the experience of the Pathfinders, several of whom had taken the opportunity to flex their commissioning process during the pilot.

- Issues were raised about the removal of the eligibility criteria – both in terms of opportunities for greater flexibility, but also in relation to significant concerns about the money being moved into other areas.
- There was uncertainty, or disparate views about what joint commissioning might mean in practice

---

<sup>3</sup> In January 2008 the CLG published research conducted by Cap Gemini which demonstrated that the national programme of £1.7b delivered net savings to the national purse of £2.55m by preventing costs of more expensive services (e.g. residential care, hospital, criminal justice costs). An update of that model which can be used at the local authority level is currently being developed and will be available later this year.

- Concerns that once the eligibility criteria were removed, and you were commissioning much broader services, then may become more difficult to conduct a meaningful needs analysis.
- Without the eligibility criteria, there were also concerns that would be very difficult to make broad statements about outcomes, and might make evidencing impact more difficult in the future
- Significant concerns were raised at some events about the issue of Local Connection. Feeling that there might be retrenchment.
- Recognition that the current situation is that there is a body of expertise in the local authority on housing related support. How if the SP team goes or is amalgamated, will authorities ensure that expertise and connection between providers and commissioners remains?
- There was a frequently expressed hope that the lifting of the ringfence will bring improved relations between housing and adult social care
- Recognition of the varying practice in commissioning between authorities
- An assertion of the importance of the whole commissioning process – strategic needs assessment, building the diversity and strength of the provider market, listening to service users – and that this was not just a generic procurement exercise to be conducted along the same principles as procuring stationery or IT. Skilled commissioners needed to retain control of the process, not corporate procurement teams.

The changes in commissioning practice were recognised as having a direct impact on providers, particularly in the following areas:-

- Enhanced flexibility – this might allow providers to offer more diverse services and also they may find that can expand into new niche markets.
- Commissioning practice may encourage flexibility and creativity
- Commissioning practice may either encourage or require partnerships. There needed to be an understanding of the time and resources needed to build successful collaborations and partnerships<sup>4</sup>.

## 3.2 Regional Issues

The need for effective regional planning, communication and support, and operational liaison was asserted repeatedly. Headline issues included:

- It is imperative to retain and refresh strategic regional structures – RIGs, provider forums etc to coordinate all the work summarised below.
- Effective regional structures were seen as essential because of the link to Government Offices, Single Regional Strategies and regionally based funding streams.
- There was a continuing need for regional needs analyses and support strategies including robust needs analyses to support regional joint commissioning
- Communications at multiple levels – between providers (via Forums), between commissioners, between both providers and commissioners, throughout the SP sector and the wider world of social care must be maintained

---

<sup>4</sup> A detailed exploration of the issues involved in collaboration to deliver SP services, including an assessment of 6 pilot schemes can be found in the Hact Collaborate project report (<http://www.hact.org.uk/downloads.asp?PagelId=175>)

- Regional mechanisms are required to provide effective cross-border working, consistency and resolution of local connection issues and disputes
- Developing and sustaining cross-authority schemes that meet cross-border needs
- Developing and supporting specialist services located in one authority that serve several authority areas (eg refuges, specialist hostels)
- Support/capacity building structures for small providers, either by groups of authorities or organisations like Sitra and its regional partners.
- Ensuring that BME/specialist needs are met
- Develop regionally agreed tools for demonstrating strategic relevance (ie to wider CAA/PSA, not just 141 & 142) and social and cost benefits
- The need for effective regional champions for HRS
- The need to forge effective links to housing sub-regions and making them work (particularly a London issue).

### **3.3 National Issues**

A number of issues emerged which are of national significance, may best be resolved at national level, and which may inform the developing transition package.

Many of these are inextricably linked with the issues around data collection and monitoring summarised in section as there was felt to be a pressing need for maintaining a degree of consistency in meeting needs and delivering services. The right balance between local democracy and a post code lottery for the most vulnerable needed to be struck and this has to be monitored nationally. There was not a consensus at the events about the right national/local balance and the mechanisms for achieving it but there was a consensus that there needs to be meaningful protection for the most vulnerable and excluded groups and we need an ongoing national picture of provision and outcomes.

Key issues emerging included

- Concerns that services for non statutory groups will erode over time
- Central government will need to take a lead in demonstrating and championing the need for HRS services.
- Concerns that quality control will erode – the QAF will need to be championed at a national level
- There is still work to be done to get partners outside of SP to engage at a national level – with health services being repeatedly mentioned
- Specific concern to track what happens during the transition to SP teams in authorities that were attributed 1 star status
- Questions raised over the ongoing ability to achieve consistency across authorities when local politics become more dominant. Or is inconsistency the inevitable and even desirable consequence of local democracy?
- Clarity over what national monitoring will continue to happen, by whom and for how long?
- The importance of ensuring a refreshed and robust cost benefit realisation model

- Much more discussion is required about what can be done nationally to support the importance of the diversity of provision, recognising both the diversity of client needs and aspirations and the value of a healthy diverse provider sector
- There was recognition of the importance the central SP team had played in achieving the continued level of financial support for SP in the build up to the last Comprehensive Spending Review. What, if any role will the team have in the next round, and how will the distribution formula alter over time once the grant becomes unnamed?

### 3.4 Data and Monitoring Issues

The SP programme has delivered very robust methods of

- assessing need,
- commissioning,
- monitoring services for efficiency, effectiveness and value and for
- measuring outcomes on an individual, service, local and national level.

Tools include

- Mandatory needs analysis informing local authority SP strategies and, often, investment strategies,
- Effective joint commissioning through the SP Commissioning Boards
- Service review mechanisms including SPLS<sup>5</sup>
- The QAF<sup>6</sup>
- National indicators 141 and 142 (previously Key Performance Indicators 1 and 2) which measure the effectiveness of services in moving people on to independent living and the support services provided.
- Models for measuring “soft” outcomes for individuals such as the Outcomes Star<sup>7</sup>
- National outcomes monitoring run by St Andrew’s University.
- Inspection of local authority SP strategy and commissioning by the Audit Commission

All of these are predicated at least in part on a ring-fenced fund with set eligibility criteria policed by central government. It is absolutely essential, if we are to retain any overall understanding of how vulnerable and socially excluded people are being served by public services in England, that these tools continue to be promoted and refreshed to meet changing circumstances and that there is sufficient clarity needs, service delivery and outcomes. This need for clarity relates to both the definitions of what is being monitored but, crucially, who has responsibility for doing it.

Solutions for achieving this from the discussions included

- A continuing enforcement role for the CLG
- Mandatory weight for the QAF and other tools
- Strong guidelines for the regional Government Offices in assessing the effectiveness of delivery

---

<sup>5</sup> Work-sheets completed by providers for commissioners which provide detailed operational and service outcome information for commissioners and for national analysis

<sup>6</sup> The Quality Assessment Framework is a tool for assessing the quality and value of services, ensuring that they meet a minimum standard and setting out a clear framework for delivering and measuring excellence. Although no longer mandatory it remains the most effective benchmark enabling evaluation and comparison of services. It has recently been updated to allow for greater flexibility in assessment. Sitra will continue to update and develop the QAF in future.

<sup>7</sup> The Outcomes Star is an approach to measuring change when working with vulnerable people. Further details can be found on the Homeless Link website

- A stronger role for the Audit Commission, either in inspecting individual services or in assessing the overall effectiveness of a local authority's services to vulnerable people and the socially excluded
- Develop further professionalisation of HRS services with increased use of accreditation (already widely used in some areas and welcomed by many providers), benchmarking or a kite-mark type of standard.
- Continuing mandatory protection for the most vulnerable and excluded groups, whether through a more limited form of ring fenced fund (administered by the Homes and Communities Agency for example) or through more detailed monitoring and inspection arrangements.

### **3.5 Personalisation**

The focus of these events was the lifting of the ring fence, not personalisation. However as a central policy driver across the care and support sector at present this issue emerged repeatedly. Clearly it is an area that is occupying both providers and commissioners. Whilst many of the themes have been discussed outside of this arena, it is worth noting that a number of central themes emerged:-

- Housing Related Support services are in many ways highly personalised, for example through the development of individual support plans, although users tend to have very little choice at present about who their service provider should be
- Recognition that personalisation provide real risks and opportunities for both service users and providers
- The dominant issue in a number of roundtables was the concerns raised in relation to balancing safeguarding and the delegation of decision taking (and therefore risk) to service users. Examples include vetting of individuals (e.g. neighbours, friends of relatives) chosen to provide services and the threat of disreputable brokerage services.
- Understanding that particular service user groups raised greater dilemmas than others particularly in the application of Individual Budgets to the most vulnerable and in relation to accommodation based services.

It is interesting to note that even though it is four months since the conferences Sitra held around Personalisation, the feelings about it are still being expressed in these quite broad brush terms. However, a number of reports have recently emerged which do contribute to the debate. Sitra is currently producing a report on personalisation and HRS with the Department of Health's Housing Learning & Improvement Network. Kate McAllister and Shaun Bennett have produced a report entitled 'Learning and Evaluation from the Individual Budgets Pilot sites'. In addition, the CLG have held a number of conferences focussing on personalisation, and are in the process of putting together a steering group to address some of the issues.

### **3.6 Getting the Message Across**

There are in fact several messages to be got across several different barriers.

While the SP ring fence has protected SP budgets it has also to some extent hidden the services from view. The importance of and need for HRS services is not as well understood at the level of strategic decision taking and resource allocation as it should be. It is an absolute priority for the sector to promote itself and develop this awareness and understanding but LSPs and senior Local Authority managers and Members also have responsibilities to develop their understanding.

Equally many operating at the front line in HRS services have an incomplete understanding of some national and local policy drivers, such as personalisation or sustainable communities, and of local decision making structures.

There needs to be a greater understanding that the ring fenced grant criteria were not the only reason HRS services existed. There are many other policy drivers, performance indicators and statutory obligations that they support and the sector needs to understand these better and demonstrate more effectively the contribution it makes to achieving them.

There needs to be much greater clarity about the role, if any, of the different central agencies – the CLG, the Audit Commission, the Government Offices, possibly the OTS – in assuring the services delivered to our most vulnerable citizens and more effective communication of what those roles, and any associated powers, incentives or resources they may bring to bear, might be.

Existing communication between providers and commissioners (and within both groups) a local and regional levels need to be maintained and improved.

## Appendix 2

---

### Has the Government Delivered against the Objectives of “Independence and Opportunity”?

---

1.1 The committee asked for evidence in relation to the extent to which Government has, so far, delivered on the commitments it made in Independence and Opportunity: Our Strategy for Supporting People. Sitra has not gone line by line through the strategy, but has instead reflected on the overall direction of the strategy, and how evidence gathered from consultation would demonstrate the success of otherwise of Government’s ability to deliver.

1.2. Independence and Opportunity focussed on 4 key areas of strategy which were as follows:-

- Keeping service users at the heart of the programme and of the local delivery of the service;
- Building on the already successful partnerships with the Third Sector;
- Delivering effectively in the new local government landscape; and
- Working towards better efficiency and less bureaucracy;

1.3. Whilst the main body of this report contains a lot of evidence which will feed into a reflection on the Government’s delivery against commitments, there are key messages inherent in the research which need to be reiterated.

#### **2. Keeping service users at the heart of the programme and of the local delivery of the service;**

2.1 There are a number of core initiatives undertaken by the government which demonstrate their commitment to keeping service users at the heart of the programme.

2.2 The first relates to the Quality Assessment Framework. In 2008 a programme was started to revise the Quality Assessment Framework used to monitor the SP programme. There were a number of reasons for this revision. The first related to the increase in baseline performance within the sector. The initial QAF had been recognised as a significant driver in developing and enhancing quality services commissioned to support the most vulnerable people within communities. It was important to recognise that what had been seen as good practice in 2003 was now broadly accepted as standard. In addition, there was a recognition that more could be done to increase the integration of service users within all aspects of the operational and strategic development of provider organisations. The original QAF had included Service User Involvement as a supplementary objective, which could or could not be used as a measure by authorities. The revised QAF has enhanced its status and included it as a core objective. In addition to that, it had interwoven service user engagement throughout all the rest of the core objectives. This reinforces the strong message that quality provision cannot be achieved within services which do not value and recognise the contribution of their service users.

2.3 The second initiative has been the development of the Outcomes framework. This was introduced in 2007 and provided for the first time an understanding of how services were supporting service users against a backdrop of five core outcomes:-

- Achieve Economic Wellbeing
- Enjoy and Achieve
- Be Healthy
- Stay Safe
- Make a positive contribution

2.4 This information has subsequently been gathered nationally, and is available to authorities, and increasingly to providers to enable them to further tailor their services so that they are providing services which are outcomes rather than output focused. There is more work to be done on making this accessible and meaningful on a service by service basis. Authorities also need much more support to enable them to move towards outcomes based commissioning models which would really ensure that service users needs are at the heart of decisions about where contracts are apportioned.

2.5 Housing related support needs to recognise the gathering momentum of the move towards more personalised services. It can be argued that the steps taken in relation to the QAF and outcomes mean that many of the services offered are more personalised than those offered through other sectors. However, there are particular issues pertinent to the personalisation of accommodation based services, and towards the use of individual budgets or self directed support by the most vulnerable and chaotic client groups. The government needs to recognise the challenges that this agenda presents, and to retain the principle at keeping service users at the heart of the strategy as it moves forward to encompass this complex agenda.

### **3. Building on the already successful partnerships with the Third Sector.**

3.1 The Government has demonstrated an ongoing commitment to partnership with the Third Sector and continues to be actively engaged with representative national bodies such as Sitra. However, the research has shown that there are clear concerns from third sector providers about the direction of travel, and how this may affect services to the most vulnerable in the future. It is important for Government to recognise the value of existing networks such as provider forums, which can give a collective strategic perspective to national, regional and local government about the current and future needs of those using housing related support. Concern about the removal of the requirement to carry out consultative longer term strategies for housing related support recognise that these mechanisms provide a useful vehicle for all voices to be heard. Without this form of wide scale consultation there is a real danger that only larger or more vociferous providers will have their perspective reflected in future spending plans.

3.2 Third Sector providers have also raised substantive concerns in relation to local commissioning initiatives risking the diversity of the sector. Practice which has developed to support the Governments agenda around efficiency and reduction of bureaucracy have led in places to excessive reliance on competitive tendering as the only procurement and market testing mechanism and to the development of 'super contracts' which effectively bar a large number of small providers from being able to effectively compete within the new environment. Diversity has been one of the strengths of the sector, and has enabled the development of specialised and responsive services. It is no ones interest to move towards a sector which is not constituted on diverse, innovative and responsive provider base.

### **4. Delivering effectively on the new local government landscape**

4.1 The Strategy lays out clearly the Governments intention to incorporate the SP funding within the Area Based Grant. The bulk of this report focuses on reaction to this initiative and the consequent hopes and fears about how that will progress. There has been work done within the CLG to strengthen ties with regional government, and this has included the development of Regional Resource Teams. However, there remain concerns about how effectively the sector will be represented and understood within the new local government framework.

### **5. Working towards better efficiency and less bureaucracy**

5.1 The Government did adhere to its commitment to put in place a national Supporting People Value Improvement Programme. Sitra were involved in delivering some elements of this programme and a number of useful guidelines and documents have come out of it. Contract monitoring and service review has focused on value for money throughout the sector and the use of the QAF and other tools has facilitated this. We have been given numerous examples of services being maintained against a backdrop of budget reductions, or of standards, capacity and throughput increasing without a corresponding increase in expenditure

5.2 Significant concerns remain around some of the initiatives which have in some places resulted from the drive to reduce bureaucracy. The main body of this evidence report contains continual reference to new arrangements in commissioning and issues resulting from authorities reshaping their contract management arrangements to drive down costs without adequate reference to quality.

## **Appendix 3: List of Contributors**

---

## Sitra Consultation Events: Organisations in Attendance

Stepping Stones Trust	SUP
City of Westminster	Dale & Valley Homes
Broadway	YHN Young Peoples Service
Surrey Community Development Trust	MBC-SP Service Team
Brighton & Hove Council	BBHA
NHF	Homes for Northumberland
TMWK	The Oaklea Trust
SP team West Sussex	Aquila Way
The Elfrida Society	G3
Stonewall	North Devon Homes
Cardinal Hume Centre	WDH
New Horizons (Teesside)	Magna
Tyneside Cyrenians	ARA
Dale & Vale Homes	Stonham
CCSTNA Com Housing	Bridgwater YMCA
Gallery Youth Project	Cornwall CC
Cheviot Homes	Somerset CC
Turning Point	Novas Scarman
Home Prime	The Junction Project
Norcare	Salvation Army
Wolverhampton CC	Sanctuary Housing
Chassell MBC	Arcu North
Sol Community Housing	Salvation Army
Linking People	Women's Aid
Burton YMCA	Chair SP Forum
Options	Pathway Project
Midland Heart	Sandwell MBC
Topcare	Roshni
Bromford Support	Richmond Fellowship
Adullam	Meridien

## Sitra's SP Commissioners' Survey: Commissioners that Responded

Barnsley	Middlesbrough
Bedford	North Somerset Council
Bournemouth	Nottingham City
Bradford	Poole
Bristol	Rochdale
Cambridgeshire	Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead
Coventry	Salford
Croydon	Sandwell
East Sussex	Shropshire
Greenwich	Solihull
Hampshire	South Gloucestershire
Harrow	Southend
Havering	Stockport
Isle of Wight	Sunderland
LB Barking & Dagenham	Walsall
LB Bromley	Wakefield
LB Hammersmith & Fulham	Warwickshire
Kent	West Sussex
Kent Probation	Worcestershire
Manchester	

## **Sitra Members: Organisations that Submitted Evidence**

Green Haven Support  
Guinness  
Hope Kent  
Lambeth Women's Aid  
Look Ahead  
Nehemiah  
Single Homeless Project

## **Sitra Roundtable Events: Organisations in Attendance**

28a Supported Living Ltd 4 NW	Macclesfield Accommodation Care and Concern Macintyre
A2 Dominion	MacIntyre Housing Association
A2 Housing Group	Magna Housing Association
Abbeyfield	Manchester Mental Health & Social Care Trust
Abbeyfield Taunton	Manchester Methodist Housing Association
Accent Foundation LTD	Manchester Social Services
Accent Group	Mayday Trust
Action for Blind People	Mencap
Action Housing Association	Mencap Housing and Support
Adullam Homes Housing Association	Mendip District Council
Adullam Homes Housing Association Ltd	Mendip Housing
Advance Housing	Mendip YMCA
Age Concern North Tyneside	Mental Health Matters
Alabare Christian Care Centre	Merseyside Probation Trust
Aldwyck Housing Association Ltd	Metropolitan Support Trust
Anchor House	Mid Sussex District Council
Anchor Staying Put	Middlesborough Council
Anchor Trust	Middlesbrough Borough Council
Anthony Collins Solicitors	Midland Heart
Aragon Housing Association	Midland Heart Ltd
Avalon	Muir Group Housing Association
Axiom Housing Association	Nacro
Barnabas Housing Association	NACRO Community Enterprises
Barnardos Northumberland Housing Project	National AIDS Trust
Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council	National Offender Management Service
Bath and North East Somerset Council	National Probation Service
Bay Housing Association Ltd	Neighbourhood and Social Exclusion Department GOYH
Bedford Borough Council	Network For Change Ltd
Bedfordshire County Council	New Horizons (Teeside)
Bexley Churches Housing Association Ltd	Newark & Sherwood District Council
Bexley Council	Newcastle City Council
BID Services	Nightsafe
Birmingham Institute for the Deaf	Nomades Housing Association Ltd
Birmingham YMCA	Norfolk County Council
Blaby District Council	North Derbyshire Women's Aid
Bolton Metropolitan Borough Council	North Devon Homes Ltd
Borough Council of Wellingborough	North Lincolnshire Council
Borough of Poole Supporting People Team	North Somerset Council
Bournemouth Borough Council	North Somerset Council, Housing & Social Services
Bournville Village Trust	North Tyneside Council
Brent Community Support Service (BCSS)	North Tyneside Council, Supporting People Team
Bridgewater Probation	North Yorkshire Adult & Community Services
Bridgewater YMCA	

Bridgwater Women's Aid  
 Brighter Futures HA Ltd  
 Brighton & Hove City Council  
 Brighton & Hove Jewish HA  
 Brighton and Hove City Council  
 Brighton and Hove City Council SP Team  
 Brighton YMCA  
 Bristol City Council  
 Bromford Group  
 Bromford Support  
 Broomleigh Housing Association  
 Buckinghamshire County Council  
 Bury Metropolitan Borough Council  
 Byker Bridge Housing Association Ltd  
 Calderdale Metropolitan Borough Council  
 Caldmore Area Housing Association Ltd  
 Cam Sight  
 Cambridge City Council  
 Cambridge Cyrenians  
 Cambridge Women and Homelessness Group  
 Cambridge Women's Aid  
 Cambridgeshire County Council  
 Camden Womens Aid  
 Cam-Mind  
 Care and Repair (Leicester) Ltd  
 Care Co-ops Ltd  
 Carr-Gomm  
 Carr-Gomm Society  
 Catch 22  
 Catholic Children's Rescue Society  
 CHADD Ltd  
 Chartered Institute of Housing  
 Chelmer Housing Partnership  
 Cherchefelle Housing Association  
 Cheshire County Council  
 Cheviot Housing Association Ltd  
 Choice Support  
 Christian Action (Enfield) Housing Association Ltd  
 Christian Alliance Housing  
 City of Birmingham YMCA  
 City of Bradford MDC  
 City of London Corporation  
 City of Westminster  
 City Of York Council - SP Team  
 Clara House  
 Coastline  
 Colchester Borough Council  
 Colchester Borough Homes Ltd  
 Compass  
 Cosgarne Supported Accommodation  
 Coventry City Council  
 Coventry Mind  
 Crawley Borough Council  
 Creative Support  
 Crewe YMCA  
 CRI  
 Crime Reduction Initiatives- YASS  
 Crossborders YMCA  
 North Yorkshire County Council  
 Northamptonshire County Council  
 Northamptonshire Probation Area  
 Northumberland Care Trust  
 Northumberland County Blind Association  
 Northumberland Home Improvement Agency  
 Northumberland NHS Care Trust  
 Northumberland Tyne & Wear NHS Trust  
 Norton House Ltd  
 Norwood  
 Nottingham City Council  
 Nottingham Community Housing Association  
 Nottinghamshire County Council  
 Novas  
 Novas Overtures Group  
 Novas Scarman Group  
 Oldham Metropolitan Borough Council  
 One Housing Group  
 OPTUA  
 Orbit Group Ltd  
 Orbit Housing Association  
 Orwell Housing Association  
 Outward Housing  
 Owl Housing  
 Oxfordshire County Council, SP Team  
 Park Lodge Project  
 Path  
 Pathway Project  
 Pendle Borough Council  
 Pennine Housing 2000  
 Perry Richards Management Services Ltd  
 Peter Bedford Housing Association  
 Peterborough City Council  
 Places for People Individual Support  
 Plymouth City Council  
 Portsmouth City Council  
 Potens/ Pendleton Care Ltd  
 Priority Youth Housing  
 Probation Service  
 Probation Taunton  
 Progress Housing Group  
 Prospects for People with Learning Disabilities  
 Raven Housing Trust  
 Refuge  
 Regenda Ltd  
 Rethink  
 Rethink Severe Mental Illness  
 Richmond Fellowship  
 Richmond upon Thames Churches Housing Trust  
 Riverside Homes  
 RNID  
 ROCC  
 Rochdale Boroughwide Housing  
 Rochdale MBC  
 Rochdale Metropolitan Borough Council  
 Rochdale Petrus Community  
 Rochdale Women's Refuge, PO Box 128  
 Roshni Women's Refuge

Croydon Churches Housing Association  
 Croydon Council  
 Dale and Valley Homes  
 Darlington Mind  
 Daventry District Council  
 Depaul Trust  
 Derby City Council  
 Derby Homes  
 Derbyshire County Council  
 Derbyshire Probation Service  
 Devon & Cornwall Probation Area  
 Devon County Council  
 Disability Housing Support Service  
 DISC  
 DISC - Independent Living Unit  
 DISC Ltd  
 District of Easington Care Services  
 Doncaster Alcohol Services  
 Doncaster Council, SP  
 Dorset County Council  
 Downland Housing Association  
 Dudley Metropolitan Borough Council  
 Durham Action on Single Housing Ltd  
 Durham County Council  
 East Boro Housing Trust  
 East Living (East Living Group)  
 East Midlands Housing  
 East Potential  
 East Riding of Yorkshire  
 East Riding of Yorkshire Council  
 East Sussex County Council  
 East Thames Group  
 Eastbourne Homes Ltd  
 Eat Riding of Yorkshire  
 ECHG  
 Elim Church Centre  
 Endeavour Housing Association  
 English Churches Housing Group  
 EPIC Trust  
 Erimus Housing  
 Essex County Council  
 Extra Care Charitable Trust Ltd  
 Family Housing Association (Birmingham) Ltd  
 Family Mosaic  
 Flagship Housing Group  
 Forum Housing Association  
 Foundation Housing  
 Foundation Housing Association  
 Framework Housing Association  
 Freeways  
 Futures at Knightstone  
 Gateshead Council  
 GIPSIL (Gipton Supported Independent Living)  
 Gloucester Youth Housing Association  
 GOEM  
 Government Office for the East of England  
 Government Office for the North East  
 Government Office for the South West  
 Rotherham MBC  
 Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea  
 Royal Borough of Kingston  
 Rutland County Council  
 RWR  
 Ryedale YMCA  
 Salford City Council  
 Salvation Army  
 Sanctuary Housing  
 Sanctuary Housing Association  
 Sanctuary Supported Housing  
 Sanctuary Trust  
 Sandwell Metropolitan Borough Council  
 Second Step Housing Association  
 Sedgemoor District Council  
 Selby District Council  
 Selwood Housing  
 Services for Young People  
 Shaw Healthcare  
 Sheffield City Council Housing Services  
 Shelter  
 Shoreline Housing Partnership  
 Shropshire County Council, Supporting People  
 Team  
 Sight Service Gatehead  
 Signpost Care Partnerships Ltd  
 Single Homeless Project  
 Social Services  
 Solihull Community Housing  
 Solihull Supporting People Team  
 Solo Housing (East Anglia) Ltd  
 Somerset County Council  
 South Cambridgeshire District Council  
 South Essex Homes  
 South Gloucestershire Council Housing and  
 Communit  
 South Holland District Council  
 South Somerset District Council  
 South Somerset Homes  
 South Staffordshire Council  
 South Tyneside Homes  
 South Tyneside Metropolitan Borough Council  
 South Tyneside Supporting People Team  
 South Yorkshire Housing Association  
 Southampton City Centre  
 Southend YMCA  
 Southern Focus Trust Housing  
 Ssafa Forces Help  
 St Andrew Housing Co-Operative  
 St Annes Community Services  
 St Anne's Community Services  
 St Edmunds Charity  
 St Jude's Women's Refuge  
 St Martin of Tours Housing Association Ltd  
 St Matthew Housing  
 St Monica Trust  
 St Vincents Housing Association  
 Stable Lads Welfare Trust Housing Association

Government office for the West Midlands  
 Granta Housing Society Ltd  
 Great Places Housing Group  
 Grimsby and Cleethorpes YMCA  
 Guinness Care & Support  
 Guinness Care and Support  
 Guinness Trust  
 H B Help  
 Habinteg Housing Association  
 HACT  
 Hampshire County Council  
 Hanover Housing Association  
 Harrogate and District Womens Aid  
 Hartlepool Borough Council  
 Heartland Homes  
 Henshaws Society for Blind People  
 Herefordshire Supported Housing  
 Hereward Housing  
 Hertfordshire County Council  
 Hestia Housing and Support  
 Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council  
 HLG  
 Home and Communities Agency  
 Home Group  
 Homes in Sedgemoor  
 Horsham District Council  
 Housing 21  
 Hove YMCA  
 HQN Limited  
 Hull and East Yorkshire MIND  
 Hull Churches Housing Association  
 HVHS  
 In Touch  
 In Touch - Home Improvement Agency  
 Ipswich Housing Action Group  
 Irwell Valley Housing Association  
 Isle of Wight Council  
 Julian House (Supported Housing)  
 Kent County Council  
 Keyhouse Project  
 KeyRing  
 KeyRing Living Support Network  
 KeyRing Living Support Networks  
 Kick Start London  
 Kiran Asian Women's Aid  
 Kirklees Council  
 Kirklees MC  
 Knightstone Housing Association Ltd  
 Lancashire County Council  
 Langley House Trust  
 LB Camden  
 Leeds City Council  
 Leeds Federated Housing Association  
 Leeds Federated Housing Association Ltd  
 Leicester City Council  
 Leicester City Council (Hostels Section)  
 Leicester City PCT  
 Leicester County Council  
 Stadium Housing Association  
 Staffordshire County Council  
 STAR Team  
 Stepping Stones  
 Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council  
 Stockton on Tees Borough Council, SP Team  
 Stoke on Trent City Council, Supporting People  
 Tea  
 Stoke-on-Trent City Council  
 Stonham  
 Stonham - Homegroup  
 Stonham Housing  
 Suffolk County Council  
 Sunderland City Council  
 Supporting People Nottingham City Council  
 Surrey Community Development Trust  
 Surrey Community Development Trust (SCDT)  
 Surrey County Council  
 Surrey Women's Aid  
 Survive  
 Sutton & Merton PCT  
 Swan Housing Group  
 Swindon Borough Council  
 Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council  
 Taunton Association for the Homeless  
 Taunton Deane Borough Council  
 Taunton Women's Refuge  
 Tees Valley Housing Group  
 Telford & Wrekin Council  
 Tenant Participation Advisory Service  
 Thames Reach  
 The Abbeyfield Wellington (Somerset) Society Ltd.  
 The Bond Board Ltd  
 The Brandon Trust  
 The Bridge  
 The Brigstowe Project  
 The Cambridge Housing Society Ltd  
 The Catholic Childrens Rescue Society  
 The Extracare Charitable Trust  
 The Gallery Youth Project  
 The Housing Link  
 The Oaklea Trust  
 The Papworth Trust  
 The Regard Partnership  
 The Salvation Army  
 Threshold Housing Link  
 Threshold Housing Project  
 Torbay Council  
 Trafford Metropolitan Borough Council  
 Trident Housing Association  
 Turning Point  
 Two Saints  
 Two Saints Ltd  
 Tyneside Cyrenians Limited  
 UBU  
 United Response  
 Uttlesford District Council  
 Vawk

Leicestershire County Council  
 Leicestershire Supporting People  
 Leonard Cheshire Disability  
 LHA Support Services  
 LHASS  
 Lifeways Community Care  
 Lincolnshire County Council  
 Liverpool City Council  
 Liverpool Housing Trust  
 London Borough of Barking and Dagenham  
 London Borough of Brent  
 London Borough of Bromley, Resettlement Team  
 London Borough of Enfield  
 London Borough of Greenwich  
 London Borough of Hackney  
 London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham  
 London Borough of Haringey  
 London Borough of Havering  
 London Borough of Hillingdon  
 London Borough of Hounslow  
 London Borough of Islington  
 London Borough of Lambeth  
 London Borough of Merton, Supporting People  
 Team  
 London Borough of Redbridge  
 London Borough of Southwark  
 London Borough of Waltham Forest  
 London Cyrenians Housing  
 Look Ahead  
 Look Ahead Housing and Care  
 Lorica St Patrick's  
 Vine Array - Women's Supported Housing  
 Voluntary Action Sheffield  
 Wakefield Council  
 Wakefield Metropolitan District Council  
 Wakefield Rent Deposit Scheme  
 Wall Women's Aid Leicestershire Ltd  
 Walsall Metropolitan Borough Council  
 Warrington Community Care  
 Warwickshire County Council  
 Wearside Women in Need, Sunderland  
 West Berkshire Council  
 West Devon Homes  
 West Midlands Probation  
 West Pier Project  
 West Sussex County Council SP Team  
 Westcountry Housing Association  
 Whitmore Vale Housing Association  
 Wigan Council  
 Wiltshire County Council  
 Wirral Borough Council  
 Wirral Council  
 WKHA  
 Wolverhampton Council  
 Women's Aid  
 Women's Aid National Office  
 Women's Housing Action Group  
 Worcestershire County Council  
 Working Links  
 Wrekin Housing Trust  
 YMCA Cambridgeshire & Peterborough  
 YMCA Derbyshire  
 YMCA England  
 YMCA Herrington Burn  
 York Housing Association  
 Yorkshire Housing Group