

Action Sheet point from Scrutiny Commission meeting of 24th April 2017, Items 11 & 12

Questions from Cllr Negus to Nick Hooper, Service Director and subsequent response (dated 24/4/17)

Nick,

Thanks for attending today and I'm sorry that we didn't get your items in time. I was the only member with queries/observations and since the reports were for information only I agreed with my colleagues that I would email them to you with a request that you reply to all of us.

Agenda item 11.

I was surprised to read in the introduction that benefits of living in Bristol were to be shared with everyone and yet the report is about finding ways to reduce the support offered to the homeless by £0.5 million.

Agenda item 12.

When you and I restructured this service in 2011, I was concerned then (and I think you were too) at the possible effects and so there really can be little fat left.

I would like to understand better what you mean by being 'closer to landlords'? Although I am normally a supporter of individual budgets, I have great concerns when individuals have such abnormal lives.

I would welcome further information on the social impact Bond. I'm particularly concerned about the risks of permanent failure or delayed success on cash flow of the providers.

Finally why has this appeared on an N H agenda just before the decision Cabinet meeting when the money was distributed on 1st January 2017? Is it simply that it was not considered originally as something that scrutiny needed to see? If this is the case then it would have provided a useful follow-up to a presentation we had discussed at a previous commission meeting.

Thanks,

Anthony

Cllr. Anthony Negus

Anthony – thanks for your comments, I will endeavour to deal with your queries.

- Agenda 11 – I think the point we are trying to make is that the overall thrust of the new homelessness approach, with its emphasis on a pathway that is managed by all the providers in that pathway rather than the individual themselves, is that we expect to get a better outcome (ie someone who can live and manage independently, ideally in work, with low risk of repeat homelessness, thus benefitting from Bristol's economic strength). The reduction of £500k we believe can be made without a reduction in bedspaces.*
- Agenda 12 – I agree with you that there is no fat left, nonetheless providers have indicated to us that think can continue to meet these needs within the budget 'envelope' we are offering. Over the last 4 years, on lower contract sums than was previously the case, providers have achieved better outcomes than the previous 5 years (in terms of people leaving the pathway through managed move-on and sustaining their accommodation).*
- I have searched both documents for the quote 'closer to landlords' but I cannot find it – I wonder if you could direct me to it, then I can respond.*
- With regard to the SIB the risk sits with the funder and the provider and they will only bid if they are as confident as they can be that they can deliver, and that a funder will*

provide cashflow. This is the whole point of establishing the SIB approach. The Council, using CLG £ will only pay out if the specified outcomes are achieved. If it is a reassurance to you the only two rough sleeper SIB's that there have been in London both paid out successfully.

- The reason it came to Scrutiny so close to the actual Cabinet meeting is that originally we were not clear that there was a key decision to be made, indeed only the SIB element requires a cabinet decision. Once we had determined that cabinet would need to decide on the SIB element we then had to wait a long time for terms and conditions to be provided by government.*

I hope this answers your queries – let me know about the 'closer to landlords' question and I will reply separately.

Regards.

Nick

Nick Hooper

Service Director – Housing Programmes