

## RECORD OF EXECUTIVE DECISION

Monday, 14 February 2011

Decision No: (CAB 10/11 5260)

DECISION-MAKER:	CABINET
PORTFOLIO AREA:	HOUSING
SUBJECT:	PROVISION OF STREET HOMELESSNESS PREVENTION
AUTHOR:	Barbara Compton

### THE DECISION

Modified recommendation:

- (i) That further urgent discussions be entered into by officers with the current provider, Southampton Voluntary Services; and
- (ii) That the decision on how to provide a service to prevent street homelessness contained in recommendations (i) to (iv) of the Cabinet report dated 14<sup>th</sup> February 2011 be delegated to the Executive Director of Neighbourhoods following consultation with the Cabinet Member for Housing.

### REASONS FOR THE DECISION

An assessment has been made as to how best to secure a service to prevent street homelessness given the uncertainty as to future funding and the need to make efficiency savings.

The recommendation to bring the service in-house to be delivered within Southampton City Council's Housing Needs Division has the following advantages:

- Service will be delivered within the wider homelessness service, as part of a larger staff group providing a similar service but to different client groups,
- Enables a close fit with the Local Authority's statutory duties, and increases Southampton City Council's ability to provide an austerity service, whilst being responsive to changes in requirements/need across the wider service
- Provides increased ability to link to city safety concerns specifically to address antisocial behaviour in and around for example car parks and city parks.
- Where only the essential service is in-sourced a saving to the council is likely to be circa £15,000. This is based on absorbing a number of the management and overhead costs within the existing structure and budget. However, if the entire Street Homelessness Prevention Team has to be included in a TUPE transfer savings to the council cannot be identified.

## **DETAILS OF ANY ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS**

1. To continue to grant fund the service using the new procedure for the administration of grants approved by Cabinet in 2010. This was rejected because provision of this critical service by means of a grant would not enable the council to specify the service we need to be delivered, and the service may be unsustainable if subject to even a small cut in grant.
2. There are also additional administration costs to Southampton City Council in carrying out a bidding process, monitoring the grant and financially scrutinising the service.
3. To commission the service; this would allow SCC to design and specify the service it can afford, based on the level of need. We would be able; through the contracting procedure, to identify the best provider, possibly at a reduced cost.

This was rejected because:

There is uncertainty as to future funding beyond 2012/13, which would mean a contract may only be available for a short term, but the tendering process would still involve administration costs to the council, as it would be subject to EU procurement procedures.

It is desirable that the service provider is independent from the agencies delivering supported housing for single homeless people in the city, as it acts as the access point for all of this accommodation. There is a lack of a developed local market for this type of service.

If delivered outside mainstream homelessness services the service is less able to adapt to changes in demand and if subject to cuts may not be viable

## **OTHER RELEVANT MATTERS CONCERNING THE DECISION**

Representation received from Jo Ash, Southampton Voluntary Services.

## **CONFLICTS OF INTEREST**

None.

## **CONFIRMED AS A TRUE RECORD**

We certify that the decision this document records was made in accordance with the Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2000 and is a true and accurate record of that decision.

Date: 14<sup>th</sup> February 2011

Decision Maker:  
The Cabinet

Proper Officer:  
Judy Cordell

---

**SCRUTINY**

Note: This decision will come in to force at the expiry of 5 working days from the date of publication subject to any review under the Council's Scrutiny "Call-In" provisions.

Call-In Period expires on 22<sup>nd</sup> February 2011

Date of Call-in *(if applicable) (this suspends implementation)*

Call-in Procedure completed *(if applicable)*

Call-in heard by *(if applicable)*

Results of Call-in *(if applicable)*