Consultation Response
Every child matters

From the Shelter policy library

September 2003

www.shelter.org.uk

Shelter

Introduction

Shelter is a national campaigning charity that every year works with over 100,000 people. Shelter has two aims: one is to prevent and alleviate homelessness by providing information, expert advice and advocacy for people with housing problems; our second aim is to campaign for lasting improvements to housing-related legislation, policy and practice. Our services include:

- A national network of over 50 housing aid centres
- Shelterline - our free, national, 24-hour housing advice service, which has recently received the Telephone Helplines Association Quality Mark
- Shelternet - our free, online, housing advice website
- The government-funded National Homelessness Advice Service, which provides specialist housing advice, training, consultancy, referral and information to other voluntary agencies, such as Citizens Advice Bureaux and members of Advice UK, which are approached by people seeking housing advice
- A number of specialist projects promoting innovative solutions to particular homelessness and housing problems. Shelter currently has four 'Homeless to Home' schemes, designed to help formerly homeless families sustain a tenancy and live successfully in the community.

Shelter welcomes the government's decision to issue a Green Paper on services for children. It offers an opportunity to address the current fragmentation of children's services and to join up responsibility for their delivery within government. It also offers an opportunity to develop policy for specific groups, such as homeless families, for whom the risks arising from a lack of joined up policy and service delivery are particularly great.

Shelter has already carried out policy and research work in areas related to those of Every Child Matters, in which we outline some of the changes we believe are needed to improve children's services.[1] In our response to Every Child Matters, therefore, we wish to draw on some of the proposals we have already made, especially with regard to strategic issues. However, in recognition of the more specific nature of the proposals in Every Child Matters, we also focus our response on specific aspects of working practice. Our response to the Green Paper focuses on the following areas:

1. What the current barriers to effective information-sharing are and what are the means of removing these
2. The current barriers to the development of multi-agency teams
3. How to integrate funding for support services to children and young people

Shelter 1

4. How to develop the Children's Trust model
5. The benefits to all those working with children sharing a common core of skills and knowledge.

Summary/overall messages

Shelter supports Every Child Matters' overall aim to improve protection of children through intervening early in problems. We agree that better integration of the work of departments and agencies is key to this approach being successful. We also welcome the Green Paper's acknowledgement that children have a broad range of needs and that these need to be addressed in a pro-active and co-ordinated way. Both Healthy Relationships and our response to the recent consultation on standards in bed and breakfast accommodation[2] show the benefits of this approach for homeless people.

We are pleased to see that government is prepared to legislate to enforce some of the proposals in the Green Paper. We believe this will ensure greater clarity and accountability in the new make up of services and that this in turn will be more likely to guarantee better outcomes for service users.

However, we also have some concerns about the scope of the proposals in Every Child Matters:

In general, we do not consider that the links between the health and educational needs of children with their housing conditions are sufficiently recognised. The detrimental effects on children's health of being homeless or in poor housing, for example are well-evidenced: children in these circumstances are more likely to suffer from infectious respiratory and gastrointestinal diseases[3] and tuberculosis;[4] there is also an increased risk of low birth weight and greater likelihood of admission to hospital.[5] In relation to education, overcrowded housing conditions make homework and reading more difficult. There is also a link with impaired language and speech skills and lower educational attainment.[6] Shelter's study of homeless families in Bristol, for example, found that, of those families forced to change their children's schooling after they became homeless, more than half said that at least one of their children had been bullied.[7]

We are concerned that whilst the Green Paper recognises homelessness as a risk factor - increasing the likelihood of negative outcomes for children - it does not propose to include housing and homelessness services within some of the new proposed structures and models of working and also does not foresee housing being involved at a strategic level. We believe that neglecting the role of housing will prevent the identification of gaps in existing services for children and hamper effective planning for future services. Shelter's research into implementation of the Homelessness Act[8] has shown the benefits of housing

working strategically with other statutory services to produce better outcomes for service users.

The models of service delivery proposed in Every Child Matters are not always sufficiently tailored to the needs of homeless and poorly housed children and young people and ensure sufficient support to them. We support the continued use of universal services, such as SureStart, where these models have proved to work successfully with families and children. However, in order to reach those most in need, they must work innovatively to target hard to reach communities and individuals.

There is a need to back up the Green Paper's proposals with a clear and robust funding framework, to ensure that new models of working are firmly established and support services are accessible to those who need them. At present, the financial implications of the proposed structural and professional changes are not fully worked out.

We would therefore like to make the following recommendations:

On information hubs:

- Policies need to be put in place to clarify data protection issues, information sources and whistle-blowing procedures - both within and between agencies.
- Becoming homeless should trigger an alert to other services using the information hub. This will help homeless families remain in contact with the support services they need.
- Government should encourage the development of other information-sharing mechanisms between departments and services, such as joint working protocols. Resources should be provided for this development.

On multi-agency working:

- There needs to be greater co-ordination of existing information on the needs of homeless families and young people, especially homelessness strategies, Supporting People and Children's Plans. This combined information should be used to inform future services for children and young people.
- Multi-agency teams should be community-based. A central part of their remit and ethos should be improving trust and building relationships between professionals and local communities.

- Multi agency teams should develop joint working policies and procedures to address the needs of 16 and 17 year olds in temporary accommodation and intentionally homeless families.
- Different models of multi-agency teams should be developed, in line with local needs, but also to deal with different client groups. Teams should have a 'core' group of workers - dealing with all cases; this should be supplemented with a broader group, who act as specialists with particular service users. To reflect the high priority of tackling homelessness, Shelter considers that a housing/homelessness worker will need to be included in all multi-agency teams.
- There needs to be clearer guidance on the roles of participating agencies and expectations on them in terms of time and financial commitments. Health Act flexibilities should be used to fund some posts; the DfES should also provide start up funding to get the teams established.

On funding:

- There needs to be further analysis of the financial implications of the proposals for local bodies delivering services, especially social services.
- Information gathered through Supporting People, homelessness strategies and Children's Plans should inform the need for support services and their future funding.
- Existing service models, such as SureStart, need to be funded to meet the needs of homeless families and other marginalised and mobile groups.

On Children's Trusts:

- Local authorities should develop their model, so that it is able to procure and deliver services to those children who are most vulnerable and need, including homeless children.
- Any general duty on local authorities to safeguard the welfare of children must be backed up with more specific responsibilities/protocols.

On common training:

- The Connexions central budget for assisting support and improvements in infrastructure for youth work agencies could be explored further in other budgets providing services to children, such as the Children' Fund.

Shelter   4

- There will need to be both core training - including housing - for all workers; more specialised training related to the role of the professional involved in working with the child or young person.
- The expertise of the voluntary sector in housing and youth work should be utilised in developing training packages.

1. What currently gets in the way of effective information sharing and how the barriers can be removed?

We are pleased to see that Every Child Matters proposes the creation of local information 'hubs' and that the Government's intention is that these will include a wide range of both statutory and voluntary sector agencies working with children. We believe that establishing a mechanism such as the information hub will improve the accuracy and comprehensiveness of data available to agencies and also help prevent children from becoming isolated/dislocated from services.

Shelter considers that information sharing between local authorities and their partner agencies is an essential basis for providing effective protection/services for children. We therefore support the government's proposal to enforce this measure through legislation.

How information hubs will help homeless people in temporary accommodation

There are currently approximately 93,000 people in temporary accommodation.[9]

Homeless people are likely to be placed in temporary accommodation in unfamiliar places and away from support networks. They therefore often become dislocated from services very quickly. At present, the support needs and vulnerability of homeless people are rarely taken into account during their assessment for temporary accommodation placements. Victoria Climbie was a good example of this - being placed in temporary accommodation without assessment of her health and other support needs.

'Notify' is an information notification system being developed by the ALG and GLA. Its primary role is to notify a selected range of services, including social services and Primary Care Trusts. Each of these services in turn will disseminate this information within their department/PCT and make contact with households and other departments and services, as appropriate. The

Shelter 5

system will enable more accurate and comprehensive information than is currently available on homelessness and temporary accommodation.

We believe that there are still structural and cultural barriers to achieving effective information sharing between departments and services. Shelter's recent research into local authorities' implementation of the Homelessness Act[10] highlights some of the problems currently experienced by councils in collecting and managing information:

a) There are variations and inconsistencies in the way in which services and departments and local authorities collect data (leading to information gaps and difficulties in planning services)

b) Local authority and local team structures can create confusions over accountability for collecting and passing on information. Responsibility for housing, education and social services also differs between unitary and 2-tier authorities; the lack of co-terminosity of local authority boundaries with other agencies can also hamper partnership working.

c) Poor working relationships between departments can produce concerns and suspicions about the sharing of personal data and a lack of understanding of the need to work together in order to tackle a complex issue such as homelessness.

To increase consistency, we consider it vital that any information-sharing model is able to capture and monitor information both within local authority departments and across local authority boundaries. 'Notify' is an important development, in that for the first time, it will be possible to identify relevant services for all statutorily homeless households living in temporary accommodation in every London borough. However, at present, there is no comparable system for local authorities outside the capital to link into.

We are glad to see that the Green Paper recognises the importance of data protection in relation to information sharing. However, we also feel that if the model is to be successful, clear procedures and additional guidance needs to be established at an early stage. These should address the type of information that will be placed on the database and the basis upon which anecdotal information would be stored and utilised. There also needs to be a whistle blowing procedure, for use by staff in both statutory and voluntary agencies. This should be used where they have concerns over the content and use of information being shared both within their own organisation and with other organisations they work with.

We support the proposal for a mechanism whereby professionals are able to utilise the database to flag up concerns they may have about individual children. However, we are concerned that this system will not be sufficient to meet the needs of homeless people. 'Notify' was developed in response to the problem of homeless families becoming dislocated from essential services and of these services being unaware of their support

needs. It is crucial that the proposed information system includes a mechanism to prevent this happening. Homelessness services must be included within the information hub and contact with them should in itself trigger an alert on the system.

Whilst information hubs are a good starting point from which to improve data collection, Shelter believes that information sharing needs to be developed through a variety of mechanisms within and between organisations. A positive impact of the homelessness review and strategy process for many of the local authorities in Shelter's survey has been the review and development of joint working arrangements. These have included review of referral arrangements, development of protocols between services and clarification of the respective roles of departments and agencies. In some cases, the process of joint working itself can produce broader benefits. The setting up of the 'Notify' system in London, for example, has helped to clarify accountabilities between participating departments and services.

We therefore believe that local authorities should be encouraged to use their participation in information hubs to develop their operational procedures.

2. What the barriers are to developing multi-agency teams further in a range of settings

Shelter welcomes Every Child Matters' proposal to create multi-disciplinary teams. This is again a model of working that we have campaigned for in the past and one that we believe has many potential benefits for users of children's services.

We welcome the Government's recognition of the value of basing multi-agency teams around the places where children spend much of their time. We feel that it is essential that services are not only based in the community, but adopt an approach that builds trust with the neighbourhoods they serve. Community based initiatives that allow local residents to have a greater say in the running of schemes, have been demonstrated to have a wide range of benefits: improving relationships between service users and professionals, improving staff morale and increasing the educational and employment attainment of service users.[11]

Identifying need for multi-agency teams

We agree with the proposal in the Green Paper that there must be a degree of discretion over the make up of multi-agency teams to reflect local conditions and circumstances. This follows the approach set out in other recent policy and legislation, such as the Homelessness Act and Supporting People. We are also pleased that the Government acknowledges that there will be a need for the model to be flexible - to utilise different types of teams/different combinations of professionals and provide/purchase services, in order to meet the needs of specific groups of service users. We believe this will provide

opportunities to work more effectively with marginalised groups/those with particular needs, such as homeless people.

Shelter's Homeless to Home projects

Homeless to Home projects work with homeless families. They provide practical and emotional support to enable families with children and pregnant women to remain in the community. Bristol's Homeless to Home team includes specialist workers for both adults and children and receives support from the local authority and the Children's Fund.

The team is able to work flexibly with families in a range of accommodation. A major strength of the service is that it is able to start work early with homeless families and thus provide them with the right kinds of help.

As well as directly providing services, Homeless to Home works in partnership with a range of other agencies, making referrals to them as necessary to ensure that all the needs of service users are met.

However, we are concerned about how information available to local authorities will be used to prioritise particular groups of children and young people in a local area. The issue of information gaps in relation to homelessness and support services has been recognised as a factor needing much improvement.[12] Shelter's Homelessness Act Implementation research found that, whilst gathering information about homelessness and existing services and agencies had been one of the most useful aspects of the review and strategy process, even on completion of their strategy documents, local authorities still identified a range of specific information gaps on the issue. These gaps included: inconsistent data collection; lack of information on Black and Minority Ethnic homelessness, repeat homelessness and the needs of non- priority need groups. A recent report into family homelessness also illustrates how, despite the fact that the needs of homeless families cut across social services, health and homelessness, there is no systematic method for collecting data that would enable it to be used as evidence of the their level of need.[13]

Shelter's research also looked at the relationship between homelessness strategies and Supporting People. Many of the target group for Supporting People are homeless or at risk of homelessness. Despite this, however, only fourteen of the twenty eight local authorities in the survey stated that local Supporting People teams had been 'fully

Shelter

engaged' with homeless strategies. This is of particular concern, as homelessness strategies from the same local authorities identified a range of additional support needs for groups not recognised in the Supporting People strategy, including young people (25), domestic violence (25), households with children (19).

We therefore consider that there needs to be a mechanism that very clearly links information gathered during homelessness strategies with Supporting People strategies and also incorporates information gathered for Children's Plans. There also need to be resources and, where necessary, training to fill these gaps to continue to inform and develop services.

Membership of multi-agency teams

Whilst we support the proposal to use multi-agency teams to integrate education, social care and health services for children, we are concerned that housing and homelessness services are not included in this list and are viewed only in the context of longer-term development of the model.

We believe that there is a need to include housing and homelessness agencies in some capacity within all multi-agency teams:

Previous research has demonstrated the lack of awareness of the level of homelessness in their district by statutory services. A report by Shelter,[14] for example illustrates this in context of Local Education Authorities. A DETR report[15] found that links between community care and housing assessment processes vary considerably and that triggers for joint assessment were likely to remain rare unless housing was more centrally involved in the process. Similarly, the generic Connexions service mainly focuses on employment, education and training. An evaluation of Connexions pilot schemes illustrated the lack of awareness of mainstream Connexions services of the needs of homeless people and use of appropriate means of delivering services.[16]

Omitting housing from multi-agency teams is also likely to have negative consequences for children: without the input of housing/homelessness services, children will not have their housing needs recognised and therefore adequately addressed. There is a good deal of evidence illustrating the poor outcomes for service users who are in this situation.[17] Housing needs were also a factor in the tragic case of Victoria Climbie. Whilst there was a lack of liaison and joint assessment between health and social services, it was failure to assess her housing needs resulted in the placement of Victoria and her guardian in temporary accommodation that was totally inappropriate for her needs.

Other recent policy initiatives have acknowledged the crucial role that housing plays in delivering integrated care to people, especially those with complex needs. More than a Roof and the Homelessness Act, for example, promote a model of joint working that includes housing, health and social services. The recent government consultation paper on improving standards in temporary accommodation also recognises the need for homeless households to receive a support package involving housing, health, education and social services.

Working Together to Safeguard Children[18] recognises the importance of housing in the welfare of children and the value of including housing services in assessments and referrals to services. Housing is viewed as important in terms of:

- Holding information of use for assessments, for example under the Children Act
- Identifying children at risk and their referral to appropriate services
- Keeping in close contact with service users through contact in their homes/temporary accommodation.

The assessment framework contained within this document is designed for use with all children in need and recognises that environmental factors, such as housing are important in the overall welfare. We suggest that this model could be incorporated into the development of new children's services.

In addition to this, Shelter believes that including housing within multi-agency teams could have beneficial impacts for children in specific circumstances:

a) 16 and 17 year olds in temporary accommodation

Despite the new Priority Need Order extending protection to this group, there is evidence that increasing numbers of 16/17 year olds being placed in bed & breakfast accommodation, often without support and without their needs being assessed by both housing (under the Homelessness Act) and social services (under the Children Act).[19] This is likely to lead to repeat homelessness.

In its previous response on standards in temporary accommodation, Shelter has argued that government should issue further guidance on the placement of 16 and 17 year olds.[20] We would like to re-state this position and additionally suggest that new Directors of Children's Services have responsibility for considering this issue further.

Shelter   10

b) Intentionally homeless families

Whilst legislation (Adoption and Children Act 2002; Homelessness Act; Children Act) covering intentionally homeless families encourages joint working and promoting the welfare of any children involved,[21] recent court judgements in the House of Lords[22] on this matter appear to have overridden this legislation. Before these judgements were made, social services authorities were able to provide assistance under s 17 of the Children Act. This typically took the form of help with a deposit or rental payments to enable a family to secure private rented accommodation. This was an important safety net for protecting the welfare of children. However, the judgements mean that social services are no longer expected to provide housing assistance to individual children and imply that it is valid action for them to take children into care pending their parents finding suitable accommodation. When this issue first arose in 2001, Shelter found strong evidence that homeless families were taking desperate measures to avoid being separated - living in poor quality private rented accommodation, or in extreme cases sleeping rough.

The focus of multi-disciplinary teams is on increasing integration and continuity of support and placing services around the needs of children. They offer an opportunity to develop more holistic models of working, especially between housing and social services authorities.

Size, scope and remit of teams

Shelter believes that multi-agency teams must be wide-ranging enough to be able to respond to a range of needs and situations, whilst not containing too many members to make it unwieldy. We believe that there needs to be a distinction made between a 'core' group of services - to be included in all teams and utilised with all cases referred to it; a broader team, containing extra 'specialist' workers, who are included for cases as necessary. To reflect the high priority of tackling homelessness, we propose that such a 'core' team should comprise: a social worker, youth and community worker, Connexions adviser and housing/homelessness worker.

Whilst the establishment of a single organisation, ie Children's Trusts, should overcome some of the previous problems lack of senior management input and 'corporate responsibility', we are concerned that the proposals are not sufficiently clear about the roles of participating agencies and the expectations there will be from them in terms of time and financial commitments. We believe that clarity in these respects is particularly important because of the potentially wide range of agencies to be involved and the fact that multi-agency teams are to be established on a voluntary basis within local authorities. In relation to homelessness, lack of clarity about the role of Primary Care Trusts in the review and strategy process produced involvement that was patchy and which led to unclear outcomes for service users.[23] We therefore consider that there needs to be guidance on this from government.

Shelter

If multi-agency teams are to be successful, it is vital that sufficient resources are provided. Health Act flexibilities could be used as one source of funding - local authorities should be encouraged to make greater use of these. In addition to this, we believe the DfES should provide start up funding to get the teams established.

3. How to encourage better integration of funding for support services for children and young people

We believe that the current funding streams of SureStart, Children's Fund, and Connexions offer a fairly clear and well co-ordinated means of funding services for children and young people. However, there remain significant problems in providing and developing services to some groups of children and young people.

Current funding gaps 1: domestic violence services

> Domestic violence is a good example of the need to better integrate funding to provide support services for children and young people. Families with children form the majority of households accepted as homeless following violent relationship breakdown. Children also form 2/3rds of the refuge population. However, services to support them lack a stable funding base and they are largely reliant on Community Fund money. Social services authorities often fail to prioritise funding to this group, despite the clear links with their own functions.

Current funding gaps 2: support for parents of teenage children

> There is currently very little in the way of support for this group of people. SureStart and the Children's Fund have helped support parents of young children, but at present there are few resources for teenagers. The situation is particularly poor for families who have children of 16 or 17. In this situation, lack of support can lead to young people leaving home - in some cases this results in the becoming homeless.[24] Family support services therefore need to increase their access and be more targeted on this group.

In addition to questions about implementation of the Homelessness Act, Shelter's HAI research also asked local authorities about Supporting People. The responses identified significant gaps in the provision of services to meet support needs. Almost all of the local authorities, for example, identified additional support needs for young people; 14 local authorities specified a need for general or specific forms of support. These included: floating support, supported interim accommodation (including for teenage parents), drug and alcohol services. 19 of the

LA s also stated that gaps existed for households with children, many of which included a need for tenancy sustainment or general family support services.

The research also highlighted 2 general issues of concern to local authorities:

- The need to increase capacity in existing service provision
- The need to plug identified gaps in services, through other means than Supporting People, such as childcare for working parents, health care, school inclusion services.

In both cases, a lack of identifiable funding streams was preventing service development.

The Homelessness Act, Supporting People and Children's Plans all promote a strategic approach, based on a response to local needs. In order to complete these plans and strategies, a significant amount of mapping that has been undertaken. We suggest that there needs to be better co-ordination of information and collation of it centrally. This information would then contain full data on the range of support services needed for homeless people and could be used to inform future Supporting People strategies and Children's Plans. We suggest that the DfES work should oversee this work.

In addition, we feel that there needs to be further analysis of the financial implications of the Green Paper's proposals for local bodies. There are resource implications in providing the effective, co-ordinated model of support services to homeless households envisaged in Every Child Matters, especially in areas of high need for services. Social services authorities struggle to meet their existing duties. [need ref] There are numerous demands on the Supporting People budget and little prospect of further money for new schemes.

We also consider that integrating funding for support services also means better use of, or adaptation of existing models, in order that they work effectively for homeless people. Current SureStart services do not always benefit homeless people because its programmes are targeted on geographical areas of deprivation. Homeless people may be placed in temporary accommodation away from these areas and therefore miss out on the services they clearly need. This Green Paper is an opportunity to address this issue. We would like to re-state our previous proposal that some of the SureStart budget is set aside for funding mobile SureStart services that are more able to reach and work with homeless and other marginalised groups.

4. How to develop the Children's Trust model - the services to be included and the risks involved in including more services

We support the proposal for the establishment of Children's Trusts, as a means of reducing current fragmentation in children's services and as a better means of meeting the needs of children, especially those who have contact with a number of services.

The current 2-tier structure of many local authorities and their differing responsibilities with relation to housing would make it difficult for housing/homelessness services to be integrated within the proposed model. It would also be very difficult to separate housing and homelessness services between households with or without children. For this reason, we are not proposing that housing departments are included. However, we believe that there are ways of developing the Children's Trust model that help to meet the needs of homeless families and young people.

Devon County Council is a Children's Trust pathfinder.

The council has many wards that are amongst the 25% most deprived in the UK. Devon does not intend to include housing within its Children's Trust. However, it is finding ways to address the needs of homeless families and young people in its district. The council has used the planning process for Children's Trust to look at some of the areas of need where its performance needs to improve in delivering services to children. From an initial starting point of wanting to support children with physical disabilities, the local authority has now broadened its aims to help children at risk of social and/or educational exclusion, including those not in school, misusing substances and homeless children.

We support the recognition in the Every Child Matters that those agencies remaining outside the Trust will still need to have a close relationship with it and that there must be mechanisms developed to ensure that joint working arrangements have the ultimate objective of improving outcomes for children. The Green Paper's proposals to place a general duty on all relevant local bodies[25] to have regard to safeguarding children to promote their welfare and work together may have some positive effect. However, as with multi-agency teams, we consider that this duty will only be effective if there is clear accountability for participating agencies. We suggest that work is carried out to define roles and responsibilities for participating agencies and that these are backed up by protocols for use when working with particular groups of service users/in particular circumstances. We believe that this work is particularly important with regard to the roles of housing and social services authorities, whose responsibilities have clear overlaps in relation to children and young people.

Shelter

5. Should all those working with children share a common core of skills and knowledge?

Shelter is generally in favour of any measures that raise the skills and knowledge of social workers and other professionals who work with children.

Again, we feel that housing knowledge and skills are a core part of working with children and young people. We therefore recommend that any training model developed should include housing. Whilst all workers will need to have some housing knowledge, there will also need to be some flexibility in the training offered, according to the role of the professional concerned. We therefore propose that there should be core training, with additional training offered in specific aspects of housing, resettlement and youth work practice, as necessary.

We also consider that voluntary sector organisations have a potentially important role to play in providing training:

> Shelter's Young Persons' Team are currently consulting Connexions services on the need for training and educational material on housing and homelessness issues. The aim is to increase the knowledge of Connexions workers on housing rights and welfare issues and to provide them with the educational materials they need. Alongside general housing knowledge, the work has highlighted the need for specialist youth work and resettlement skills - especially that promoting confidence -building and independent living skills.

> This work is likely to be repeated with residential social workers and demonstrate the need for them to develop a different set of housing-related knowledge and skills, relating to their distinct role with young people.

Shelter's work has been funded through Connexions. The Connexions budget contains money for the development of strategy and good practice in youth work. We believe that this is an important function and believe that other budgets, such as the Children's Fund should ensure that they set aside an appropriate amount of money for it.

End Notes:

1   Lewis, H (2003), Healthy Relationships, London: Shelter

2   Neuberger, J, (2003), response to government consultation document, Improving standards of accommodation for homeless households placed in temporary accommodation

3   For example, Homelessness and Ill-Health, Report of a working party of the Royal College of Physicians of London (1994)

4   London Divided: Income Inequality and poverty in the capital, GLA (2002)

5   Lissauer et al, Influence of homelessness on acute admission to hospital, Archives of Disease in Childhood, no 69

6   Power et al, No place to learn: Homelessness and education, Shelter (1996)

7   Where's Home? Children and homelessness in Bristol, Shelter (2002)

8   Credland, S (2003), Local Authority Progress and Practice, London: Shelter

9   ODPM (Sept 2003), Statutory Homelessness: England Second Quarter 2003. London:ODPM

10   Credland, S (2003), Local Authority Progress and Practice, London: Shelter

11   For example, Holman, R (2003), Kids at the Door Revisited, London: Russell House Publications

12   DTLR, (2002), More than a Roof, London:DTLR

13   Gorton, S (2003), Guide to Addressing Family Homelessness for Primary Care Trust, forthcoming

14   Power, (1995), No Place to Learn, London: Shelter

15   DETR (1997), Making Partnerships work in Community Care, London: DETR

16   Dickinson (2001), Lessons Learned from Connexions Pilots - Research report 308, London: DfEE

17   For example, Waters, M (1999?), From Pillar to Post, London: Shelter

18   Department of Health (1999), Working together to safeguard children: a guide to inter-agency working to safeguard and promote the welfare of children, London: The Stationery Office

19   'Rooms with no view'. In The Guardian, 02/07/03

20   Neuberger, J, (2003), response to government consultation document, Improving standards of accommodation for homeless households placed in temporary accommodation

21   The Children and Adoption Act (2002) clarifies social services' powers to provide assistance to families and children where local housing authorities do not have a duty to house them. S 12 of the Homelessness Act 2002 requires local housing authorities and social services to work together find solutions for families with children who are not owed a re-housing duty by the housing authority, such as those who are intentionally homeless

22   House of Lords judgements: G v LB Lambeth, W v LB Lambeth, A v LB Lambeth

23   Lewis, H (2003), Healthy Relationships, London: Shelter

24   NCH (2003), End of My Tether, London: NCH

25   Paragraphs 5.32 and 5.35

Shelter