

# **SUPPORTING PEOPLE WITH NO RECOURSE: LEARNING FROM EARLY INTERVENTIONS AND PARTNERSHIP WORKING IN EMERGENCY ACCOMMODATION**

---

**With Anna Yassin (Glassdoor), Donna Ferber  
(Dover Outreach Centre), Malcolm Dabbs  
(Enfield Council) and George Dunstall (All  
People All Places)**

**BREAKOUT SESSION**

# FLOW OF THE SESSION

---

- Anna setting the scene on No Recourse to Public Funds, the importance of accommodation in casework and in partnership working
- Donna's Case Study from Dover followed by reflections and questions
- Malcom and George's case studies from the SIAS Grant followed by reflections and questions

**DOVER  
OUTREACH  
CENTRE**

**Victory House  
Snargate Street, Dover**

**Charity Reg. No.  
1168737**



## CASE STUDY

Client details:

Male, age 37

Czech Republic

19 years in UK



- Accessed DOC since Jul 24 – ongoing
- support Czech Gypsy decent Orphanage
- Came to UK at 18 Modern Slavery Case
- Czech Embassy
- Mental Health
- Referrals: Live well Kent
- and Medway Dover
- Foodbank Counselling –
- 12 sessions

**Working in partnership to  
accommodate NRPF Clients**



**apap**

a local response  
to homelessness

## History & Context:

- Opened in 2010 as roving shelter in Haringey
- Expanded to include a second circuit in Enfield around 2015
- Traditional winter model of 'shelter' – low needs, seasonal, volunteer led
- During Covid delivered shelter; both hotel and static shelter provision
- 2021 Opened daytime provision following feedback from NS clients
- Post Covid need to reevaluate what the organisation did, for who and why – created CEO post
- New strategy puts daytime provision at front and centre of what we do – roots us in the community, provides year-round footprint, strategic focus on meeting local need and plugging identified gaps in provision.
- Appetite to continue shelter provision, but to meet local need and avoid duplication – higher needs, predominantly NRPF, year round

## Model:

- Partnership with Enfield council off-street accommodation launched winter 2022
- January 2025 took model to Haringey and launched with SIAS funding
- Both now operating as year-round, with dedicated APAP staffing capacity to support NRPF clients.
- All clients are Day Centre clients. APAP have that relationship before anyone goes into the shelter as opposed to blind referrals in
- APAP complete a client needs assessment, including initial appointment with immigration advisor – this is completed on site through an outreach relationship with the provider (RAMFEL)
- If there is a strong chance of success, with the right evidence – APAP will offer to accommodate
- Following council risk assessment client can be accommodated immediately
- Council off-street accommodation is 24/7 staffed, single occupancy service

## Model Continued....

- APAP casework the client, supporting with evidence gathering, securing ID, tax records, bank statements etc for submission
- APAP provide access to travel, food expenses and clients can access all of our day centre offer as well
- Average length of stay is around 3 to 4 months, but a successful outcome has been as short as 7 days and as long as 12 months.
- If a positive immigration outcome is achieved APAP end their housing offer following completion of a UC application
- Move-on responsibility and lead agency becomes the council, with ongoing support from APAP
- As with all clients, APAP does not close cases – they remain able to access support through the day centre as does anyone facing homelessness locally.

## **Benefits:**

- We can focus on tackling local need as it presents through the day centre and provide a year-round offer
- This means higher need clients with often multiple barriers that could not be placed in volunteer-led communal provision
- Cheaper than alternative single occupancy provision
- We can offer much longer stays – not spending energy looking for next shelter / Casework continuity
- Avoid duplication – where rough sleepers with recourse present we can quickly refer them in for council support, rather than us accommodating and trying to then handover to the council
- APAP do not have to staff or coordinate a night shelter
- Enabling both crisis intervention AND homeless prevention work
- Clients are known across both council and APAP services, no surprises
- APAP staff ‘hosted’ at accommodation
- Council outreach ‘hosted’ at day centre

# **Challenges:**

## **Funding:**

- This is more expensive than a communal/roving shelter
- Patchwork of funding
- NSTF as core / Trust & Foundation

## **EU Nationals:**

- Low hanging fruit from Brexit is gone.
- Left with much more complicated immigration and entrenched rough sleepers
- Lack of evidence / alcohol or substance dependent / poor mental health / limited work history etc

## **Non-EU Nationals:**

- Increasing number of non-EU clients seeking 'right to private life' applications through the 20-year route
- These can take significantly longer than EU settled status cases
- The potential for 12 months plus stay is increasing with these cases and it is difficult to make the case for accommodating
- Need a much stronger case before any offer can be made

## **Move-on:**

- Lack of quality supported accommodation services
- Client capacity to manage a tenancy/UC claim

## Learning:

- Working in partnership is hard, especially across sectors
- Need to build and sustain both strategic and operational buy-in – otherwise it won't work
- There are different motivations and approaches for wanting to achieve the same thing – that is fine
- Nobody has enough money to do what they would like – focus on complementing and not duplicating existing provision to ensure value for money
- Identify gaps in local provision and build that case
- Complex cases require expert input from expert agencies – no one agency can do it all – partnership and collaboration is critical
- Coordinate services around the client, not the other round.
- Recourse to public funds does mean that all the issues in a client's life are resolved and it presents new challenges – managing benefits, IT illiteracy, tenancy sustainment etc etc

# Night Shelter Outcomes

From Nov 24 - Oct 25

- . 19 guests in total across 7 (ish) beds (4 in Enfield and 3 in Haringey, but Haringey only launched in mid-January)
- . Of those 19:
  - . 19 verified RS
  - . 19 NRPF on entry
  - . 17 EU nationals / 2 non-EU nationals
  - . 10 gained settled status & 1 Leave to Remain granted – **58%**
  - . 3 evicted due to behaviour and 1 left voluntarily – no CHAIN verified return to streets
  - . 10 positive move on's (PRS or supported accommodation) – **71% (excluding the 5 still accommodated)**
  - . Of the 5 still accommodated at the end of the period – 3 working on immigration submissions and 2 have secured status (2 of the 10 above) and looking to move on options

# Case Study 1:

## AM – Enfield:

- AM first came to APAP as a rough sleeper in 2022, engaged briefly but drifted off didn't see him until late 2024 – still rough sleeping
- Entrenched rough sleeper of many years, alcohol dependant, lost all documentation
- Rough sleeping with a small group of other Romanian nationals in similar circumstances
- Had no idea what his immigration status in the UK was, but ready to engage
- Explained to AM that before we could offer him accommodation, we needed to be more confident of whether there was a likelihood of securing 'settled status'. In the meantime, he kept attending the day centre to access primary services and so that we could also maintain contact
- Established he had pre-settled status. Initial interview with RAMFEL. APAP offered accommodation in March 2025.
- We worked to gather evidence and purchase ID docs. This took until the end of August, when we submitted the application.
- He then secured settled status in the first week of November 2025
- **9 months from offer of accommodation to outcome**

# Case Study 1 Continued....:

## AM – Enfield:

- Great outcome, BUT, challenges remain....
- AM not capable of managing UC account on his own
- IT illiterate
- Low level of literacy generally
- Limited work history or ability to work
- Remains alcohol dependant and is yet to be fully willing to engage in that support
- Would be best placed in supported accommodation, but lack of appropriate provision
- Questions as to whether he will be able to sustain PRS, but needs probably not high enough to meet threshold for high support services

Securing recourse to public funds is a great step forward and obviously vital to securing housing and an income from which they are better placed to address other issues, but it also doesn't magically resolve all the other issues in a clients life....

AM remains a regular client at the day centre and continues to access support from APAP.

# Case Study 2:

## ME – Haringey:

- Iranian national – suffering from bad mental health and PTSD as a result of experiences in Iran
- Developed a Class A substance dependency in the UK
- Long standing rough sleeper
- Needed to reapply for LTR, but due to a criminal conviction linked to his drug use, there was concern it would be rejected and he may have to reapply as an Asylum Seeker.
- Due to mental health and rough sleeping, engagement could be patchy and there was a lack of engagement with medical professionals until crisis points.
- Lack of trust, presented as often volatile and unpredictable behaviour
- Moved from RS to APAP bed in April 2025 and built a strong relationship with Project Workers who supported him to attend psychiatric, medical & D&A support – alongside supporting with the immigration work
- Got on to and sustained a script once off the streets
- APAP gathered documents, paid for ID and contacted the prison he had been in to get his education certificates as well as support letters from friends and other agencies he'd engaged with over the years
- Application submitted in May 2025, status granted in July 2025
- UC up and running by September
- **6 months from accommodation offer to UC up and running**

## Case Study 2 Continued.....:

### ME – Haringey:

- Great outcome. Secured renewed LTR, relevant documents and recourse to funds
- Many ups and downs in relation to his mental health and his substance use, but the stability of the accommodation offer meant that he was better able to cope with these and had people he could ask for support from.
- Suitable move on accommodation remains a challenge