UNIVERSITY of York

This is a repository copy of Non-commissioned exempt accommodation in Bradford.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper: <u>https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/id/eprint/226008/</u>

Version: Published Version

Other:

Kennedy, Kelli orcid.org/0009-0002-2514-0985, Barnes, Amy Jane Elizabeth orcid.org/0000-0002-8122-9792, Pleace, Nicholas orcid.org/0000-0002-2133-2667 et al. (2 more authors) (2025) Non-commissioned exempt accommodation in Bradford. UNSPECIFIED.

https://doi.org/10.15124/yao-17wr-qq78

Reuse

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.





Non-commissioned exempt accommodation in Bradford

Dr Kelli Kennedy, Dr Amy Barnes, Professor Nicholas Pleace, Dr Katie Pybus and Dr Adam Formby

April 2025

Key finding: those living in single-occupancy non-commissioned exempt accommodation were better supported and with better social and housing conditions, compared to those in multi-occupancy accommodation

40-second animation of key finding:



Click image or this link to play on YouTube

Summary of all findings

1. Journeys into housing: Participants entered supported housing from a variety of avenues. Journeys were not always accounted for in tenancy decisions (*e.g. placing a person in drug recovery in shared accommodation with current users*) and in data collection. Journeys were often non-linear and between providers.

2. Housing structure: A key factor shaping a person's experience was whether they lived alone in singleoccupancy accommodation (feeling positively) or with other households in multi-occupancy accommodation (feeling negatively). Privacy, location and physical goods all contributed to or hindered people's ability to get back on their feet and transition out of the accommodation.

3. Operation of and rules within housing: Participants in multi-occupancy found strict rules around socialisation and banning visitors in rooms contributed to isolation, affecting mental health and hindering support networks.

4. Discrepancies in housing care and support provision: Reported care and support quality and quantity were inconsistent across providers, with all participants mentioning issues around transparency and/or accountability. Participants expressed baseline minimum needs of privacy, safety, digital access (wifi) and meaningful support from their provider to successfully rebuild their lives.

5. Paths to exit: Some providers encouraged participants to make their accommodation feel like home while others placed barriers. The former was valued by participants as part of their journey to successfully 'be ready' for and capable of managing their next home. Participants wanted to move on from supported housing but were (to date) unsuccessful bidding for housing (partly due to issues with local housing supply) extending their stay.

For more information about this research, contact Dr Kelli Kennedy at kelli.kennedy@york.ac.uk.

For policy recommendations in this sector, contact Professor Nicholas Pleace at nicholas.pleace@york.ac.uk This research was funded by the UK Prevention Research Partnership Collaboration (MRC) - ActEarly [reference MR/S037527/1], with support from The York Policy Engine, which receives funding from the UKRI Research England Development Fund. Content and views in this briefing are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of the UK Prevention Research Partnership/MRC or UKRI Research England. DOI:10.15124/yao-17wr-gq78