

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990

PLANNING AND COMPULSORY PURCHASE ACT 2004

SECTION 78 APPEAL

BY MR PAUL CROCKER

AFFORDABLE HOUSING REBUTTAL

review of Annie Gingell of Turley's Affordable Housing Statement

Rebuttal prepared by Jo Witherden BSc(Hons) DipTP DipUD MRTPI

on behalf of **MARNHULL PARISH COUNCIL**

March 2025

PLANNING INSPECTORATE REFERENCE: APP/D1265/W/24/3353912

LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY REFERENCE: P/OUT/2023/02644

Dorset Planning Consultant Limited

Director: Jo Witherden BSc(Hons) DipTP DipUD MRTPI

Registered in England – 10086020



Contents

1.	Introduction	1
2.	Affordable Housing Offer and Policy Compliance.....	1
3.	Supply of affordable housing for the Parish.....	2
4.	Requirement for affordable housing within the Parish	3
5.	Bids per property	5
6.	Temporary Accommodation / Homelessness	5
7.	Past Affordable Housing Delivery	7

Appendices

Appendix A1.	Land North of Crown Road – Planning Statement Extract	1
Appendix A2.	Emails from Aster Group Senior Land Manager	1
Appendix A3.	Local Housing Needs Assessment: A Guide to Good Practice	2
Appendix A4.	Email from Senior Housing Enabling & Policy Officer	3
Appendix A5.	MHCLG data.....	5

1. Introduction

- 1.1 This Rebuttal Proof of Evidence has been prepared in relation to matters raised in the Affordable Housing Statement (AHS) by Annie Gingell (BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI) of Turley, on behalf of Mr Paul Crocker, the Appellant (CD11.003).
- 1.2 It seeks to clarify some of the points in the Appellant’s proof to provide a balanced view to this Inquiry on the Affordable Housing Need across the Dorset area, and how this relates to the location of the appeal site (Marnhull). It is considered that the points raised are best addressed in writing to save Inquiry time.

2. Affordable Housing Offer and Policy Compliance

- 2.1 The development plan requirements for the affordable housing offer are that:
- 40% of the total number of dwellings should be affordable homes, of which 70% to 85% should be provided as affordable rented and/or social rented housing (Policy 8)
 - 60% of the affordable housing should be one or two bedroom properties (and 40% of market housing) (Policy 7)
- 2.2 In paragraph 2.4 (and Table 2.1) of the Appellant’s proof reference is made to an amended tenure split. This is not evident in any of the other Inquiry documents. The Proposed Site Plan - Affordability (CD1.024) does not appear to have been updated (and the same mix is included in the very latest indicative site layout dated 26.02.25 CD4.021), and there is also inconsistency with the submitted draft S106 (CD4.009) that refers to not less than 70% of the affordable homes being affordable rented, which would equal 34 (not 25) affordable homes. I provide Figure 1 below to assist with illustrating this point:

Figure 1. Tenure Split of Affordable Housing Units

Tenure	AHS CD11.003	Application form	Site Plan P22039-P1 CD1.024	Appellant SoC CD4.005	Draft S106 CD4.009	Illustrative plan CD4.021
Affordable Rented	25 (52%)	Not specified	8 (17%)	17%	> 70%	17%
Shared Ownership	11 (23%)		15 (31%)	31%	up to 30%	31%
First Homes	12 (25%)		25 (52%)	52%		52%

- 2.3 There is no reference to any social rented homes (rather than affordable rent) being provided in the Draft S106, despite a clear distinction between them in the NPPF.
- 2.4 Turning to the house sizes, the house size by tenure is not specified, but across a scheme of 120 dwellings the requirements in Policy 7 would suggest that 58 of the homes should be 1 and 2 bedroom. The latest indicative layout for Land off Butts Close suggests a mix comprising 0 x 1 bedroom and 51 x 2 bedroom homes, which is lower than the policy requirement, provides no 1 bedroom homes and such deviation is not justified by local circumstances. There is no indication / discussion whether it is intended for one of both of the 2 bedroom flats above the retail unit on Land off Church Hill to be affordable housing tenures.

3. Supply of affordable housing for the Parish

- 3.1 In paragraph 3.22 reference is made to the indicated supply of 141 affordable housing units for the Parish as set out in the Regulation 14 Neighbourhood Plan (CD6.001). The Appellant states that "It is however important to recognise that only the 'Land north of Burton Street' site has full planning permission (P/RES/2022/05524). The remaining three sites currently only have outline permission, two of which do not have live reserved matters applications. None of the sites are allocations."
- 3.2 This appears to be casting doubt on whether the remaining sites will deliver the expected level of housing. The housing sites in question are:

Figure 2. Affordable Housing Sites

Reference	Location	Permitted	Dwellings	AH dwellings
2/2018/1124/OUT	Land North of Crown Road	01/07/2022	up to 72	69
P/OUT/2021/03030	Land off Butts Close	02/03/2023	up to 39	20
P/RES/2022/05524	Land North of Burton Street	16/05/2023	61	25
P/OUT/2023/00627	Salisbury St, west of Tanzey Lane	08/05/2024	up to 67	27

- 3.3 Land north of Crown Road is being brought forward; a reserved matters application was submitted on 28 June 2024 (P/RES/2024/03588) by Ms Gingell's work colleague, Sarah Hoskin of Turley, on behalf of Hampshire Homes. The application is under officer consideration following updated plans (the latest iterations having been submitted in

March 2025). The site is intended to be delivered by Aster Group, who have met with Parish Council representatives. Whilst the proposed affordable housing required as part of the planning permission will only bind the developer to providing the 40% requirement (with 15 affordable rented and 14 shared ownership units proposed – Appendix A1 provides an extract from the submitted planning statement), the intention is that the whole site will be affordable housing, as confirmed in the email extract from Vicki Turnbull Cert CIH, the Senior Land Manager at Aster Group – see Appendix A2. A further email suggests that they anticipate a start on site should be possible this year (also provided in Appendix A2).

- 3.4 Land off Butts Close is owned by the Appellant, and under the current permission would deliver 20 affordable homes. Given the Appellant’s stated commitment to delivering affordable homes, and that this site is part of the Appeal site, there is little reason to believe that the 20 homes on this site will not be delivered.
- 3.5 Land North of Burton Street is accepted by the Appellant as delivering 25 affordable homes (as confirmed in paragraph 3.23 of the AHS).
- 3.6 Land off Salisbury Street is also owned by the Appellant. Again, given the Appellant’s stated commitment to delivering affordable homes, there is little reason to believe that this site will not be delivered.

4. Requirement for affordable housing within the Parish

- 4.1 In paragraphs 3.25 and 3.26 reference is made to Housing Register data as an indicator of affordable housing need for the Parish, as set out in the Regulation 14 Neighbourhood Plan (CD6.001). The Appellant states that “it does not account for need over the 15-year plan period. Nor does it consider the need for the range of other affordable tenures outlined in Annex 2 of the NPPF. Therefore, while a useful indicator of present need, this data does not constitute a formal assessment of affordable housing need.”
- 4.2 Firstly the Housing Register data can and most likely does include applicants that would be eligible for other affordable tenures – there is no restriction applied that would prevent households that may be eligible for affordable home ownership or other intermediate tenures from registering (providing that their income, savings and investments do not

exceed £60,000), and such applicants would most likely be within Band D. As explained in Appendix 10 of the emerging Neighbourhood Plan:

For definition of housing need bands please refer to

<https://www.dorsetcouncil.gov.uk/w/housing-register-bands>. The highest Band A has urgent / exceptional needs (such as statutory homeless) and these are graded down to the lowest Band D, where the person at the time of their application, lives in a property which is adequate for their needs in terms of size and facilities but generally has less than £60,000 and may have housing-related debts or some welfare / medical / disrepair need, requirement for older people's housing or may be a supported housing or care leaver not ready to move on, but is not currently deemed to be homeless / in overcrowded accommodation / split family / living in unsatisfactory or unsanitary conditions.

- 4.3 Whilst it is accepted that this data does not constitute a formal assessment of affordable housing need that could be provided through a local housing needs survey, the Appellant has had ample opportunity to carry out such a survey but has declined to do so. In the interim the best source of information available to this Inquiry is the Housing Register data.
- 4.4 In paragraph 4.22 the Appellant notes that the number of households on the register (for the whole of Dorset) was subject to a sharp drop in 2022, and thereafter "has steadily increased each year, highlighting a growing and persistent demand for housing support in spite of the stricter eligibility criteria." They do not refer to the available data on the number of households on the register with a local connection to Marnhull, which remained static for the period for which data was acquired (November 2023 and January 2025). Nor do they provide any evidence to substantiate the claim that the eligibility criteria were made stricter in 2022 (when the register was created as a result of merging the legacy systems of the previous Councils). An alternative explanation (put forward by Dorset Council in previous appeals and confirmed by the Senior Housing Enabling & Policy Officer as shown in Appendix A4) is that the refresh of the system would have got rid of the 'dead wood'. The potential for 'dead wood' is explained in section 2.4 of the good practice guidance on Local Housing Needs Assessments (Appendix A3). This would include people who had registered initially but were no longer eligible for a wide range of reasons, whether having been found accommodation, moved away, were in a better financial position, etc.

This 'dead wood' will begin to accumulate again unless there are systems in place that regularly check and update the status of those on the register, which may explain at least some of the increase since 2022. Dorset Council have confirmed that they do not currently ask applicants on the register to verify their situation every year, and are looking to put in place a system to address this, but exactly how or when has yet to be decided.

5. Bids per property

- 5.1 The Appellant provides data on bids per property in Table 4.2, and concludes that the average is 173 bids (which is a claim re-stated in 5.18, 7.9 and 7.14). The calculation is erroneous, as the actual mean (average) based on 3 adverts would be $(109+64+64)/3 = 79$.
- 5.2 It is also highly speculative to conclude that "For every successful letting, there are tens, sometimes hundreds, of households left without access to an affordable home, highlighting the significant gap between demand and supply." For example, this does not take into account the fact that people placing bids may already be in affordable housing (seeking alternative housing to suit their needs), as confirmed by the Senior Housing Enabling & Policy Officer (Appendix A4).

6. Temporary Accommodation / Homelessness

- 6.1 The Appellant's AHS (at 4.28-4.32) appears to suggest that the number of households in temporary accommodation is a good indicator of affordable housing need, and that this is particularly acute in Dorset. Table 4.3 provides the number of households in temporary accommodation by accommodation type, sourced from the MHCLG published data for 31 March 2024, and equated to 261 households. This data needs to be read and analysed in context - copies of the relevant tables from the MHCLG published data are included in Appendix A5.
- 6.2 Firstly the figure of 261 should be compared to the 5,406 households on the register as recorded at that time - so less than 5% - and based on the FOI request in the Appellant's Appendix, this figure was down 23% on the previous year. The length of time in temporary

accommodation is not known nor is the nature of the households or their locality (other than somewhere in Dorset).

6.3 The Appellant claims in 4.39 that these are 'high homelessness rates' but this is not the case statistically. The England average is 0.738% (0.687% for areas outside of London), the Dorset average is 0.369% (see Figure 3), so homelessness levels are comparatively low. The same applies to households threatened with homelessness.

Figure 3. Comparative Homelessness Data (MHCLG)

Table A1 - Number of households by initial assessment of homelessness circumstances and needs England, April 2023 to March 2024								
		Total initial assessments ^{1,2,6}	Assessed as owed a duty			Number of households in area ⁵ (000s)	Households assessed as threatened with homelessness per (000s)	Households assessed as homeless per (000s)
			Total owed a prevention or relief duty	Threatened with homelessness within 56 days - Prevention duty owed	Homeless - Relief duty owed ⁴			
E92000001	ENGLAND	358,370	324,990	146,430	178,560	24,209	6.05	7.38
E12000007	London	72,020	65,350	27,890	37,460	3,659	7.62	10.24
-	Rest of England	286,340	259,640	118,540	141,100	20,550	5.77	6.87
E12000009	South West	32,030	29,000	12,790	16,210	2,531	5.05	6.40
E06000059	Dorset	3,306	1,407	762	645	175	4.36	3.69

6.4 Also, the MHCLG tables show that the total households assessed as either homeless (645) or threatened with homelessness (762) to which Dorset Council owned a duty was 1,407. The majority of households falling into either category were found accommodation in permanent solutions. For example, of those that were threatened with homelessness, the majority were secured accommodation for 6+ months before being made homeless, with only 30% (232) going on to require accommodation.

6.5 As demonstrated in Appendix A4, of those threatened with homelessness, about half (543) had a history of mental health problems, 342 had a physical disability, and 162 had a learning disability, notwithstanding other factors that may have applied. This suggests that a good proportion of those in such need may have required specialist housing, or may have had specific locational requirements. About 42% of those threatened with homelessness were in work / training, and 23% looking for employment - which again would have locational implications which will not necessarily be addressed by provision being made in Marnhull as per this Appeal. This point is not made in the AHS.

- 6.6 In paragraph 4.35 the Appellant suggests that the fact that the most common reason was the end of private rented tenancies under assured shorthold agreements indicates a significant reliance on this sector. Ms Gingell appears to be suggesting that private rented tenancies are therefore a problem, but does not recognise that, of those threatened with homelessness, a significant proportion (40%) go on to find suitable housing in the private rented sector, with only 35% ending up in the social rented sector. For those that are homeless, about a third (32%) find suitable housing in the private sector rented. The good practice guidance on Local Housing Needs Assessments (Appendix A3) specifically notes that the private rented sector may provide an alternative acceptable means of housing for some groups in need.
- 6.7 Based on this fuller analysis of the data and guidance available, the Appellant's conclusions that the MHCLG data demonstrates the pressing need for an increase in rented affordable housing stock is not borne out, particularly in the context of this Appeal. The 'any affordable housing in any location' argument that is being promoted is not necessarily the right solution for many of the households in need, and particularly for the more vulnerable households as referenced in 4.36, for the reasons relating to mental health problems, physical and learning disabilities, and enabling those in employment to be close to their jobs and connections with friends / family.

7. Past Affordable Housing Delivery

- 7.1 Section 5 of the Appellant's statement (and paragraph 9.6 – 9.7 of the summary) deals with past delivery and seeks to make the case that the shortfall against the projected need in the various housing market assessments is significant. Whilst the figures are not disputed, the 'cumulative shortfall' method is not a reasonable proxy of existing need or future shortfall.
- 7.2 The projected assessments of need are intended to inform policy making, through the Local Plan, and are based on various assumptions that in many cases provide an ideal rather than a realistic figure. For example, in terms of rent, the latest Local Housing Needs Assessment (CD5.008) assumes that rents should be no higher than 30% of the household income, whilst accepting that the analysis of current letting practice and housing benefit payment thresholds is that 40% is acceptable (paragraph 7.25-28). If a more 'real world'

assumption was taken it is clear that the predicted need would be lower. The report also recognises that there is potential for some double-counting - for example (7.64) "the modelling contains a category in the projection of 'existing households falling into need'; these households already have accommodation and hence if they were to move to alternative accommodation, they would release a dwelling for use by another household". Again, the role of the private rented sector is not taken into account in the predicted need calculations - paragraph 7.69 notes "It is worth briefly thinking about how affordable need works in practice and the housing available to those unable to access market housing without Housing Benefit or Universal Credit with a housing element. In particular, the increasing role played by the Private Rented Sector (PRS) in providing housing for households who require financial support in meeting their housing needs should be recognised."

Appendix A1. Land North of Crown Road – Planning Statement Extract

Affordable Housing Proposed

- 5.3 The proposed scheme will comprise the development of 69 dwellings, and at least 40% of the units will be affordable.
- 5.4 The table below identifies the proposed affordable housing mix.

	Affordable Rent	Shared Ownership
2 Bed Bungalow	1	0
2 Bed House	4	6
3 Bed House	10	7
4 Bed House	0	1
Total	15	14

- 5.5 The scheme will therefore equate to 42% affordable housing, with a tenure split of 48% Affordable Rent and 52% Shared Ownership.
- 5.6 The submitted 'Tenure Plan' (ref. 22081-PL-2-03 rev C) identifies the location of the affordable units across the site.

Appendix A2. Emails from Aster Group Senior Land Manager

From: Vicki Turnbull <Vicki.Turnbull@aster.co.uk>
Date: 17 July 2024 at 11:17:18 BST
To: Jules <jules.cormack@marnhull-pc.org.uk>
Subject: Marnhull

Hello Jules

Thank you for call today.

The PROW officer is Graham Stantley (not George!) attached is plan for the RPOW whilst the site is secured prior to commencement of development.

The affordable plan for 40% (I believe) of homes is a policy compliant to the s106 and the requirement to deliver affordable homes on the site under planning policy. Aster will be delivering the remaining market sales homes as affordable but just not bound by the s106. We do not bind the whole site and all the units in the s106 as it affects our ability to apply grant funding and restricts the land value so in turn affects our charging ability.

We have not delivered an open market sale homes now for quite some time due to market conditions and we are likely to deliver the additional homes as mostly shared ownership with some extra affordable rent although the mix may change depending on our delivery to Homes England across the region. What ever the split is we will be providing a whole site for affordable housing here at Marnhull.

Kind regards

Vicki Turnbull Cert CIH
Senior Land Manager

From: Vicki Turnbull <Vicki.Turnbull@aster.co.uk>
Date: 14 January 2025 at 10:26:02 GMT
To: jules.cormack@marnhull-pc.org.uk
Subject: Marnhull

Hello Jules

Happy New Year

Just wanted to update you Marnhull.

We have submitted some more information on the drainage strategy this week, I think we are nearly there with everything the council require.

I will inform you of a potential start on site date as soon as I have it, I would imagine it will be summertime, although the access works should commence earlier, more like spring.

Kind regards

Vicki

Vicki Turnbull
Senior Land Manager

Appendix A3. Local Housing Needs Assessment: A Guide to Good Practice

prepared by: Glen Bramley and Hal Pawson with John Parker on behalf of: The Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions, February 2000

Section 2.4 - Major Sources

2.17. For many of the elements of this calculation there may be *more than one potential source of information*. This may be valuable for cross-checking estimates (sometimes called 'triangulation'), but there are likely to be some differences. Judgement should be used to assess which sources may be more reliable, or to correct for known omissions or definitional differences. Having done this, it may be appropriate to average estimates from different, equally valid sources (see Appendix 8 for examples). In general, great care should be taken, when referring to multiple sources of information, *to eliminate or discount for double-counting of the same people*.

Housing Registers (Waiting Lists)

2.18. Housing Registers or Waiting Lists have traditionally been the main immediate and ongoing source of information of need and demand for social housing. Where recent housing needs surveys are not available, they are still a key source. Where housing needs surveys are available, they are likely to be most useful for monitoring and

updating demand estimates over time between surveys. Good practice in the administration and use of information from housing registers is discussed more fully in Chapter 6. However, some of the key points are summarised here:

- where RSLs play an important role, Common Housing Registers (CHRs) would ideally provide a consistent, consolidated picture of needs registered with all providers; where CHRs do not exist, some allowance must be made for people registered on different providers' lists, but making allowance to eliminate double-counting.
- for monitoring new need, it is essential to monitor the number of new applications and the number of existing applicants whose application is deleted or suspended on re-registration; the key number here is 'net applications' (i.e. new applications less deletions); this may be calculated indirectly as the change in the active list less cases rehoused or nominated (see Chapter 6, section 6.2)
- as noted above, housing registers should generally include all homeless households, so that this group are included but not double-counted
- housing registers should preferably be open to all, but even then it is likely that not all need, and possibly only a minority of need, will be registered; estimates based only on housing registers are likely to be an underestimate for this reason, but this may be offset by the inclusion of 'deadwood' and 'insurance' registrations; Housing Needs surveys are valuable for assessing the extent of unregistered need

1.37. At the same time, local authorities must pay more attention to what is happening in the private housing sector. Problems may be arising because of the very broad spectrum of people and dwellings in the sector, the ageing of the stock, fluctuations in the market, or for other reasons. The revival since 1989 of the private rented sector, which may with provide an alternative acceptable means of housing some groups in need, adds a complicating factor into the assessment. The availability of this option depends to some extent upon the operation of the Housing Benefit (HB) system, itself subject to review in the context of the Green Paper on Housing and reviews of the Social Security system.

Appendix A4. Email from Senior Housing Enabling & Policy Officer

From: Chris McDermott <chris.mcdermott@dorsetcouncil.gov.uk>
Sent: 19 March 2025 11:49
To: Jo Witherden - DPC <jo@dorsetplanning.co.uk>
Cc: Paul Derrien <paul.derrien@dorsetcouncil.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: Marnhull Planning Appeal - affordable housing statement

Dear Jo,

The change to the figures in 2022 was a review of the register and to have one allocations policy instead of the original 4 covering the old council areas. As you said the review also got rid of the 'dead wood'. Applicants are not asked to verify their situation every year however there is an intention to review the register, but it is not known to what extent this will be.

There is a meeting on Friday 21/03/25 to discuss what the options are and how we will proceed. We will know more of the meeting outcome next week.

Applicants can only bid on properties if they are on the housing register. If applicants wish to move from their current affordable housing, they have to be on the housing register to bid.

As per the Dorset Council Housing Allocations Policy 2021 to 2026 (revised August 2024)

Eligibility

Eligible applicants are defined by immigration legislation and include the following (see appendix 1 for a full list):

- British and Irish citizens habitually resident in the UK
- applicants who have Settled Status, Pre-settled Status or who arrived in the UK before 31.12.2020 and are in the process of applying for settled status or their qualifying family members under the European Union (Withdrawal Agreement) 2020
- people from outside the European Union with indefinite leave to remain, refugee status or humanitarian protection
- applicants who are not classified as ineligible under S160Z(A) Housing Act 1996 (as amended by the Localism Act 2011)
- people arriving in the UK under the Ukrainian Family Scheme or Homes for Ukraine Scheme

Dorset Council local connection criteria

13.1 Dorset Council local connection criteria are:

- residency in the area
- 2 years or 3 years out of the last 5 years
- close family continuous residency in the area (parents, siblings, non-dependant children)
- 5 years evidenced
- paid employment in the Dorset Council area
- 16 hours per week average for minimum period of 1 year (including zero hours contracts)
- offer of permanent employment to social tenant in the Dorset Council area
- 16 hours per week average for period no less than 1 year (including zero hours contracts) and where it is unreasonable to travel from current social housing property
- location requirements
- any requirements detailed in a Section 106 Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and or a local lettings plan

13.2 A local connection is not established if residency is a consequence of being detained under the authority of an Act of Parliament or by being placed in the area to receive treatment or rehabilitation of any kind for any kind of dependency.

13.3 Applicants accessing the register via local connection, location requirements relating to S106 Town and Country Planning Act 1990 are limited to bidding on properties within that development only.

I have provided a link to the Dorset Council Housing Allocations Policy 2021 to 2026 in case you need Appendix 1 [Dorset Council Housing Allocations Policy 2021 to 2026. Revised August 2024 - Dorset Council](#)

Please call if you need any further discussion but I am not available Thursday or Friday this week.

Kind regards
Chris

Chris McDermott
Senior Housing Enabling & Policy Officer
Housing
Dorset Council



Appendix A5. MHCLG data

Initial assessments of statutory homelessness duties owed England, April 2023 to March 2024

Select local authority by clicking on the box below and using the drop-down button below:

Dorset

Number and % of households			Number and % of households		
Total number of households assessed ^{1,2}	3,306		Total households with support need(s) owed a duty	1,014	72.1%
Total households assessed as owed a duty	1,407	42.6%	Total number of support needs for those owed a duty ⁵	2,477	
Households assessed and duty owed:			Support needs of households owed a prevention or relief duty⁷:		
Threatened with homelessness - Prevention duty owed	762	23.0%	History of mental health problems	543	38.6%
<i>Of which:</i> due to service of valid Section 21 Notice	257	7.8%	Physical ill health and disability	342	24.3%
Homeless - Relief duty owed	645	19.5%	At risk of / has experienced domestic abuse	174	12.4%
Not threatened with homelessness within 56 days - no duty owed	136	4.1%	Offending history	130	9.2%
Withdrew application before assessment - no duty owed	1,755	53.1%	History of repeat homelessness	111	7.9%
Not eligible / no longer eligible - no duty owed	8	0.2%	Drug dependency needs	94	6.7%
			History of rough sleeping	102	7.2%
			Alcohol dependency needs	94	6.7%
Reason for loss of last settled home for households owed a prevention duty:			Learning disability	162	11.5%
Family or friends no longer willing or able to accommodate	202	26.5%	Young person aged 18-25 years requiring support to manage independently	66	4.7%
End of private rented tenancy - assured shorthold	282	37.0%	Access to education, employment or training	183	13.0%
Domestic abuse	62	8.1%	At risk of / has experienced abuse (non-domestic abuse)	42	3.0%
Non-violent relationship breakdown with partner	28	3.7%	At risk of / has experienced sexual abuse / exploitation	39	2.8%
End of social rented tenancy	54	7.1%	Old age	66	4.7%
Eviction from supported housing	19	2.5%	Care leaver aged 18-20 years	28	2.0%
End of private rented tenancy - not assured shorthold	37	4.9%	Care leaver aged 21-24 years	15	1.1%
Other violence or harassment	6	0.8%	Care leaver aged 25+ years	16	1.1%
Left institution with no accommodation available	10	1.3%	Care leaver aged 21+ years (retired option)	1	0.1%
Required to leave accommodation provided by Home Office as asylum support	0	0.0%	Young person aged 16-17 years	19	1.4%
Home no longer suitable - disability / ill health	14	1.8%	Young parent requiring support to manage independently	27	1.9%
Other reasons / not known ⁶	48	6.3%	Former asylum seeker	4	0.3%
			Served in HM Forces	23	1.6%
Reason for loss of last settled home for households owed a relief duty:			Victim of modern slavery	2	0.1%
Family or friends no longer willing or able to accommodate	192	29.8%	Difficulties budgeting	194	13.8%
End of private rented tenancy - assured shorthold	73	11.3%			
Domestic abuse	118	18.3%	Age of main applicants owed a prevention or relief duty⁷:		
Non-violent relationship breakdown with partner	79	12.2%	16-17	17	1.2%
End of social rented tenancy	12	1.9%	18-24	269	19.1%
Eviction from supported housing	21	3.3%	25-34	331	23.5%
End of private rented tenancy - not assured shorthold	29	4.5%	35-44	315	22.4%
Other violence or harassment	15	2.3%	45-54	219	15.6%
Left institution with no accommodation available	47	7.3%	55-64	143	10.2%
Required to leave accommodation provided by Home Office as asylum support	0	0.0%	65-74	79	5.6%
Home no longer suitable - disability / ill health	17	2.6%	75+	34	2.4%
Other reasons / not known ⁶	42	6.5%	Not known ⁸	0	0.0%

Accommodation at time of application for those owed a prevention duty:			Accommodation at time of application for those owed a relief duty:		
Private rented sector	338	44.4%	Private rented sector	81	12.6%
Living with family	194	25.5%	Living with family	159	24.7%
No fixed abode ³	2	0.3%	No fixed abode ³	80	12.4%
Social rented sector	88	11.5%	Social rented sector	42	6.5%
Living with friends	55	7.2%	Living with friends	70	10.9%
Homeless on departure from institution	14	1.8%	Homeless on departure from institution	69	10.7%
Rough sleeping	1	0.1%	Rough sleeping	68	10.5%
Owner-occupier / shared ownership	6	0.8%	Owner-occupier / shared ownership	8	1.2%
Temporary accommodation	12	1.6%	Temporary accommodation	27	4.2%
National Asylum Seeker Support (NASS) accommodation	0	0.0%	National Asylum Seeker Support (NASS) accommodation	0	0.0%
Refuge	6	0.8%	Refuge	10	1.6%
Other / not known ⁴	46	6.0%	Other / not known ⁴	31	4.8%
Household type of households owed a prevention duty ⁷ :			Household type of households owed a relief duty ⁷ :		
Households with children (Families)	339	44.5%	Households with children (Families)	179	23.5%
Households without children (Single Households)	423	55.5%	Households without children (Single Households)	466	61.2%
Single parent with dependent children - Male	1	0.1%	Single parent with dependent children - Male	1	0.2%
- Female	3	0.4%	- Female	3	0.5%
- Other / gender not known	205	26.9%	- Other / gender not known	132	20.5%
Single adult - Male	1	0.1%	Single adult - Male	5	0.8%
- Female	6	0.8%	- Female	3	0.5%
- Other / gender not known	340	44.6%	- Other / gender not known	404	62.6%
Couple with dependent children	112	14.7%	Couple with dependent children	38	5.9%
Couple / two adults without dependent children	56	7.3%	Couple / two adults without dependent children	51	7.9%
Three or more adults with dependent children	18	2.4%	Three or more adults with dependent children	5	0.8%
Three or more adults without dependent children	20	2.6%	Three or more adults without dependent children	3	0.5%
Not known ⁸	0	0.0%	Not known ⁸	0	0.0%
Households assessed as a result of a referral, including under the Duty to Refer			Employment status of main applicants owed a duty ⁷ :		
Total households assessed as a result of a referral	305	100.0%	Registered unemployed	282	20.0%
Total households referred under the Duty to Refer	214	70.2%	Not working due to long-term illness / disability	283	20.1%
Adult Secure Estate (prison)	3	1.0%	Full-time work	212	15.1%
Youth Secure Estate	0	0.0%	Part-time work	185	13.1%
National Probation Service	96	31.5%	Not seeking work / at home	60	4.3%
Community Rehabilitation Company	0	0.0%	Not registered unemployed but seeking work	41	2.9%
Hospital A&E, Urgent Treatment Centres or in-patient care	28	9.2%	Retired	78	5.5%
Mental Health in-patient care	15	4.9%	Student / training	16	1.1%
Jobcentre Plus	9	3.0%	Registered employed off work	53	3.8%
Adult Social Services	23	7.5%	Working irregular hours	59	4.2%
Children's Social Services	38	12.5%	Other	19	1.4%
Children's Early Help Services/Children's centres	2	0.7%	Not known ⁸	119	8.5%
Nil Recourse Team	0	0.0%			
Secretary of State for defence in relation to members of the armed forces	0	0.0%			
Not Known	0	0.0%			
Households referred by an agency (not subject to the Duty to Refer)	82	26.9%			
Households referred by another local authority	9	3.0%			
Ethnicity of main applicants owed a prevention or relief duty ⁷ :			Sexual identification of main applicants owed a duty ⁷ :		
White	981	69.7%	Heterosexual	832	59.1%
Black / African / Caribbean / Black British	5	0.4%	Homosexual (Gay/Lesbian)	20	1.4%
Asian / Asian British	4	0.3%	Bisexual	30	2.1%
Mixed / Multiple ethnic groups	17	1.2%	Other	4	0.3%
Other ethnic groups	2	0.1%	Prefer not to say	521	37.0%
Not known ⁸	398	28.3%	Not known ⁸	0	0.0%

Statutory homelessness prevention duty outcomes England, April 2023 to March 2024

Select local authority by clicking on the box below and using the drop-down button below:

Dorset		
	<i>Number of households</i>	
Total number of households where prevention duty ended^{1,2}	768	
Reason for households' prevention duty ending:		
Secured accommodation for 6+ months	445	57.9%
Homeless (including intentionally homeless)	232	30.2%
Contact lost	44	5.7%
56 days elapsed and no further action	19	2.5%
Withdrew application / applicant deceased	23	3.0%
No longer eligible	3	0.4%
Refused suitable accommodation offer	1	0.1%
Refused to cooperate	1	0.1%
Not known ⁶	0	0.0%
Existing or alternative accommodation secured at duty end:		
Moved to alternative accommodation	290	65.2%
Stayed in existing accommodation	155	34.8%
Type of accommodation secured for households at end of duty:		
Social rented sector	156	35.1%
Private rented sector	179	40.2%
Staying with family	53	11.9%
Staying with friends	16	3.6%
Owner-occupier	5	1.1%
Other	32	7.2%
Not known ⁶	4	0.9%
Main activity that resulted in accommodation secured for households:		
Accommodation secured by local authority or organisation delivering housing options service	102	22.9%
Helped to secure accommodation found by applicant, with financial payment	38	8.5%
Helped to secure accommodation found by applicant, without financial payment	76	17.1%
Negotiation / mediation / advocacy work to prevent eviction / repossession	41	9.2%
Negotiation / mediation work to secure return to family or friend	36	8.1%
Supported housing provided	10	2.2%
Discretionary Housing Payment to reduce shortfall	3	0.7%
Other financial payments (e.g. to reduce arrears) ³	6	1.3%
Other ⁴	70	15.7%
No activity – advice and information provided	63	14.2%
Household type of those with accommodation secured at duty end⁵:		
Households with children (Families)	198	44.5%
Households without children (Single Households)	247	55.5%
Single parent with dependent children - Male	0	0.0%
- Female	1	0.2%
- Other / gender not known	123	27.6%
Single adult - Male	0	0.0%
- Female	2	0.4%
- Other / gender not known	199	44.7%
Couple / two adults with dependent children	64	14.4%
Couple / two adults without dependent children	34	7.6%
Three or more adults with dependent children	10	2.2%
Three or more adults without dependent children	12	2.7%
Not known ⁶	0	0.0%

Statutory homelessness relief duty outcomes England, April 2023 to March 2024

Select local authority by clicking on the box below and using the drop-down button below:

Dorset

Number of households

Total number of households where relief duty ended^{1,2} 1,009

Reason for households' relief duty ending:

Secured accommodation for 6+ months	263	26.1%
56 days elapsed	628	62.2%
Contact lost	69	6.8%
Withdrew application / applicant deceased	28	2.8%
Refused final accommodation	7	0.7%
Intentionally homeless from accommodation provided	5	0.5%
Local connection referral accepted by other LA	9	0.9%
No longer eligible	0	0.0%
Notice served due to refusal to cooperate	0	0.0%
Not known	0	0.0%

Type of accommodation secured for households at end of relief duty:

Social rented sector	153	58.2%
Private rented sector	83	31.6%
Staying with family	15	5.7%
Staying with friends	3	1.1%
Owner-occupier	0	0.0%
Other	9	3.4%
Not known ³	0	0.0%

Main activity that resulted in accommodation secured for households:

Accommodation secured by local authority or organisation delivering housing options service	122	46.4%
Supported housing provided	18	6.8%
Helped to secure accommodation found by applicant, with financial payment	31	11.8%
Helped to secure accommodation found by applicant, without financial payment	26	9.9%
Other activity through which accommodation secured	35	13.3%
No activity	31	11.8%

Household type of those with accommodation secured at duty end⁵:

Households with children (Families)	72	27.4%
Households without children (Single Households)	190	72.2%
Single parent with dependent children - Male	0	0.0%
- Female	1	0.4%
- Other / gender not known	50	19.0%
Single adult - Male	4	1.5%
- Female	0	0.0%
- Other / gender not known	163	62.0%
Couple / two adults with dependent children	18	6.8%
Couple / two adults without dependent children	21	8.0%
Three or more adults with dependent children	3	1.1%
Three or more adults without dependent children	2	0.8%
Not known ³	1	0.4%