



Draft REVIEW OF
HOMELESSNESS AND ROUGH SLEEPING
IN THE DISTRICT OF EPPING FOREST
2021-2022

**If you would like this document
in a more accessible format,
then please contact:**

The Housing Strategy Team
Housingstrategy@eppingforest.dc.gov.uk

Telephone 01992 564 214

or at the Civic Office

323 High Street

Epping

CM16 4BZ

DRAFT

REVIEW OF HOMELESSNESS IN EPPING FOREST DISTRICT – 2021/2022

Introduction

This review of Homelessness and Rough Sleeping in the District of Epping Forest (the District) was carried out between May and December 2021 to inform the Council's Homelessness and Rough Sleeping Strategy for 2022-2027.

The Review seeks to:

- Assess the comparative levels of homelessness or risk of homelessness between 2018/19 and 2020/21
- Establish the direction of travel to anticipate likely future levels of homelessness
- Identify what is being done and by whom, and the resources available to prevent and tackle homelessness
- Form part of the evidence base for the Homelessness and Rough Sleeping Strategy 2022-2027

Summary

In 2020/21 a total of 567 households approached (or were referred to) the Council for assistance to prevent or resolve homelessness.

Of these, 186 households were provided with information and advice, 123 households received assistance to prevent or delay them from becoming homeless and 258 households who were homeless at the point of contact were provided with temporary relief (generally in temporary accommodation) and help to find somewhere to live. The Council assessed whether it owed a main housing duty to 143 households and accepted a main duty to make an offer of settled accommodation for 96 households.

The majority of approaches were made by households that had been living with family or friends who were no longer willing or able to accommodate them, or households that had been asked to leave private rented accommodation.

The pandemic had a notable impact on the profile of households seeking help from the Council. Fewer households were asked leave private rented accommodation and more households told to move out by family and friends. Homelessness due to domestic abuse and non-violent relationship breakdown also increased as did the number of households placed in temporary accommodation, although the use of Bed and Breakfast reduced to emergencies only.

Many more people were found to be sleeping rough or at risk of sleeping rough than pre-pandemic (where typically very few if any were identified on a given night), and 23 people were identified provided with accommodation and support as part of the Everyone In campaign.

The council has been particularly effective at preventing homelessness and supporting families and single people in temporary accommodation to build resilience and providing activities to improve the wider determinants of long-term health and wellbeing across all sections of the community.

Evidence base

Statistics

The evidence base for the review draws statistical information from a variety of local and national sources including periodic submissions to Department of Levelling Up Homes and Community ((DLUHC) formerly Ministry for Housing and Local Government (MHCLG)), independent data gathered by the Office of National Statistics (ONS), cross cutting multi-agency needs assessments such as the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA), statutory planning documents like the Local Plan, and routine financial and performance management information.

Wherever possible the most up to date and consistently defined data has been used to identify trends and patterns and make projections. However, allowances should be made for variations depending on the source and data definitions at the point of collection.

(e.g. the latest Local Authority Profiling information relate to 2020/21 whereas the Census data typically used for control purposes was gathered in 2011)

Consultation

The statistical evidence has been combined with qualitative information gathered through surveys, meetings, personal accounts, lived experiences and comprehensive formal and informal consultation events with partner organisations, statutory agencies, residents, and community groups. The outcome of the consultation has been published alongside this review.

Research

The qualitative and quantitative data has been supported by research of social policy publications and peer comparisons.

Analysis

The information has been analysed by a multi-skilled team of in-house professionals including officers responsible for delivering the service in conjunction with strategists and those responsible for governance and budgets. The review and associated documents have been scrutinised by the Housing Growth Lead at Essex County Council acting in the capacity of an external critical friend.

Findings of the review

Achievements and positive outcomes

The following positive outcomes have been achieved since April 2020

Accommodation solutions

- 23 people sleeping rough were accommodated as part of the Government's 'Everyone In' initiative.
- 12 people sleeping rough were granted tenancies of settled accommodation.
- 2 people sleeping rough were reunited with their families.
- A 6-bed property was purchased and converted into a House in Multiple Occupation (HMO) to provide affordable accommodation for former rough sleepers or those at risk of sleeping rough.

- A Council house was converted into a 4-bed HMO and leased to CHES (the Council's commissioned rough sleeper service) to provide supported housing pathway for rough sleepers (or those at risk) with multiple and complex needs.
- There was a 73% reduction in the use of Bed and Breakfast accommodation which is now only used in emergencies if nothing else is available.

Funding solutions

- The Essex Rough Sleeping Initiative (RSI) partnership successfully bid for RSI year 4 funding in 2021/2022.
- Additional RSI funding was secured to appoint a mental health specialist to work within the homelessness team in 2021/2022.

Practical solutions

- During the first lockdown, 200 cooked meals per week provided by 3Food4All were distributed to Norway House temporary accommodation scheme (Norway House) and three local sheltered housing schemes.
- Over 100 toilet rolls were donated to residents.
- Activity packs and craft kits were donated to children living in temporary accommodation.
- Norway House continued to receive 2-3 food donations per week of fresh fruit and vegetables, bread, dried foods and canned goods from local businesses and members of the community.
- Christmas food hampers distributed to 76 households in need.
- Upper Clacton Rugby Club provided a Christmas present for every child living in Norway House.

Inclusion solutions

- All residents at Norway House received weekly welfare calls since being introduced in March 2020.
- Fully inclusive Community Culture and Wellbeing projects, activities and courses were provided for households in temporary accommodation including:
 - Garden Project
 - Arts Projects
 - Cooking and nutrition courses
 - Enrichment after school clubs
 - Trauma awareness training for staff

The Homelessness Reduction Act and the Council's duties

The HR Act increased the duties placed on the Council and other statutory bodies primarily to intervene at an earlier stage, to prevent and relieve homelessness, in addition to the established main housing duty to provide somewhere settled to live for those who qualify.

The Council is also now obliged to provide tailored support to those without a priority need, typically single people who are homeless or at risk of homelessness, and applicants who are classed as intentionally homeless. However; those seeking assistance are required to actively co-operate with an agreed personal housing plan. There are 12 duties in total and associated measures.

Comparative data 2018/19-2020/21

The measures are designed to identify the reasons why people become homeless or are at risk of becoming homeless, the numbers and characteristics of the people who approach the Council for help, and the Council's activity in regards to preventing, relieving and securing housing where it has a duty to do so.

A cautionary note

The Government staggered the introduction of the HR Act in recognition of the burden that it would place on local housing authorities. Therefore conclusions drawn from the early data should be made with caution as the figures do not include legacy cases (applications received prior to the new duties) and may not account for retrospective adjustments (following data consolidation exercises).

Number of assessments and duties owed

Households assessed under the Homelessness Reduction Act 2017 and duty owed

Households assessed and duty owed	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21
Total number of households assessed	335	378	389

Reason for prevention or relief duty decision

Total households assessed as owed a duty	331	99%	376	99%	381	98%
Prevention duty owed - (Threatened with homelessness)	189	56%	216	57%	123	32%
Relief duty owed - (Homeless)	142	42%	160	42%	258	66%
Not threatened with homelessness within 56 days - no duty owed	4	1%	2	1%	8	2%

Overall, the number of households presenting to the Council and receiving a homelessness assessment has increased over the last three years from 335 in 2018/19 to 389 in 2020/21.

There was a reduction in the number of households threatened with homelessness and owed a 56-day homelessness prevention duty which went from 189 in 2018/19 to 123 in 2020/21. This was largely attributed to the Coronavirus Act 2020 as amended which provided protection to social and private tenants between March 2020 and October 2021 by delaying when landlords could evict tenants.

However, the number of households presenting to the council as homeless, increased from

160 in 2019/20 to 258 in 2020/21, primarily due to being asked to leave by friends or family, domestic abuse and non-violent relationship breakdown

Reason for risk of loss of last settled home – Prevention duty

Risk of loss of last settled home – Prevention duty	2018/19		2019/20		2020/21	
Family or friends no longer willing or able to accommodate	58	31%	77	36%	49	40%
End of private rented tenancy - assured shorthold	91	48%	79	37%	31	25%
Domestic abuse	7	4%	2	1%	8	7%
Non-violent relationship breakdown with partner	3	2%	13	6%	13	11%
End of social rented tenancy	3	2%	6	3%	0	-
Eviction from supported housing	3	2%	3	1%	2	2%
End of private rented tenancy - not assured shorthold	2	1%	1	0.5%	3	2%
Other violence or harassment	0	-	1	0.5%	3	2%
Left institution with no accommodation available	0	-	2	1%	0	-
Required to leave accommodation provided by Home Office as asylum support	0	-	0	-	0	-
Other reasons / not known ⁶	22	12%	32	15%	14	11%

The main reason for the loss of the last settled home for people at risk of homelessness has changed over the past three years. In 2018/19 the main reason was the end of a private rented tenancy (48%) followed by family or friends no longer willing to accommodate (31%).

By 2020/21 the trend had reversed with the main reason being friends or family no longer willing to accommodate (40%) then end of private rented tenancy (25%). The largest increase was due to non-violent relationship breakdown which rose from 2% to 4%.

Ending the prevention duty

	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21
Total households where prevention duty ended^{1,2}	151	223	108

Reason for households' prevention duty ending:	2018/19		2019/20		2020/21	
Secured accommodation for 6+ months	76	50%	95	43%	57	53%
Homeless (including intentionally homeless)	50	33%	76	34%	18	17%
Contact lost	7	5%	13	6%	9	8%
56 days elapsed and no further action	11	7%	25	11%	10	9%
Withdrew application / applicant deceased	4	3%	10	4%	13	12%
No longer eligible	1	1%	4	2%	1	1%
Refused suitable accommodation offer	1	1%	0	-	0	-
Refused to cooperate	1	1%	0	-	0	-
Not known ⁶	0	-	0	-	0	-

The Council was able to end its prevention duty in around half of all cases by successfully working with applicants for 56 days to stop them from becoming homeless (either by

negotiating to remain in their current home or finding alternative accommodation). Between 33% -34% of those receiving prevention support became homeless between 2018/19 and 2020/21. This reduced to 17% in 2020/21. This can be attributed in part to the success of the Councils interventions and the interim measures that the government introduced to prevent evictions during the peak of the pandemic.

Relief duty

Reason for loss of last settled home for households owed a relief duty:	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21
Family or friends no longer willing or able to accommodate	40 28%	52 33%	102 40%
End of private rented tenancy - assured shorthold	19 13%	15 9%	16 6%
Domestic abuse	12 8%	27 17%	51 20%
Non-violent relationship breakdown with partner	15 11%	19 12%	31 12%
End of social rented tenancy	10 7%	4 3%	5 2%
Eviction from supported housing	0 -	0 -	0 -
End of private rented tenancy - not assured shorthold	1 1%	2 1%	7 3%
Other violence or harassment	5 4%	4 3%	11 4%
Left institution with no accommodation available	4 3%	4 3%	2 1%
Required to leave accommodation provided by Home Office as asylum support	0 -	0 -	0 -
Other reasons / not known ⁶	36 25%	33 21%	33 13%

The majority of households to whom the Council owed a relief duty were already homeless when they first approached the Council. The main reason for homelessness being family or friends no longer willing to accommodate. The nom which increased between 2018/10 and 2020/21 from 28% to 40% and in real terms more than doubled from 40 households to 102 households.

The number of households becoming homeless due to domestic abuse significantly increased during the same period from 8% to 20 % and in real terms from 12 households to 51 households.

The percentage of social rented tenancies that were ended reduced from 7% to 2% during the period.

Household type of households owed a prevention duty:	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21
Single parent with dependent children - Male	2 1%	8 4%	3 2%
Single parent with dependent children - Female	67 35%	72 33%	42 34%
Single parent with dependent children - Other / gender not known	4 2%	0 -	0 -
Single adult - Male	31 16%	46 21%	28 23%
Single adult - Female	40 21%	49 23%	36 29%
Single adult - Other / gender not known	0 -	0 -	0 -

Couple with dependent children	25 13%	19 9%	9 7%
Couple / two adults without dependent children	12 6%	15 7%	3 2%
Three or more adults with dependent children	6 3%	6 3%	0 -
Three or more adults without dependent children	2 1%	1 0.5%	2 2%
Not known ⁸	0 -	0 -	0 -

Female single parents with dependent children consistently formed the largest cohort of households to whom the council owed a prevention duty, followed by single adult females and single adult males. There has been a steady increase in the percentage of single adults qualifying for assistance compared to other cohorts.

Household type owed a relief duty:	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21
Single parent with dependent children - Male	5 4%	3 2%	10 4%
Single parent with dependent children - Female	39 27%	24 15%	49 19%
Single parent with dependent children - Other / gender not known	0 -	0 -	1 0.4%
Single adult - Male	43 30%	78 49%	118 46%
Single adult - Female	33 23%	38 24%	65 25%
Single adult - Other / gender not known	1 1%	0 -	0 -
Couple with dependent children	12 8%	12 8%	4 2%
Couple / two adults without dependent children	8 6%	5 3%	9 3%
Three or more adults with dependent children	0 0%	0 -	2 1%
Three or more adults without dependent children	1 1%	0 -	0 -
Not known ⁸	0 -	0 -	0 -

Single males formed the largest cohort of households requiring a relief duty, accounting for just under half of all applicants in 2019/20 (49%) and reducing slightly in percentage terms in 2020/21 (46%) – but increasing in real terms from 78 to 118 during the period.

Support needs

Support needs of households owed a prevention or relief duty⁷:	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21
History of mental health problems	95 29%	81 22%	104 27%
Physical ill health and disability	58 18%	49 13%	67 18%
At risk of / has experienced domestic abuse	40 12%	29 8%	52 14%
Offending history	25 8%	20 5%	20 5%
History of repeat homelessness	23 7%	12 3%	16 4%
Drug dependency needs	13 4%	18 5%	16 4%
History of rough sleeping	10 3%	9 2%	18 5%
Alcohol dependency needs	10 3%	22 6%	19 5%
Learning disability	20 6%	13 3%	10 3%
Young person aged 18-25 years requiring support to manage independently	13 4%	10 3%	19 5%

Support needs of households owed a prevention or relief duty⁷:	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21
Access to education, employment or training	10 3%	4 1%	4 1%
At risk of / has experienced abuse (non-domestic abuse)	3 1%	13 3%	17 4%
At risk of / has experienced sexual abuse / exploitation	3 1%	6 2%	8 2%
Old age	4 1%	1 0.3%	6 2%
Care leaver aged 21+ years	4 1%	2 1%	3 1%
Care leaver aged 18-20 years	2 1%	4 1%	6 2%
Young person aged 16-17 years	2 1%	3 1%	6 2%
Young parent requiring support to manage independently	9 3%	5 1%	2 1%
Former asylum seeker	2 1%	3 1%	2 1%
Served in HM Forces	1 0.3%	3 1%	2 1%

More than half of applicants had one or more support needs. The most commonly reported being a history of mental health problems which remained fairly constant at between 29% - 27%, followed by physical ill health or disability of around 18% and between 12-14% at risk of or having experienced domestic abuse.

There was a notable increase in the number of people who reported being at risk of or having experienced abuse (non-domestic abuse) and a slight increase in the number of applicants reporting sexual abuse/exploitation, both of which may correlate with the increase in single homeless males and females over the same period.

The percentage of people with learning disabilities who became homeless or threatened with homelessness reduced from 6% to 3% .This may have been due to the reduction in evictions and a reluctance to exclude vulnerable people from the family home during the pandemic.

Temporary Accommodation

Homeless Households in Temporary Accommodation	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21
Norway House Council owned hostel	36	30	33
Hemnall House self-contained block with floating support	4	8	7
Council owned self- contained general needs housing	29	51	50
Brook Haven and Women's refuge	3	3	2
Nightly purchased self-contained private sector units	N/A	5	14
Zinc Arts Charity temporary accommodation	1	4	12
Other registered providers	1	3	4
Bed and Breakfast	25	11	1
Total	99	115	123

The Council has access to a range of temporary accommodation units at its disposal including council owned a general needs hostel, pods and chalets with shared facilities and on-site housing support staff at Norway House, a block of self- contained flats at Hemnall House with out-reach support, and self-contained houses and flats pepper-potted across the Council stock.

This is supplemented where necessary with women's refuge spaces nightly purchased self-contained private sector housing, nominations to Zinc Arts Charity accommodation and as a last resort emergency bed and breakfast (which has all but been phased out).

Main housing duty decisions

	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21
Number of main duty decisions made	84	146	143
Main duty decision	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21
Homeless + priority need + unintentionally homeless (accepted*)	60 71%	99 68%	96 67%
Homeless + priority need + intentionally homeless	7 8%	8 6%	7 5%
Homeless + no priority need	10 12%	36 25%	31 22%
Not homeless	7 8%	3 2%	9 6%

The number of main duty decisions that were recorded for 2018/19 presents a false low as it only included cases assessed under the HR Act, excluding legacy cases.

The number of main duty assessments and acceptances have remained stable over the last two years. In 2019/20 146 decisions were made and a main duty was accepted for 99 households or 68% and in 2020/21 143 decisions were made and 67% were accepted.

Priority need of households owed a main duty:	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21
Household includes dependent children	47 78%	58 59%	28 29%
Mental health problems	2 3%	15 15%	13 13%
Physical disability / ill health	6 10%	16 16%	20 21%
Household includes a pregnant woman	0 -	2 2%	4 4%
Domestic abuse	0 -	2 2%	4 4%
Young applicant	0 -	1 1%	7 7%
Old age	1 2%	0 -	1 1%
Homeless because of emergency	0 -	0 -	3 3%
Other	3 5%	3 3%	11 12%
Vulnerable with children	1 2%	2 2%	5 5%

The most common priority need for being owed a main housing duty remains being a household with young children. However the ratio has reduced significantly from 78% of all cases in 2018/19 to 29% in 2020/21.

Referrals from other agencies

Households assessed as a result of a referral, including under the Duty to Refer	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21
Total number of assessments following Duty to Refer		12	32

Households assessed as a result of a referral, including under the Duty to Refer	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21
Adult Secure Estate (prison)	No data*	0 -	2 4%
Youth Secure Estate	No data*	0 -	0 -
National Probation Service	No data*	2 12%	3 6%
Community Rehabilitation Company	No data*	0 -	3 6%
Hospital A&E, Urgent Treatment Centres or in-patient care	No data*	3 18%	4 8%
Mental Health in-patient care	No data*	0 -	4 8%
Jobcentre Plus	No data*	3 18%	5 10%
Adult Social Services	No data*	1 6%	2 4%
Children's Social Services	No data*	1 6%	6 12%
Nil Recourse Team	No data*	0 -	0 -
Secretary of State for defence in relation to members of the armed forces	No data*	0 -	0 -
Other / not known	No data*	2 12%	6 12%
Households referred by an agency (not subject to the Duty to Refer)	No data*	5 29%	15 29%
Households referred by another local authority	No data*	0 -	2 4%

There is no data for 2018/19 as the duty to refer was not introduced until 2019/20
There has been an increase in referrals as agencies have become familiar with the process.
Further work is required to increase the referrals that are made via this route to make every contact count.

Profile of households who have experienced homelessness

Employment status

Employment status of main applicants owed a duty⁷:	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21
Registered unemployed	73 22%	66 18%	121 32%
Not working due to long-term illness / disability	74 22%	94 25%	66 17%
Full-time work	45 14%	57 15%	38 10%
Part-time work	47 14%	57 15%	46 12%
Not seeking work / at home	54 16%	48 13%	48 13%
Not registered unemployed but seeking work	8 2%	11 3%	22 6%
Retired	6 2%	10 3%	12 3%
Student / training	5 2%	12 3%	2 1%
Other	19 6%	21 6%	19 5%
Not known ⁸	0 -	0 -	7 2%

In 2018/19 22% of accepted applicants were registered as unemployed and an equal number were not working due to long term illness or disability. By 2020/21 this had changed to 32% registered unemployed and 17% not working due to long term illness or disability.

Ethnicity

Ethnicity of main applicants owed a prevention or relief duty⁷:	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21
White	262 79%	315 84%	307 81%
Black / African / Caribbean / Black British	35 11%	34 9%	26 7%
Asian / Asian British	13 4%	4 1%	11 3%
Mixed / Multiple ethnic groups	13 4%	8 2%	13 3%
Other ethnic groups	7 2%	5 1%	6 2%
Not known ⁸	0 0%	10 3%	18 5%

The data on the above table has been reproduced and published by DLUHC from more detailed ethnicity classifications that the Council routinely gathers.

The vast majority of households described their ethnicity as white at between 79% and 84%. Black/African/Caribbean/Black British saw a marked decrease from 11% in 2018/19 to 7% in 2020/21 and the 'Not known' cohort increased from 0% to 5% over the same period.

Age

Age of main applicants owed a prevention or relief duty⁷:	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21
16-17	3 1%	7 2%	3 1%
18-24	62 19%	58 15%	86 23%
25-34	108 33%	122 32%	117 31%
35-44	69 21%	75 20%	73 19%
45-54	60 18%	65 17%	53 14%
55-64	19 6%	37 10%	37 10%
65-74	8 2%	11 3%	10 3%
75+	2 1%	1 0.3%	2 1%
Not known ⁸	0 -	0 -	0 -

The majority of households fall within the 25-34 age group over the three year period and remaining fairly constant, decreasing slightly from 33% in 2018/19 to 31% in 2020/21.

The most significant variation is in the percentage aged between 18-24 which has increased from 19% to 23% and aged between 55-64 which has increased from 6% to 10% over the same period.

Sexual identification

Sexual identification of main applicants owed a duty⁷:	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21
Heterosexual	No data*	No data*	326 86%
Homosexual (Gay/Lesbian)	No data*	No data*	5 1%
Other	No data*	No data*	8 2%

Prefer not to say	No data*	No data*	42	11%
Not known	No data*	No data*	0	0%

The sexual identification of the main applicants was not captured in this format until 2020/21 when 86% identified as heterosexual, 1% as homosexual 2% as other and 11% preferred not to say.

People sleeping rough

Compared to neighbouring London Boroughs and several of the other Local Authority Areas in Essex, there are typically very few if any people known to be sleeping rough in the District on any given night.

The data is gathered from a variety of sources. One night a year a snapshot is taken of the whole area where volunteers count the number of people they find bedded down in the open. This is combined with the numbers of people who are found to be sleeping rough by Chess the Councils commissioned outreach service or approach the service for assistance.

When the MET office forecasts the temperature dropping to zero or below (or 'feels like' zero or below) the Council triggers the Severe Weather Emergency Protocol and offers immediate temporary accommodation to everyone sleeping rough until the temperature rises above zero once more.

Emergency Covid Accommodation (1 ST wave)	Temporary Accommodation (s188/s193)	Temporarily staying with friends	NSAP, Project Protect etc.	Move-on Accommodation
	2	4	0	20

Gypsies, travellers and boat moorings

Homelessness

Year	Amount	Outcomes
2018/2019	1	Homelessness prevented
2019/2020	0	N/A
2020/2021	1	Case closed - no contact

In 2018/19 one household that approached the Councils Housing Needs service for help with homelessness prevention identified as a member of the Gypsy and Traveller community and another household presented in 2020/21.

Domestic Abuse

Year	Amount	Outcomes
2018/2019	0	N/A
2019/2020	0	N/A
2020/2021	1	Lost contact

One household from the Gypsy and Traveller community approached the Councils Housing Needs service fleeing domestic abuse in 2020/21

Source - Management Information

Factors affecting future levels of homelessness in the District

Top 10 most deprived neighbourhoods in Epping Forest

The table below lists the 10 most deprived neighbourhoods in EFDC in 2019 and the wards where they are located.

	LSOA Name	Ward Name	Rank	Decile
10 Most Deprived Areas	Epping Forest 013A	Loughton Alderton	5,221	2
	Epping Forest 007E	Waltham Abbey Paternoster	6,610	3
	Epping Forest 009A	Waltham Abbey High Beach	8,666	3
	Epping Forest 003C	Passingford	9,468	3
	Epping Forest 007A	Waltham Abbey North East	9,594	3
	Epping Forest 017A	Grange Hill	9,597	3
	Epping Forest 011C	Loughton Broadway	10,408	4
	Epping Forest 009B	Waltham Abbey North East	10,509	4
	Epping Forest 011B	Loughton Broadway	10,606	4
	Epping Forest 011A	Loughton Broadway	11,012	4

Social and economic mobility

In 2019 Loughton Alderton was ranked in the most deprived 20% of areas in England, with a population of 1647 people.

Between 2015 and 2019 Waltham Abbey Paternoster moved up from being ranked in the bottom 20% of the most deprived areas of England to the bottom 30%.

Between 2015 and 2019 a total of 48 neighbourhoods increased in their rank and 30 decreased their rank.

The neighbourhood which saw the most improvement between 2007 and 2019 was in the ward of Lower Sheering.

Population growth

The age distribution of the estimated population of 131,137 in 2018 was 0-15 (18.9%) 16-64 (61.4%) older people 65+ (19.6%).

All age categories

EFDC household population for all age categories was projected to increase to approximately 131,695 people in 2021 then by 3.9% to 136,762 people by 2033 and by 4.9% to 138,197 people by 2037.

Older people

It is estimated that by 2033 there will be an increase of circa. 22% in the 65+ household population and circa.24% increase in the 75+ household population.

By 2037 it is estimated that there will be an increase of c.29% in the projected 65+ household population and a circa.34% increase in the projected 75+ household population

Source: Assessment of need for housing and accommodation for older people in Epping Forest District to 2033 Housing LIN December 2021

Housing supply for older people

The Council has a relative undersupply of housing for older people for sale/shared ownership, compared to its comparator authorities, and to the all-England average. However, it has an oversupply of housing for older people to rent.

The Council also has a relative undersupply of housing with care compared to both its comparator authorities and to the all-England average and a substantially higher prevalence of residential care beds. Conversely it has a relative undersupply of nursing care beds compared to comparator authorities, but a higher prevalence compared to the all-England average.

Older people and disability

There are approximately 11,000 people 65+ in Epping Forest District with a long-term disability or health problem who experience limitations in terms of their day-to-day activities.

Dementia

There are approximately 1,052 people 65+ with dementia in Epping Forest District, projected to rise to 1,639 by 2033 and 1,879 by 2037.

Source: Assessment of need for housing and accommodation for older people in Epping Forest District to 2033 Housing LIN December 2021

Council housebuilding scheme

The Council is undertaking an ambitious housebuilding programme and plans to develop circa 195 homes for affordable housing between 2021/22 and 2025/26.

More than Bricks and Mortar estate regeneration schemes

Major regeneration schemes are currently underway at Limes Farm in Chigwell and Nine Fields in Waltham Abbey.

Garden Towns

Harlow and Gilston is a designated Garden Town with sites in EFDC, Harlow and East Herts. The intention is to develop around 3,900 new homes in EFDC between 2020 and 2033.

- 2,100 in Water Lane (to the south west of Harlow)
- 1,050 in Latton Priory (to the south of Harlow)
- 750 in East Harlow (the site will provide 3,350 new homes in total. The remaining 2,600 will be delivered on land within Harlow district)

For further information please contact the Housing Strategy Team
Housingstrategy@Eppingforestdc.gov.uk

Communities and Wellbeing

21 February 2022

DRAFT