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1. In April-May 2015 the Supreme Court gave judgment in three landmark homelessness cases:

2. Since that time the dust has begun to settle in the aftermath of these decisions as local housing authorities, lawyers and the courts have begun to grapple with how the principles set down by these cases should be applied in practice. The purpose of this paper is: (i) to discuss some of these recent developments and emerging themes following Hotak, Haile and Nzolameso; and (ii) provide an overview of the other key homelessness cases decided in 2016-17.

PART 1: DEVELOPMENTS FOLLOWING HOTAK, HAILE AND NZOLAMESO

Vulnerability post-Hotak

3. Nearly two years on from Hotak, Kanu and Johnson we do not yet have any further guidance from the Court of Appeal about how the relevant principles are to be applied. The case of Jesse Panayiotou v Waltham Forest LBC, which is to be heard by the Court of Appeal on 10 or 11 May 2017, should hopefully provide some additional guidance. But, in the meantime, we have a number of decisions of the High Court and the County Court, as well as permission decisions from the Court of Appeal, which give an indication of the points of dispute which are emerging:
   i. Hosseini v Westminster CC, Central London County Court, Legal Action, October 2015, p42

1 This is an updated version of a paper dated 30 November 2016, presented at the Chartered Institute of Housing homelessness conference in December 2016.
25/6/15
Successful s204 appeal. Fact that son had provided support for father in past did not mean he would do so in future, at level sufficient to ensure father would not be vulnerable. Breach of PSED as reviewing officer had not made inquiries of son.

ii. R (Barrett) v Westminster CC [2015] EWHC 2515 (Admin)
28/7/15
See PSED section below.

iii. HB v Haringey LBC, Mayors and City County Court, Legal Action, January 2016, p46
17/9/15
Successful s204 appeal. Unable to tell from review decision what attributes had been assigned to the ordinary person and where on a spectrum between noticeable and substantial, reviewing officer had placed ‘significantly’.

iv. Barrett v Westminster CC, Central London County Court, Legal Action, February 2016, p45
2/10/15
Successful s204 appeal. No consideration of applicant’s specific health problems. No consideration of what toilet and laundry facilities available in area (relevant as applicant had bowel problems). No finding on whether applicant disabled so not possible to identify what steps necessary to meet her needs and hence breach of PSED.

v. R (Omar) v Wandsworth LBC
11/11/15
Unsuccessful judicial challenge to refusal to provide s188(3) Housing Act 1996 accommodation. Fleeting reference within judgment to the approach to vulnerability post Hotak.

vi. Ryan v Westminster CC [2015] EWCA Civ 1448
17/11/15
Whether reviewing officer had properly weighed up difference in opinion between Now Medical and applicant's doctor and had erred in applying wrong comparator. Permission to appeal refused.

vii. Hemley v Croydon LBC [2015] EWCA Civ 1519
19/11/15
Arguable that judge, in quashing a review decision on vulnerability, had substituted her own view for that of the reviewing officer. Permission to appeal granted to Croydon.

viii. Mohammed v Southwark LBC, Central London County Court, Legal Action, July/August 2016, p48
18/12/15
Successful s204 appeal. In the absence of guidance from Hotak as to the meaning of the term significantly, by analogy with the use of the word ‘substantial’ in the context of the Equality Act 2010, the word meant ‘more than minor or trivial’.

ix. Taani v Hackney LBC [2016] EWCA Civ 216
25/1/16
Argument that reviewing officer had misapplied the Hotak test in using the phrase ‘fend for yourself’. Permission to appeal refused: ‘[t]o seize on that phrase as supporting an appeal is simply linguistic opportunism.’

x. Ward v Haringey LBC, Central London County Court, Legal Action, September 2016, p38
17/2/16
Successful s204 appeal. Judge found that reviewing officer had misapplied Hotak test. On the meaning of ‘significant’: ‘I am not convinced that the term merits further definition. The search for precise meaning by reference to synonyms (for example ‘serious’ or ‘substantial’) or by reference to the opposite (‘not significant’) seems a fruitless search for unachievable certainty of meaning for a word of indefinable scope and penumbra. Moreover, ‘significant’ is a word whose meaning varies with context. A search for meaning by reference to use in other contexts threatens error through analogy from inapposite and very different context. Suffice to say that I consider that the information available to the reviewer, on a fair and reasonable reading, indicates that the degree of significance of ES’s vulnerability is well within the core meaning of the word significant’.

xi. R (Abdusemed) v Lambeth LBC
19/2/16
Unsuccessful challenge to refusal to provide s188(3) accommodation. A local housing authority had not erred in refusing to provide accommodation pending review to homeless woman challenging decision as to whether she was vulnerable, notwithstanding diagnosis of moderately severe PTSD and fact she was sleeping in Mosque at night and wandering streets by day.

xii. Shaja Butt v Hackney LBC, unreported, Central London County Court
22/2/16
Successful s204 appeal. Failure to give sufficient reasons as to the meaning of the word ‘significantly’.

xiii. SS v Waltham Forest LBC, Central London County Court, Legal Action, October 2016, p41
5 September 2016
Successful s204 appeal. Reviewing officer had not lawfully applied the Hotak guidance and had failed to carry out a composite assessment.

xiv. Jesse Panayiotou v Waltham Forest LBC, CA
To be heard on 10 or 11 May 2017
Court of Appeal to consider the meaning of the word significantly.

4. From these cases, two points of general application emerge. First, there has been some ambiguity about the characteristics of the ‘ordinary person’. The answer to this may perhaps be found at [71] of Hotak: an ordinary person should be taken to be ‘robust and healthy’. But, if a reviewing officer takes a slightly different view (perhaps justified on the basis that there is scope for variation among robust and healthy people) then the cases suggest that adequate reasons must be given in order that an aggrieved applicant can establish what characteristics the ordinary person is endowed with and why, in order that they can, if necessary, challenge those reasons. See s203 Housing Act 1996 and Nzolameso v Westminster CC [2015] UKSC 22, [2015] HLR 22 at [32] per Baroness Hale on the duty to give reasons in homelessness cases: ‘[n]or, without a proper explanation, can the court know whether the authority have properly fulfilled their statutory obligations’.

5. Second – as predicted by a number of practitioners at the time the judgment in Hotak was handed down – there has been some divergence as to the meaning of the word ‘significant’, in the context of assessing whether an applicant is significantly more vulnerable than an ordinary person if made homeless. See Hotak at [53] per Lord Neuberger.

6. So what does the word ‘significant’ mean in this context? Does it simply mean a vulnerability that is ‘not insignificant’ i.e. one that is more minor or trivial? That would mirror the meaning of the word ‘substantial’ in the context of the Equality Act 2010. Or does it mean ‘very large’? Alternatively, is the significance of a particular vulnerability a qualitative judgment involving a factual evaluation best left to the good sense of housing officers, not readily susceptible to definition and of which further elucidation would be unhelpful?

7. My view, would be that the first of these three possible meaning accords best with the language of the statute and the judgment in Hotak. But whatever the answer, the divergence in approach thus far suggests that further guidance from the Court of Appeal will be welcome.
8. A third point, which does not feature in the cases above, but which I have come across in a number of review decisions post-\textit{Hotak}, is a tendency in review decisions to judge whether an applicant is vulnerable solely with reference to how he or she has been able to manage while statutorily homeless but still with a roof over his or her head, while neglecting to fully consider the impact of having to sleep on the streets. This may flow from the fact the Supreme Court carefully avoided relying on the concept of ‘street homelessness’ in \textit{Hotak}, as it is a phrase which can mean different things to different people. See [40] and [42]. However, this is certainly not to say that the impact of sleeping on the streets should be ignored. Vulnerability involves consideration of the risk of harm to the applicant if he or she is not provided with accommodation. See [37] and [93]. This may encompass a range of situations and should not exclude the effects when either ‘street homelessness’ (whatever that may mean) or when living in accommodation which is not reasonable to continue to occupy.

\textbf{The public sector equality duty post-\textit{Kanu}}

9. The public sector equality duty has fallen for consideration, post-\textit{Kanu}, in the following recent cases ranging from first instance to the Court of Appeal.

i. \textit{Hosseini v Westminster CC}, Central London County Court, \textit{Legal Action}, October 2015, p42
   25/6/15
   Successful s204 appeal. Fact that son had provided support for father in past did not mean he would do so in future, at level sufficient to ensure father would not be vulnerable. Breach of PSED as reviewing officer had not made inquiries of son.

   8/7/15
   Suitability of accommodation under Part VII Housing Act 1996. P was an Iranian refugee who had been detained and tortured leaving her with post-traumatic stress disorder. She applied to Kensington and Chelsea as homeless and, in due course, was found to be owed the main housing duty. She was subsequently made an offer of accommodation in line with s193(7) Housing Act 1996. She refused the offer on the basis that the window in the property reminded her of the cell in which she had been tortured and gave her flashbacks. Kensington and Chelsea carried out a review and found that the property was suitable and (applying the law in force prior to the amendments introduced by the Localism Act 2011) that it would have been reasonable for her to have accepted the offer. As such the main housing duty came to an end. The decision was upheld on appeal and the Court of Appeal dismissed a second appeal. The reviewing officer had been entitled to find that it would have been reasonable to accept the
offer and had paid due regard to the public sector equality duty. The Supreme Court granted permission to appeal on 29 February 2016.

iii. *R (Barrett) v Westminster CC* [2015] EWHC 2515 (Admin)
28/7/15
Successful challenge to refusal to provide accommodation pending review. B was a 58 year old woman with various medical conditions including anorexia, obsessive compulsive disorder, severe irritable bowel syndrome (resulting in ‘sudden and violent emptying of stomach contents’), panic attacks, anxiety and foot pain. Westminster refused to exercise its discretion to provide her with accommodation pending review of a decision that she was not vulnerable and did not have a priority need for the purposes of s189(1)(c) Housing Act 1996. B sought to challenge this refusal by way of judicial review. John Bowers QC, sitting as a deputy judge of the High Court, allowed her application. Westminster had paid only ‘lip-service’ to B’s medical conditions and to the new evidence that had been submitted on her behalf, and as such had failed to carry out the ‘conscientious requirements’ of the public sector equality duty.

2/10/15
Successful s204 appeal. No consideration of applicant’s specific health problems. No consideration of what toilet and laundry facilities available in area (relevant as applicant had bowel problems). No finding on whether applicant disabled so not possible to identify what steps necessary to meet her needs and hence breach of PSED.

10/12/15
Successful s204 appeal. Intentional homelessness. Breach of PSED. Failure to make adequate inquiries into why person with mental health problems who dealt badly with stress, had left accommodation and failure to focus sharply on whether she was disabled.

xv. *Shaja Butt v Hackney LBC*, unreported, Central London County Court
22/2/16
Successful s204 appeal. Failure to spell out, in at least summary form, the conclusions reached in respect of the four matters specified in [78] of *Hotak* a breach of PSED and a failure to give sufficient reasons. N.b. it is questionable whether this decision is correct following the decision in *Haque* (below).

5 September 2016
Successful s204 appeal. Reviewing officer had failed to consider protected characteristic of sex, in context of contention that applicant was vulnerable as a result of the effects of domestic violence.


14 September 2016

Successful s204 appeal. Not clear from review decision whether reviewing officer had considered questions posed by Lord Neuberger in *Hotak*, in discharge of the public sector equality duty. Reviewing officer had also failed to consider protected characteristic of sex, in context of contention that applicant was vulnerable as a result of the after effects of sexual assault.


Ms Wilson, the Respondent, was a single mother to two young boys aged (at the time of the appeal) 11 and 14 respectively. In March 2014 Ms Wilson applied to Birmingham, the Appellant, as homeless. Birmingham proceeded to make inquiries into her application and, while doing so, placed Ms Wilson and her sons in a Hotel in Edgbaston for two months, before moving them to the 11th floor of a high rise flat. In June 2014 Birmingham found Ms Wilson to be owed the main housing duty under s193(2) Housing Act 1996. In August 2014 Birmingham made a final offer of accommodation to her, in performance of the duty, of a flat on the 8th floor of another high rise block known as Thornton House. Ms Wilson refused the offer. Her reason for doing so, she told Birmingham, was that her sons had a fear of heights and that living in high rise accommodation was adversely affecting their mental health. Birmingham rejected these reasons and informed Ms Wilson that the duty owed to her had come to an end.

This decision was upheld on review. The reviewing officer expressed the view that he had considered the public sector equality duty under s149 Housing Act 1996 but that ‘there is no information available to the City Council to suggest that any member of your household suffers from a condition which could reasonably be termed a disability’. This decision was quashed on appeal. The judge at first instance held that Birmingham had failed to make adequate inquiries into whether Ms Wilson’s elder son was disabled for the purposes of the Equality Act 2010. The Court of Appeal allowed Birmingham’s appeal. The reviewing officer had considered the correct question, following the guidance in *Pieretti v Enfield London Borough Council* [2010] EWCA Civ 1104, [2011] 2 All ER 642, namely whether there was a ‘real possibility’ that a member of the Appellant’s household was disabled. His conclusion that there was not could not be
characterised as irrational. However in reaching its decision the Court indicated that it would be desirable for clearer guidance to be given by Birmingham in its standard forms explaining in simple terms, to homeless applicants such as Ms Wilson, the effect of refusing a final offer of accommodation.

xix.  

London Borough of Hackney v Haque [2017] EWCA Civ 4
17/01/2017

The Respondent, Mr Haque, suffered from chronic muscoskeletal problems which in turn had given rise to significant psychological problems. The combination of his various health conditions meant that he was disabled for the purposes of s6 Equality Act 2010. Having been asked to leave his mother’s house, where he had been living, Mr Haque applied to the Appellant, the London Borough of Hackney, as homeless. He was provided with accommodation pursuant to the main housing duty under s193(2) Housing Act 1996, it having been recognised, among other things, that he was vulnerable and that he had a priority need. The accommodation comprised a single room on the third floor of a hostel. Mr Haque complained that the room was not suitable, within the meaning of ss206 and 210 Housing Act 1996, owing to particular aspects of his physical and mental health conditions. It was said that the cramped size of the room restricted his movement exacerbating his back, shoulder, leg and neck pain. The size of the room, together with the fact that the hostel had a ‘No Visitors’ policy meant that he was isolated, which exacerbated his depression and anxiety. In addition the hostel had no laundry. This resulted in him wearing dirty clothing, since he was physically unable to carry his clothes to the laundrette. The combined effect of these points had resulted in Mr Haque increasing the dosage of his anti-depressant medication. Medical evidence was submitted in support of these contentions. Nevertheless, the reviewing officer determined that the accommodation was suitable. In reaching his decision, the reviewing officer reasoned that the room was of ample size but was cluttered by Mr Haque’s possessions. That Mr Haque could use local parks, restaurants and eateries to meet family and friends, or see them in their own homes, and so did not need an exception to the No Visitors policy in order to avoid an adverse impact on his depression. That the nearest launderette was close enough for Mr Haque to be able to reach it carrying a moderate load. And that the council’s medical advisor (Dr Keen of Now Medical) had concluded that the evidence did not sufficiently demonstrate that the accommodation was exacerbating Mr Haque’s conditions. The review decision was quashed on appeal to the county court. HHJ Luba QC found that the reviewing officer had either failed to comply with the requirements of the public sector equality duty under s149 Equality Act 2010,
as explained in *Hotak*, or had failed to give sufficient reasons to demonstrate that he had complied. Specifically, the judge held that the effect of Lord Neuberger’s reasoning in relation to the public sector equality duty at [78] of the *Hotak* judgment, coupled with the statutory duty to give reasons contained in s203 Housing Act 1996, will in almost all circumstances oblige a reviewing officer to spell out, at least in summary form, his or her decisions on the four issues identified by Lord Neuberger in *Hotak*. The reviewing officer had failed to discharge this burden. The Court of Appeal allowed Hackney’s appeal. Care needed to be taken before treating any part of the judgment in a leading case as if it were of statutory force, with a general effect divorced from the facts of the case under review. The four-stage approach outlined by Lord Neuberger in *Hotak*, was aimed at assisting reviewing officers in deciding whether an applicant is vulnerable. On the facts of the present case the public sector equality duty required:

- A recognition that Mr Haque suffered from a physical or mental impairment having a substantial and long term adverse effect on his ability to carry out normal day to day activities; i.e. that he was disabled within the meaning of s6 Equality Act 2010, and therefore had a protected characteristic.
- A focus upon the specific aspects of his impairments, to the extent relevant to the suitability of his room as accommodation for him.
- A focus upon the consequences of his impairments, in terms of the disadvantages which he might suffer in using the room as his accommodation, by comparison with persons without those impairments: see s149(3)(a) Equality Act 2010.
- A focus upon his particular needs in relation to accommodation arising from those impairments, by comparison with the needs of persons without such impairments, and the extent to which the room met those particular needs: see s149(3)(b) and (4) Equality Act 2010.
- A recognition that Mr Haque's particular needs arising from those impairments might require him to be treated more favourably in terms of the provision of accommodation than other persons not suffering from disability or other protected characteristics. See s149(6) Equality Act 2010.
- A review of the suitability of the room as accommodation for Mr Haque which paid due regard to those matters.

On a fair and 'stand back' reading of the decision as a whole, the reviewing officer had given sufficient reasons to show that he had complied with these requirements.
10. The decision in *Poshteh* has been appealed to the Supreme Court (case ID UKSC 2015/0219). The hearing took place on 14 February 2017. Judgment is awaited. The two issues under consideration are: (i) the scope of the enquiries required of a local authorities when making decisions in homelessness cases to which s149 Equality Act 2010 applies; and (II) the standard of review to be applied by courts when reviewing decisions of the local authority in such cases. The majority in the Court of Appeal felt that the public sector equality duty did not add anything of substance to the discharge of the local authority’s duties, at least on the facts of that case. It will be interesting to see whether the Supreme Court agrees.

11. More generally, whether or not the public sector equality duty adds anything to the duties of a local housing authority in discharging its functions under Part VII Housing Act 1996 will, according to the Supreme Court in *Kanu*, depend of the facts of the case in hand. See [79]. Sometime it will. Sometimes it will not. Unfortunately, mantras such as the need to ‘focus very sharply’ on the duty, do not always provide much in the way of practical assistance in deciding when and how the duty should be applied.

12. However, looking more closely at the facts and reasoning in *Kanu* and in the key Court of Appeal decisions pre- and post-*Kanu*, one can see there are several practical aspects/consequences of the duty which may of relevance. (The points overlap to an extent.)

i. **The duty to make inquiries**: where the duty applies, a local housing authority is bound to take positive steps to take account of the applicant’s disability by making such inquiries as are necessary to ascertain whether an applicant is in fact disabled and, if so, whether that disability is relevant to a matter in issue. See *Pieretti* at [36], approved in *Kanu* at [73] and [76]-[77]. Though it is for the local authority to decide whether or not the duty is engaged i.e. whether there is a ‘real possibility’ that a member of the Appellant’s household is disabled. See *Wilson*.

ii. **The duty to give reasons**: in order to show that the duty has been complied with a local housing authority must provide adequate reasons. ‘Throw-away’ references and repetition of ‘formulaic and high-minded mantras’ in decision letters will not suffice. See *Kanu* at [78] and [82]. On the other hand, a local authority is not required to expressly spell out the answers to the questions posed in *Kanu*, providing that on a fair and ‘stand back’ reading of the decision as a whole, it is possible to establish that the reviewing officer has considered the relevant matters. See *Haque*.

iii. **The appropriate level of scrutiny**: in instances where the duty is engaged a court on appeal may scrutinise a review decision more closely than would otherwise be the case to assess whether the duty has been complied with. Where the duty is engaged the court should not adopt a ‘benevolent’ approach c.f. *Holmes-Moorhouse* [2009] 1 WLR 413. See *Kanu* at [79]. Likewise,
where the duty is engaged and it is said that insufficient inquiries have been made into an application, the court is not restricted to considering whether the failure to make a particular inquiry was *Wednesbury* unreasonable. See *Pieretti* at [35]-[36] and c.f. *Cramp v Hastings BC* [2005] HLR 48. Though, the initial decision as to whether or not the duty is engaged – a question of whether there is a ‘real possibility’ that a member of the Appellant’s household is disabled – is subject to review on *Wednesbury* grounds. See *Wilson*.

13. The decisions referred to at [9] above each involve the application of one or more of these principles which are all, in essence, procedural. This reflects that fact that the public sector equality duty requires the local housing authority to have regard to the need to achieve the results set out in s149 Equality Act 2010, as opposed to requiring a particular result. Which, in turn, reflects a Parliamentary intention that there should ‘be a culture of greater awareness of the existence and legal consequences of disability’. See *Pieretti v Enfield LBC* [2010] EWCA Civ 1104, [2011] HLR 3 at [28] per Wilson LJ, approved in *Kanu* at [74].

**Out of borough placements and the best interests of the child post-*Nzolameso***

14. My experience has been that despite the guidance given by the Supreme Court in *Nzolameso*, out of borough placements are still very common. No doubt this is a consequence of the immense pressures placed on local housing authorities. And the extent to which local housing authorities have adopted policies on such placements, the quality of those policies and the regard that is being had to the interests of any children involved is variable.

15. That notwithstanding, there have been relatively few cases dealing with the issue, or dealing with the wider issue of the application of the best interests principle to homelessness cases. The following are the only cases of which I am aware:

  Successful s204 appeal. Suitability. Failure to apply *Nzolameso* guidance in placing out of district, including failure to identify which school would be best for child.

  Successful s204 appeal. A was a single parent with four children, then aged 10, 8, 3 and 2 years old. A became homeless after fleeing long-term domestic violence at the hands of her husband.
and moved into a refuge in R’s borough in September 2013. Her children commenced school in R’s borough in October 2013. At the time of the appeal, 3 of the 4 children attended primary school in R’s borough and the youngest attended nursery in R’s borough. One of the children had a diagnosis of severe ADHD and A was in receipt of DLA and carer’s allowance for her. R accepted that they owed the family the main homelessness duty and placed them in temporary accommodation out of borough in Bexleyheath. This location meant that the family had a daily commute of five hours to school and back each day, which was causing considerable disruption to the children’s education and wellbeing. On appeal, the judge held that R’s decision was unlawful for want of properly consideration of the needs and wellbeing of the children and in particular the disruption that would be caused to their education by being forced to change schools.

- **Saleem v Wandsworth LBC UKSC 2015/0253**
  22/3/16
  Permission to appeal refused. Did not raise an arguable point of law.

- **Barakate v Brent LBC**, unreported, Central London County Court
  10 October 2016
  Successful s204 appeal.
  In deciding that accommodation offered to the applicant in Birmingham, pursuant to a policy adopted post-Nzolameso, was suitable, Brent had erred in law. Suitability is a relative concept. In cases involving out of borough placements it is relevant to consider not only the availability of accommodation within and near to the district of the local housing authority but the timescale in which such accommodation may become available. Brent had failed to consider this point.

**Intentional homelessness post-Haile**

16. In contrast to the principles in *Hotak* and *Nzolameso* which seem to crop up relatively frequently, the decision in *Haile* has received rather less judicial attention over the last year. This is perhaps because the circumstances in which a supervening event will break the causal chain – with the exception of the settled accommodation cases with which attendees will be familiar – are relatively rare. In distinguishing *Din*, Lord Neuberger in *Haile* took the view that the causal chain had been broken because a supervening event had occurred (i.e. the birth of Ms Haile’s child) which would certainly have rendered her homeless as opposed to ‘merely a possibility that one might well have occurred’. See [79]-[80]. So to usefully rely on the decision in *Haile* a homeless applicant will need to point to an event which would certainly, and not just possibly, have rendered him or her homeless.
17. I have recently been involved in a case where the applicant was evicted from temporary accommodation, which he was occupying for his daughter, for smoking. The accommodation was B&B accommodation meaning he would not have been able to stay there beyond six weeks, and so he would have had to leave the accommodation irrespective of the alleged deliberate act. See Articles 2-4 Homelessness (Suitability of Accommodation) (England) Order 2003, SI 2003/3326. This is one situation where the principles in Haile may of relevance.

18. Magoury v Brent LBC, Central London County Court, Legal Action, February 2016, p46 (a successful s204 appeal at first instance) provides another example. In that case the review decision was quashed as the reviewing officer had failed to consider whether the applicant would have become homeless anyway as a result of the benefit cap.

19. Contrastingly the homeless applicant in Cox v Brent LBC [2015] EWCA Civ 1551 was refused permission to appeal by the Court of Appeal against a decision that he had made himself intentionally homeless from accommodation where a possession order had been granted on the basis of rent arrears, following which a fire had rendered the accommodation uninhabitable. Although superficially this might appear to the perfect case for a Haile type argument, the difficulty for Mr Cox, was that he was provided with alternative accommodation for a short period following the fire, and the Court of Appeal took the view that it was the latter accommodation from which he had become intentionally homeless.

PART 2: OTHER RECENT HOMELESSNESS CASES

Eligibility

20. Samin v Westminster City Council, Mirga v Secretary of State for Work and Pensions [2016] UKSC 1, [2016] 1 WLR 481: regulations denying housing assistance and income support to the respective former workers in these cases did not result in unlawful discrimination contrary to the Treaty on the Functioning of the EU (TFEU). S was an Austrian citizen who came to the UK in 2005. He worked sporadically for ten months, mostly in part-time employment, but stopped work in 2006 owing to various physical and mental health problems. In 2010 he applied to Westminster as homeless. Westminster refused to assist him on the footing that he was not eligible for assistance within the meaning of s185 Housing Act 1996. This decision was upheld on review and on appeal. The Court of Appeal dismissed a second appeal holding that S did not have a right of residence under the Immigration (European Economic
Area) Regulations 2006, SI 2006/1003: he had not retained his ‘worker’ status for the purposes of those regulations as there was no realistic prospect of his return to work and so he could not be regarded as ‘temporarily unable to work’ within the meaning of regulation 6(2)(a). S appealed, arguing that the refusal to provide him with homelessness assistance constituted ‘discrimination on grounds of nationality’ which was prohibited by article 18 TFEU and that the denial of assistance in his case was disproportionate. The Supreme Court dismissed his appeal. Article 18 did not confer a general right not to be discriminated against and was limited to ‘the scope of application of the Treaties’. An EU citizen can claim equal treatment with the nationals of an EU country only if he or she is able to satisfy the conditions for lawful residence in that country. Since S was not a worker, he was not exercising his treaty rights, did not have a right to reside under Immigration (European Economic Area) Regulations 2006 and could not avail himself of the anti-discrimination provisions. The question of proportionality did not arise.

**Duty to accept application**

21. R (Edwards) v Birmingham CC [2016] EWHC 173 (Admin): unsuccessful challenge to alleged ‘gatekeeping’ by Birmingham CC. This was a claim for judicial review involving four applicants who had sought homelessness assistance from Birmingham, all of whom claimed to be ‘homeless at home’ on the basis that they had accommodation but that it was not reasonable for them to continue to occupy. The challenge was primarily directed at the general practices and policies which Birmingham had in place to deal with homeless applications which, it was said, gave rise to an unacceptable risk that applicants would not be dealt with lawfully and failed to reflect the immediate and urgent nature of the duties to make inquiries and provide interim accommodation. Hickinbottom J dismissed the claim for in two cases (where permission had been granted) and refused permission in the remaining two. Whether the conditions for making inquiries into a homeless application and providing interim accommodation were satisfied were matters for the local housing authority to determine subject to review on conventional public law grounds, as opposed to a matter of precedent fact for the court to decide. On the facts of the individual cases Birmingham had, for the most part, not acted in breach of its statutory duties and where errors were made, they were rectified quickly meaning that relief was not warranted. As such the cases under consideration did not provide sufficient evidence for the claim that Birmingham was guilty of systemic failings.

22. R (H) v London Borough of Southwark [2016] EWHC 1665 (Admin), 8 July 2016: H was a 58 year old woman with a long history of mental health problems and a diagnosis of depression. She applied to
Southwark as homeless in June 2015. It was decided that although she was homeless, she did not have a priority need. On 1 October 2015, H then made a second homeless application. New evidence was submitted on her behalf, from a clinical psychologist, referring to previous suicide attempts, suicidal ideation and assessing H as ‘quite a high suicide risk’. Again, she was found not to have a priority need. This decision was upheld by a review decision issued on 3 February 2016. On 23 February 2016, H was advised that she could not appeal this decision. Her temporary accommodation was due to end a week later. The following day, H (by her account) formed the intention of killing herself, and embarked on a plan to do so, taking a bus toward Blackfriars Bridge, intending to either jump from the bridge or throw herself under a train. While she was on the bus, H received a call from her GP – who was concerned for her health – who managed to persuade her to attend the surgery. She did so, and while there contemplated throwing herself out of the window. She was seen by the GP who recorded her as having ‘clear suicidal ideation’. Following this she was referred urgently to the mental health team who noted that she was having active suicidal thoughts with plausible evidence of plans and intent, stemming from her accommodation situation. On 1 March 2016, H made a further homeless application based on these circumstances. Southwark refused to accept the application asserting that there had been no material change in the circumstances and the facts which led to the previous adverse decision. Amanda Yip QC (sitting as a Deputy Judge of the High Court) allowed H’s application for judicial review. In deciding whether the duty to accept the application had arisen the question was whether it was based on exactly the same facts as the previous application. See R v Harrow LBC Ex p. Fabia [1998] 1 WLR 1396, (1998) 30 HLR 1124 and Rikha Begum v Tower Hamlets LBC [2005] EWCA Civ 340, [2005] HLR 34. In this instance, the events of 24 February 2016 marked a new development which resulted in new medical evidence. As such the application did not raise exactly the same facts and Southwark had erred in failing to accept it.

23. R (Abdulrahman) v London Borough of Hillingdon [2016] EWHC 2647 (Admin), 28 October 2016: From June 2012 the Claimant, A, lived in a property in Hayes, Middlesex together with her husband and their nine children. They occupied the property under an assured shorthold tenancy. At the time of obtaining the tenancy, A’s husband wrongly informed the landlord that nine people – rather than 11 – would be occupying the property. In or around October 2013, the family were evicted from the property and following this, on 28 October 2013, A and her husband applied jointly to the Defendant, Hillingdon LBC as homeless. By a s184 decision communicated on 30 December 2013, Hillingdon concluded that A and her husband had become homeless intentionally. It was said that A’s husband had obtained the tenancy in Hayes by deception and that by allowing extra people to stay at the property without the
landlord’s consent, they had failed to keep the property in good repair. A’s husband sought a review of this decision. The review decision was issued on 18 February 2014. The finding of intentionality was upheld. A’s husband then appealed, but the appeal was subsequently abandoned when he left the country and moved back to Somalia (where he and A had come from, to the UK, in around 2008). In the meantime, Hillingdon had been accommodating the family in Bed and Breakfast accommodation. But in March 2016, sometime after the appeal was compromised (the exact timing is not entirely clear), this was brought to an end and the remaining family members dispersed. A, together with her two youngest children, stayed with various friends and relations. While the older children made alternative arrangements. Then, on 28 March 2016, and several times thereafter, A sought to make a fresh homeless application to Hillingdon. This was refused. A instructed solicitors who sought to make a further application on her behalf arguing that the application should be considered afresh as her husband had returned to Somalia and her three older children no longer lived with her. This was also refused, with Hillingdon stating that the application was ‘based… on the same facts as the previous one made on 28 October 2013’. Neil Cameron QC sitting as a Deputy High Court judge allowed A’s application for judicial review. Although Hillingdon had applied the correct legal test, the decision that the application was based on the same facts as the previous one was irrational.

24. R (Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea) v London Borough of Ealing and Ms Hacene-Blidi (Interested Party) [2017] EWHC 24 (Admin), 13 January 2017: the interested party, Ms Hacene-Blidi, was a disabled wheelchair user with four children. She had lived in the area of Ealing since 2008 in accommodation in the private rented sector. In March 2015, her landlord having commenced possession proceedings, she applied to the Defendant, Ealing LBC, as homeless. Ealing accepted the main housing duty under s193(2) Housing Act 1996 toward her. In November 2015, Ms Hacene-Blidi was made an offer of accommodation under Part VI Housing Act 1996 which Ealing regarded as suitable. She refused this offer and Ealing duly notified her by letter of 24 November 2015 that, pursuant to s193(7) Housing Act 1996, the duty owed to her had come to an end. Ms Hacene-Blidi was evicted from her accommodation by her landlord on 1 December 2015. She then applied to the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea for homelessness assistance. Kensington and Chelsea decided she was owed the main housing duty and, by letter of 12 January 2016, sought to refer her back to Ealing pursuant to the local connection provisions. Ealing responded, acknowledging that the conditions for referral were satisfied but stating that they had previously discharged their duty toward Ms Hacene-Blidi and that no further duty was owed. In reaching this decision they relied on the decision in the case of R v Hammersmith & Fulham LBC, ex p. O’Brien (1985) 17 HLR 471, where Glidewell J had taken the view
that a local housing authority that had previously discharged its duty, was not then required to accept a referral under the local connection provisions on behalf of the same applicant save where there had been a new incidence of homelessness. Kensington and Chelsea sought judicial review of Ealing’s decision. HHJ Karen Walden-Smith allowed the claim. O’Briann was decided under the Housing (Homeless Persons) Act 1977 which – unlike Part VII Housing Act 1996 – contained no express provision for the cessation of duty, and should no longer be regarded as good law. Following the decisions in R v LB of Harrow, ex p Fabia [1998] 1 WLR 1396 and Rikha Begum v LB of Tower Hamlets [2005] EWCA Civ 340, it was clear that a local housing authority must accept a homeless application save where it is based on exactly the same facts as an earlier application. In this case Ms Hacene-Blidi’s second application was not based on exactly the same facts as her first. Her first had been made at a time when her then landlord had begun possession proceedings against her. Her second had been made following her eviction. As such Kensington and Chelsea had been right to accept the second application. And since there was no suggestion that Kensington and Chelsea had acted unreasonably or irrationally in accepting the main housing duty, Ealing were bound to accept the referral.

Interim accommodation

25. R (Abdusemed) v Lambeth LBC, 19 February 2016: unsuccessful challenge to refusal to provide s188(3) accommodation. A local housing authority had not erred in refusing to provide accommodation pending review to homeless woman challenging decision as to whether she was vulnerable, notwithstanding diagnosis of moderately severe PTSD and fact she was sleeping in Mosque at night and wandering streets by day. Some discussion (apparently) of ‘street homelessness’.

Intentional homelessness

26. Huda v London Borough of Redbridge [2016] EWCA Civ 709, 12 July 2016: H applied to Redbridge as homeless in October 2008 and was placed in temporary accommodation under s188(1) Housing Act 1996. He occupied the accommodation under a licence granted by a third party. In due course Redbridge, by a decision under s184 Housing Act 1996 found H to be homeless, eligible and to have a priority need, but to have become homeless intentionally. This decision was upheld by a review decision issued on 13 January 2010. Following this decision, H remained in the temporary accommodation pursuant to s190(2): the duty to provide accommodation for a ‘reasonable’ period to those in priority need who have become homeless intentionally. But as a result of an administrative oversight, no action was taken to remove him from the property, and he remained there for a further two years. On 12 July 2012 – by which point H had been in the accommodation for nearly four years – H’s solicitors wrote to Redbridge asserting that his being allowed to remain in the property had
rendered it settled accommodation meaning that he could no longer be regarded as having become homeless intentionally. This was treated as a fresh homeless application. By decision dated 17 July 2012, H’s argument was rejected. This decision was upheld on review. The temporary accommodation, it was said, was not settled accommodation and so was not sufficient to remove H’s ‘self-imposed disqualification’. The reviewing officer held that ‘accommodation under this provision is simply not capable of being settled’. In addition, the accommodation was held to have been precarious and with little security of tenure, principally on the basis that H’s continued occupation was under a licence, was always contingent on the mistake of his occupation being overlooked, and that action might have been taken to remove him at any time. The Court of Appeal dismissed H’s appeal. The reviewing officer’s finding that H’s occupation had been under a licence was a finding of fact and was not perverse. The fact that the s190(2) duty came to an end did not change the nature of the permission to occupy (i.e. the licence was unaffected). Whether accommodation is settled is a question of fact or degree. There is no rule of law that only circumstances outside the occupation agreement are relevant to whether accommodation is settled. Overall the conclusion of the reviewing officer was open to him on the facts.

Assessment of needs

27. R (Smajlaj) v London Borough of Waltham Forest [2016] EWHC 1240 (Admin): GS was a single woman of Albanian origin who had been trafficked to the UK in May 2014. She spoke limited English and had a number of mental health problems and particular needs arising from her history of being trafficked, including symptoms consistent with post-traumatic stress disorder. In October 2015, GS applied to Waltham Forest as homeless. During the course of her application, representations were made on her behalf by her solicitors, drawing attention to some of GS’s particular needs including the need for her to be accommodated somewhere where the specialist treatment she was receiving from the Helen Bamber Foundation could continue, and where she would not be at risk of isolation. On 5 November 2015, Waltham Forest issued a decision under s184 Housing Act 1996 finding that GS was homeless, eligible for assistance and had not become homeless intentionally, but that she was not vulnerable and so did not have a priority need. The decision letter acknowledged that, in view of this, Waltham Forest were under a duty under s192(2) Housing Act 1996 to provide GS with advice and assistance to help her find accommodation, advising her to: ‘Kindly refer to the copy of the information booklet Housing Advice and Options in Waltham Forest that was given to you to assist you in your securing alternative accommodation’. The letter indicated that GS’s interim accommodation would be terminated in seven days. GS requested a review of the decision and accommodation pending review. In the alternative, Waltham Forest were asked to accommodate her under s192(3) Housing Act 1996, which contains a
power to accommodate those to whom s192 applies. Waltham Forest refused both requests for accommodation. GS sought judicial review. Judge A Grubb (sitting as a Deputy High Court Judge) allowed her claim. Under s192(4) Housing Act 1996, a local housing authority is required to carry out an assessment of a homeless applicant’s housing needs prior to providing advice and assistance under s192(2). An authority may discharge this duty by gathering the relevant information during the decision making process. That is, a distinct assessment is not necessarily required providing that the ‘nuts and bolts’ of the applicants housing needs have been ascertained already. See *R (Savage) v Hillingdon LBC* [2010] EWHC (Admin). While the legislation does not expressly provide that the assessment should be carried out prior to any decision whether to exercise the discretion to accommodate under s190(3), the requirement was implicit. In this case, Waltham Forest had failed to assess the nuts and bolts of GS’s very particular accommodation needs. As such the advice and assistance offered under s190(2), and the refusal to exercise the discretion to accommodate her under s190(3), were unlawful.

**Local connection**

28. *R (Tanushi) v Westminster CC and Hillingdon LBC*, 22 January 2016: accommodation pending referral under local connection provisions. T applied to Westminster as homeless. Westminster accepted the main housing duty but referred her case to Hillingdon under the local connection provisions. Westminster agreed to accommodate T until the referral had been accepted. A disagreement then arose between Westminster and Hillingdon and both refused to provide accommodation. The court granted T permission to apply for judicial review of both authorities, finding she had a strong case against Westminster and that Westminster had an arguable case that the obligation had passed to Hillingdon. Westminster ordered to provide interim relief.


**Costs**

30. *R (Lopes) v London Borough of Croydon* [2016] EWCA Civ 465, 24 May 2016: L lodged an appeal in the county court under s204 Housing Act 1996. Further evidence was submitted on her behalf during the course of the appeal, following which the parties agreed, that the appeal should be withdrawn. A consent order was drawn up. But it was not approved in time for the hearing, and the parties were required to attend. The Circuit Judge approved the order, which provided for both parties to make written submissions on costs. Submissions were duly filed and another Circuit Judge, on the papers,
awarded L 85% of her costs. Croydon appealed against the costs order. A question arose as to the correct destination for such an appeal, and whether the ‘second appeal test’ should be applied. Considering the matter together with a number of costs appeals that had arisen in other civil proceedings, the Court of Appeal gave the following guidance, applicable to homelessness appeals and appeals from decisions of district judges, at [54]:

- If the county court judge has heard the appeal and ruled on the issues determined by the district judge (including the validity or otherwise of the claims, the relief to be granted and the costs of the hearing before the district judge), any appeal will lie only to the Court of Appeal. Permission must be sought from the Court of Appeal and the second appeal test will apply.
- In respect of the costs of the appeal to the county court, any appeal will lie to the Court of Appeal;
- It would be open to the county court judge to grant permission to appeal to the Court of Appeal in respect of the costs of the appeal to the county court and the normal test for permission will apply. It would also be open to the Court of Appeal to grant permission applying the same test.
- If there has not been what can properly be regarded as a hearing of the appeal, any appeal (which is almost certainly to be one on costs) is to the High Court judge and the normal test will apply.

31. Since the judge in this instance had not heard the homelessness appeal, the subsequent appeal on the issue of costs lay to the High Court and the second appeals test was not applicable. See London Borough of Croydon v Lopes [2017] EWHC 33 (QB) for the High Court’s subsequent decision on the appropriate costs order in that case.