

**(by email)**

Our reference: MGLA091225-9994

8 January 2026

Dear

Thank you for your request for information which the Greater London Authority (GLA) received on 8 December 2025. Your request has been considered under the Freedom of Information Act (FOI) 2000.

**You requested:**

1. Any impact assessments, reviews, or evaluations conducted by the GLA on the siting or community impact of homelessness hostels in residential areas of Lewisham since 2019.
2. Any correspondence between the GLA or the Deputy Mayor for Housing and Lewisham Council relating to the operation or location of *[Named location]*.
3. Any current or planned reviews of hostel density, community safety, or placement strategy for supported accommodation in South-East London.

**Our response to your request is as follows:**

1. I can confirm that the GLA holds an incident review report dated January – July 2025.

The GLA commissions a 'hub' and a 26 bed 'staging post' in Lewisham and these form part of a service called No Second Night Out (NSNO), which is delivered by St Mungo's and has multiple sites across London. There are also Lewisham Local Authority commissioned services at the same site. The document, written by St Mungo's, relates to anti-social behaviour incidents involving residents of Lewisham Local Authority commissioned services and NSNO at this site.

Please find attached a copy of this report. Please note that some of the content is exempt from disclosure under Section 31(1)(a) Law enforcement, Section 38(1)(b) Health and safety and Section 40 Personal information.

Section 31(1)(a) covers all aspects of the prevention and detection of crime and can apply to information relating the location and identifiable features of the accommodation where

# GREATER LONDON AUTHORITY

there is a likelihood that rough sleepers would be singled out for harassment, intimidation and possible violence by others<sup>1</sup>.

Section 31(1)(a) of the Act is engaged because the release of this information would, or would be likely to, prejudice the prevention or detection of crime. The provisions and Section 31(1)(a) of the Act are engaged by information which could be used by those intent on committing criminal acts to harm the public.

Section 38(1)(b) of the Act is duly engaged because of the potential risk to public safety as set out in the Act.

Under FoIA the 'public interest' is not the same as what might be of interest to the public. In balancing the public interest in disclosure, we consider the greater good or benefit to the community if the information is released or not. The 'right to know' must be balanced against the need to enable effective government and to serve the best interests of the public.

Considerations favouring disclosure; There is a clear public interest in the release of information that helps demonstrate the work of public bodies. To help facilitate this understanding, there is a justifiable public interest in placing into the public domain information that would allow the public to assess the way in which public authorities undertake assessments on the quality and effectiveness of services offered to help protect the homeless.

Considerations favouring non-disclosure; Conversely the disclosure of this same information would increase the risk of criminal activity, violent crime, or other incidents at an event if made public and seen by those intent on causing harm. It is not in the public interest to release information that could be directly used to harm or plan harm to the public.

The public interest favours maintaining the exemption provisions of s.31(1)(a) and s.38(1)(b).

2. Unfortunately, we have estimated that the cost of complying with this part of your request would exceed the "appropriate limit" specified in the Freedom of Information and Data Protection (Appropriate Limit and Fees) Regulation 2004 SI 2004 No 3244. These are known as the 'Fees Regulations' for brevity.

Section 12 of the Act provides that a public authority is not obliged to comply with a request if the cost of determining whether we hold the information, locating and retrieving it and extracting it from other information would exceed the appropriate limit. The aforementioned Fees Regulations stipulate that this limit is £450; calculated at £25 per hour for every hour spent on the activities described and equates to 18 hours of work.

I can confirm that there is no information held within the scope of your request between the Deputy Mayor for Housing and Lewisham Council.

There are however, at least seven members of staff within our Rough Sleeping team whom your request would need to be coordinated with. There is no mechanism at our disposal to

---

<sup>1</sup> [New research reveals the scale of violence against rough sleepers | Crisis | Together we will end homelessness](#)

# GREATER LONDON AUTHORITY

perform an automated search for relevant information. An initial search of one staff account has returned over 100 returns. We estimate there will be in excess of 700 emails (or email chains containing several emails) held within the team.

We have therefore refused this request under the cost limit provisions of section 12 of the Freedom of Information Act and this letter therefore constitutes a refusal notice under section 17(1) of the Act.

We have estimated that it would take at least 35 hours of work to comply with your request (based on approximately 3 minutes per email / email chain) to locate and extract the specific information you have requested from our records, including separating it from other information which is not directly related to your request.

In order to bring your request within the cost threshold, you may wish to limit your request to a time period of a year. Please note any narrowed request will be treated as a new request for information for consideration under the Act.

3. Please find attached a copy of an information report for local residents which relates to the GLA commissioned service No Second Night Out. A near identical report also exists for internal use only which details some additional information regarding the space onsite that will be used for the new staff office.

If you have any further questions relating to this matter, please contact me, quoting the reference MGLA091225-9994.

Yours sincerely

## **Information Governance Officer**

If you are unhappy with the way the GLA has handled your request, you may complain using the GLA's FOI complaints and internal review procedure, available at:

<https://www.london.gov.uk/about-us/governance-and-spending/sharing-our-information/freedom-information>

## **ASB Report Review January-July 2025**

### **Purpose**

Following the SNT Ward Panel meeting on 09/07/25 and discussions with the [REDACTED] managers, Regional Heads and Commissioners, it was decided that we would look at the ASB data we currently hold to identify themes and inform a data led action plan.

### **Findings, Evidence and Analysis of ASB data**

[REDACTED]  
Reports total: 49

Reports between January-March: 9

Reports between April- July: 40

Clients identified: 29

Awaiting CCTV review: 2

#### **Types of incidents clients were involved in:**

Noise: 13 total (44.8%)

Drug use/dealing: 8 total (27.5%)

Misuse of public space: 4 total (13.7%)

- Street drinking 2
- Begging 2

Verbal abuse: 3 total (10.3%)

- Between two clients: 2
- To a member of the public: 1

Pet related disturbances: 1 total (3.4%)

#### **NSNO Staging Post:**

Reports total: 4

Clients identified: 4

#### **Types of incidents clients were involved in:**

Noise: 2 total (50%)

Misuse of public space: 2 total (50%)

- Street drinking 1
- Street drinking and public urination 1

#### **NSNO South Hub**

Reports total: 1

Clients identified: 1

#### **Types of incidents clients were involved in:**

Misuse of public space: 1 total (100%)

- Street drinking 1

## Themes

### Noise

Noise disturbance is the highest reported type of ASB across the [REDACTED]. Partly this may be attributed to the warmer weather as people are outside more and have their windows/doors open. There has been an increase in noise related complaints from [REDACTED] in the past few months which is likely due to the pool table and furniture being moved to the reception area of [REDACTED] which means more people are in this area later into the evening. The benefits of these changes for residents, however, have meant that they are able to engage with staff more regularly and are able to access support and activities throughout the night. Other repeat areas of noise have been outside the gates on [REDACTED] and behind the ground floor rooms of [REDACTED].

#### Ideas:

- Meet with the night teams to discuss noise complaints and ensure cohesion in responding to neighbours and addressing excessive noise past 10pm with residents.
- 'Noise buffer' landscaping along the perimeter of [REDACTED]/NSNO closest to [REDACTED]
- Look into changing the doors of the rooms on the ground floor of [REDACTED] so they have limited opening
- Create an outside area for clients to sit outside which is partially covered and therefore creates a sound barrier

### Drug use/dealing

Drug related activity is the second highest related ASB type. "Hot spots" where this is the most prevalent is by the driving school on [REDACTED]. There is a 50/50 split of the reports for drug use and picking up drugs however anecdotally, neighbours report of clients engaging in drug deals is a more frequent issue.

#### Ideas:

- Monthly ASB reports to be pulled and identify if there are clients who are involved in repeat incidents around drugs and an action plan to be worked on with Lead Worker to address this
- Discussion with the SNT around warnings being given to clients who are repeatedly involved in incidents in line with support from ADDER
- Send a letter to all residents advising that the approach to drug dealing/use in the community will potentially have involvement from the SNT moving forward
- Request temporary CCTV to be put up by the Safer Communities Teams around "hot spot" areas [REDACTED]
- Continued reporting to the SNT when we receive intelligence regarding drug dealing so they can add to their data and inform their policing priorities

### **Street drinking**

This is the only form of reported ASB which has involved clients from all of the [REDACTED]. This is potentially due to clients not being able to drink alcohol in the NSNO South Hub and being limited to drink in their rooms in NSNO Staging Post however where NSNO clients have been identified in incidents, these have been resolved efficiently with meaningful conversation and/or ABC's.

### **Ideas:**

- A focus on client involvement across the [REDACTED] for clients to have things to engage and fill time with
- Community Charter/behavioral agreements which specifically outline the commitment to the locality around alcohol consumption which staff go through when clients move in (if not already in place)

### **Question:**

- Can NSNO clients access AA meetings on site currently? Would this be useful?

### **Summary:**

We have seen a large increase in reports from neighbours in the first quarter of this year compared with the fourth quarter of last year. This, however, can be attributed to the Locality Coordinator being properly in post and both [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] working to engage the community in reporting through SNT Ward Panels, the community newsletter, local flyering and liaising with external stakeholders. There has also been some duplication of reports due to internal issues with reporting on Opal which have been raised with the Quality Team.

Despite this, it is likely that there is still under-reporting from all services due to the process being unclear. [REDACTED] has now completed a session with most staff of the HGS on the commitments we have under the locality management plan and explained the process of creating an ASB log. At the moment, [REDACTED] is the main person creating ASB logs. The goal is for the [REDACTED] teams to be able to independently identify and record ASB on the internal ASB logs and with the changes from the Quality Team, assign these to [REDACTED] for oversight. This will give us a clear picture of ASB across the site and accurate themes which may need supportive action.

Three key areas have been identified – noise, drug related activity, and street drinking – which account for over 80% of the ASB logs recorded across the [REDACTED]. Focusing on tackling these specific areas should have the biggest impact as well as being dynamic to respond to new areas which may arise when collecting the data from a monthly ASB report.

Some suggestions have been included based on the evidence above; however, further management input may be beneficial to create a formalised action plan.

## **Information from the Greater London Authority on changes to the No Second Night Out service at [REDACTED], Lewisham**

Like Lewisham Council, the Greater London Authority is committed to tackling the rough sleeping and homelessness crisis and providing much-needed support to those forced to sleep rough on our streets. Some of this support is provided through the No Second Night Out (NSNO) service, which has multiple locations across London.

NSNO aims to provide an immediate route off the street for people sleeping rough, a comprehensive assessment of their needs and circumstances, and intensive specialist support to secure a positive housing outcome. At the [REDACTED], NSNO has an experienced team of 32 staff that deliver:

- An assessment hub, where people are initially assessed and a move-on plan is agreed.
- 26 staging post rooms, which provide short-term accommodation for those who need extra time to secure their onward accommodation.

We take seriously concerns about the impact of the service on levels of antisocial behaviour locally. While reviews by St Mungo's have found that NSNO residents are usually not involved in reported incidents of antisocial behaviour in the local area, we are mindful of the cumulative effect of all the services on the site. We want to do as much as possible to mitigate any impact on the local community, whilst ensuring the highest quality of support for those using the NSNO service. As such, the GLA and St Mungo's have agreed the following changes to NSNO at [REDACTED].

### **1. New on-site office for 24/7 staff presence**

NSNO will establish a new office within the staging post building. This means there can be a 24/7 staff presence within the staging post. It will help ensure the service's residents always have quicker access to staff support and there will be faster identification of any potentially problematic behaviour/activity, within and in the vicinity of the service. Building works are being scheduled and the new office is expected to be completed by January 2026.

### **2. Cap on residents with high support needs**

From December 2025, NSNO will begin to change the balance of support needs in the staging post accommodation. There will be a cap of 15 residents with high support needs, reduced from 26 currently, and the remaining beds will only be available to people with low to medium support needs. If these 15 beds are occupied, anyone with high support needs will instead be supported at other locations elsewhere, meaning NSNO provision will still reflect need.

We believe this meets the twin goals of reducing the likelihood of incidents that might negatively impact the local community, whilst also enabling staff to provide more intensive support to the smaller number of people with high support needs who do remain.

### **3. Stronger management oversight**

The assessment hub and staging post both benefit from having a dedicated Service Manager and Deputy Manager to oversee the day to day running of the sites, overseen by an experienced Senior Service Manager and Head of Pan London Rough Sleeping Services. Managers have already begun to strengthen processes at the site:

- Referral checks: Every referral to the staging post will now be reviewed by the Service Manager, including screening for heightened risk that the person is likely to be involved in anti-social behaviour in the vicinity of the service.
- Risk management: Existing residents assessed as high risk for antisocial behaviour in the locality will be discussed with the Head Services and can be moved to alternative sites.
- Incident review: Any significant reports of incidents outside of the service involving NSNO clients are reviewed by the Head of Services to ensure that appropriate action has been taken.
- Continuous improvement: Managers will continue to review operations and make any potential improvements identified. For example, clearer signage is being installed at the entrance to discourage people from congregating inside the gates.