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CHAPTER 1
CONTEXT OF THE RESEARCH

1.1 PURPOSE

The aim of this study is to identify and analyse the most effective policy measures to ensure access to decent housing for immigrants with legal status and people belonging to ethnic minority groups. A key objective of the research is to assist the development of more coherent and integrated policies in relation to access to housing for immigrants and ethnic minority groups as part of the further development of member states’ NAPs/Inclusion.

This study is set within the framework of the EU strategy to combat poverty and social exclusion. In this context it examines the housing situation of legal immigrants and people from ethnic minority groups in relation to the following key parameters of housing experience:

- access to housing
- affordability of housing
- quality of housing
- social integration in neighbourhoods (ghetto prevention).

A key assumption underlying the research objective is that policies to improve the position of these groups in the housing market are of three types:

- policies to address the processes of exclusion from the housing market
- coherent policies to meet the housing needs of immigrants and ethnic groups
- integrated policies which address the factors creating housing and social exclusion for immigrants and ethnic groups.

The outputs of the research are the identification and evaluation of the mix of policy approaches that can assist most effectively in this regard. Of particular importance is the role that housing can play in furthering social inclusion.

1.2 METHODOLOGY

The study draws on existing research and data and compares and contrasts policy approaches and outcomes in a strategic sample of eight different countries chosen from the EU-15, the EU-10 and the Accession countries in the area of access to housing for immigrants and ethnic minorities. Account has also been taken of international studies and experience in this area and the views of those experiencing poverty and social exclusion. This has included consideration of the information and data gathered by the European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia (EUMC) in Vienna and also interviews with stakeholders in the case study countries. However, recent research undertaken by the EUMC on “Discrimination and Racism in Housing” based on reports of the EUMC National Focal Points was not available to the authors of the present study.
The sample of five countries from the EU-15 was selected using the widely accepted typologies of western European welfare regimes developed by Esping-Anderson and by Silver (see Edgar et al, 1999) and is as follows:

Social Democratic       Sweden
Liberal                 UK
Conservative-corporatist France, Belgium
Formative               Spain

The three former Communist countries in the sample (Hungary, Romania and Slovenia) were chosen on the basis of contact with researchers in these countries over the last two years in preparation for the enlargement of the European Observatory on Homelessness and Housing Exclusion and, as part of which, a number of countries had prepared working papers for FEANTSA (European Federation of National Organisations Working with the Homeless) on housing and homelessness.

The project co-ordinators provided a brief for the researchers in the eight countries providing guidelines for the production of a national report covering a range of defined tasks related to the research objectives and required outcomes. In summary they include an elaboration and evaluation of the following:

- the national context in relation to legislative and policy frameworks, migration patterns, institutional framework and NAPs/Inclusion (JIMs and NAPs for EU-10 countries)
- access to and quality of housing for immigrants and ethnic minorities
- barriers to access to housing for immigrants and ethnic minorities
- the importance of access to decent and affordable housing for immigrants and ethnic minorities and the significance of housing to social inclusion
- evaluation of policies and programmes.

The main sources of information for the national researchers were secondary data and published research. The quality and amount of this information varied significantly from country to country, being particularly good and extensive in France, Sweden, and the UK. Data were of poorer quality and less available in the other countries and were supplemented by interviews with service providers, policy makers and NGOs in Hungary, Romania, Slovenia, and Spain. In addition, special papers from experts were commissioned in Hungary, and special analysis of Census data obtained in Slovenia. Policy makers and experts were also consulted in France and the UK.

The brief required that the study conclusions be tested in discussion with policy makers, experts and organisations working in the field. Thus the research plan has included the following seminars:

- **Commencement Seminar** (February 2004)
  Brought together the researchers in the 8 countries and agreed the working method, the required outcomes and deliverables.
- **Interim Seminar** (June 2004)
  Allowed the partners to discuss the national reports
- **Draft Report Seminar** (November 2004)
  Allowed the partners to discuss the draft report
• Delphic Seminar (June 2005)
  Aims to provide feedback from policy makers, experts and organisations.

In summary, the research methodology involved the following tasks:

• collation and review of EU policy framework
• review of EU level research on migration and housing policy
• production of eight national reports
• review and evaluation of policy measures drawing upon the national reports and EU level research.

1.3 POLICY FRAMEWORK

The policy context of the research lies within the linked fields of social exclusion, discrimination and immigration. Discrimination can be considered as one of the causative factors of poverty and exclusion affecting particular immigrants and minority groups within society. It is an obstacle to routes out of poverty for significant immigrant and minority populations within the member states.

The European Council of Lisbon in March 2000 recognized that the extent of poverty and social exclusion in the European Union was unacceptable. Building a more inclusive European Union was thus considered as an essential element in achieving the Union's ten year strategic goal of sustained economic growth, more and better jobs and greater social cohesion. The Lisbon Council agreed to adopt the Open Method of Coordination, combining national action plans and a Community Action Programme involving transnational cooperation and research, in order to make a decisive impact on the eradication of poverty and social exclusion by 2010. One of the priorities for the action programme is the carrying out of thematic studies concentrating on research on policy and on areas where the National Action Plans were seen to have shortcomings. The research reported here constitutes one of the themes selected by the Programme Committee. In the context of housing, it is important to point out that the Social Inclusion Common Objectives cover both “access for all to decent and sanitary housing” and “policies which seek to prevent life crises” (including becoming homeless). In addition, the revised common objectives (2003) also include targeting “the high risk of poverty and social exclusion faced by some men and women as a result of immigration”.

The European Union now has well developed and co-ordinated policies on discrimination. Council Directive 2000/43/EC (June 2000) implemented the principle of equal treatment between persons irrespective of racial or ethnic origin, and stated that specific action in the field of discrimination based on racial or ethnic origin should go beyond employment and cover areas such as education, social protection including social security and healthcare, social advantages and access to and supply of goods and services. To this end, any direct or indirect discrimination based on racial or ethnic origin within the areas covered by this Directive should be prohibited throughout the Community. This prohibition of discrimination should also apply to nationals of third countries. A Council decision in November 2000 established a Community action programme for transnational exchanges and research to reinforce policies to combat direct or indirect discrimination based on racial or
ethnic origin, religion or belief, disability, age or sexual orientation, for the period from 2001 to 2006.

The policy measures outlined above have introduced the issue of equal access to services including housing, and the role of access to decent housing in social inclusion. Housing however is a national competence. There is no specific Directorate General in the European Union to address housing policy issues, and construction of housing is not presently covered by the Structural Funds. The European Union Race Directive, however, explicitly bans racial discrimination in the field of housing. The research reported here is designed to shed light on the extent of unequal access to housing for immigrants and ethnic minorities and to evaluate policy measures to combat this.

With the entry into force of the Treaty of Amsterdam in May 1999, parts of asylum and migration law were incorporated into Community law. This meant that the rights of EU and third country nationals became areas of policy where the EU has some competence. In October 1999, the European Council met in Tampere to define policy guidelines for the future, including asylum and immigration policies. The overarching objective of this special meeting was the “establishment of an area of freedom, security and justice” in the European Union. The Tampere Council also stressed the need for the European Union to ensure fair treatment of third-country nationals. A more vigorous integration was needed that should aim at granting third-country nationals rights and obligations comparable to those of EU citizens. The Council agreed that further progress should be made in these areas at the November 2004 meeting resulting in the Hague Programme. It was thus recognized that a successful migration policy could not be separated from successful integration strategies to be implemented within the member states (see also Communication COM(2001)387). Concern has been expressed that the importance of access to decent housing has not been recognized as a vital factor in successful integration strategies, and that information on the extent to which housing has been a factor in hindering successful integration of immigrants is lacking. The research reported here is designed to meet these deficiencies.

The special position of Roma people in Europe has attracted particular attention from the European Commission, including research under the Discrimination and Social Inclusion action programmes and a proposal from the EU Network of Fundamental Rights Experts in their 2003 Annual Report for a Roma Integration Directive. This arose from fears that the Race Directive would not be appropriate in all respects for Roma because, although it considered equal treatment, it did not deal with their integration. In recognising the housing situation of the Roma, the recently published report on the situation of the Roma in the European Union (European Commission, 2004) recommends that the European Union should amend rules to permit the use of the European Regional Development Fund for projects in the field of housing and related infrastructure. The housing situation of Roma communities is given particular consideration in the present report. Finally it should be noted that although the European Council issued a Directive in January 2003 laying down minimum standards for the reception of asylum seekers, including housing, no such directive applies to legal immigrants or refugees granted permission to stay.
1.4 DEFINITION ISSUES

The target groups defined in the research brief are:

- immigrants with legal status
- ethnic minorities.

The brief requires that the structure and methodology of the research should reflect the differences between the two groups, but also acknowledge their similar experiences. The brief also requires the research to base analysis on the definitions of immigrants and ethnic minorities currently used in the different countries being investigated, in order to take into account the particular policy context of each country. Awareness of differences in definitions of the target groups is also important because the definitions determine the scale of the issue, especially with regard to ethnic minorities.

Migrant and ethnic minority are overlapping categories. Many ethnic minorities originated at some time from a migratory process, but many have also been settled for several or more generations, perhaps centuries, in their present country and can be considered as indigenous. Not all or even most immigrants constitute ethnic minorities in their host country, although some may do so. Many minorities and immigrants do have something in common however – weakness in the labour and housing markets and exclusion from mainstream society. It is these groups who are the target of this study. Economically strong migrants and minorities—for example those with skills and in demand in the receiving country—are not the subject of this study because they do not experience social exclusion and have no problems obtaining access to quality housing.

1.4.1 Immigrants with legal status

The generally accepted and broad definition of immigrants is people who have moved from their country of birth to another country. Within this broad definition, migration can be broken down into more specific categories according to intended length of stay, citizenship, reason for migration, and legal status. The proportions in these different categories can vary significantly from country to country.

Some immigrants intend to stay for short periods only and for specific purposes. These comprise mainly tourists and students. Although the latter have housing requirements that may endure for three years or more, neither group is relevant to this study because there is no stated intention to stay permanently or even in the medium term in the new country. They have consequently not been considered in the case study countries.

Other immigrants intend to stay for longer periods and some migrate with the intention of living permanently in the adopted country. Most countries define incomers as foreign citizens rather than migrants. This is linked to an official registration process for those who intend to stay for more than a minimum period, usually one year, which determines the numbers of people classed as resident foreign citizens in official statistical sources. This is standard across all the eight case study countries and is the base level definition of immigrants with legal status.

After a certain period of residence, permanent permission to stay is usually given, with or without citizenship of the adopted country. This period varies from country to country. In
Hungary, a permanent residence permit is normally obtained after three years although this is separate from citizenship. When permanent residence is granted, the individual can decide whether or not to apply for Hungarian citizenship. In France and the UK, five years’ residence qualifies foreign residents to apply for French or British citizenship, not normally withheld. In most countries, qualifying residential periods are reduced for legitimate and validated family members.

Reasons for migration vary and determine the routes and mechanisms by which people obtain permission to stay in a new country. Controlled and legitimate movements (such as labour market movements between EU member states) are reflected more or less comprehensively in official statistics. Refugees and asylum seekers however pose problems of migration control, and uncertainty regarding numbers which are not reflected in official statistics. Most countries however have consistent definitions with respect to refugees and asylum seekers and there is consistency in the definitions of which types of immigrant have legal status.

The terms asylum seeker, refugee and alien require definition. Asylum seekers are those immigrants who have fled their home country for reasons of persecution and who claim they would suffer continued persecution if returned there. In most countries they have permission to stay while their application for asylum is considered, but there are conditions varying in severity from country to country with regard to their rights (for example to housing and support) during this assessment period. However, there are two distinct legal bases for claiming asylum in France – Convention Asylum (under the Geneva Convention 1951) and Territorial Asylum (introduced in 1998 by the Chevènement Act). Refugees are asylum seekers whose application for asylum has been completed and who have been granted permission to stay in the adopted country, either for a limited period or permanently. Once this permission is obtained they have the same rights as indigenous citizens. Aliens are those people who have no legal status. These include people who have entered the country illegally, asylum seekers whose application for refugee status has been refused and who have not yet left, and others such as those who have remained after permission to stay has expired (for example students who have finished their course or those whose visa has expired).

Hungary, Romania and Slovenia also offer a special status to foreigners who enter the country as a consequence of war or conflict in their own countries; they are granted temporary permission to stay until the situation improves. Most of the immigrants in this category have come from the former state of Yugoslavia. This is defined as temporary protection status in Hungary and Slovenia and temporary humanitarian protection in Romania. In Slovenia the law with respect to this status was changed in 2002 so that immigrants from Bosnia and Herzegovina could be granted permanent permission to stay.

This study is aimed at immigrants with legal status, and hence is not directly concerned with aliens. Asylum seekers have undetermined status and different housing requirements to refugees, but are of relevance since they will have an impact on housing markets. Aliens cannot be ignored either because of the numbers of immigrants without permission to stay known to be resident in some countries. In Spain it is estimated that there are about one million foreigners with no residence permit, compared to about 1.7 million with legal status. These immigrants without permission to stay have significant effects on housing markets and hence cannot be ignored when analysing the role of housing in the integration of those immigrants who do have legal status. Indeed, regularisation legislation changes the legal
status of aliens in some countries. The number and proportion of immigrants without
permission to stay are less in the other case study countries but their existence still has effects
on those parts of the housing market used by immigrants in general.

In all the case study countries except Sweden, migrants’ children born in the host country are
considered to be citizens of that country and hence cease to be foreigners. These second and
third generation immigrants may as a consequence become invisible as far as official
statistics are concerned unless their place of birth is recorded in official statistics such as the
Census. Although as citizens of the host country they have equal rights with all other
citizens, their origins may expose them to discrimination and disadvantage and hence for
policy purposes it is important to consider their needs. Second and subsequent generation
immigrants, whether they have become citizens of the host country or not, have been
included as legitimate objects for this study. As an illustration of their quantitative
significance, the number of children born in Sweden of two immigrant parents (and hence
excluding those who are Swedish citizens) was 130,000 in 1980, 280,000 in 2000 and is
expected to be 550,000 in 2020.

1.4.2 Ethnic minorities

Definitional issues can be simplified by grouping minorities according to the classification
shown below which includes a migration dimension. This classification is for heuristic
purposes only. As indicated above, many minorities were at some point in time immigrants,
but those whose migration dates back several generations can be considered to be indigenous
to their country of residence. For the purposes of this study, migrant refers to migration
within the recent past and the present.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Racial</th>
<th>Cultural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Migrant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-migrant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In only one of the eight case study countries, the UK, is there an official recognition and use
of the concept of ethnic minority where this has a racial dimension. For the 2001 UK
Census of Population, individuals self-reported their ethnic identity within a broad given
classification and with the option to further describe their ethnic group; the main groups are
White, Mixed, Asian, Black and Chinese. Detailed ethnic data at the smallest of geographical
scales are available in the UK and are also collected routinely by private and public agencies
for the purposes of ethnic monitoring. This level of detail can be confusing and the use of
Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) groups as a generic term for ‘non-indigenous’ households
is widespread in policy discourse in the UK. In none of the other case study countries is it
possible to obtain data on the ethnic composition of the population where ethnicity is
assumed to refer to racial type. Although all countries have official data on birthplace and
citizenship, it is not possible to infer ethnicity (racially defined) from these variables.

The absence of official data on ethnicity as racially defined does not mean that such data do
not exist at the local/unofficial level, or that they are not used as a guide to policy and
practice. In France and Sweden there are no official data on ethnicity, but information on the
ethnic origins of applicants (inferred from nationality or unofficial sources) for housing is

---

1 The Spanish Government has announced during the course of this study that certain migrants without permission to stay
will be granted an amnesty which will give them more rights with respect to housing.

2 In Sweden, one of the parents must be a Swedish citizen for the child to be considered as a Swedish citizen.
used as a control mechanism for housing management and ghetto prevention even though such practices may contravene equal opportunities and anti-discrimination legislation. In Spain there is no official status for any ethnic minority, but there is a recognition that the Gypsy population has distinct needs which require a policy response.

All of the countries recognize and hold official data on **national minorities** however. These are minorities within the population who are full citizens of the state and are distinguished culturally, usually by language, but not by race. They may also have a well developed sense of self identity which they wish to preserve. In terms of the classification at the beginning of this section they can be considered as non-migrant cultural minorities. National minorities as so described are recognized by the Council of Europe’s Framework Convention on the Protection of National Minorities and four of the case study countries have designated some national minorities as having special rights connected to the preservation of their cultural identity. These are shown in Table 1.1:

Table 1.1 National minorities in case study countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hungary</th>
<th>Romania</th>
<th>Slovenia</th>
<th>Sweden</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Armenian</td>
<td>Armenian</td>
<td>Hungarian</td>
<td>Sami</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgarian</td>
<td>Bulgarian</td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>Tornedalers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatian</td>
<td>Croatian</td>
<td>Roma</td>
<td>Swedish-Finns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>Czech</td>
<td>Roma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>German</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>Greek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roma</td>
<td>Hungarian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romanian</td>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruthenian</td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbian</td>
<td>Polish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakian</td>
<td>Roma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenian</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukrainian</td>
<td>Serbian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Slav</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Slovakian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tatars</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Turks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ukrainian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Roma deserve more discussion since they constitute not only a distinct indigenous minority group in many European countries, but also because there are various definitions of the Roma community leading to confusion about numbers and also because they constitute one of the most deprived and excluded minority groups across Europe. In different member states, other terms are used as well as Roma including - gypsy, gitano, sinti and traveller. These do not necessarily refer to the same group. Additionally, official statistics often rely on self definition leading to variations in estimates of the true number of Roma in particular countries. Statistics giving estimates of the numbers of Roma people in the case study countries are given in Chapter 2.
This Chapter puts into context two central aspects: on the one hand migration trends and ethnicity and on the other hand the structure of housing markets and types of housing policies impacting on immigrants and ethnic minorities. Both aspects are intertwined as previous migration waves and the ethnic composition of the population have been significant in shaping legislation, attitudes and market opportunities/obstacles. An understanding of these features is crucial to grasp the current housing situation of immigrants and ethnic minorities. The literature on both these aspects is extensive, and this chapter provides only a brief summary of key issues relevant to the present research objectives.

2.1 MIGRATION TRENDS

Migration to the countries of the European Union has varied considerably over time in terms of scale, causes, ethnic composition and consequences for receiving countries. Recently, migration patterns have started to change in Europe and worldwide as a consequence of globalisation. Migration is now more mixed and includes asylum seekers, displaced persons and those seeking temporary protection, family members coming to join migrants already settled in the EU, labour migrants and growing numbers of business migrants. The dominant trend is that the vulnerability of recent waves of immigrants has increased. This is reflected in problematic access to housing.

White (1993) has made a useful categorisation of European in-migration into three distinct waves: labour migration up to the mid 1970s (including intra-European and colonial origin movements), family reunification (mid 1970s to 1990) and post-industrial after 1990 (including asylum seekers, clandestine movements and business migrants). Each wave has had a distinct impact at a different time from country to country and has varied considerably in scale. It has been argued (Salt, 1999) that an important characteristic of the recent migration patterns and trends identified in the European Union states is variability from country to country. There are marked differences in the migration fields of individual countries, reflecting a range of historical (for example colonial links) and geographical (especially proximity) processes. While there has been a trend towards greater harmonisation of migration policy across the EU, there is only limited evidence of convergence in migration experience (Edgar et al, 2004).

Migration patterns to and between the EU-10 countries have differed in type from those in the EU-15 and have been smaller in number. Among the identified trends are intra-regional labour market flows between neighbouring countries, and asylum and transit migration from outside Europe. Labour market movements are closely related to the informalization of the economies of eastern European countries associated with their political and economic transformation. Much of the intra-regional movement is also ethnic in nature, for example the movement of ethnic Hungarians from Romania and Ukraine to Hungary, and Moldavians to Romania. Growing numbers of asylum seekers and economic migrants are seeking entry to the EU-15 via countries in Eastern Europe as staging posts, but numbers are much smaller than those seeking access to the EU-15 directly. Few are seeking to make their permanent
home in Eastern Europe, but this may change with full EU membership and growing economic prosperity.

Summary data for the eight case study countries are presented in Table 2.1. These data exclude foreign born but naturalized citizens, and hence underestimate the true number of foreign born residents. For Sweden when naturalized citizens are included the number of foreign-born residents rises to over 1 million or 12 per cent of the total population. It should also be noted that Spain has a large number of immigrants without permission to stay compared to those who do, and hence the figure for Spain is a considerable underestimate of the actual number of foreign born residents. In Belgium, France, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden and the UK immigrants constitute a significant minority and can be expected to have an influence on housing markets. Romania and Hungary have very small foreign-born populations by comparison. Table 2.1 also shows the foreign born populations broken down by broad area of origin. In the case of France, Spain and the UK, the large proportion of immigrants from outside Europe is related to an influx from previous colonial countries. In the case of Belgium, which maintained rather problematic relations with its ex-colonial countries, the influx of non-European immigrants relied on active campaigns of the government to attract Moroccan and Turkish immigrants in order to supply the economy of the sixties and early seventies with an industrial labour force. The table hides more local factors such as geographic proximity within Europe: a significant proportion of the foreign-born in Sweden, for example, are from the other Nordic countries, and a large proportion of the foreign-born in Slovenia are from the former Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

Table 2.1 Foreign born residents: number and percentage of total population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Absolute Numbers</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EU-15 Other Europe</td>
<td>Outside Europe</td>
<td>EU-15 Other Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>563,000 26,000 303,000</td>
<td>5.5 0.25 3.0</td>
<td>892,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>1,195,498 360,181 1,707,507</td>
<td>2.1 0.6 2.9</td>
<td>3,263,186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>11,000 83,000 17,000</td>
<td>0.1 0.8 0.16</td>
<td>110,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>8,000 8,000 12,000</td>
<td>0.04 0.04 0.05</td>
<td>28,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>14,000 154,000 2,000</td>
<td>0.7 7.7 0.1</td>
<td>170,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>312,203 40,771 448,355</td>
<td>0.8 0.1 1.1</td>
<td>801,329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>224,700 48,000 177,000</td>
<td>2.5 0.5 2.0</td>
<td>450,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>859,138 198,123 1,240,686</td>
<td>1.4 0.3 2.0</td>
<td>2,297,947</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Foreign population in Belgium, 1 January 1999
2. Eurostat 1999. Excludes naturalised citizens
3. Resident foreigners 2001 (Office of Immigration and Nationality of the Ministry of Interior for Central Statistical Office)
5. Population Census 2002. The census includes all persons living in Slovenia at the time of the Census, regardless of their legal status
6. 2003 Statistics Sweden. Figures do not include those with Swedish citizenship
2.2 Ethnicity

The diverse ethnic composition of European states can be linked to historical and contemporary migration patterns, and also to post-1945 boundary changes. The latter have contributed to ethnic diversity in two of the case study countries, Hungary and Romania. Those countries with colonial histories (Belgium, France, Spain and the UK) have significant ethnic minorities from outside Europe some of which can be racially defined, and are so defined in the UK. The particular position of the Roma, present for many generations to varying degrees in all of the case study countries, must also be recognised. There is thus a considerable overlap between immigrant and ethnic minority populations, but the long standing residence of some minorities should be taken into account when examining their housing experiences.

In all the case study countries data are held on the numbers of people in the national minorities, mostly obtained from Population Censuses. These data are the result of voluntary self-definition and hence some doubt exists as to their accuracy. Table 2.2 gives the numbers of people in Hungary, Romania, Slovenia and Sweden in those national minorities recognised as having special rights connected to the preservation of their cultural identity, and Table 2.3 gives the numbers of the racially (self) defined minorities in the UK.

It is felt that in Hungary, Romania and Slovenia the numbers of Roma people recorded are significantly less than the true figure (from 50 to 100%) because of the choice of some Roma individuals to not identify themselves as such. Estimates of the Roma population in all the case study countries are given in Table 2.4.

Table 2.2 National minorities in Hungary, Romania, Slovenia and Sweden

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hungary¹</th>
<th>Romania²</th>
<th>Slovenia³</th>
<th>Sweden⁴</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Armenian</td>
<td>1,165</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>59,764</td>
<td>Hungarian 61,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgarian</td>
<td>2,316</td>
<td>Hungarian 1,431,807</td>
<td>Italian 21,200</td>
<td>Tornedalers 45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatian</td>
<td>25,730</td>
<td>Roma</td>
<td>535,140</td>
<td>Roma 3,246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>120,344</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>35,791</td>
<td>Roma 45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>6,619</td>
<td>Ukrainian</td>
<td>61,098</td>
<td>Jews 25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>5,144</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roma</td>
<td>205,720</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romanian</td>
<td>14,781</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruthenian</td>
<td>2,079</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbian</td>
<td>7,350</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakian</td>
<td>39,266</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenian</td>
<td>4,832</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukranian</td>
<td>7,393</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources:  
1 Census 2001  
2 Census 2002, main groups only  
3 Census 2002  
Table 2.3 Ethnic composition of UK population, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>% of population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>54,144,848</td>
<td>92.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>705,470</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian British Indian</td>
<td>1,058,205</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>764,260</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>293,946</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Asian</td>
<td>235,157</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or Black British</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Caribbean</td>
<td>587,892</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black African</td>
<td>470,314</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Other</td>
<td>117,579</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>235,157</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>235,157</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 2.4 Estimates of the Roma population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Official number (last census)</th>
<th>Estimate figures</th>
<th>Average estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>535,000 (2002)</td>
<td>1,200,000 to 2,500,000</td>
<td>1,850,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>No data available</td>
<td>600,000 to 800,000</td>
<td>700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>190,046 (2001)</td>
<td>600,000 to 800,000</td>
<td>700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>No data available</td>
<td>280,000 to 340,000</td>
<td>310,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>4,096 (2001)</td>
<td>90,000 to 300,000</td>
<td>195,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>No data available</td>
<td>40,000 to 50,000</td>
<td>45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>No data available</td>
<td>20,000 to 30,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>3,246 (2002)</td>
<td>7,000 to 10,000</td>
<td>8,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Council of Europe based on different sources

Although in none of the case study countries does the combined number of migrants and non-migrant minorities significantly exceed 10 per cent of the total population, there are locations and regions where this proportion is much higher because of the non-uniform spatial distribution of these groups. In the UK most of the ethnic minorities reside in the larger urban areas in England, notably London, the West Midlands and the northern conurbations. Local concentrations in these cities can exceed 40 per cent of the population as a whole. Similar distributions are found in the major French cities. In Sweden, immigrants are attracted to the larger cities because of employment opportunities and the support of other previous migrants, and similar processes operate in Belgium and Spain. There is less concentration in the EU-10 countries with the exception of the Roma who tend to live in separate, and poorer, settlements and communities. These concentrations increase the impact of immigrants and minorities on housing markets specifically, and more generally act as factors increasing social exclusion.

---

3 2219 Travellers and Gypsies in England and Wales + 167 in Scotland + 1,710 in Northern Ireland.
4 Includes Roma, Sinti and Travellers
The key housing issue with respect to the objectives of this study is market vulnerability. This covers not only low and irregular income, a characteristic shared by indigenous disadvantaged groups, but also those determinants of market weakness which immigrants and ethnic minorities have more than other groups. The most significant of these are information deficits and discriminatory practices. Information deficits are the consequence of unfamiliarity with the housing and welfare systems of the host country, which are compounded by language difficulties; they are characteristic of immigrants rather than ethnic minorities. Discriminatory practices may be direct or indirect. Direct discrimination would include barring access to housing because of migrant or ethnic/national status. An example of indirect discriminatory practice would be the provision of housing generally which does not meet the specific needs of immigrant or minority groups (small units when immigrant households are large for instance), or requesting references which immigrants would find it very difficult to provide.

The most difficult and intractable problem that all European countries have faced with respect to housing has been the provision of housing for low income groups. This has not only been a question of quantity, but also of quality, affordability, and location. General housing quality standards have improved across Europe as incomes and expectations have risen and these have affected what is acceptable for poorer groups. At the same time, affordability has to be achieved either through subsidised construction or rental allowances. Location is also significant. Market forces tend to segregate rich from poor, and physically separate and distinct slums have been a consistent feature of urban Europe. State sponsored solutions have often re-created concentrations of the poor which may have solved a housing problem but exacerbated social exclusion. When applied to immigrants and ethnic minorities, additional issues of “otherness” arise which may be either positive or negative in their implications and consequences. Ghettoization and its role in social exclusion remain problematic, and raise issues of choice and the relative merits of assimilation versus multiculturalism. The provision of, and access to, quality housing are key variables in resolving these dilemmas.

In some countries (for example France) housing issues have been given high priority; in others (for example Spain) housing has been given less prominence. In those countries where housing has been prioritised, structures and agencies exist which can be applied to changing problems, including access to housing for immigrants and ethnic minorities. There is responsibility for housing at central government level, and the existence at local level of public and private (voluntary) sector agencies to deliver centrally driven policies. In those countries where housing has had less policy salience the provision of access to quality housing for these groups may prove more difficult, since the structures and agencies will need to be developed or restored. Additionally, in Belgium and Spain government is regionalised with a high degree of local autonomy. This makes the development of a consistent national housing policy difficult, but on the other hand does allow the possibility of locally developed policies more appropriate for local circumstances.

In those countries where housing has had some prominence, various policies and structures were developed and put into practice in the latter part of the twentieth century, ranging from free market solutions (e.g. the UK in the 1980s) through interventionist policies within a market context (e.g. the Netherlands and Sweden), to collectivist provision in the former Communist bloc. At the beginning of the twenty first century, most countries in Europe have
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adopted an essentially market approach to housing provision for the majority based on home ownership, with differing approaches to provision for low income groups. With respect to the latter the following broad policy types can be identified:

- **subsidised provision supplemented by rental allowances (France, UK):** the major mechanism for housing lower income groups is subsidised provision by State sponsored organisations, supplemented by rental allowances as rents have risen in recent years. Supply, quality and affordability are under direct policy control.
- **former subsidised production, now dependent on limited rental allowances (Sweden):** subsidised construction of housing has virtually ceased (except for specified very vulnerable groups) and municipal housing companies (MHCs) act like private landlords. Unlike social housing in France and the UK, in Sweden housing owned by municipal housing companies is accessible to all households.
- **virtually no subsidised provision (Belgium, Spain):** there has been no history of large scale construction of subsidised housing for the poor who are reliant on a very small State rented sector, poor quality private rented sector accommodation and the cheapest home ownership options.
- **transitional economies of the former Communist bloc (Hungary, Romania and Slovenia):** mass privatisation of State owned housing has left many poor households as part of a residual State rented sector or dependent on the poorest quality private sector housing, both rented and owned. The withdrawal of the State has left housing provision largely in the hands of a developing and immature private market.

The effectiveness of these policy types in providing access to quality housing for low income groups has varied. In some cases, notably France and the UK, the housing circumstances of large numbers of poor households have been significantly improved but social exclusion has in some cases increased due to location on large peripheral housing developments remote from employment and other facilities. Historical provision by municipal housing companies in Sweden has provided quality housing for many poorer households, but the contemporary situation for the disadvantaged has deteriorated with the cutback in subsidised provision and a wider more market driven role for the MHCs. Where measures to assist poor households gain access to housing have been less developed, such as in Belgium and Spain, their housing conditions have remained poor. In the transitional economies, privatisation has taken precedence over redistributive measures and the poorer households have not experienced an improvement in their housing conditions. Those poorer households who have seized the opportunity to become owner occupiers have faced a deterioration in their housing since they are now responsible for maintenance expenditure formerly borne by the State.

Policy measures to provide access to quality housing for lower income groups would be expected ceteris paribus to assist all such groups, including immigrants and ethnic minorities. The additional disadvantages of these groups (information deficit and discrimination) may however counteract any assistance they may derive from policies driven by income considerations. Two questions arise here:

- are measures to assist lower income groups gain access to quality housing effective, and if not why are they failing? This should include broader issues of social exclusion, for instance quality housing which excludes by means of segregation.
- what further measures are required to tackle the particular difficulties faced by immigrants and ethnic minorities?
With respect to the first question, in those countries where policies to assist lower income households have been ineffective or absent (notably Belgium and Spain, and latterly the transition economies), the position of immigrants and ethnic minorities would be expected to be especially difficult taking into consideration the additional barriers to access they face, notably information deficit and discrimination. Moreover, where indigenous groups face housing difficulties, the provision of additional assistance targeted at immigrants and ethnic minorities is likely to face political resistance and also encounter social tensions which make its implementation problematic.

With respect to the latter question, distinction is required between general policies and measures to deal with discrimination, equal opportunities and social exclusion, and specific policies to deal with these issues within the housing context. For example, there may be legislation which proscribes discrimination generally on the grounds of race which can be avoided in a housing context. This has occurred in Sweden where immigrant applicants have been rejected as tenants by landlords on the grounds of income level and rent paying reliability. Moreover, there may be conflicts between different policy objectives. In France all groups have equal rights to housing and all applicants for rented housing have the legal right to be treated the same. Some HLMs however have quotas for ethnic groups in order to preserve racial mix and avoid ghettos. This has meant that some ethnic minority households have been denied access to housing in order that the policy of racial balance is maintained.

Where general policies on equal opportunities and discrimination fail in the housing context, attention needs to be given to:

- either specific legislation with respect to housing
- and/or the establishment of agencies in the public or private/voluntary sectors dedicated to the improvement of the housing situation of immigrants and ethnic minorities.

In the UK, the Scottish Parliament has built into its homelessness legislation specific requirements that the rights to accommodation and support guaranteed by the legislation are available to all groups irrespective of race, gender and sexual orientation. More generally in Britain, housing associations have been established to deal specifically with the housing needs of BME households. This is in addition to exacting general legislative guarantees for all groups to be treated equally, and suggests that general anti-discrimination and equal opportunities legislation is insufficient to ensure equal access to quality housing.

Further difficulties are caused by indirect rather than direct discrimination. Minority groups may be severely disadvantaged in terms of housing not as a result of direct exclusion, but as a result of provision of housing and support which does not meet their specific needs. The lack of intention to discriminate does not diminish the exclusion which can result from unintentional discrimination. Indirect discrimination is in some ways more difficult to deal with because it is by definition less obvious. Monitoring of the distribution of housing among different groups is important in combating discrimination generally, but is vital in dealing with indirect discrimination. Effective information systems are crucial in this context. The employment of staff from minority groups by housing agencies at all levels is also important in dealing with discrimination, direct and indirect, but can be especially effective in countering the latter.
Although immigrants and ethnic minorities share disadvantage in housing markets, their experiences are not identical. Information deficit in particular is more a problem for immigrants than for ethnic minorities. The different groups will be faced with some different problems demanding different policy solutions. There are also differences within the groups; not all immigrants are the same, and there are variations in the housing experiences of immigrants. All of these differences and the housing pathways associated with them need to be taken into account in an evaluation of appropriate policy responses.

For immigrants, there are differences with respect to legal status. Those immigrants with automatic legal status (for example movement within the EU by EU citizens) will be entitled to the same housing rights as indigenous citizens, and their difficulties centre around information availability and access procedures for housing appropriate to their circumstances. For immigrants whose legal status is undetermined (asylum seekers for example) transitional housing may be required during the assessment period, followed by movement to more permanent and individual housing once permission to stay is granted. The particular problems they face as foreigners in a different culture may require support as well as accommodation and the help of specialised agencies.

There are significant variations between ethnic minorities which are reflected in different housing requirements. In the UK Asian minorities have different requirements to Afro-Caribbean households derived from cultural and demographic variables. The former tend to have larger families (and hence a need for larger dwellings) and are culturally more distinctive (leading to a requirement for proximity to specialised facilities). Preservation of cultural distinctiveness may require a certain degree of spatial concentration of Asian households raising issues regarding the positive or negative aspects of segregation. Similar considerations may apply to Roma communities in various countries across Europe. In Spain, immigrants from South America face fewer difficulties than those from North Africa as a consequence of greater cultural similarity with the host population. However, Cabrera (2002) suggests that more recent immigrants, including Spanish speaking immigrants from south and Central-America, face more serious problems and are often exploited in social networks of ‘compatriots’ who arrived in the country at an earlier stage.

The evaluation of what would constitute the most effective policy responses to the housing needs of immigrants and ethnic minorities must be placed within the broader context of how to improve the housing of disadvantaged households, and also take into account the specific needs of immigrants and minorities and the variability within these groups.

---

5 Regulation (EEC) 1612/68, of the Council of 15 October 1968 on freedom of movement of workers within the Community. A national of a Member State who is employed in the territory of another Member State shall enjoy all the rights and benefits accorded to national workers in matters of housing including ownership of the housing needed. Such a worker may, with the same rights as nationals, put his/her name down on the housing list in the region where he/she is employed.
2.4 CONCLUSION

This chapter has defined the demographic and housing policy context within which this study is set. Of particular note are the variations within immigrant and minority populations from country to country, and within the case study countries, as well as the common difficulties they share with all disadvantaged groups. These shared difficulties of low and uncertain incomes are compounded by those peculiar to immigrants and minorities, namely discrimination and information deficits.

Chapter 3 describes and discusses in detail the problems that immigrants and minorities face in accessing decent affordable housing in the case study countries. Chapter 4 examines the current policies that are intended to deal with these problems, and Chapter 5 evaluates these policies and contains recommendations as to how to improve their effectiveness.
### 3.1 INTRODUCTION

Among many of the immigrants arriving in Europe in the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries, there has been an increasing vulnerability to housing exclusion and homelessness witnessed, in part, by a growth in foreign born users of homeless services (Edgar et al, 2004). A ‘hierarchy of vulnerability’ can be identified with the position of immigrants in the hierarchy determined in large part by their legal status (itself a reflection of the tightening of immigration controls and the increasing rigour of asylum procedures), but also associated with the characteristics of immigrants themselves (their skill levels, their relative wealth, their gender, age and so forth). The vulnerability of immigrants to housing exclusion and homelessness is however, also clearly linked to the changing structures of national and regional housing markets and is perpetuated by the lack of compensatory alleviating or preventive policies. This vulnerability is also to be found among ethnic minorities in most countries, both those who previously arrived as immigrants and those (like the Roma) who form a cultural minority among the citizenry.

Access to housing is becoming more market driven. Even in countries with relatively high levels of social housing, the role of social housing agencies is becoming market oriented. Hence any consideration of the role of housing in the social inclusion of ethnic minorities and immigrants needs to be undertaken in the wider context of economic advantage or disadvantage. The way in which the housing market and housing market organisations generally operate in favour of individuals and organisations according to their occupational and economic status operates to the disadvantage of immigrants and ethnic minority groups. They may additionally be exposed to various forms of non-economic direct and indirect discrimination.

This part of the report considers the housing situation of immigrants and people from ethnic minority communities. This understanding leads to a discussion of the housing that may be distinctive to immigrants and ethnic communities. The particular vulnerability of some, arising from gender, age or cultural circumstances, is then considered. This provides a basis for consideration of the barriers to access to decent and affordable housing. While the operation of the housing market, by excluding some from decent housing, may help to create social exclusion among immigrants and ethnic minorities, housing is a key factor in enabling social inclusion. The conclusions identify some of the key issues to be evaluated in relation to the policy measures that may be required to promote the integration of immigrants and the inclusion of ethnic minorities.

In order to facilitate comparative analysis across the eight case study countries they have been grouped into the following categories, following Edgar et al. (2004). This classification recognizes the utility for policy purposes of a proportion of the housing stock being in the social rented sector and thus under the direct influence of public policy:

- countries with a sizable social/public housing sector (equal to or greater than 15% of the national housing stock) and well developed and integrated housing policies: France, Sweden and the United Kingdom. France and the UK are differentiated from Sweden in
that they have a longer history of immigration derived from a colonial past and as a consequence have large ethnic minority populations many of which are French and British born. Furthermore, Swedish public sector housing differs from that in France and the UK in not being directed at lower income or vulnerable groups.

- countries with a small social housing sector (less than 15% of total stock) and less developed or integrated housing policies: Belgium and Spain. Belgium does however have a more developed social welfare system than Spain which to some extent mitigates against the lack of integrated housing policies.
- countries of the EU-10 and Romania in the transition from a centrally planned to a market housing system.

3.2 HOUSING CIRCUMSTANCES OF IMMIGRANTS AND ETHNIC GROUPS

Summary

Immigrants and people from minority ethnic communities are more likely to live in deprived areas and in poor quality, over-crowded and unpopular housing and to pay a higher proportion of their household income to occupy that housing.

Legal status, ethnic origin and discrimination are key factors affecting access to housing for immigrants.

The relative poverty and weak labour market position of people from minority ethnic communities restricts their choice in the housing market and constrains their ability to be residentially mobile in order to improve their housing situation.

Voluntary organisations report disproportionately high numbers of immigrants and ethnic minority people among the homeless population living in hostels in most EU-15 countries.

Significant variations exist within and between different immigrant and ethnic groups.

Specific issues or problems can be discerned in different countries (e.g. the EU-10, countries with a long history of immigration).

Racial discrimination and harassment play an important role in the disproportionate housing exclusion experienced by immigrants and people from minority ethnic communities.

Immigrants and minority ethnic people face significant difficulties in getting good quality, affordable housing with secure tenure in all the member states of the European Union. While there are similarities in the housing circumstances of immigrants and ethnic minorities, the underlying processes that confine them to the worst sectors of the housing market vary between groups and across countries.
3.2.1 Immigrants

In relation to immigrants there are marked differences in access to housing across the EU and, more importantly, in relation to their legal status and the social protection afforded to them.

The differential access to rights conferred by migrant status creates a ‘hierarchy of vulnerability’ which is manifest in the poorer housing conditions of those on the lower levels of this hierarchy, in their social segregation, and in their low pay and poor working conditions. Their lack of assured rights and their relatively deprived status in comparison to those with full citizenship also mark them out for racial harassment and xenophobia. Edgar et al (2004) describe different pathways to homelessness taken by legal immigrants (including legal labour, family reunion, repatriates), refugees and asylum seekers, and those without legal status.

Among legal immigrants their socio-economic status, their social networks and ability to access information on housing tend to structure their housing opportunities on arrival. Repatriate immigrants (e.g. Germany, Finland and Greece) have been relatively well catered for by government policy in the past but evidence suggests that support they receive in this way has tightened in recent years and thus a higher proportion end up in unpopular and poorer ends of the housing market (Busch-Geertsema, 2003; Sapounakis, 2003).

Immigrants without legal status are not the focus of this research but it is clear that for many their status means that the accommodation is transitory, at best, allowing them to keep one step ahead of the authorities. Exclusion from social housing and normal rental contracts means that they have a dependence on fellow expatriates for information on the availability of affordable and accessible places to reside. It also follows that the likelihood is that, where they find accommodation, it will be of the worst kind ‘in the most run down and shadiest end of the property market’ (Gibney, 2001, p12). The increase in illegal immigration thus places a greater strain on those parts of the housing market to which the most disadvantaged and vulnerable immigrants and ethnic minorities resort.

The numbers of asylum seekers entering the case study countries vary significantly and hence the effects on the housing systems concerned also vary. The numbers of asylum seekers and the proportion accepted as refugees with permission to stay is shown in Table 3.1. The numbers applying are high in Belgium, France, Sweden and the UK. The number granted permission to stay is low however in all eight countries. This does not necessarily mean that all those rejected leave the country and hence the impacts on housing markets are still significant. Furthermore, although the numbers applying for asylum in Spain are low, the number of persons who have entered the country illegally are high as pointed out in Chapter 2.
Table 3.1 Numbers of asylum seekers and decision on application 2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Asylum applications</th>
<th>Permission to stay granted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>16,940</td>
<td>1,201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>59,768</td>
<td>6,526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>2,401</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>1,077</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>5,918</td>
<td>405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>31,348</td>
<td>3,525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>49,369</td>
<td>11,091</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Some common trends can be identified in relation to the accommodation of asylum applicants (Dutch Refugee Council, 1999). Insufficient reception facilities push asylum seekers into the worst sectors of the housing market or into homeless hostels. Lengthening periods of stay in reception facilities exacerbate this situation. Immigrants from new refugee countries and larger families face more problems than others in finding adequate accommodation. Reception in large-scale centres, it is concluded, ‘where asylum seekers are institutionalised for lengthy periods of time are detrimental to creating a reasonable starting position for integration’ (Dutch Refugee Council, 1999, p26).

In Sweden, about half of the asylum-seekers since 1994 have arranged their own accommodation. All of them are entitled to a place in an asylum camp, although the Migration Board has sometimes found it difficult to acquire such housing and in reality, asylum camps are only found outside the big cities where many want to stay.

A report by the Stockholm Integration Department (1999) identified a series of reasons why refugees do not get housing even when they have residence permits:

- they have not spent enough time in the queue with those landlords who operate queuing systems
- they lack both money and contacts
- large families cannot afford to rent the few large apartments that do exist
- landlords tend to ask for references covering two years’ complaint-free residence, and references from temporary refugee accommodation are not accepted, which effectively excludes new arrivals, and
- programmes to reduce the number of immigrants in areas with low shares of Swedes.

In France, it is estimated that the current demand for housing or accommodation arising from all forms of asylum is between 375,000 and 400,000 (Maurel, 2003). This figure includes convention as well as territorial asylum seekers, statutory refugees and overstaying (failed) asylum seekers. Hence, for 2001, Maurel (ibid) estimates an average of 72,000 new arrivals, 110,000 at pre-determination stage, 102,000 statutory refugees and 100,000 failed asylum seekers (overstayers). This analysis clearly demonstrates that the housing implications of asylum immigration cannot be determined on the basis of figures based solely on annual asylum applications. The housing effect must take account of both the stock (new applicants) and flow (processing of applicants) through the immigration system.
Mainstream publicly-funded homeless shelters and emergency accommodation are being used to plug some of these gaps for asylum seekers and statutory refugees. Firstly, this accommodation is being used to meet the needs of those who are denied access to specialised facilities, for which they are eligible, because it is over-subscribed. The average length of stay in specialist asylum accommodation (CADA) rose by 50% in four years (from one year to 545 days). The main outcome of this logjam is that, in practice, almost all available places are earmarked for families. This means that single people, although legally entitled to specialised accommodation, are consigned to the emergency provision or to sleeping rough. Furthermore, almost two-thirds of all convention asylum applications are in the Paris region where status determination times may average 9-10 months and hence this group are also forced to rely on emergency homeless accommodation or alternative informal housing arrangements.

In the UK, controlling access to housing has been central to recent government asylum and immigration strategy. The system of dispersal across the UK aimed to relieve the burden on London and the South East of England. Central Government hoped to avoid social exclusion and racial tension, by linking dispersal to existing settled immigrant communities. They also aimed to prevent asylum seekers moving back to London. Groups of asylum seekers (by country of origin) were dispersed in clusters to UK regions. Local authority participation in the scheme was voluntary and asylum seekers were generally relocated to areas with a pool of empty social housing in the most unpopular housing areas. In general these were also areas of high unemployment and poverty. Hence the dispersal system largely relocated vulnerable asylum seekers to communities which were already marginalised (Pearl and Zetter, 2002, p234-238).

A study by Shelter Scotland (Buck, 2001) evaluated the provision of housing and support to asylum seekers in Scotland. Asylum seekers reported a lack of choice in coming to live in Scotland and that they had no choice of accommodation within the City of Glasgow. Furthermore, support services were not meeting their needs in terms of settling into local communities. Most participants quickly began to feel isolated and realised they were largely housed in areas characterised by poverty and social problems. They spoke of fears for their security and the widespread experience of harassment and abuse.

Based on the views expressed by asylum seekers, the Shelter report recommended that a reasonable choice and more appropriate/sensitive accommodation be offered to them. There was also a need to ensure adequate resettlement support, taking account of different languages, communities and cultures. The study also highlighted problems at the point of transition to refugee status. Government support ended after 14 days and households were required to apply for other benefits and accommodation during that very short time. It was found that policy regarding the possible transfer to other accommodation had been slow to develop and implement.

The Belgian reception system changed drastically in 1997. The new reception system is linked to the asylum procedure. Asylum seekers are first directed to reception centres run by the State or the Red Cross to await a decision on the admissibility of their application. During the admission stage, asylum seekers can only obtain social aid in a reception centre. When the application is declared admissible, there is a choice between staying in a centre or finding independent accommodation. After a positive decision, asylum seekers are assigned to a municipality responsible for social assistance. Problems occur in organising the transit
from the centres to the municipalities in part because of the problem of finding housing. The fact that social aid is paid approximately six weeks after the application makes it very difficult in most cases to sign a contract to rent a house and make the first payment.

In practice, many asylum seekers who are allocated to smaller municipalities in rural areas never reside there, but choose to find their own lodgings in one of the bigger cities. During the asylum procedure, the vast majority of immigrants end up in the private rental sector and usually in the bottom end of this sector. Research in Antwerp has shown that the country of origin influences accessibility. People from ‘newer’ refugee-countries find it more difficult to find rental accommodation. Single people fare better than large families. Many end up in neighbourhoods with a vacancy rate above average, in neighbourhoods where housing quality and social facilities are poor and in neighbourhoods with high percentages of migrant inhabitants.

In Spain the housing situation is particularly difficult for migrants without legal status. Those who have entered Spain by official channels and been given permission to stay do better, but they generally have to seek accommodation in the private sector and face problems of overcrowding, and poor physical housing in rural areas for agricultural workers.

The situation in the EU-10 States and Romania appears to be less problematic partly due to the small scale of the problem. Legislation for the integration of asylum seekers is generally very recent or is yet to be fully implemented.

In Slovenia persons with permission to stay obtained through temporary protection status (TPS), can be accommodated either through the national housing programme, accommodation centres or the private rental sector. Accommodation centres are the main source of accommodation of people under TPS. The quality of housing varies but the majority of accommodation centres are in very poor condition. Furthermore, they are usually isolated, situated at the margins of the towns, leading to further segregation and ghettoization of the TPS refugees. In the past twelve years approximately half of the refugees under TPS lived in private rental accommodation, the quality of which is usually low (damp, small apartments in inconvenient locations).

Asylum seekers also resort to either asylum facilities (there is one reception centre in the country with 120-bed capacity) or the private rental sector. However, the majority of asylum seekers stay in the asylum where they receive basic maintenance (Gosenca and Rudolf 2003). Refugees who have been granted asylum have the right to free accommodation for six months in housing provided by the Ministry of the Interior. They are also entitled to receive a financial allowance for the payment of rent for private accommodation for a period of three years. Moreover, special care is provided for vulnerable groups, to whom suitable accommodation is granted.

The Romanian Government approved a special programme for the integration of refugees in 2001 which included the right to housing. The Ministry of the Interior provides reception accommodation for a maximum period of one year and local authorities and NGOs provide housing under common programmes with the National Office for Refugees. The standard of accommodation is relatively high by Romanian standards. There are currently about 600 refugees in Romania, only 10% of whom live in special accommodation centres. The remainder have decent housing by Romanian standards. Those who are still living in accommodation centres are vulnerable immigrants such as unaccompanied minors, older
people and disabled people. Asylum seekers, after successful determination of their application, can apply for housing under the same conditions as Romanian citizens. The National Office for Refugees covers 50% of the rent for a period of one year. Usually refugees are directed to cities where there is an accommodation centre. The new government ordinance (93/2004) regarding social integration of foreigners who were granted a protection status states that these foreigners also have access to housing on the same basis as Romanian citizens but the instruments to implement this are not yet in place.

In Hungary, asylum seekers are required by law to live in one of the three reception centres, community shelters or other places of residences assigned by the Office of Immigration and Nationality (OIN) of the Ministry of the Interior. Upon request, the asylum seeker can rent private accommodation if a valid rent contract is submitted to and accepted by OIN. After six months of the determination of refugee status, refugees are paid a one-time settlement benefit regardless of whether they live in a reception centre and can apply for housing assistance to enable them to access rented accommodation. In theory this can be used to access both public and private rented accommodation, but in practice refugees are restricted to the private sector. Within five years they can apply for a ‘home-making grant’ in the form of an interest free loan to assist in access to home ownership.

3.2.2 Ethnic Minority Communities

In relation to people from ethnic minority communities, our review demonstrates differences across the EU related to the structure of the housing market and the role of the state in housing. In particular, the proportion of the housing stock that is in the public/social rented sector appears to be a significant factor in the housing opportunities of minority groups. Within countries there is also clear evidence of differences between minority groups. In France, Sweden and the UK similar circumstances exist for ethnic minority groups in relation to a high concentration in the major cities and areas of high housing demand (Paris, London and Stockholm), and of segregation of minority groups in the poorer quality parts of the public/social housing and not for profit sectors. There is also evidence of diversity among ethnic groups in relation to their housing experience. Finally there is evidence of a persistence and inter-generational component to the housing experience of particular ethnic groups.

In the UK, the 44 most deprived local authority areas contain proportionately four times as many people from minority ethnic groups as other areas. In 12 of the 32 London Boroughs more than a third of households are from a minority ethnic background (compared to 8% in the UK) and more than half of households in Brent and Newham are from an ethnic minority group. In France, 51% of Turks, 43% of Southeast Asians, 44% of Algerians and 41% of Moroccans live in the districts where at least a third of people live in a household with at least one immigrant member. In Sweden, most residential areas in which immigrants make up the majority are found in the three big city regions and targeted by the City Initiative (Integration Board 2003). More recent Swedish research evidences similar patterns in other towns (Integration Board 2004), as well as the tendency that segregation has deepened in the course of the last decade.
Households from minority ethnic communities tend to have a greater reliance on social rented housing but also often tend to end up in the worst public sector housing. However, in all these countries some ethnic groups are more dependent upon social housing than others.

In France, a number of studies have highlighted the bad housing conditions (mal-logement) of immigrant populations in public housing. Thus 45% of households of Turkish origin and 50% of families of Algerian, Moroccan and black African origin were considered very badly housed in contrast to 11% of the general French population. Thus the gap between the immigrant and French populations concerning housing conditions is far from improving (GELD, 2001). There is in fact a tendency towards aggravation of the situation, which is in contrast to studies of INSEE (INSEE, 1999) which indicate that there is a ten year ‘housing quality’ gap between immigrants and the French that is forecast to diminish over time and ultimately disappear. Recent demonstrations in Toulouse testify to the continuance of the problem over many years to include the next generation of immigrant families. There are also particular problems with the housing of Roma. Although there is no systematic overview available of shanty-town settlements in France, national newspapers, such as Le Monde and Le Parisien, frequently report on the appalling living conditions of immigrants, especially Gypsies, in French urban regions. In the winter of 2002, Le Monde for instance regularly wrote about the three Roma camps in Choisy-le-Roi (e.g. 5 and 6 December 2002), close to Paris, while another group of Bulgarian Gypsies, according to the same newspaper, survived in an airport hangar in Bordeaux in the southwest of France (9 November, 2002). Other similar Gypsy camps were identified by Le Parisien in the town of Lieusant (Seine-et-Marne, 7 November 2002). Segregated settlements and all types of inadequate habitats still affect between 10-12% of the Roma population, an improvement from the 30% affected in 1991.

In the UK home ownership is most common among Indian and Pakistani households. Bangladeshi, Caribbean and African households are disproportionately concentrated in social housing – nearly 50% compared to 20% of white and 10% of Indian households (see Figure 3.1). These differences reflect differences in area of residence, income and type of household. Those in social housing are over-represented in high rise accommodation (Lakey, 1997). Ethnic minority households are more likely to live in over-crowded conditions (15% compared to 2% of white-British households). Bangladeshi and Pakistani households are more likely to be overcrowded (40% of households), probably indicating a lack of accommodation for larger (or extended) families. Although the level of ‘black homelessness’ in the UK lacks accurate quantification, it is known to be highly significant. Evidence cited by Burrows (1997) demonstrated that 14% of UK households identifying as black had experienced homelessness at sometime in their housing careers, compared to 4.3% of the total population. Hence, while most homeless people are white, the risk of homelessness is three times greater among black households.
A mixture of market processes and discrimination, together with the dismantling of a housing policy able to counter this, explain why housing segregation on ethnic lines has become more distinct during the 1990s in Sweden. There is a growing policy concern of large minority group families who live in over-crowded conditions or, partly as a result of this, become homeless. According to Statistics Sweden (2003, p. 6), 71% of all children live in single-family houses but only 24% of the children who are born outside the Nordic countries and the EU. Furthermore, few of the families have access to large apartments which are almost only found in old, private-rental buildings and are expensive to rent or buy.

In Belgium and Spain national housing policy is relatively weak and is delegated to autonomous regions. Home ownership predominates and the level of social housing is small. Thus in Belgium and Spain the housing situation of minority groups cannot be identified easily by tenure differences but rather by differences in the quality of housing. The housing situation of ethnic minorities in each country has several distinct strands. There is the spatial strand of segregation (dominantally metropolitan, however also regional in the case of for instance mining areas), exclusion from decent housing, and the development of informal housing markets and landlord exploitation. There is the rural strand of, for example, the agricultural workers of Rioja in rural Spain. Finally there is the strand of the Roma population (especially in Andalucia).

The two main outstanding issues of housing and social exclusion for ethnic minorities in Spain can be summarised, first, as the persistence of the shantytown (chabolismo) and sub-standard housing and, second, the emergent problems arising with urbanization policies involving Roma (FSGG, 2003).

Although the housing situation of the Roma community varies widely, a significant part of this population lives in sub-standard housing and the vast majority of inhabitants of shantytowns are in fact Roma. Many of these areas are located around or within big cities.
The requirements to housing access in a home ownership society such as Spain are practically impossible to fulfill for the majority of Roma. There are certain patterns of behaviour that are required in order to be granted a mortgage (formal jobs, previous capacity of saving and indebtedness, annual income tax declarations) that are not the reality for many Roma families who work in informal activities.

According to *Fundación Secretariado General Gitano* (FSGG, 2003), there are several elements that contribute to the maintenance of shantytowns in Spain. The main obstacle to eradicate shantytowns is perceived to be the lack of economic resources, but it is more likely a matter of difficulties in finding solutions and of evasion of administrative responsibilities. The task of eradicating *chabolismo* and sub-standard housing often surpasses the technical and administrative capacities of local councils. The lack of clear responsibility for housing operates as an obstacle that leads to inactivity. A philosophy of integrated action, both with the relocated families and existing inhabitants of the neighbourhood, is lacking. Consequently, as local conflicts are not solved, the environment deteriorates quickly or new environments of *vertical chabolismo* are generated. The lack of models of good practice on relocation that could pick up the experience accumulated in this field must be underlined. For example, the negative effects of the construction of “transition neighbourhoods” have been demonstrated. The houses and the environment of these neighborhoods are low-quality and lack appropriate maintenance. There are no policy measures to assist the rehoused families to take care of the buildings, and no participation and socialization spaces. Overcrowding, another significant characteristic of these neighbourhoods, results from extended families living together because of the lack of housing alternatives. This situation often leads to new *chabolismo* or the illegal occupation of houses. Lastly, the lack of access to public housing and the free market situation for buying or renting block the choices of improving the housing situation for newly-formed households.

In Belgium, ethnicity is correlated with poor housing. Minorities arising from legal labour migration still tend to live concentrated in the poorer neighbourhoods of the cities and their housing quality is still lagging considerably behind, but this affects certain groups more than others. Turks and Moroccans in particular experience worse housing conditions than migrants from the EU-15. They often face problems to access the housing market because of discrimination based on race, ethnic origin and culture. In some cases this kind of discrimination can lead to homelessness. Barriers in accessing the private rented sector sometimes force purchase in the poorest parts of the owner occupied stock. As Turks and Moroccans tend to be concentrated predominantly in the cities, so as to avail themselves of the demand for low-skilled labour on the local labour markets, they have sought housing in these available, cheap dwellings.

A possible alternative to home ownership could be the social rental sector. But this is still too limited in scope to offer any prospects, and moreover foreign nationals are still much discriminated against in this sector, or are not aware of their opportunities to enter it. In Belgium Kesteloot and Meert (1999) have commented on the different shares of Moroccan and Turkish people in social housing. For traditional Muslim Moroccans, they suggest that public housing is the only good alternative if they want to escape from poor housing without mortgages. The more secularised Turkish people have least problems with mortgages and so are hardly to be found in the social rental sector.
The last group of countries consists of those that are in transition from a centrally planned housing market to a privatised housing economy. In our study Hungary, Romania and Slovenia are used to exemplify the key issues.

These countries are characterised by poor housing conditions for large segments of the population of whom national minorities are a part, especially in Romania and to a lesser extent in Hungary and Slovenia. They share the experience that immigration is a phenomenon of the last decade and is thus relatively small in scale. Hence ethnic minorities who are foreign born or children of foreign born parents are not a significant proportion of households. Ethnic minority households are small in number and recent in origin – mainly since 1990 – and do not appear to have significant housing problems since most are in strong labour market situations.

All three countries contain national minorities who retain their linguistic and cultural identity and whose rights are prescribed in the constitution and legislation of those countries. National minorities do not have housing problems significantly different from the overall population with the exception of the Roma.

The main group in all three countries to experience exclusion from adequate housing and segregation in the housing market are the Roma. Their housing circumstances are discussed below (section on vulnerable groups). It is sufficient at this point to explain the diversity that exists among the Roma community in each of these three countries in their housing circumstances. The differences in numbers of Roma in each of the countries should also be highlighted, from about 1.8 million in Romania, 700,000 in Hungary and only 8,500 in Slovenia (see Chapter 2; Table 2.4).

In Romania most of the Roma live in segregated areas in one of three types of settlement (Zoon, 2001):

- The “mahala”, remoter rural communities in a naturally developed area with a compact Roma population. The building has an acceptable quality, but the infrastructure is very poor.
- Urban ghettos in apartment buildings abandoned by state enterprises and municipalities. Homeless families seeking temporary shelter quickly take over these housing units.
- Slums or shanty settlements, comprised of shacks and hovels, often built without authorization on municipal or private land on the outskirts of the city.

The most important issue related to housing that Roma communities are facing now in Romania is the problem of eviction. For historical reasons, Roma communities have had limited access to property (either land or housing). Families who had a job in a state owned enterprise before 1989 owned their dwelling. The closure of state owned enterprises has thrown these families into poverty. They were not able to pay the utilities for housing and became subject to eviction.

The president of the Union of Roma (“Slovenska Romska zveza”) classified the living conditions of Roma in Slovenia into three groups (Horvat 1997):
• Roma reaching a “high standard of living”. These are Roma living in urban centres, in apartment blocks in rented flats, including those living in brick houses of their own outside of Roma settlements.

• Roma with a “lower standard of living”. These live in high density Roma settlements, which are settlements of one or two-room houses, made of brick or wood.

• Roma with the “lowest standard of living”. They live in isolated settlements located at the border of village communities. Their huts are dark, damp, and unhygienic, without toilets and bathrooms.

According to the Governmental Commission for Assistance to the Roma (September 2003), these two last groups are the most numerous: the majority of Roma live in settlements isolated from the Slovene population and in poor conditions, in substandard or below the minimum housing standards at the margins of populated areas. The data indicate that one-third live in dwellings of which half were built without the necessary permits, 58% live in makeshift housing (e.g. barracks, containers, trailers) and only 12% live in apartments. Thus housing is perhaps the most pressing and complex issue for the Roma in Slovenia and many of them single out inadequate housing as their main problem. The specifics of the problem are various – from Roma settlements built illegally on land owned by non-Roma, to the vehement refusals by non-Roma to admit new Roma neighbours to their settlements (Perič 2001).

According to a recent (2003) national survey in Hungary (Kemeny and Janky, 2004), the average size of Roma households is far above the national average. Combined with the fact that about two-thirds of Roma houses had only two rooms, this has lead to overcrowding. Furthermore, about 36,000 Roma (6 per cent of the total population) are living in traditional colonies where there is a preponderance of shanties and huts.

Table 3.2 The characteristics of settlements with or without a large number of Roma population (2001 census data)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The type of the settlement</th>
<th>Without sewerage</th>
<th>Without flush toilet</th>
<th>Good 1/</th>
<th>Bad 2/</th>
<th>Crowded according to the EU definition 3/</th>
<th>Overcrowded 4/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budapest</td>
<td>0,3</td>
<td>3,7</td>
<td>8,6</td>
<td>7,0</td>
<td>11,9</td>
<td>4,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big cities</td>
<td>2,2</td>
<td>4,5</td>
<td>11,2</td>
<td>6,4</td>
<td>14,4</td>
<td>4,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cities with 5-50 thousand inhabitants - Non-Roma</td>
<td>7,5</td>
<td>13,6</td>
<td>11,2</td>
<td>18,4</td>
<td>16,3</td>
<td>5,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cities with 5-50 thousand inhabitants – Roma</td>
<td>12,8</td>
<td>19,1</td>
<td>8,5</td>
<td>22,6</td>
<td>21,4</td>
<td>9,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlements with under 5 thousand inhabitants - Non-Roma</td>
<td>13,6</td>
<td>22,9</td>
<td>10,4</td>
<td>28,2</td>
<td>17,2</td>
<td>5,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlements with under 5 thousand inhabitants – Roma</td>
<td>24,6</td>
<td>35,0</td>
<td>7,2</td>
<td>39,2</td>
<td>23,1</td>
<td>10,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7,5</td>
<td>13,3</td>
<td>10,2</td>
<td>17,3</td>
<td>15,7</td>
<td>5,4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 The house is qualified as ‘Good’ if has all mod. cons. And it was built after 1989 or it is with double mod. cons.
2 The house is qualified as ‘Bad’ if one of the following conditions is satisfied: without flush toilet, without sewerage, no bathroom, when the house lacks the foundation and is constructed from adobe
3 The house is ‘Crowded’ when it has more inhabitants than the number of rooms (kitchen is here also considered as room)
4 The house is ‘Overcrowded’ when it has more than two persons/room (kitchen is here not considered as a room)

Source: Farkas, 2004
3.3 **Housing Needs Specific to Immigrants and Ethnic Groups**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Immigrants need access to appropriate housing information and advice during the early stages of arrival and integration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asylum seekers need adequate reception facilities to prevent homelessness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is little knowledge of (and in some countries little data on) the specific housing needs of ethnic minority communities among policy-makers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority ethnic groups have a younger age structure which is reflected in household type and family size and hence their housing need.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alleviation of over-crowding is a key housing need especially for some ethnic groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some minority groups (e.g. religious, ethnic and national) have specific housing needs related to their extended family structures or cultural norms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential location is critical to the housing needs of ethnic minority groups related to cultural requirements, community support and the meeting of thresholds for specialist service provision.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The housing needs of immigrants may be understood in relation to the stages in the migratory process and in relation to the legal status and rights afforded to the immigrant in the host country. Although all immigrants have the same need for access to decent and secure accommodation there are specific and different needs for labour migrants, reunified families, refugees and asylum immigrants.

Immigrants who have a right of residence need access to appropriate housing information and advice (in their own language) during the early stages of arrival and integration. There is no clear evidence we can find that this is co-ordinated as an element of integration strategies in any of the case study countries. Integration strategies appear to focus primarily on language skills, employment and advice on immigration procedures. Advice regarding housing and coordination with housing agencies is lacking in relation to the provision of advice on acquiring and maintaining a tenancy or in relation to housing rights. As a result of discrimination in the rental housing market advice needs to be coupled with direct support to enable immigrants (with a residence status) to provide landlords with the required references, rent deposit or rent guarantees that are needed to secure a tenancy.

The detail of the policy measures that are in place, or that may be needed to address this issue, are presented in the final part of this report. At this point it is pertinent to highlight the differences in approach among the case study countries. In the EU-10 and Romania the scale of immigration has not yet reached a level where this has become an issue.
In the UK, France and Sweden responsibility may be seen to fall on either integration agencies or housing agencies, for example the GELD in France and the Integration Board in Sweden. In the UK housing authorities are required to prepare housing advice and information strategies (under Housing Acts). This is a relatively recent requirement and there is no evidence yet that these strategies relate specifically to the needs of immigrants. However, the Race Equality legislation has led to good practice in presenting information in different languages. Furthermore, separate housing legislation in Scotland requires that the provision of information and advice is available to all groups irrespective of race.

In Belgium and Spain action has been taken by voluntary agencies in a direct and innovative manner. In Belgium, for example, the Social Rental Agencies (especially in Brussels, Antwerp and Ghent) grew out of the difficulty of the first generation of migrants to find decent and affordable housing; their major function is to mediate between landlord and tenant. However, recent studies have shown that, so long as accommodation is in short supply, the SRAs are able to be selective in the candidates they support (Blommaert et al, 2005). In Spain the Provivienda (Pro-Housing experience) acts as a mediator between potential tenants and landlords, while the Fundación “La Caixa” (a foundation depending on the private savings bank) provides funding for housing projects, reception centres and supported flats for vulnerable immigrant persons. However, this is not their only or main client group.

Asylum seekers need adequate reception facilities during the determination process. The evidence presented above is of an inadequate scale of provision of reception centres and inadequate financial support to enable people to secure their own accommodation (especially in areas of high housing demand). The outcome for asylum applicants is often to resort to homeless agencies or seek support from expatriates. There is a need to recognise the role played by homeless service providers in this process and to address the issue since this is not the primary role of homeless agencies (see Feantsa, 2003).

There is little knowledge of, and in some countries little data on, the specific housing needs of ethnic minority groups. There has been only limited research on this general topic and hence it is difficult to provide a clear or convincing explanation why ethnicity, in itself, should be an important factor in determining access to and opportunity within the housing market. However, the very diversity of ethnic groups presented above suggests that housing needs can only be adequately understood by local studies and strategies that draw on consultation with minority communities.

However, there is some evidence of needs specific to ethnic minority communities that are related to differences in family size, cultural norms or segregation. In the UK, for example, minority ethnic groups have a younger age structure than the population overall, reflecting past immigration patterns and family size differences – 48% of the minority ethnic population is under 24 years old (c.f. 31% for the population as a whole). Recent analysis of people using temporary or emergency homeless services or supported accommodation shows there to be an increasing proportion and, in some cases, a majority of young minority ethnic people using such accommodation and support (SEU, 1999; Edgar et al 2003).

In France, leaving home does not normally occur until the age of 25 years (the age at which everyone can apply for the RMI (Minimum Integration Income). Only 27% of men and 13% of women stay at home after this age on average, but for young people of Algerian origin,
over half of men (56%) and 38% of women are still at home at this age. In its report of 2002 on poor housing, the Foundation Abbé Pierre studied the responses of housing officials at three different sites spread throughout France who recognised that young people born of immigrants have more difficulty in meeting their housing needs. The lack of small housing units to suit young people in the locality where people of North African origin live is part of the reason according to the housing officials interviewed. The need for larger family accommodation for young families and for accommodation to meet the needs of different generations (or extended families) forced to share housing is also evident.

In the UK, 43% of the Bangladeshi population are of school-age and a majority of Bangladeshi households are over-crowded. Hence, for some ethnic communities larger young families require larger accommodation which is currently not available in the areas where they live, or at a cost that they can afford.

However reports by NGOs in France, have demonstrated that the over-representation of African families in non-standard housing such as hostels, residential hotels, or squats and in over-crowded housing cannot be solely explained by the question of inadequate resources. Other brakes on access to decent housing are identified including polygamy and the family and social structures that lead to over-occupation in housing. Traditions of solidarity in this population still pervade their life and this obliges those who are in housing to accommodate members of their family or friends who are in difficulty. In this way, they find themselves in overcrowded conditions with all the problems that this entails, such as problems with the neighbours or degradation of facilities.

It is difficult to relate specific housing needs to cultural norms. Some commentators make reference to the prohibition on lending in the Koran and attitudes to mortgage finance for house purchase among Muslim households. It is hard to substantiate this empirically by reference to differences in home ownership rates, although Kesteloot and Meert (1999) provide some evidence for this among Moroccan immigrants in Belgium. There are, however, housing needs that relate to neighbourhood or locational factors of housing choice. Muslims and other religions may have a desire to live near to a Mosque or temple or religious school. The Roma, many of whom live in segregated and degraded neighbourhoods or shantytowns, have a clear need for basic infra-structure and improvements in dwelling amenities to meet minimum standards of habitation. There may be an assumption at official level that these are not needed because of a further assumption that the Roma culturally reject houses with modern conveniences.
3.4 VULNERABILITY IN THE HOUSING MARKET

Summary

Recent immigrants are more vulnerable than previous waves (family reunion or labour immigrants). There is evidence of increasing levels of homelessness among recent immigrants.

There is evidence that immigrants who arrived some years ago and who are now ageing have specific needs.

Women are particularly vulnerable, especially as a result of domestic and family abuse. There is evidence of increasing numbers of immigrant and ethnic minority women in women’s shelters.

Young unaccompanied minors are vulnerable – there is evidence of increasing numbers of this age group in the immigrant population.

The Roma are especially vulnerable to discrimination and harassment which perpetuates their social and residential segregation.

While poverty and a weak labour market situation create vulnerability, some immigrants and people from ethnic minority communities are especially vulnerable in the housing market as a result of factors of gender, age, position in the immigrant community or of discrimination.

Among recently arrived immigrants the increasing levels of homelessness reported by service providers in recent years suggests an increasing vulnerability compared to previous waves of immigration (which were associated with labour migration or family reunion). This is especially evident for immigrants who lack networks of social support among existing expatriate communities. Recent reports by FEANTSA document the nature and extent of this problem (see http://www.feantsa.org).

However, it is evident that age is an important component explaining vulnerability (or specific housing and support needs) both among recent arrivals and ethnic minority communities. The increase in unaccompanied minors is reported throughout Europe in recent years. Existing facilities – children’s homes, homeless services or refuges – are inappropriate to meet their specific needs. Specific agencies, services and facilities have emerged in a number of countries to cope with this rising trend.

In countries such as the UK and France where immigration has been a more long-standing phenomenon, the ageing of the immigrant or minority ethnic community is an evident issue requiring new and specialised housing (or support) responses. In France there is a group largely of men living on their own in hostels or furnished accommodation who, although most of them have responsibility for a family in the country of origin, have decided to stay in France even though they are over retirement age. Poorly integrated into society, these older single men are deeply-rooted in the places where they have always lived: hostels and furnished rooms.
Table 3.3 Evolution of the foreign population aged over 65 in France

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>EU</th>
<th>Algeria</th>
<th>Morocco</th>
<th>Tunisia</th>
<th>Other Africa</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>280,184</td>
<td>179,099</td>
<td>27,796</td>
<td>6,140</td>
<td>3,620</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>62,872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>359,500</td>
<td>213,982</td>
<td>63,532</td>
<td>19,033</td>
<td>6,842</td>
<td>2,775</td>
<td>53,336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% increase</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>128.6</td>
<td>210.0</td>
<td>89.0</td>
<td>322.4</td>
<td>-15.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Census of 1990 and 1999

Recent reports by FASSILD (in 307 immigrant workers’ hostels) and by SONACOTRA (the most important manager of migrant hostels), indicates an ageing of hostel residents which is projected to continue at least until 2011 when those aged over 55 could be a majority of hostel residents. This ageing has particularly affected those of North African origin, notably those of Algeria. It is difficult to accurately estimate the number of the isolated ageing immigrant population in dispersed housing that live outside of immigrant worker’s hostels. However, the CILPI, in its 1999 annual report, estimated that this category represents 80,000 people – equivalent to the number housed in hostels (CILPI, 1999).

Ageing immigrant people are also characterised by being caught between two identities. Resident in France, although haunted by the myth of returning to their original country, they make return trips between the two continents, country of origin and country of destination, until a paralysing sickness immobilises them either here or there. The report of IGAS (2002) warns against unrealistic or simplistic approaches in dealing with this situation. The ageing of the migrant population is also evident in Hungary, where parents join previously migrant non-dependent children.

In Scotland specific housing projects have been developed by housing associations in response to the expressed needs of the Chinese community to develop sheltered housing for elderly Chinese (often but not solely single men). Equally, minority-led housing associations in England have focussed on the specific needs of older people from Asian and Caribbean communities (Ratcliffe, 2001).

Women from ethnic minorities also face specific vulnerability in the housing market. This can occur for a variety of reasons. Relationship breakdown, a key factor in homelessness, is higher among some ethnic groups (de Feijter, 2003). For some immigrant women their residence status is dependent upon a violent or abusive partner. Young women may need to flee arranged or forced marriage. Evidence from a number of countries (including Belgium, Denmark, Germany, Netherlands, and the UK) indicates that the proportion of immigrants (or women from ethnic minority communities) in shelters for women fleeing domestic abuse has been increasing in recent years. Studies have suggested that discrimination is occurring as the crisis centres reach a threshold level for how many they can accommodate with their current resources and that women from ethnic minorities are discriminated against in the distribution of housing.

In Scotland, specialist women’s refuges have been established in the main cities of Glasgow (since 1982) and Edinburgh (since 1988) in response to the needs of women from ethnic communities. However, in recent years these refuges also report increasing numbers of immigrant women among their clientele. These include asylum seekers and women whose residence status is dependent upon their husband. According to present immigration rules women who enter the UK to join a husband may be granted a one year probationary period at
the end of which she can apply for the right to settle (referred to as the one-year rule). This application can only be made by the resident spouse on behalf of the woman. A snapshot analysis of the reception figures in 2001 indicated that 15% of women in the Glasgow shelter were immigrants in this category.

Women migrants in particular often have no other alternative than a women’s shelter if they want or if they have to get out of an abusive family relationship. The absence of bureaucratic red tape and anonymity of women’s shelters further distinguishes such institutions from other social support services, where foreign nationality and residence status are often barriers to admission.

In terms of ethnicity as a factor in vulnerability leading to poor housing, the major group to suffer in this context is the Roma (EC, 2004; World Bank, 2003). The degree of vulnerability varies across the EU. Conditions are worse for Roma in Romania, Hungary, Spain and Slovenia among the case study countries, although housing is generally poor for Roma, travellers and gypsies in Belgium, France, Sweden and the UK also. The differences are of degree, not of kind. The poor quality of Roma housing has been described above, of particular note being in the worst cases the lack of sanitation, water and electricity in separate Roma settlements. Such housing makes up the worst conditions for any group across the EU.

In addition to the poor physical conditions, vulnerability is increased by lack of security with respect to land tenure and ownership, and sharp physical segregation from the rest of the community. Furthermore, Roma families are large and have more children, increasing vulnerability and the significance of poor housing conditions; overcrowding is common. Segregated poor quality and overcrowded housing occupied by Roma is also to be found within the larger towns and cities. The Roma experience physical, economic and social exclusion. This is exacerbated by discrimination at official and unofficial levels, resulting in some cases in Eastern Europe and Spain in eviction from settlements which although of poor physical quality may be of long standing. Negative experiences have also led some Roma communities to prefer segregation, a factor which itself can have a deleterious effect on achieved housing quality.

Unaccompanied minors are an increasing problem among migrants to the EU as a consequence of the greater vulnerability of asylum seekers generally. There has also been an increase in human trafficking, usually for the sex industry and sometimes involving minors. When discovered, the main option for unaccompanied minors is a reception centre, although these are seldom fit for purpose in any of the case study countries and are a short term solution only. There is a lack of data available on numbers of unaccompanied minors; these are likely to be small in comparison with the total number of migrants, but significant in terms of their acute vulnerability and lack of easy policy options.
3.5 BARRIERS TO ACCESS

Summary

Legal barriers include insecurity of migrant status, and limited rights to access to services for non-citizens

Economic barriers include poverty, lack of access to housing subsidies or income support

Cultural barriers include lack of support networks or of access to formal support structures

Spatial barriers include segregation leading to stigmatisation, and location mismatch of housing demand and supply

Discrimination is overt and covert, and there is a lack of enforcement of race equality and anti-discrimination legislation in relation to housing

Specific or individual barriers include rejection or suspicion of majority-led solutions or services

The legal status of migrants and their (constrained) rights of access to services and social protection, combined with the weak economic position of immigrants and ethnic minorities are key underlying factors creating barriers to access decent and affordable housing. These structural factors are exacerbated by discrimination operating both overtly and covertly in the declining rented housing sector upon which many, in these groups, depend. Housing market barriers and factors are discussed in detail in chapter 4.

Legal Barriers

Legal status, in relation to the right of residence, acts as a barrier to acquiring housing at a critical time in the migration process (a stage at which the foundations of integration in the host society are laid) for two main reasons. First, until residence status is determined the right to work or access income support is limited. Hence those who are unable (or unwilling) to accept, the often limited supply of, asylum accommodation have insufficient resources to afford the market rents of decent housing. Second, obtaining a rental contract often requires references, a deposit and a guaranteed residence for a minimum period of the contract all of which are difficult to provide for newly arrived immigrants. Indeed, there is sometimes a ‘catch-22’ situation where a test for acquiring residence status is the possession of adequate housing. Until 2002, foreigners in Slovenia had to prove that they already had “adequate housing” when they applied for a permanent residence permit. Amending legislation, in that year, has not removed all the barriers. According to the director of the Ljubljana Housing Fund, many migrants and foreigners have problems because landlords are reluctant to allow their address to be used to arrange the permanent residence.

Even with the right to residence, non-citizens face barriers in some countries where their rights to access public housing, or housing subsidies or loans are denied them. For example,
Slovenian citizenship (or citizenship of other EU states) is among the criteria of eligibility for social and non-profit housing and for the favourable loans of the Housing Fund of Slovenia. Hence during the ten year period required for naturalisation access to housing is restricted to this degree. These restrictions are not universal, however, and in the other case study countries permission to stay means possession of the same rights with respect to housing as indigenous citizens. A legal entitlement to housing however does not guarantee access to it because of shortages of supply, non-enforcement due to lack of political will or institutional capacity, and discrimination. In Belgium, Spain, Hungary and Romania the right to housing for migrants and minorities is frustrated by lack of supply of affordable housing, and policy and institutional deficiencies. In France, Sweden and the UK there is a less acute problem of supply, but migrants and ethnic minorities are often allocated to the poorest parts of the housing stock. The enshrinement of rights in law or as part of a general Constitution is only one step in the guarantee of access to decent and affordable housing; it may not be sufficient, but it is certainly necessary.

**Economic Barriers**

In an unregulated housing market low income and/or unstable employment is a barrier that immigrants and ethnic minority groups share with other poor and unemployed households. In Sweden, for example, the Welfare Account Committee (*Kommittén Välfärdsbokslut*) concluded that immigrants (defined as persons born outside the country) in general were the “losers” of the economic crisis and changes in the 1990s and that by the end of the century they had less “welfare resources” overall than Swedes (SOU 2001:79). One explanation that the committee put forward to explain this was that many immigrants arrived during the 1990s, when the country suffered from a severe economic crisis that resulted in cuts in social security levels and very high unemployment rates (ibid., p. 78-79).

While historic patterns of migration may account for part of this increased vulnerability, there is evidence in many countries that an increasing proportion of immigrants arrive with lower educational attainment and skills (Kesteloot and Meert, 2000) and that this weak labour market position relative to indigenous citizens is persisting to the second and third generations (Verhoeven et al, 2003). Although the same persistence is found in Sweden, research has shown variation among immigrant groups. Franzén (2004) compared the source of income for immigrants from Poland, Iran, Turkey and Chile who had been 7-16 years in the country and found that especially those who came from Iran, Turkey and Chile had a worse situation regarding several welfare variables than people migrating from Poland. Similar patterns of labour market vulnerability are found in all of the case study countries.
**Cultural Barriers**

Kinship support can be essential in gaining access to decent housing especially for young families and recently arrived immigrants. As the pattern of migration has shifted from family reunion to asylum applications it is probable that immigrants increasingly lack such support. This affects their opportunities, for example, to get information on vacant flats or to find guarantors. Particularly in countries with high levels of home ownership, kinship resources are an important factor in access to housing. In Slovenia, for example, this is the case with inheritance of land and property as well as a variety of supporting activities related to self-help building. Interviewees in the Centre of Social Work (Moste) stated that immigrants were in a worse situation than the local population because they did not have any relatives who could help them. In fact their situation was worse since “mostly it was they who were sending money to their families in other republics where the unemployment rate was much higher” (interview). Remittances of this type are important for some ethnic groups in most countries, and persist for many years of residence, limiting the resources available for housing and other related services. Data from the IMF (2003) indicate that Bosnia and Herzegovina and Albania (for example) are among the top five countries in the world on the basis of remittances as a percentage of the GDP (18% and 17% respectively). Assistance from family members is also crucial in Spain in accessing owner occupation, the main tenure for almost all income groups. Recently arrived migrants are thus disadvantaged in not having one of the key factors in gaining access to housing.

Cultural barriers are also reflected spatially in terms of threshold requirements for culture-specific services and desire for mutual support and cohesion. These are discussed below.

**Spatial Barriers**

Concentration of foreign nationalities or minorities in certain neighbourhoods in a town can be an indication of segregation processes as well as solidarity between the migrants (Eggerickx et al, 1999). In either case, segregation places spatial limits on housing opportunities already limited by other factors. When segregation results in stigmatisation, people become trapped in more deprived areas. Hence, some of the reasons that so many immigrants move to and remain in the so-called deprived areas, despite the fact that a great share of them do not like it there (ibid., p. 139) are local shortage of housing and the individual households’ lack of resources and contacts. The Swedish Integration Board finds that it “has reason to believe that there are further mechanisms in society that direct certain groups of people to precisely these neighbourhoods, not least discrimination by landlords and also municipal housing companies” (Swedish Integration Board, 2003, p. 146). Even in those countries with large social housing sectors such as France and the UK, segregation of minorities is widespread and chronic. This segregation can have both positive and negative aspects but is a product of the housing system which has to be recognized within a more general process of social exclusion. The sharp segregation of some Roma communities, especially in Spain, Hungary and Romania is an acute example of these issues.
Discrimination

Direct housing discrimination has not been the focus of much research and studies of discrimination have tended to allude to the issue indirectly while focussing on the labour market and education. Neither has housing been the focus of special interest for discrimination offices and committees investigating and suggesting counter measures to ethnic discrimination. Discrimination is clearly more evident among some groups (in particular those of non-European or Roma origin).

Discrimination in housing is often difficult to prove and hence to counteract. It occurs in relation to both entry to and exclusion from housing. Selective allocation occurs in the discriminatory attitudes of private landlords as well as the institutional procedures of public landlords. This makes it more difficult for people from some ethnic minorities to gain access to decent housing. On the other hand, harassment by neighbours forces households to move.

Analysis of complaints, involving housing, to the Discrimination Office in Sweden shows that, although discrimination occurs in relation to mortgage brokers and to common-ownership or tenant owned housing, most of the discrimination cases explicitly relate to the rented housing market (see Figure 3.2). The complaints against ‘housing allocation agencies’ relate to how municipally organised housing queues treat immigrants or ethnic minorities. The “other” category relates to harassment by neighbours and subletting.

Figure 3.2 Housing discrimination complaints in Sweden

![Complaints to DO Sweden 1995-2004 (n=321)](image)

Source: www.do.se, DO, undated

A review of four different discrimination studies in Sweden (Lange, 1999), covering 7,500 immigrants, concluded that subjective and objective discrimination coincide to shape a “hierarchy of dominance” affecting both the socio-economic and housing market position of ethnic groups. The “ethnic hierarchy” based on the experiences of discrimination among different groups in Sweden (de los Reyes & Wingborg 2002, p. 57), demonstrates a greater vulnerability for some groups (e.g. people born in Africa, Iran, Turkey and Latin America) than for others (people born in central Europe and Vietnam). Evidence of similar variation exists in other countries.
The Roma are often reported to be homeless, being evicted or living in overcrowded conditions and there are frequent official as well as informal reports on cases of discrimination. In a survey of 150 Roma, the Swedish DO6 found that 30 per cent claimed that, during the three years preceding the survey, they had been refused to buy or rent a dwelling due to their ethnicity, and 50 per cent had been harassed by neighbours during the two preceding years (DO 2004, p. 19-20). Housing is the most common field for reported discrimination, and 30 per cent of all reports concerned public housing. Restitution for those discriminated against however is difficult if the landlord justifies tenant selection on the grounds of income/rent paying ability. Where restitution depends on actions taken by the person discriminated against, this may be difficult due to lack of education, income and self confidence; this has been observed in Belgium as well as Sweden and is almost certainly commonplace throughout the EU.

Discrimination against Roma is widespread throughout the case study countries but is particularly acute in the EU-10 and Romania. Evidence of discrimination against other groups is not so clear mainly because discrimination in other fields, especially the labour market, receives more attention and is more effectively monitored. Indirect discrimination may be as effective as direct discrimination in restricting housing opportunities but is more difficult to monitor and mitigate. Furthermore, it may be a consequence of other policy initiatives. In France the use of quotas restricting the allocation of housing to certain groups to achieve social mix and prevent ghettoisation can significantly reduce the housing opportunities of these groups.

Even in the UK which has strong anti-discrimination legislation and a large public housing sector, there is evidence of poor housing experiences as a result of discrimination. In extreme cases there is physical harassment of minorities and the segregation of some groups in the poorest part of the public sector for reasons of security and mutual support. This applies particularly to some of the Bangladeshi community in London.

Discrimination, both direct and indirect, is a powerful factor in restricting the housing opportunities of migrants and minorities. It particularly affects asylum seekers (who have fewer rights), racially distinctive minorities, and is more prevalent in the private sector but by no means absent in the public sector. This is in the context of legislation in all the case study countries which prohibits discrimination and which should in theory protect these groups in the housing market and public sector housing.

Specific or individual barriers

Specific circumstances exist in some countries that create barriers to housing for some immigrant or ethnic minority groups. One example is the situation of a small group of people in Slovenia. ‘The erased’ is the popular name for a group of nearly 18,000 people, whose names were erased from the register of permanent residents in Slovenia after independence in 1991 (Zorn 2003, p.134-135). This meant that, at the time of housing privatisation (under the Housing Act 1991), they could not exercise their right to buy like other residents. Furthermore, as foreigners they were unable to buy any other dwelling or real estate. Discrimination, such as loss of employment and loss of entitlements to any social benefits, further aggravated their housing vulnerability.

---

6 The report provides very scarce information on this survey, which was made by students at the Centre for Immigration Research, Stockholm university.
On the other hand, the decisions, attitudes or perceptions of individual people also affect access to housing. Whether such factors of individual agency can be regarded as barriers to access to decent and affordable housing, their impact on the living circumstances of some households needs to be understood in arriving at policy measures to address this issue. These individual or agency factors can be illustrated by reference to three examples. First, there is the individual’s (or household’s) attitude to the migratory process. The importance of remittance money to families in the country of origin and the ‘myth of return’ have both been cited as examples of attitudes that affect the decisions people make in solving their housing needs or pursuing a housing career. Second, the perceptions people hold can lead them to reject majority-led solutions especially where there is a fear of racial discrimination or harassment. Clearly such perceptions can arise directly from experiences of institutional discrimination or lack of consultation. Nevertheless, the emergence of gender-based or ethnic-led agencies in some countries has arisen in part for this reason. Third, the lack of information of housing rights or opportunities acts as a clear barrier to the pursuit of residential choice. This may be more evident for some (e.g. older people from ethnic communities).

3.6 CONCLUSIONS

The evidence presented in this chapter indicates widespread and in some cases acute difficulties facing migrants and ethnic minorities in obtaining access to decent affordable housing across the case study countries. Immigrants and people from minority ethnic communities are more likely to live in deprived areas and in poor quality, over-crowded and unpopular housing and to pay a higher proportion of their household income to occupy that housing. The worst housing is experienced by asylum seekers outside official reception centres coping in the free market, and some of the Roma communities especially in Hungary, Romania and Spain. Poor housing conditions however are experienced by a wide range of migrant groups of all legal statuses, and by minority groups in all the countries involved in this study. A review of the research literature reveals similar circumstances across the EU15 and EU10. Racial discrimination (direct and indirect) and harassment play an important role in the disproportionate housing exclusion experienced by immigrants and people from minority ethnic communities

Recent migration to the EU is more varied in terms of origins and is composed of more vulnerable groups than previously. This has caused increased difficulties with respect to housing. This affects mostly the EU-15 since migration to the EU-10 has been smaller and in most cases as a transition to the EU-15. There are however acute housing difficulties generally in the EU-10 countries, and very acute problems for Roma households.

Conditions are least bad in those countries with a significant public/social rented sector (France, Sweden and the UK), and worst in those countries where the sector is small (Belgium and Spain) or has recently been privatised (Hungary, Romania and Slovenia). The scale of the problem also varies according to the numbers of people involved; Roma for example are especially numerous in Romania and Spain, and there are very large minority communities in France and the UK. Although generally the problems in the latter countries are not acute, the scale of the problem in terms of affected households is greater.
In terms of needs, immigrants require access to appropriate housing information and advice during the early stages of arrival and integration. Asylum seekers need adequate reception facilities to prevent homelessness. There is however little knowledge of (and in some countries little data on) the specific housing needs of ethnic minority communities among policy-makers. Minority ethnic groups have a younger age structure which is reflected in household type and family size and hence their housing need; alleviation of over-crowding is a key issue for some ethnic groups. In addition, some minority groups have specific housing needs related to their extended family structures or cultural norms.

The barriers to access to decent affordable housing are legal, economic, cultural and spatial. Legal barriers include insecurity of migrant status and limited rights to access to services for non-citizens. Economic barriers include poverty, lack of access to housing subsidies or income support, and cultural barriers include lack of support networks or of access to formal support structures. There are also spatial barriers: segregation can lead to stigmatisation, and location mismatch of housing demand and supply.

The following chapters review and evaluate existing policy measures to improve the housing circumstances of migrants and ethnic minorities, and make recommendations as to how these measures can be made more effective.
4.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter examines the policy measures developed in each country that may affect access to decent housing for immigrants and ethnic minorities. The focus of the chapter is to describe the development and nature of these policies; the following chapter will draw out the evaluation and impact of policies in order to establish recommendations. The emphasis of the chapter is on housing policies but other relevant policies (e.g. immigration policies, urban regeneration policies) are considered where these affect the housing outcomes of our target groups.

Analyses of housing policies in the EU-15 indicate several important factors which must underpin any understanding of the nature of policy measures for ethnic minorities and immigrants (Kleinman et al, 1998; Avramov, 2003; Edgar et al 2002). Broadly they indicate a range of factors including:

- Retreat of the state from housing provision (decline in building, right to buy and transfer of stock to companies)
- Reliance on weakly regulated private markets (plus deregulation of private renting and mortgage finance)
- Decline in rented sector overall (and of social renting) and increased emphasis on ownership
- Market oriented approach to social housing (new business methods and use of private finance in the social rented sector)
- Growing inequalities in regional housing markets and the impact of urban renewal on local housing markets.

Analysis of housing markets in the EU-10 (New Member States) also suggests a policy reliance on ownership and a weak rented and social rented sector (Tosics, 2001; Mandic, 2002). However, it is also apparent that the EU-10 countries (together with Romania) have experienced a lack of an overall housing strategy until very recent years (UN Economic Commission for Europe, 2000).

Although the effects of these structural factors vary across different housing regimes (Edgar et al, 2002; Avramov, Impact study 2003), this understanding has two main implications:

- These housing market factors affect all disadvantaged groups in society, so policies to redress their effects will also impact on ethnic minority households;
- It is unrealistic to expect these structural factors to be redressed in the short or medium term and hence proactive policies of an integrative, progressive or inclusionary nature will be limited by this macro-scale structural context.

It can, of course, be argued that the debate should start from consideration of the macro-scale structural character of the housing market and reconsider the policies, procedures and mechanisms that should be strengthened or altered to meet a more integrative and universalistic vision of society (Arbaci, 2003). This is perhaps one role of the NAPs/JIMs; however, review of the National Action Plans suggests the need for development in the...
presentation of housing policies in relation to the housing market and its role in social inclusion (Joint Inclusion Report, 2004).

The development and effectiveness of policy measures to ensure access to decent and affordable housing for immigrants and ethnic minorities depends essentially on two main factors:

1. the institutional capacity of the state, market and civil society to assess the need for housing policies in this area and to be able to implement them;
2. the ability of the state to provide housing either directly (by allocation of social or public housing) or by supporting civil society actors (e.g. housing companies/associations or co-operatives), or to have the powers to regulate the market providers (primarily private landlords).

By institutional capacity we mean the existence of agencies of the state, market and civil society to plan for, provide and manage housing. In particular, the state requires statutory responsibility in relation to the planning and provision of housing establishing the specific roles of central, regional and local government. The implementation of policy requires the existence of agencies tasked with the delivery of the housing product. Of course, such institutions also require the financial, technical and administrative capacity to implement policies. For the state to ensure access to housing for these groups requires the ability to target housing provision or influence the allocation of the existing housing stock. Particularly given the dependence on rented housing among ethnic minorities and immigrants (see previous sections), this implies the existence of an adequate supply of social or public rented housing stock.

In Chapter 3 we identified a broad typology of countries to facilitate comparative analysis across the eight case study countries. This section uses this grouping to describe the housing policies which have affected, directly or indirectly, the housing experiences of migrants and ethnic minorities.
4.2 GROUP A COUNTRIES: FRANCE, SWEDEN, UK

These are countries with institutional capacity and a strong state role in housing policy and provision. All three have large social rented sectors, although in Sweden new production has ceased and existing provision is not targeted at disadvantaged households, and in the UK the sector is shrinking due to transfers to private ownership. These are also countries that have had a long history of race equality legislation and have relatively strong structures of anti-discrimination bodies (EC, 2004a). On the other hand, they differ in relation to the immigration patterns and history (see Chapter 2).

All three countries have in common the availability of a social housing sector whose allocation can be used to assist some categories of immigrant as well as particular ethnic groups to gain access to decent and affordable housing (albeit often in the most residual parts of the sector - see chapter 3). Despite these similarities in housing policy and structure, our review of policies presented below indicates distinctive approaches adopted in each of the three countries to the housing needs of immigrants and ethnic groups. In broad terms, the differences can be summarized as a difference between generalized and targeted policies. This reflects different conceptualization of the issues in response to the political tensions arising from multiculturalism, assimilation and social inclusion.

In France, policies have been characterized by the creation of specific agencies (with related funding programmes) and the use of policies targeted at migrant workers within the context of a political philosophy which has espoused a philosophy of assimilation. More recently, the assimilationist approach has developed to its logical conclusion with policies for immigrants and ethnic groups being subsumed within the broader social inclusion framework of policies for disadvantaged people. In Sweden, which has experienced a distinctive pattern of...
immigration (see chapter 2) and a welfare tradition based on a universalist approach, the housing outcomes of ethnic groups are reflected within the concern for policies to deal with the effects of discrimination, urban segregation and neighbourhood renewal. In the UK, where the notion of multiculturalism has come to enshrine the acceptance of the ever increasing ethnic diversity of the UK population, housing policies for people from ethnic minorities focus primarily on the role of social landlords and ensuring that minority needs are met by improving and monitoring the practices and procedures of agencies in the social rented sector.

FRANCE

Immigrant housing policy in France has gone through three major post-war phases:

i. No policy concerning the housing of immigrants (before 1956);
ii. A specific immigrant housing policy (1956-1989);
iii. Dilution of immigrant housing policy within a global policy of housing people in difficulty (1990 to present).

In the first phase, immigrants were forced to find solutions to their housing needs in the private housing market. In certain geographic areas, there was a paternal housing policy by employers for workers and immigrants could benefit from this to varying degrees. However, most of them were obliged to turn to the most dilapidated parts of the private housing sector. The housing outcomes were low quality private housing, shanty towns or ‘bidonvilles’, and transit camps.

In the second phase a wide range of policy instruments was developed and targeted at immigrant workers. These measures included the establishment of specific agencies, and the creation of specific funding structures and mechanisms to co-ordinate action to improve the housing conditions of immigrants. The key instruments used to implement this specific policy were associated with the creation of La Sonacotral (National Construction Society for Algerian Workers: Société Nationale de Construction pour les Travailleurs Algériens); Les Foyers de Travailleurs Migrants (Immigrant Worker Hostels); Le Fond d’Action Social (Social Action Fund) and the Commission Nationale pour le Logement des Immigrés (National Commission for the Housing of Immigrants) – see Box 4.2.

With the exception of the FTM, little was done to directly provide accommodation and effort was mainly toward persuasion and assistance to housing agencies to help migrants. In addition to the Social Action fund, since 1975 part of the employers’ contribution for housing has also been used to fund the provision of housing for immigrant workers, at a level of 1/9th of the 1% total. This was primarily used to finance hostels and family housing. Progressively, the use of these funds has been extended to the housing of people in difficulty.
Box 4.1 Agencies and Action Created in France (1956-1974)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Sonacotral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Founded in 1956 for Algerian workers, the Sonacotral became the Sonacotra to reflect its wider remit of helping all workers without any distinction of nationality. As a mixed economy organisation, the Sonacotra aimed to develop housing directed at immigrants.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The FTM (Immigrant Worker Hostels)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Their creation dates from the sixties. These establishments were constructed to satisfy the needs of lone immigrant workers. They were intended to be a temporary housing solution (in a similar way to the transit camps which housed immigrant families). But these dwellings became permanent housing for the clientele of essentially North African origin and later were used to accommodate new immigrations, in particular from Sub-Saharan Africa.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The F.A.S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Social Action Fund, for immigrant workers and their families. It was initially created in 1958 for Algerian Muslim workers coming to France. Its mission is to support the integration of immigrant workers and their families in different fields (housing, health, training, culture, spare-time activities, etc). It operates by granting funds to organisations that work for these objectives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The CNIL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Created in 1974 to coordinate the actions to improve the housing conditions of immigrants, it realigned its mission in 1978 to prioritise the housing of families. With the capacity to attribute funds originating in part from the national employers housing contribution of 1% of total salary costs consecrated since 1950 to the housing effort, this commission has the means to convince HLM organisations of the self-interest in providing immigrant households access to their housing stock.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since the early 1990s changes in French society have required changes in public housing policy as much for immigrants as for other disadvantaged groups in society. Recognition of the issues of social exclusion meant that, in addition to the general housing crisis, traditional housing solutions were not perceived to be adapted to this marginalised group. Changes in the nature of immigration itself, in the increasing visibility of the needs of new generations of French people of immigrant origin and the ageing of single immigrant workers who occupy migrant hostels all signalled the need to adapt existing policies. This most recent phase is characterised by treating immigrants as part of the socially excluded or disadvantaged population rather than using specifically targeted measures. At the same time there was an augmented role for non-profit making organisations (NGOs) in housing, social support and mediation.

All the specific tools reserved until now for immigrants are henceforth open to all disadvantaged people. Thus the hostels for migrant workers, which had become faded and old-fashioned, now have the objective to embrace a wider public. As a consequence, some have been renovated and are for the most part transformed into social residences. In addition, the Commission Interministérielle pour le Logement des Immigrés (CILPI; Interdepartmental Commission for Immigrant Housing) was created in June 1998 to replace the C.N.I.L (National Commission for Immigrant Housing). Its mission is to determine immigrant housing policy (for families and single people), to elaborate measures to renovate immigrant hostels and to evaluate such projects.

The immigrant population is perceived as a disadvantaged group and therefore should benefit from the tools put in place for disadvantaged people. These include in France a large social rented sector and involve a range of measures including legislation, finance measures,
housing strategies and housing allocation procedures (see Box 4.3 below). Of particular note is the Act of December 2000 requiring a minimum level of public sector housing in every community above a certain size. The assumption was made that the particular difficulties faced by migrants and the increasingly evident second and third generation migrants would be tackled by anti-discrimination and equal rights measures and that no special housing policies or strategies would be needed for migrants.

The POPS (Occupation Protocol for Public Housing) aimed to include in public housing more of the most disadvantaged people, but at the same time to control the sociological balance. Housing allocations were made from very detailed studies, which went from the general family situation in the building to the composition of each landing, to achieve the desired balance. Today, the question of social intermixing (mixité sociale), and the fight against social segregation and racial discrimination are at the heart of the new housing policies. These questions affect immigrants directly and indirectly, their local concentrations, and the discrimination that they suffer.

One aspect of policy during this period has been a larger role for non profit-making organizations which work for the housing of disadvantaged people. The State has grant-aided NGOs to specialise in the housing field, in social counselling and in mediation to facilitate access to housing for marginal groups. These organisations were also asked to reassure landlords on the “good conduct” of poor renters. These have involved a range of measures implemented by organisations operating in a federation (FNARS).

During this most recent policy phase new agencies have been created to report on issues of poor housing and discrimination. These include the Haut Comité pour le Logement des populations défavorisées (the Senior Committee for housing for disadvantaged people) and the Groupe d'Etude et de Lutte contre les Discriminations (Group to study and combat of Discrimination, GELD). In its annual report in 2002 the Senior Committee recommended the need for a legally enforceable right to housing. The GELD has advocated the creation of a housing inspectorate to regulate the measures and practices of different housing institutions.
The Besson Act of 31st May 1990
The big contribution of this Act has been to underline in its first article that “The guarantee of a right to housing constitutes a duty of solidarity for all the nation. Any person or family experiencing particular difficulties because of the inadequacy of their incomes or their living conditions, has a right to help from the community, under the terms fixed by this Act to access decent and independent accommodation and to stay there”.

PDLPD (Departmental plans for the housing of people in difficulty; « Plans départementaux pour le logement des populations en difficulté »)
These departmental plans for housing for disadvantaged people (PDLPD) are the instruments of the Besson Act and they must, underlines article 6 of the Act, give a priority to persons or families without housing or threatened with eviction without re-housing, or for those who are housed in slums, insalubrious or temporary housing.
The PDLPD should also analyse the needs of people in difficulty by settlement area and fix the objectives to be attained.

FSL (Fonds Solidarité Logement)
The “Housing Solidarity Fund”, which as its name indicates, is a financial tool which gives help in the form of loans, subsidies, or guarantees for access to housing, or to maintain housing for those who come under the terms of the Act and who fulfil the necessary conditions. The associations working with disadvantaged people agree that this financial tool helps the PDLPL to work well and helps the dialogue between the different authorities (State, Department, Councils, and Charity Organisations).

This Act requires every community over 1500 inhabitants in Ile de France, and 3500 inhabitants in other regions, localized in a conglomeration of over 50 000 inhabitants, to provide at least 20% of its housing stock as public housing. Since 1st January 2002, all communities which haven’t achieved the minimum quota of public housing will be obliged to provide this by a certain deadline or face penalties, 801 communities are in this situation

The orientation act relative to the fight against social exclusion, 29 July 1998
It asserts in its first article that the fight against social exclusion is a national necessity based on respect of the equal dignity of all humans and it is the priority of all public policies of the nation. As far as housing is concerned, this Act reaffirms and renews the measures of the Besson Act. Concerning improving the attribution of public housing, it provides the measure of “a unique Departmental registration”. The introduction of this “numéro unique” means that any application for public housing must be registered and given an individual number.

Numero Unique d’Enregistrement pour Ameliorer l’Accès au Logement Social:
Single Registration Number to Improve Access to Public Housing. The targets mentioned in the Fight against Exclusion Act of 1998, are to guarantee the right of access to housing to all applicants, to improve the transparency of the allocation of public renting housing, to give more equality of opportunity between housing seekers and to measure the delay or waiting time between application and allocation.
UNITED KINGDOM

In the UK, housing policies for people from ethnic minorities focus primarily on the role of social landlords (local authorities and housing associations) and ensuring that minority needs are met by the social rented sector. The Race Relations Act (1976) made it unlawful to discriminate on racial grounds when allocating housing and local authorities have a statutory duty under the Act to consider the needs of minority ethnic communities. In addition, central government guidance makes it clear that local authorities must conform to the Commission for Racial Equality’s (CRE) Code of Practice for housing managers. Hence policies have tended to focus on providing guidance to social landlords and regulating and monitoring of their activities. Four specific aspects of policy are referred to in much of the literature and government documents:

1. Local housing strategies: guidance to local authorities emphasizes the need for them to take account of the needs of people from minority ethnic communities in drawing up their housing strategies. These should be based on a proper assessment of the housing needs of local minority populations and sound systems of ethnic monitoring.

2. Housing allocation policies: these include the CRE Code of Practice in Rented Housing has been a local authority performance indicator since 1995; the National Housing Inspection system (under the Audit Commission Inspection Service) as a means of examining performance and change; the Housing Corporation Black and Ethnic Minority Housing Policy (2001).

3. Ethnic-led housing associations (BME Associations): these have existed in England for some years. Evidence of the government’s continuing support for the black-led housing movement can be found in the Housing Corporation’s announcement of grant aid to help BME associations to restructure their rents (2004).

4. Employing people from ethnic minorities in housing organizations: positive action training in housing is cited as an example of good practice.

Harrison and Phillips (2003; pp90-92) summarise the contemporary evidence on ‘Good practice, audit, regulatory performance, monitoring practices, supervision and challenge’. In recent years, the UK government has indicated a commitment to race equality and monitoring. Local housing strategies should be based on a proper assessment of the needs of local minority ethnic populations, and ‘mainstream’ bodies are expected to work with minority ethnic housing associations and community groups. Government has also been encouraging firmer action against racist harassment and more effective minority ethnic participation. Recent Government guidance *Tackling Racial Harassment: Code of Practice for Social Landlords* (DETR, 2001) is cited as evidence of progress as is the National Housing Inspection system (under the Audit Commission) as a means of examining performance and change. Harrison and Phillips (2003) also concluded that the Housing Corporation has made an extensive commitment to BME research and monitoring and to developing coherent strategies for progress review.

Further examples of improving practice (cited by Harrison and Phillips 2003; p91) include:

- A regulatory code imposing the duty of the Race Relations (Amendment) Act 2000 on housing associations
- Strengthening the BME component of the Housing Investment Programme by the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister
- Production of a management tool for race equality for housing associations and regulators to undertake race equality audits and benchmark performance
- Benchmarking for race equality in Best Value procedures.
However, Harrison and Phillips (2003) concluded that there remained a need for more resources to ensure effective implementation and argued that there are continuing concerns about how far housing providers and service organisations are fulfilling expectations on good practice, on monitoring, on partnerships and participation.

BME housing associations do not provide housing exclusively for ethnic minorities but do address the specific needs of these groups. Their existence acknowledges that the large social rented sector does not meet the needs of all minority groups adequately and that general provision for disadvantaged groups has not been sufficient for minorities.

A relatively new area of enquiry has been that of the employment of ethnic minority staff in housing organisations as a strategy for providing more sensitive services and more appropriate housing for BME communities (Somerville, Steele and Sodhi, 2002). Somerville et al (2002) made a series of recommendations on recruitment and staff training, for example that ethnicity of staff should broadly reflect the communities in which organisations operate. Improvements could be achieved through better consultation with BME communities and staff and possibly through sub-contracting some work to BME-led housing associations. However, research suggested that for housing associations, black and minority ethnic housing and staffing strategies were not necessarily yet a firm part of business planning and organisational arrangements at a strategic level, while evidence about local authorities was patchy (Harrison and Phillips, 2003, p9).

Furthermore, Steele and Sodhi (2004) note that whilst housing associations, being the main providers of new social housing in the UK, have a pivotal role to play in promoting equality of opportunity for black and minority ethnic communities, few of them recognised their potential in this respect in terms of using their resources to employ ethnic minority contractors and consultants (2004, p151). Their main findings demonstrated that invitations to companies to join their lists of contractors and consultants were often given to ‘known’ or ‘recommended’ contractors, which militated against the promotion of equal opportunity (2004, p154). The authors concluded that the situation may change in the future, given the recent legislation and codes of practice from influential bodies such as the Housing Corporation and the Commission for Racial equality (2004, p156).

Box 4.3 Positive Action Training in Housing (PATH)

The PATH schemes are minority ethnic-led schemes that train black people in the housing field. The training includes a paid placement in a housing organisation, such as a local authority or housing association, with day-release to allow the trainee to attend an academic institution offering a vocational qualification in one of the housing professions.


Although policies have tended to focus on improving the role of social landlords there has been increasing concern about the increasing vulnerability of young people from ethnic minorities experiencing homelessness. The new homelessness legislation in Scotland (passed in 2003) requires that provision is made for all groups, including ethnic minorities and that this must be demonstrated by local authorities in their Homelessness Strategies. This is a
tacit recognition that general anti-discrimination measures are not adequate and that specific legislative measures are needed for housing.

In this context, a key issue raised by Steele (2002) was the lack of awareness of need and cultural sensitivity in homelessness service provision, raising the question of whether solutions to ethnic minority youth homelessness lie in developing specialist provision or in improved mainstream services. Consideration was also given to whether specialist services reinforce separateness and militate against multi-culturalism (p187). However, it was concluded that in the face of a too slow pace of change in mainstream services, positive action programmes and specialist, black-led service provision were to be welcomed. Steele (2002, p180) cites the example of a befriending scheme developed in Nottingham where young black people provided peer support to those experiencing homelessness or undertaking resettlement. The scheme provided one-to-one support through trained ethnic minority volunteers and an empowering approach. Though it had not been systematically evaluated, the befriending scheme discussed by Steel (2002, p185) was recommended as an example of good practice.

It should not be assumed that all solutions to housing disadvantage and homelessness among migrant groups will be provided through the state. NGOs have an important role to play in developing and supporting specialist provision for migrants and ethnic minority households facing homelessness. This could take the form of providing or advising on the provision of black led or culturally oriented specialist temporary and permanent housing, as well as advice and support services. Minority ethnic led NGOs could be very well placed to work in partnership with mainstream housing and service providers to overcome some of the barriers to using these services experienced by ethnic minority groups. While the notion of directly involving ‘faith communities’ in housing policy remains sensitive (Farnell et al, 2003), some potential examples of good practice through this approach have been highlighted by Ellery (2004). Faith Regen UK is a multi-faith organisation which ‘works at grass roots level to make them instruments of change in the community’. Working with 80 faith organisations, Faith Regen UK helps build capacity to work in local communities through training and fundraising activities and tackling the lack of awareness of government initiatives and opportunities. The agency takes the lead in project development; assists with development of homelessness strategies; and provides skills development and improved communication between government and faith communities. Although not yet rigorously evaluated, it is suggested that such developments can support tenants from different faiths or ethnic groups to develop skills of tenant participation and overcome barriers or perceptions that regeneration agencies and programmes are white dominated.

With respect to migrants, there are particular provisions made for asylum seekers through the National Asylum Support Service (NASS), but very few special measures to ensure access to decent housing for legal migrants and refugees. The expectation is that their needs will be met within the general provision for disadvantaged groups, with the added protection of anti-discrimination legislation. This has been shown to be inadequate in the housing context however and the burden of assistance to these groups has fallen on the voluntary sector and NGOs. These largely provide support, information and advice, often for specific groups, but assistance is also provided by generalist groups such as Shelter who help all homeless people.
The objectives for Swedish housing policy have varied throughout the years. After the Second World War and until the 1970’s, construction and modernisation of the housing stock have been the major targets. However, since the 1970’s the composition of people living in the housing stock has been the focus. Concentration of disadvantaged and poor people in certain areas became obvious after the large construction programme (the Million Homes Programme), a feature also of the French and British housing systems. Since then, combating segregation has been one of the main challenges for Central Government as well as the local authorities.

Policy measures aimed at improving the housing situation of ethnic minorities in Sweden are largely focussed on measures to prevent segregation of immigrants in the worst quality housing estates. Local, co-operative and partly state-funded projects aiming at facilitating integration and raising the level of deprived housing estates have a long tradition in Sweden. Hence, the comprehensive City Initiative (see below) is but one of a long, broad series of projects aiming at improving ethnic integration and the reputation as well as the actual functioning of residential areas and suburbs characterised by high quotas of immigrants. These initiatives have often been jointly funded by the Government and the municipalities and implemented in co-operation between NGOs, municipal agencies and/or municipal housing companies (MHCs), and evaluated by researchers.

In 1995/96 the Government allocated 125 million SEK (€14 million) for “Special Measures in Immigrant-dense Residential areas” in the big city regions (Blommanpengarna), in order to fight segregation and exclusion. A few years later Stockholm City devoted 500 million SEK (€55 million) to projects in residential areas in the outskirts of the city (Ytterstadssatsningen) with the purpose to counteract unemployment, segregation and social problems, and especially to break the negative consequences of segregation through social initiatives as well as physical renewal – in the course of time the latter aspect came to dominate the initiative. In connection with the articulation of the metropolitan policy, the Government in the years 1998-2000 granted 490 million SEK (€54 million) to “National Examples” (i.e. projects aiming at sustainable improvement of deprived residential areas with the aim to counteract segregation).

In 1998, the Parliament accepted the Government’s Bill on City Policy, Development and Justice – a Policy for the City in the 21st Century (Gov. Prop. 1997/98:165). This introduced a special strategy for developing the big city regions with the following goals:

– to give the metropolitan regions good conditions for growth and thereby be able to contribute to the creation of new jobs within the regions as well as in the rest of the country.

– to break the social and ethnic segregation in the metropolitan regions and to work for equal living conditions for their inhabitants (ibid., p. 30)

An essential element in the strategy was to provide funding for local development work, implemented in cooperation between different local partners in deprived residential areas, a policy that is referred to here as the City Initiative (Storstadssatsningen).

The City Initiative is a direct result from the Metropolitan Policy that was adopted in 1997/98.
and involves some 2 billion SEK (€220 million) (Lahti Edmark 2002, p. 44 ff.). In 1999, the Government made agreements with seven municipalities, their housing companies and local NGOs on the funding of “local development” in 24 deprived (utsatta) residential areas in the big city regions (Stockholm, Göteborg and Malmö). Together, these projects are called The City Initiative (Storstadssatsningen). The projects ended in July 2004 and hence their evaluation, which formed a part of the project agreement, has not been assessed at the time of writing. Although more than 3 billion SEK (€330 million) have been spent on projects aiming at counteracting ethnic segregation in the city regions over the past 5-10 years, and several deprived residential areas have continuously been the arena for both state and city funded integration projects, segregation is deepening (Andersson & Bråmå 2004).

Seven researchers have summarised 16 reports evaluating the City Initiative in Malmö in a common report (Andersson et al. 2004). As in other cities, the projects had different organisation, local goals and methods although all shared a special focus on immigrant-dense, deprived areas. In Malmö, between 35% and 62% of the residents in the areas involved were born abroad. Between 2000 and 2002, the share of people born abroad increased in all targeted areas despite the integration project (ibid., p. 171).

The general strategy in the Malmö version of the programme emphasised “link-working” to connect people, organisations and cultures to each other. However, the short-term, temporary organisation that characterised all the projects, together with the fact that the resources allocated to the individual projects were re-negotiated every year, contributed to a general sense of instability and employment insecurity for the staff of the projects. Furthermore, the project resources tended to be absorbed by already established, Swede-dominated organisations. Of the 47 institutions and organisations who received funding from the City Initiative in Fosie during 2003, only four were immigrant associations (ibid., p. 23), and in general, the project activities did not succeed in attracting immigrants in this part of the city (ibid., p. 26). The authors suggest that this failure may be due to an “unacknowledged exclusion process”, which occurs when the project managers take for granted that activities, associations and meeting points should be organised in typical and traditional Swedish ways (ibid., p. 33). Another project (in Hyllie) was more successful in reaching immigrants through the employment of three “integrators”, representing and targeting the Arabic, Albany and Afghani minorities. However, through this focus other ethnic minorities were neglected and the Swedish residents refrained from taking part in the activities (ibid., p. 50).

Attempts to stimulate “cooperation in housing” failed mainly because of the difficulty of implementing real improvements without the cooperation of the landlord, or because of weak community leadership among the immigrant community (ibid., p. 99). An ambitious project aiming at involving residents in an infamous housing block within Rosengård, achieved some success in consulting over three hundred residents about their experiences and suggestions of change for the block. Their ideas primarily concerned deficiencies in the dwellings and their immediate environment, as well as the problem of overcrowding. Work groups were organised to elaborate and implement the residents’ proposals. However, in these work groups the property owners had greater power than the residents. The result was that the groups “could not agree on a single suggestion concerning improvement of the indoor environment of the dwellings” and the property owners appeared reluctant to invest in improvements focussing discussions on the residents’ own responsibility for the environment (ibid., p. 69). In the end of 2002, this project was abolished, and some interviewees claimed that the outdoor environment even deteriorated during the time of the project (ibid., p. 72).
addition, the Rosengård projects suffered from a limited local council budget, which made it impossible to continue projects when the state funding was dismantled in 2004.

In summary, the City Initiative suffered from the same problems already defined in other urban improvement or integration projects. Its specific location in “immigrant-dense” residential areas” made it hard to determine the best approach to increase ethnic housing integration – such projects should rather be located in “Swede-dense” areas that were opened up for immigrants. Some local projects have improved contacts between residents and between them and the authorities, and some activities have improved the knowledge or work experience of immigrants in the targeted area, which in turn will probably facilitate their integration on the labour market. However, housing problems do not appear to have been solved or sustained. Hence, immigrants’ access to decent housing does not seem to have been improved significantly by the city initiative in Malmö.

A recent review of Nordic research on interventions in segregated neighbourhoods (Lahti Edmark, 2002) concludes that many “integration projects” should rather be viewed as a way of securing social services and activities in deprived housing areas. On this view, interventions for integration in segregated areas could be viewed as a kind of substitute for regular welfare arrangements, when these are fading or failing. In this respect, the abundance of interventions does have some, though limited, positive results at the local level in terms of increasing equality, but since they cannot influence institutions and structures outside the targeted residential area, their power to counteract segregation is limited. Within the framework of previous research and a European research project (UGIS), comparing city initiatives against segregation in 32 neighbourhoods/city parts located in 19 cities in 9 European countries, Andersson (2004) draws quite pessimistic conclusions regarding the possible success of targeted or selective integration programmes.

According to Andersson (Integration Board 2004, p. 72), segregation can only be prevented or countered if there are simultaneous efforts to affect also those residential areas where no immigrants live: “If a better mixed population is an important objective, all parts of the city must be targeted and not only a few of them”. However, no such intentions are present in the Government’s current integration policy, nor in its metropolitan policy. The general conclusion regarding current and recent integration projects by the Integration Board (2004, p. 76f.) is that the segregated structure of the city will not be changed by accomplishing a better socio-economic and ethnic mix in a few parts of the city (see Box 4.5). An initiative that has the ambition to break housing segregation in a city region as a whole must also embrace all its municipalities and districts. On the other hand, there is a tendency of mainstreaming integration issues in the way that these are being ascribed a more central position as a goal in the state and municipal administration (p. 73).

Box 4.4 Example of a Local Development Agreement in Sweden

| Huddinge (Sweden): An analysis of the consequences of integration in Vårby Gård. | One of the objectives of the Swedish metropolitan policy is to break the trend of social, ethnic and discriminatory segregation in metropolitan areas. The municipality of Huddinge, which has signed a local development agreement, has developed an analysis of the consequences of integration. The main idea/philosophy is that measures to prevent the occurrence of various forms of segregation should be taken in the planning stages. This analysis has been applied to a construction planning programme in Vårby Gård, one of the districts covered by Huddinge's local development agreement. The planning programme has been analysed from several perspectives for its value in terms of type of accommodation, work opportunities, communication, attractiveness, identity, social networks, participation and opportunities for interaction. The analysis has resulted in some proposals for changes, which will be taken into consideration in the future. |
Belgium and Spain are representative of countries that have a federal or (autonomous) regional structure of government. The responsibility for housing policy is primarily delegated to the regional tiers of government with the implication of a weak central direction (or financing) of housing policy combined with diverse, and often weak, regional policy structures for implementing housing policies.

This overall governance context is allied to an approach to housing that encourages home ownership. Both countries have among the highest levels of home ownership in Europe (74% and 83% respectively) combined with some of the lowest levels of rented and especially social rented housing (the latter being 6% and 2% respectively). Furthermore (social) rented housing stock tends to be concentrated in the main cities in both countries.

Migration flows in both countries are relatively high although the pattern and history of migration differs. Belgium has experienced a relatively long period of immigration from elsewhere in Europe as well as from non-EU countries. Spain, for a long time a country of net emigration, has experienced a more recent history of net immigration (mainly from non-EU countries) and a rapid rise in the level of immigration over the last decade. Regional migration flows in both countries are substantial and the areas experiencing the greatest housing stress are the major cities, and areas of fastest economic expansion, where rented housing stock is lowest.

In summary there is an overall lack of policies aimed at improving access to housing for immigrants and ethnic minorities (with the exception of the Roma in Spain) in the context of a private sector dominated market. The emphasis on home ownership policies is particularly unhelpful to migrants. The absence or lack of central government responsibility or competence in housing policy means that implementation of the Common Objective to improve access to housing for vulnerable groups relies on indirect influence rather than direct control. An integrated approach is required to assure access to housing for immigrants and ethnic minorities; however, the different competences to ensure this are divided between the levels of government making this difficult to effect. The effective implementation of anti-discrimination policies (determined at federal level) is also affected by this subsidiarity in relation to housing policies.

The need for co-ordination and partnership working is more necessary in the absence of targeted policies on housing but there is little evidence of this occurring (at least in Belgium). The relatively weak institutional capacity in housing, reflected by the low level of social housing and the weak ability to control the private rental market, leads to reliance upon the role of the NGO sector.

**BELGIUM**

In 1994 access to decent housing became a constitutional right in Belgium. This means that every citizen who is legally in the country should have a right to decent, affordable and secure housing. Following a devolution process of the State that started during the 1970s, the implementation of housing policies is constitutionally assigned to the region (Flanders, Wallonia and the Brussels Capital Region).
Until its restructuring into a federal state, Belgian housing policies aiming at provision of a decent house for all, evolved since the end of the 19th century along three major axes:

1. the stimulation of owner occupation with e.g. grants, cheap credit and tax deductions,
2. a rental policy (which should discriminate between social and private renting),
3. the fight against slum housing.

These axes of Belgium housing policy never merited the same priority. In particular, policy remained silent on the crucial dimensions of housing taxation and private rental policies. The promotion of home ownership has dominated policy. In contrast, the promotion of social rental housing has remained very limited. Housing renewal has been paid only lip service.

In addition, the principles of private renting have remained intact since the 19th century. As a consequence as far as rent legislation is concerned this means: powerful protection of the right of ownership; contractual freedom of the parties; an assumed equality of the parties; and the largely supplementary character of rent legislation.

The overall result is that the Belgian housing market is dominated by owner-occupation, marginal social housing, a hard and stable residue of poor quality dwellings and a private renting sector becoming unaffordable for vulnerable people (with rents up to 40% of the disposable income in Brussels).

Following transfer of housing responsibilities to the regional governments this model of housing policy has remained stable. Despite this stability, the regions took some housing policy initiatives during the 1990s. In fact, despite this growing autonomy of the regions, their housing policy is characterised by a high level of convergence (e.g. a growing interest in the three regions for social rent). The only noticeable difference concerns the pace of their actions. In general, budgets are more constraint in the Brussels Capital Region and in Wallonia.

Of particular importance in relation to migrants and minorities is the role played by NGOs following the introduction of social rental agencies (SRAs) in the three administrative regions. The first SRAs were founded during the 1980s as NGOs in order to interfere in the private rental market. They guarantee the landlord the rent and keep an eye on housing quality and the tenants get an affordable rent and a reasonable security. The first SRAs dealt – although not exclusively – with the housing of migrants (de Decker, 2002). Today tens of SRAs are at work either founded by the civil society (NGOs) or by local government (councils or social services). Despite their appeal, they nevertheless control only a small share of the market. This leads to the conclusion that the overwhelming majority of housing transactions are determined by market conditions. Moreover, recent research indicates that SRA have become more selective in their choice of candidates to support (Blommaert, 2005)

In terms of housing outcomes those migrants, who are legally in Belgium, have equal access to all governmental schemes. On the basis of available information, we can observe no statistical discrimination against migrants in these housing schemes (indeed, there is even an over-representation of migrants in social housing and in receipt to housing allowances). This implies that the housing poverty of migrants – which is real and persistent – has to be linked to the interaction of different features including:
1. the general lack of housing policy budgets,
2. the inefficiency of housing policy,
3. the economic position of migrants,
4. the family structures of the migrants (with the limited availability of affordable dwellings for large families),
5. cultural features (e.g. the attitude towards debts and mortgages)
6. discrimination on the private rental market.

Those immigrants who arrive illegally in Belgium have no housing rights. Nevertheless, the fact that illegal immigration exists has obliged the government to act. This has included action against slum landlordism by criminal law (fines and re-possession). Despite wide press coverage, few landlords are convicted however. Between November 2001 and September 2003, the Flemish Housing Inspection booked 550 dwellings in 188 buildings (Haagdorens, 2004). In total, 121 landlords were condemned. Most of these dwellings were situated in nineteenth century urban neighbourhoods (especially Ghent and Antwerp). 56 % of the booked dwellings were simple rooms. In those 550 dwellings, in total about 1000 people were housed. In 76 % of the cases, the residents had a foreign nationality. About 8 % of the booked landlords rented 35 % of the total number of booked dwellings. This situation points to the serial and professional character of this activity. Moreover, 13% of the landlords were organised as a firm. This breaching of the housing law went hand in hand with other criminal acts which were registered, such as trade of human beings, organised prostitution and illegal employment.

In addition to housing policies, there is evidence that urban renewal action has acted to the disadvantage of immigrant communities in Brussels. De Lannoy and Geets (1994) examination of urban renewal in Brussels found that large-scale projects of urban renewal at the end of the 1980s (on the occasion of the arrival of the high speed train in Brussels South) went hand in hand with an expulsion of well targeted migrant groups in the adjacent Brussels municipality of St Gillis. These projects resulted in a net loss of foreigners (mainly Spaniards, Portuguese and Moroccan households). In fact, the local policy was oriented towards “cleaning out” of the municipality, resulting in gentrification with a replacement of the poorer foreign families by middle class household (a process which is continuing). A similar process took place around the Brussels North Station where, besides thousands of Belgian households, also several hundreds of Turkish households were removed, in order to install a large-scale office neighbourhood.

SPAIN

The Spanish housing market is characterised by a small private rented sector and an almost non-existent public-rented sector (Pareja et al, 2003) and has experienced the highest house price rises in Europe creating serious affordability problems for most households (RICS, 2004). In the face of this situation central housing policy since the 1980s has aimed at improving affordability in the owner-occupied sector (Eastaway et al, 2004) while the rented market has not received any stimulus to counteract its rapid decline. Central government, through the Ministerio de Fomento (Ministry of Development), establishes measures on protected housing7 and produces the National Housing Plan. However, the National Housing

---

7 Protected housing – Vivenda de Protección Oficial – is an instrument of financial support to residents and bricks and mortar subsidies for families with an income below 5.5 times the minimum wage (€518.3 per month in the 2002-2005 housing programme).
Plan (2002 to 2005) mainly provides the conditions for and distribution of funds and credit. The regional governments of the autonomous communities develop the Housing Plans in their territories, together with their own policies. Thus housing is more an administrative jurisdiction of the regional and local governments, who develop their own policies and strategies. There are thus wide regional disparities in housing policies. On taking office in June 2004, the Socialist government promised to strengthen the central government’s role by creating a new Housing Ministry with plans to provide more protected housing, subsidies and incentives to promote the rental market.

The reliance on home ownership (84%), the negligible social housing sector (2%) and the decline in private renting (12%) represent significant difficulties in gaining access to decent housing for the most disadvantaged including immigrants and gypsies (the most important ethnic minority in Spain). Figure 4.1 illustrates the scale of the decline in government / public housing development since the mid-1980s.

Two elements characterise this situation in which market led solutions are the main locus in which immigrants and ethnic minorities resolve their housing situation. Firstly, there is a wide diversity of policies across the autonomous regions (and no action in some areas) and secondly, especially in regard to immigrants, there is reliance upon the role of NGOs to implement programmes of action.

This diversity of approach to housing policy is illustrated here by reference to housing policies and programmes in three regions, each with different approaches to coping with the issue of improving the housing situation of the main ethnic minority group in Spain (the Roma). There are an estimated 700 000 Roma (gypsies) in Spain (see Chapter 2).

Figure 4.1 Housing Initiated in Spain (1981 – 1999)

Madrid illustrates the development over time of different approaches to re-housing and social action in the removal of the chabolismo (shanty housing occupied by immigrants and Roma). These approaches have involved new investment, development of institutional capacity and partnership working involving horizontal and vertical co-ordination (see Table 4.1). These can be summarised as:
1. **Investment in the removal of ‘chabolismo’:** by a combination of housing strategies including: demolition, re-location of families, use of temporary and ‘sub-standard’ housing and the acquisition of housing to re-house families;

2. **Co-ordination:** recognition of the need to integrate physical housing action with social integration;

3. **Creation of a specific agency:** the Institute of Re-housing and Social Integration (Instituto de Realoamiento e Integración Social) (IRIS) to co-ordinate this work;

4. **Partnership and Consortium Approaches:** involving central, regional and municipal government.

The city of Barcelona can be cited to illustrate the use of social housing and partnership approaches. ADIGSA is a state company owned by the Government of Catalonia (Generalitat de Catalunya), whose activities come under the housing and land-use policy of the Department of the Environment Housing Department (Departament de Medi Ambient i Habitatge), which manages social public dwellings in Catalonia.

ADIGSA began its work in June 1985, with the transfer to it of 60,000 homes built by the State prior to 1980. Between 1985 and 2000 nearly €450 million were spent on rehabilitating and repairing public housing (built for disadvantaged or low-income groups) and on corrective and preventive maintenance of more than 77,000 homes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td><em>Real Decreto sobre actuaciones de Remodelación y Realoamiento en determinados barrios de Madrid</em></td>
<td>remodelling and relocalization</td>
<td>12 districts (38,540 housings in total).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>The regional government, the city council and the national government signed a Collaboration Agreement</td>
<td>eradication of the <em>chabolismo</em>. <em>Barrios de Tipología Especial (BTE)</em></td>
<td>18 districts, 1,500 families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Second Collaboration Agreement</td>
<td>Integral Social Action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998 to</td>
<td>Institute of Re-housing and Social Integration (Instituto de Realoamiento e Integración Social) (IRIS)</td>
<td>Acquisition of housing, demolition of BTE</td>
<td>575 houses acquired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>First Consortium for Re-housing Excluded Population. (City of Madrid, Municipal Housing Company, IRIS)</td>
<td></td>
<td>680 families re-housed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 BTE demolished</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ADIGSA has also taken part in various partnership agreements with the districts involved. These agreements are geared towards fostering social integration and cohesion so as to continue with processes of remodelling and of active participation by the network of local neighbourhood associations in the renewal of the districts (ADIGSA, 2003).

Most of the people who benefited from this type of “protected” housing belonged to the last great migratory wave that arrived in Barcelona during the 1960s and 1970s and settled in populated *chabolas* or sub-standard housing. The population that first occupied this social
housing was mixed (Gypsy and non-Gypsy). However, a growing gypsy concentration has occurred over time.

Andalucia, on the other hand, illustrates the use of a strategic planning approach. Three-fifths of the gypsies in Spain live in Andalucia. The housing strategy in recent years has concentrated on two substantial plans: the Integral plan for removing shanty towns in Andalucia (1997) and the Third Andalucian Plan of Housing and Land (1999)\(^8\). The Integral Plan focuses on shanty towns inhabited by gypsies, while the Third Andalucian Plan targets the lowest-income families and other disadvantaged social groups including the Gypsies. This reflects the shift that has taken place in other countries (e.g. France and Hungary) from targeted policies towards policies of social inclusion aimed generally at disadvantaged groups.

These plans illustrate four intervention strategies:

- **Shanty town removal**: all the families that settled were relocated in the same group of housing.
- **Rent of housing**: the government pays the rent to re-house the *chabolista* families until their inclusion in V.P.O. (*Vivienda de Protección Oficial*; protected housing) - i.e. the regional government subsidizes these expenses to the city councils.
- **Purchase of dispersed housing**: the regional government subsidizes the city councils to purchase housing spread throughout their territories to be rented to the *chabolista* families with protected rents.
- **Patronage formula**: some NGOs agree to provide social support for *chabolista* families re-housed from the shantytown. The NGO would guarantee to provide social support and the housing would be owned by the NGO.

The role of NGOs has been important in facilitating access to housing for all disadvantaged groups including immigrants and ethnic minorities in the context of a lack of social rented housing and limited availability of private rented accommodation. Two case study examples are used here to illustrate different approaches involving, firstly, mediation with private landlords and, secondly, their role in developing multi-agency coordination of action.

The *Provivienda* (Pro-Housing experience) began in 1989 as a non-profit association to facilitate access to housing for disadvantaged groups. Since 1997, the program has been extended and is called "Programme of Support for the Integration through Housing of Collectives with Difficulties". It is depends off its findingg on the Health and Social Services Council of Madrid with the co-operation of the Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs. However, it deals with a range of disadvantaged groups as well as immigrants and gypsies. Pro-housing acts as a mediator between the landlords and the potential tenants, giving guarantees to owners on the payment of the rent, establishing a multiple risk policy, and carrying out continuous observation of the problems during the first year. Thousands of contracts have been signed with persons belonging to a range of different nationalities (mostly Latin-Americans, North-Africans, Sub-Saharan and Eastern Europeans). Pro-Housing also has two other projects aimed at eradicating shanty dwellings in two metropolitan areas of Madrid (in Boadilla del Monte, immigrants, and in Peñagrande, Gypsies).

\(^8\) Plan Integral de Erradicación del Chabolismo en Andalucía (1997) and III Plan Andaluz de Vivienda y Suelo (1999)
RASINET is a network to integrate fourteen institutions, public and private, of the Region of Murcia to facilitate the integration of immigrants into housing. The network includes church organizations, trades unions, the Red Cross, information centre for foreign workers and the regional immigration office among others and meets under the auspices of the City Council of Murcia. One of their main objectives is to coordinate and share information on housing resources registered by each organization, in order to improve their intervention with immigrants and thus also to avoid duplication of resources. This approach uses new technologies to establish a virtual platform of knowledge on the situation of foreigners living in the Region of Murcia. In this manner, RASINET has implemented a bank of information resources for supporting immigrant access to housing including information on available housing and temporary accommodation, and public aid and subsidies. RASINET also provides a mediation service and assists in the pursuit of the dwellings that are let and was selected as a good practice example by the Spanish Red Cross in 2003 citing the following main achievements:

- Maximum profit with very limited resources.
- Good coordination among different private and public organizations and institutions.
- Wide participation (653,923 people were dealt with through the internet page).
- Success in mediation (175 persons provided with housing in 2003).

4.4 GROUP C COUNTRIES: HUNGARY, SLOVENIA, ROMANIA

These countries are characterised by a domination of housing policy driven by the transition to a market led housing system. Three major transformations could be observed during the 1990s: state withdrawal from the housing market, the mass privatization of the public housing stock and the alteration of the housing assistance system (i.e. rental allowances).

The devolution of responsibilities from central government to local authorities has not been backed by proportional decentralisation of resources thus leaving local authorities with ‘unfunded mandates’ (Tsenkova, 2000). The privatisation of housing and the lack of a strong legal framework for housing maintenance have meant that most municipalities are practically incapable of independently dealing with the housing problems of socially disadvantaged groups (Dandolova, 2003).

A national housing policy is lacking or of very recent origin among this group of countries. The two major policies during the transition, privatisation and restitution, caused a massive re-allocation of real-estate property and this issue dominated the public policy agenda during the 1990’s. However, the shelter function and issues such as affordability and accessibility of housing for disadvantaged groups in the market, as well as the newly emerging housing risks such as homelessness, were marginalized and practically invisible as a policy issue (for further analysis see Mandič 2001).

Policies for social or public sector housing are not yet an integral part of the national housing policy or have only recently been introduced. This is coupled with a lack of institutional capacity reflected in the fact that there exists no clear division of competencies between central and local governments, nor specialized participants in the process, including the roles of private entrepreneurial structures or civil society organizations (Dandolova, 2003). Thus, although new legal, institutional and financial instruments have recently been introduced in a number of these countries it has been the lack of institutional capacity that has characterised
them up to now and made access to affordable housing difficult for socially disadvantaged groups.

The numbers of migrants are small, and the most problematic indigenous minority is the Roma population who suffer a range of socio-economic disadvantages, reflected in poor housing circumstances. Poor housing conditions and urban segregation figure among the most striking material expressions of poverty hitting the Roma community in this group of countries. Under the communist regimes Roma tended to live in well-defined inner city areas called *mahala*. The course of transition has deepened the gap between the Roma (*mahala*) settlements and the rest of the urban population (World Bank, 2003). Policies have tended to focus on the improvement of housing conditions in slum settlements in projects targeted on the Roma population. The use of general housing policies to improve access to decent affordable housing has been limited by the lack of public housing to allocate and weak institutional capacity and resources affecting all socially disadvantaged households in these countries. Policies to address the issues arising from the resulting spatial segregation have been particularly problematic. However, existing studies indicate that the commitment of local authorities and the involvement of civil society and the Roma themselves are crucial factors for the success of such policy measures (European Commission, 2004).

**HUNGARY**

The development of a housing strategy is a recent innovation in Hungary. The National Office of Housing and Construction (established in 2003) was transformed into a government office in 2005 (led by a minister without portfolio) with the strategic goal to implement the National Housing Programme and a Government Commissioner was appointed to develop and launch the programme.

Due to the extremely small amount of public housing and the small scale of available housing allowances it is apparent that securing the appropriate housing conditions in Hungary is first of all a ‘private matter’ and is determined by a household’s financial capacity.

There are some visible migrant groups like Chinese, Mongols, Vietnamese, Russian speakers, Arabs, as well as Western Europeans. Most of these groups are only a few thousand in number and most of them, except for the Mongols who are generally low-skill wage workers, are either entrepreneurs or highly skilled workers (Nyiri, 2003). Accordingly, the majority of these migrants do not belong to the economically disadvantaged social stratum.

The only ethnic group with outstandingly high social and thus housing problems are the Roma. Although the Roma population is heterogeneous with respect to language, identity and social position, the vast majority are over-represented among the poor.

The first (of three) medium-term package of measures to promote the social integration of the Roma was passed by the government in 1997. One part of the undertaking related to education and culture and focuses on the Roma as a minority. On the other hand, social, housing, employment and regional programmes target Roma as an underprivileged group. In this package of measures issues concerning education and culture were given more emphasis than other fields. Furthermore, education and employment topics are addressed in a more multilateral approach compared to the issue of housing. The critical housing condition of many Roma is addressed through a programme for the elimination of colonies and colony-
like neighbourhoods and through the development and improvement of infrastructure (utilities and services) in Roma colonies. The elimination or rehabilitation of Roma colonies is the only objective of the National Housing Programme, ‘At Home in Europe’ (2003), that explicitly addresses the Roma’s housing problems.

One of the strategic goals of the National Housing Programme is to establish fair, balanced and sustainable support systems for the disadvantaged. Accordingly a whole pillar of the Programme deals with the necessary reforms related to the access to housing and relevant social assistances. The colony elimination sub-programme is intended to be put into effect through house building / purchase aids and social house rent assistances together with measures targeting the betterment of the environment, and social, employment and educational problems. The programme mentions that the improvement of equal opportunities for deprived and low income households is realized also through housing maintenance costs support and arrears management assistances. We can conclude that while policies in the field of education, culture, and employment target the Roma explicitly, policies concerning housing - except for the elimination of colonies and National Roma Self Government’s (NRSG) social house building programme - are intended for the underprivileged social strata in general and therefore will probably not help the Roma if there is discrimination or other barriers to their effectiveness.

The Roma were recognized for the first time as ethnic minority in 1993 (Act on Rights of National and Ethnic Minorities) and, in addition to their individual rights, they were granted the collective right of self-governance9. A social house building program, launched by the Széchenyi-Plan in 2001, is managed by the NRSG. The aim of the program is to contribute to the improvement of housing conditions of Roma and the NRSG offers financial assistance for house building projects of local authorities and minority self-governments that provide, for free, at least ten building plots supplied with public services. Although the programme has been launched with a find of 300 million HUF (€1.2 million) the planned provision of 200 houses has not been met to date with only six completed and sixty-six under construction.

SLOVENIA

According to the Slovenian Constitution, the state is obliged to provide conditions under which citizens can attain suitable housing. For this purpose the state has adopted the policy document ‘National housing programme (Official Gazette RS 43/2000)’ (Nacionalni stanovanjski programme). The eligibility criterion for non-profit rental and social housing, favourable housing loans and rent subsidies (the key elements of housing policy) is citizenship of the Republic of Slovenia or, after May 2004, citizenship of the member states of the European Union. Non-citizens with permission to stay in Slovenia are thus in a weaker position with regard to access to decent housing.

The housing of migrants or any ethnic minority groups, except Roma, are not mentioned in the programme. Nor does the new Housing Act (69/2003) in any way address the housing

---

9 The National Roma self-government (NRSG) was established by Act LXXVII of 1993. Electors voted in the local minority self-government elections have the right to select the 53 members of the NRSG. The NRSG is a legitimate representative body of Roma living in Hungary and by law is empowered to express opinion about all the issues concerning this community.
conditions of migrants or minorities. Three specific groups can be singled out for specific treatment under Slovenian law - the Roma people, refugees and asylum seekers.

Non-profit and social rented housing is provided by municipalities and non-profit housing organisations but has been slow to develop since 1991 and only people who have permanent residence in the municipality in which the non-profit dwellings are being rented are eligible. The well developed form of temporary accommodation for migrant workers that existed prior to 1990, has been lost mainly to the private rented sector. As a result, the private rented sector, and a multitude of new supportive arrangements, have become significant for disadvantaged groups including foreigners and those naturalised migrants that have not managed to enter other private accommodation. The supply of private rental accommodation is relatively small, and the quality of services and the choice of accommodation are generally poor.

There is a significant diversity in how policy addresses the housing issues of different immigrant and ethnic groups. In terms of the policy-cycle stages (i.e. the stages of definition of goals, formulation of measures, implementation, monitoring and evaluation) some issues are not even recognised as a problem, while others were recognised, responded to by policies, tackled by implemented measures and even became subject to monitoring. A schematic overview is given in the table 4.2.

Table 4.2  Housing issue, according to the achieved policy-cycle, by specific groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Policy cycle</th>
<th>Naturalised Migrants</th>
<th>Legal Foreigners</th>
<th>Refugees</th>
<th>Asylum seekers</th>
<th>Roma</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recognition of the problem</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals declared in policy</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures Formulated</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>partly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures Implemented</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>partly</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>partly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes Monitored and Evaluated</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the case of naturalised migrants and of legal foreigners, no problem was recognised and the housing outcomes of this group are not perceived to be significantly different from the rest of the population. However, they may still face discrimination. There is no sign of policy concern about their discrimination, while the non-citizens of EU states are, in principle, not eligible for non-profit rented housing or for favourable state loans.

Given the imbalance between the demand and supply of rented housing and a very weak legal protection of tenants in private renting, it is the migrants that are mostly victims of the ‘black housing market’. Despite this, there is a lack of policy concern for the quality of housing at the bottom end of the private rented sector which exhibits very poor conditions, overcrowding and lack of security of tenure. In Slovenia, neither the inclusion of migrants, nor the role of housing in their integration, is a policy concern.
On the other hand, policy is relatively well defined and measures formulated and implemented for asylum seekers and refugees. There is a well developed housing measure in the form of accommodation centres. NGOs have played an active role in demanding the improvement of living conditions in asylum and refugee accommodation centres.

The situation of the Roma population is quite specific. There is a clear recognition of the problem of their poor housing conditions and of their settlements which are claimed to exist illegally on land which has been subject to restitution. There are various measures devised and adopted to tackle these issues. However, while the responsibility for dealing with the problem is located at the municipal level, the municipalities are inadequately equipped for the task and demand greater involvement from the state level. The state provides general financial support to municipalities for the construction of rental social housing, yet this programme does little to target the specific needs of Roma settlements. The Republic of Slovenia Housing Fund offered, through tenders, loans to municipalities for programmes intended to establish permanent housing for Roma families while at the same time improving the living conditions of other residents who live in their neighbourhoods. The Ministry of the Environment states that no application for a loan has met the required criteria for approval.

Similarly, the legalisation of Roma settlements is a multilevel instrument composed of several measures (which are specific to each case) including regulatory and financial measures (such as co-financing the purchase of the land on which the Roma settlements exist). However, the legalisation and regulation of the Roma settlements have been impeded by restricted budgets and financial assistance to municipalities that was, according to Perić (2001), merely symbolic. The Government has therefore effectively transferred the burden of financing and regulating Roma settlements onto the shoulders of the municipalities, while the municipalities understand the issue of financing as a state responsibility.

ROMANIA

A UN Economic Commission for Europe report for Romania (2000) argued that the main housing concern was the lack of an overall strategy for Romania’s housing sector at that time. The Government response to the complex housing situation was very much focused on single issues, such as promoting homeownership. In addition, the recognition of the potential roles of local government and other partners was relatively weak and responsibilities were generally poorly defined. The lack of clarification of responsibilities and the narrow focus on individual issues hampered the development of an integrated strategic approach and the commitment to coordinated implementation. They further argued that this lack of an overall strategy was also reflected in the inefficient targeting of public spending which was not reaching the population most in need. For example, the allocation of subsidies to the public rental stock was applied across the board irrespective of income. In addition, the activities of the National Housing Agency (NHA), which at that time was the main focus of public expenditure, did not concentrate on those areas most in need of government investment.

In addition to the general lack of an overall strategy and the growing issue of inadequate social housing, the key challenges, according to the international experts, were the condition and suitability of the existing stock, the lack of finance and the poorly developed markets and market demand. As well as giving greater priority to housing as a key determinant of the quality of life, the UN report recommended the need for legislative and institutional change, improvements in institutional capacity including the professionalisation of housing activities, the shift from supply-side subsidies to targeted demand-side intervention and a robust
forecast of need and demand. Crucially the report recommended the establishment of a national co-ordinating body for all matters related to housing. This analysis stresses the scale and complexity of the housing problems facing the country and the very sustainability of the housing situation. While there has been some progress since 2000, a recent round table (May 2003) suggests that these recommendations remain valid.

At the same time research within Romania (Pascariu and Stanculescu, 2003) identifies a range of policy issues to be addressed regarding housing including the lack of funding, unclear distribution of roles and responsibilities, lack of managerial capacity at local government level, lack of coordination between housing and related policy fields, poor coordination of central and local government levels and a lack of housing programmes.

The issue of policy measures to improve access to housing for immigrants and ethnic minorities needs to be understood in this context. In summary it is apparent that the issue of immigrants and asylum seekers is very small in scale and that NGOs respond to their needs in addition to the National Office for Refugees accommodation centres. The main outstanding problem therefore resolves around the housing needs of the Roma population.

The housing deprivation of Roma population in Romania has been clearly documented (Zamfir & Preda 2002). PHARE support has recently pushed Roma housing onto the national policy agenda. According to Rughinis (2004) the Ministry of Information has reported (MIP 2003, p. 54-55) that several ministries are involved in planning solutions for Roma housing issues such as:

1. solving ownership issues related to houses and agricultural terrain;
2. rehabilitation of housing and environment in Roma neighbourhoods, over the next 4 years;
3. supporting firms and NGO’s involved in providing infrastructure and utilities in Roma neighbourhoods;
4. supporting projects of housing construction and rehabilitation in Roma communities;
5. supporting local Roma initiatives of housing rehabilitation and construction;
6. building social housing allowing non-discriminatory access to Roma (over the next 10 years).

The governmental programme “Partnership for Roma Support - 2003” has granted €1.6 million for projects in three areas including housing. The Phare Programme for Supporting the Strategy of Improving the Roma Situation 2004-2005 will provide grants in several areas, including infrastructure and social housing (CRCR 2004). Rughinis (2004) points out that the previous two Phare programmes for supporting the Governmental strategy for the Roma did not explicitly promote housing projects. Out of the 40 projects financed out of the Phare Roma Partnership Fund in 2001-2002, only one involved housing rehabilitation and securing property rights (Murray 2001, p. 4). The Fund for Improving Roma Situation (2002-2004) supported 36 projects in areas such as community development, education, health, civic participation, and social security; the only area related to housing involved the clarification of ownership acts. While housing projects were not excluded, they were not encouraged, and the high costs associated with building or repairing houses discouraged applicants. The explicit priority granted to housing is a recent development in the design of Phare projects for Roma communities, acknowledging the relevance of housing for human rights and welfare.

---

10 The Phare programme is one of the three pre-accession instruments financed by the European Communities to assist the applicant countries of central Europe in their preparations for joining the European Union.
Residential segregation of the Roma is not perceived to be a major political issue in Romania. The Governmental Strategy for Improving the Roma Situation (Governmental Decision HG 430 / 2001) and the National Plan for Combating Poverty and Promoting Social Inclusion make no reference to residential segregation. A survey of local government representatives in the field of public housing indicated that the “maintenance or creation of social mix preventing social segregation” was considered the last priority among nine choices. The most important four priorities, in descending order, were: affordability of housing, accommodation for homeless people, housing quality, and housing provision for disabled people (Pascariu & Stăncaulescu, 2003).

A major issue related to housing that Roma communities are facing now in Romania is the problem of eviction. Roma communities have had limited access to property, either land or housing. Because many Roma illegally occupied abandoned buildings or settled in slums, authorities took steps to remove them. Programmes of transferring tenure to city hall or to relocate Roma families have had both positive and negative effects. Relocation to peripheral areas isolates poor Roma communities and segregation is the main consequence. Transferring tenure to city hall and transforming this property into social housing for Roma could not be successful unless continuous integration measures are maintained.

Box 4.5 Example of a Roma Housing Project in Romania

**Piatra Neamț**

The housing project in Piatra-Neamț became famous when the Mayor declared his intentions to segregate the Roma in a well-guarded colony at the margin of the city, in October 2001. The Mayor had even used the term “ghetto” (Haller 2001), creating a huge media scandal. The Prime Minister and the President issued condemnation statements (see Gergely & Morteau 2001). The ERRC Memorandum for the UN Rapporteur on the right to housing (ERRC 2002) and the Rapporteurs’ account mentioned the Mayor’s project as proof of segregation tendencies (Kothari 2002). The Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights ODIHR – OSCE has organized a round table on confidence building held in Piatra-Neamț (ODIHR 2002), attempting to establish a monitoring system to prevent discrimination of Roma in access to social housing. The case of Piatra-Neamț has been the first to draw substantial public attention in Romania toward the risk of ethnic segregation. It has also been the first and, to date, the most important housing project with Roma beneficiaries since 1990.

*Source: Rughinis, C 2004*
4.5 Conclusions

Facilitating access to housing for immigrants and ethnic minorities takes place in the context of a predominantly private sector housing market and one where even the actions of social housing agencies are becoming more market oriented (e.g. becoming more reliant upon private finance and more risk averse in management decisions). The tenure differences between countries are evident but, in most countries, there has been a decline in the rented housing sector upon which immigrants and ethnic minorities mainly depend. It is in this context that, in the majority of our case study countries, central government involvement in housing policy-making, implementation or provision is relatively weak.

The availability of public sector housing provides government with a controllable instrument of policy within which to mediate supply and demand in the housing market. It is only in France, Sweden and the UK, among our case study countries, where this exists to any significant degree. However, this requires transparent allocation policies and central government monitoring or direction if the needs of immigrants and ethnic minorities are to be protected. In France the recent introduction of the single registration number and the proposed introduction of a housing inspectorate should ensure equality of opportunity and transparent allocation procedures. In the UK, control over the public sector housing stock is gradually being transferred from local authorities to housing associations and government has introduced guidance, regulatory procedures and ethnic monitoring to ensure equality of access. In Sweden, public sector housing is controlled by municipal housing companies and anybody can apply to live in a social rented dwelling, because the needs based criteria that are common elsewhere in the EU do not apply. Strong long-term policy emphasis has been put on equality of access and avoidance of spatial differentiation by income or social group. However, without transparent allocation procedures the protection of groups such as immigrants and ethnic minorities is difficult.

Belgium and Spain reflect the situation in countries where home ownership policies have been predominant and government intervention in the housing market has been limited. Furthermore, federal or regional structures of government in which the regional governments are autonomous present difficult challenges to the achievement of the objective to improve access to housing for vulnerable groups. While anti-discrimination policies are determined at national level and integration strategies and housing policies at regional or local level, the development of co-ordinated strategies in this policy domain requires specific action to ensure vertical as well as horizontal integration that this implies.

The case study countries of Hungary, Romania and Slovenia have experienced common features of privatisation of the housing stock, coupled with devolution of responsibilities and relatively recent introduction of housing planning. They also share the common feature that the scale and nature of housing problems of recent immigrants is not a significant problem and that, with respect to minority groups, it is the housing situation of the Roma that is the most significant issue to address. Differences in policy approach reflect the variation in national housing situation. In Romania, the scale of the housing crisis is critical requiring legislative and institutional change and increased expenditure. Romania also has the largest scale of Roma housing situation to deal with of the accession states. Although issues of segregation are important the scale of the problem requires long-term action that addresses the full range of issues of lack of basic infrastructure, housing improvement, utility and housing debt and integration. Hungary has prepared a national housing plan within which recent strategies are coping with the need to use both universalist approaches to deal with the
needs of all disadvantaged groups in the housing market while making targeted policies for
the Roma more effective and integrated. In Slovenia, the Roma issue is on a smaller scale
and involves policies to address the issues involved in the illegal occupancy of land if
housing investment is to occur within current public expenditure rules.

Evaluation of these policies in the overall context of improving access to housing for
immigrants and ethnic minority groups is the subject of the next chapter. This review of
housing policies indicates important differences between all the countries studied that this
evaluation needs to consider. France has a wide range of measures that include both
mainstream and targeted policies. The approach to improve access to housing, to a large
extent, has historically focused on immigrant workers and has included a broadening range of
approaches. France has also developed its institutional approaches over time to include a
wide range of specific agencies with funding and responsibility in this policy area. In the UK
policies have evolved to address mainly the role of social landlords in order to improve
equality of access. This has involved guidance and regulation and has been informed by
detailed research commissioned by government. More recently, specific needs (young
homeless, older people) have been addressed through a range of approaches including the
development of BME housing associations and direct initiatives. Sweden has tended to focus
on issues concerned with segregation and neighbourhood renewal of residential districts
where immigrant communities are concentrated. The lack or absence of policies in Belgium
and Spain has tended to reinforce the important role of NGOs although this response has been
local, limited in scale and to rely upon uncertain funding.
5.1 INTRODUCTION

The review of the housing circumstances affecting immigrants and ethnic minority groups (presented in Chapter 3) and the description of policy measures employed to address these needs (in Chapter 4), indicate the significance of structural, institutional and agency factors. At a structural level the main problems resolve around the lack of supply of affordable housing and the economic disadvantage endured by migrants and minority groups. At an institutional level issues resolve around a lack of capacity and inadequate or inefficient governance to enable strategic and operational decision-making to respond to the identified needs of ethnic minorities and the integration of immigrants into citizenship. At an agency level the poverty and weak labour market position of the target groups reduce their ability to exercise choice and lower effective demand. This is compounded by discriminatory decisions and actions of individual gatekeepers who control allocation of the scarce resource that affordable housing represents.

This chapter presents an evaluation of existing policy approaches and measures in order to assess their impact on improving the housing outcomes of the target groups. The chapter begins with an overview of the policy context of social inclusion in which this review is based. It then examines the three key issues of prevention of discrimination, the integration of immigrants and vulnerable groups into housing, and the measures required to facilitate access to affordable and appropriate housing. This understanding of the nature of the problems and of the aims of intervention recognises the need for a mix of policy approaches that involve all levels of governance (EU, national, regional and local). To be effective, action will involve all scales of social organisation - the market (individual responsibilities), civil society (community responsibility) and the state (collective responsibility). Innovation in practice is then discussed briefly in order to consider ways in which the EU Strategy to combat poverty and social exclusion can facilitate the dissemination of good practice in this policy domain.

We begin this discussion, however, by clarifying our understanding of the nature of the policy instruments that may be brought to bear. Bemelmans-Videc et al (1998) present a three-fold typology of policy instruments based on the degree of constraint imposed on target groups. Adapting this understanding for the purposes of this study, we can establish a possible policy typology to include:

1 Regulatory instruments:
   a. Statutes / legislation
   b. Regulatory bodies / ombudsman structures

2 Allocative instruments:
   a. Economic, funding, subsidy measures
   b. Provision measures (e.g. social housing)

3 Enabling instruments:
a. Institutional measures (e.g. improving institutional capacity by, for example, creating specific agencies)
b. Policy guidance.

This understanding informs our approach to the discussion and evaluation of policy measures and the recommendations for action.

However, an evaluation of the effectiveness of policy must consider more than the operation of individual policies. Thus, although the increase in provision of affordable rented housing is a necessary condition to improve access to housing, this is not a sufficient condition. Equally, while the effective implementation of anti-discrimination legislation is a necessary condition, this in itself is not a sufficient condition to achieve these policy aims. A mix of policies is required together with the effective governance framework that allows the integration of their implementation. Our review of existing policies (chapter 4) has demonstrated that, in countries with a longer history of immigration, policies have evolved over time and that a wider range of policy instruments have been employed to achieve these aims. An evaluation of policies therefore needs to be sensitive to the stage of development of housing policies in response to the experience and scale of the immigration and ethnic minority population.

Evaluation of policy measures needs also to be aware of the political context within which they have emerged. Previous chapters, and our review of the literature, indicate clearly two separate but related aspects of this policy framework that need to be borne in mind. First, we have made reference to the distinction between a political philosophy towards integration that stresses an assimilation of different cultures and those that are based on recognition of different cultures and stress a multi-cultural approach to policy formulation. Although some countries are identified with one particular approach both can influence policy and there is recognition of change in approach in some countries as immigration experience and policy response has developed. Second, there is a tension in policy development between universalist approaches and targeted approaches. Mainstream housing policy can be broadened, for example, to ensure that housing legislation and housing practice respects race equality. Equally, housing investment can target specific needs and vulnerable groups. Both are appropriate but may not be equally effective. Our review suggests that, in some countries, targeted policies have given way to more universalist approaches within the framework of social inclusion strategies.
5.2 SOCIAL INCLUSION AND SOCIAL COHESION

The European Social Policy Agenda, agreed at Nice in December 2000, recognised the dual role of social policy both as a productive factor and as a key instrument to reduce inequalities and promote social cohesion. The Community Strategy to combat poverty and social exclusion has been established within the framework of the ‘open method of co-ordination’ (OMC) (EC, 2000). In the context of the OMC, the member states agreed to develop their National Action Plans on Social Inclusion (NAPs/Inclusion) to achieve four common objectives. This section begins with a consideration of the implications of the open method of coordination for the development of measures involved in this policy area. This understanding provides a basis for consideration of the NAPs/Inclusion in relation to the presentation and monitoring of policies to facilitate access to housing for immigrants and ethnic minorities. The section concludes with a brief discussion of the implications of this review for future development of the NAPs/Inclusion in this vital policy field.

The Open Method of Coordination

A substantial literature has arisen in recent years assessing the processes and approaches adopted in the open method of coordination as a central tool of EU social policy making (see Borrás and Jacobsson, 2004). It is beyond the scope of this study to evaluate in detail the effectiveness of the processes of the OMC in this policy field. The intention is to present the basic elements in order to review the NAPs/Inclusion and draw conclusions about the future role they may play in relation to the presentation and development of policy measures to improve access to decent housing for immigrants and ethnic minorities.

The European Council of Lisbon (2000) established the key elements of the OMC which are designed to help Member States to progressively develop their own policies and involves:

- fixing guidelines with specific timetables for achieving goals
- establishing, where appropriate, quantitative and qualitative indicators and benchmarks tailored to the needs of different Member States and sectors as means of comparing best practice;
- translating these European guidelines into national and regional policies by setting specific targets and adopting measures, taking into account national and regional differences;
- periodic monitoring, evaluation and peer review organized as mutual learning processes.'

(par. 37, Lisbon European Council conclusions, 2000).

Within the framework of the Common Objectives (revised in December 2002) and the development of Common Indicators established by the Social Protection Committee (and endorsed at the Laeken European Council in December 2001), the member states prepare National Action Plans (EU-15) and JIMS (EU-10 / accession states). Co-operation between member states is encouraged by the Community Action Programme and progress in the NAPs/JIMs is subject to regular monitoring and evaluation in the Joint Reports on Social Inclusion (European Commission, 2004b).

The development of the national action plans on social inclusion based upon a common set of objectives and the development of comparable indicators, it is suggested, provides the framework for promoting exchange of good practice and mutual learning at Community level and should encourage integration and co-ordination within countries. This description of co-ordination refers to what may be called ‘horizontal integration’ – the co-ordination and
partnership between institutions and stakeholders. However, the national action plans will be ineffective if they do not link national policies and programmes to the neighbourhood level where housing exclusion and disadvantage occur. Hence, vertical integration is also important in linking policies at the European, national, regional, municipal and local scales. The first Joint Inclusion Report on the national action plans (EC, 2001) refers specifically to this challenge of vertical integration in relation to the improvement of service delivery. There is reference firstly to the need to complement national action plans with integrated approaches at regional and local level. Secondly, there is recognition of the need to address the issue of the links between the national, regional and local levels particularly in those Member States with strong regional (or federal) structures.

Review of the NAPs/Inclusion policy measures related to housing for immigrants and ethnic minorities

A summary of the relevant policy measures contained in the NAPs/JIMs is presented in Appendix 2. This section describes the key features of those policies and the differences in approach between countries that these policies represent.

Member States prepare NAPs/Inclusion in order to present their strategies, priorities and efforts in promoting social inclusion and combating poverty and social exclusion. One key aim of the OMC is to ensure that plans link to national policy making and that established priorities (i.e. the common objectives) are integrated and co-ordinated by regional and local strategies.

Housing is a policy domain where responsibility, in most countries, is decentralised to regional and local authorities. Despite this, the plans lack precise details of local housing strategies that will enhance national policies or achieve key priorities developed under the OMC (access to decent housing was one of eight core challenges identified in the Joint Inclusion Report, 2001) in relation to our target groups. Although several countries have established responsibility for local preparation of housing strategies (Belgium, Spain and the UK), it is only the French NAPs/Inclusion that specifically refers to the role of the departmental plans (the PDALPDs) in addressing the priority to improve access to housing for immigrants and ethnic minorities. However, guidelines do exist in the UK for local housing strategies in this respect (see chapter 4).

All the NAPs/Inclusion identify that access to decent housing is a key factor to prevent social exclusion. However, our general overview of the second round of NAPs/Inclusion (for the case study countries) is that they make little specific reference to immigrants and ethnic minorities in relation to the housing policy domain. There is a presumption, either stated or implicit, that race equality legislation forms a basis against which equality of opportunity and, by implication, access to services (including housing) is protected for all citizens.

The analysis sections of most of the plans highlight the higher risks of social exclusion resulting from immigration and ethnicity and most (with the exception of Belgium) refer to the living circumstances of ethnic and immigrant communities (and make reference to specific aspects of disadvantage that affect access to housing). However, this analysis is not always followed through in the policy sections with specific reference to housing policies affecting immigrants and ethnic minorities (Belgium, Spain, the UK). The French and Swedish plans make specific reference to housing policies affecting immigrants and ethnic
minorities or the targeting of policies on residential areas where they live. The Spanish, Hungarian and Slovenian plans make specific reference to strategies to improve the living circumstances of the Roma but are not always clear about housing measures as distinct from measures to deal with poverty and unemployment.

Perhaps as a result of the absence of common indicators in the housing policy field, none of the reports specifies targets or indicators by which specified policies can be evaluated in relation to access to housing for these target groups. There is therefore an apparent presumption that targets to achieve access for ‘all people’ to decent housing will improve the situation for immigrants and ethnic minorities. However, it is clear that universal provision will need to be complemented by targeted policies if the barriers to access to housing facing immigrants and ethnic minority communities (see chapter 3) are to be overcome.

The French plan includes direct reference to specific policies in its description of the implementation of policies to provide universal access to decent housing (see section 4.1.2.2 in the plan). There is reference to specific initiatives to increase the supply of suitable housing for large families, young immigrants and young people of immigrant background. Given our analysis above (chapter 3), the provision of large family housing especially in the Ile-de-France (specifically mentioned) will benefit immigrant families. This provision is intended to be driven by the assessment of local needs by the PDALPDs (departmental plan for access to housing for the disadvantaged). In addition, housing assistance regulations have been modified to meet the needs of young seasonal workers (aged under 25). The department associations for information in housing (ADIL), currently operating in 66 departments are to be extended to the whole country. The five-year programme for migrant workers housing is extended to 2006 and the guidelines in the programme are to be retained and confirmed. These guidelines include three main targets: guarantee suitable housing, ease the path to independent housing, and the integration of migrant workers housing structures in the city.

Under the heading of ‘Good, reasonably priced accommodation’ (section 4.7), the Swedish plan states that the goal of housing policy is ‘to make it possible, on a sustainable basis, for everyone to live in good, reasonably priced accommodation and in a stimulating and secure environment (in) … equal and dignified living conditions’. It is in this context that the plan refers to the special measures required for large-scale residential districts where households with a foreign background are over-represented. These special measures are implemented through the metropolitan policy in which the Government is cooperating with some local authorities in order to improve integration and social participation among households in ‘disadvantaged’ housing districts. However, the examples of good practice presented in section 6 of the report do not specifically relate to housing measures.

Similarly, references to strategies to improve the living situation of the Roma are made in the plans of Spain, Hungary and Slovenia but the specification of the measures is vague and there are no specific targets or guidelines presented. The housing issues are often subsumed within a more general aim of policy to improve their disadvantage in other policy areas such as education, health and employment. In Spain, for example, the Gypsy Development Programme is mentioned in relation to ‘the development of integrated social intervention programmes which include simultaneous activities in the fields of education, housing and habitat, health, training and employment and social services’. The nature of this integrated approach and the specification of housing measures and how these relate to other action is not clearly identified or presented in relation to targets or measurable indicators.
The Hungarian plan refers to the fact that the transposition and effective implementation of the EU anti-discrimination directive (2000/43/EC) should form part of the strategy for promoting the integration of ethnic minorities and other disadvantaged groups, and that the Commission has encouraged greater efforts to facilitate access to housing in non-segregated areas for the (estimated 600,000) Roma. However, the main policy measure referred to that had an impact is the colony elimination programme (continued until 1988). Although the social housing construction programme (launched in July 2000) has ‘improved the situation, the comfort indicators of such homes are still very low and are way below the national average’ (section 2.4).

In Slovenia, the main goal of the National Housing Programme (adopted in 2000) is to stimulate the acquisition of non-profit and social housing for young families, low-income families and vulnerable groups including the Roma. The programme of measures for the assistance of the Roma is implemented by the responsible Ministries in areas of employment, education and housing. A key policy measure concerning housing is the legalisation of Roma settlements. This is necessary to enable them to qualify for specific financial assistance under the Structural Policy and Regional Development. This funding aims mainly, it appears, to provide Roma settlements with basic public utilities.

Role of the NAPS/Inclusion

In the context of the OMC and this brief overview of the content of the NAPs/Inclusion, it appears that most of the NAPs/Inclusion have not generally presented coherent and integrated policies in relation to access to housing for migrants and ethnic minority groups. Although the issue is recognised in the analysis section in the plans, this understanding is not coherently presented in terms of policy measures; neither is there specific reference to the role of mainstream (national) policies. Furthermore, our impression is that initiatives that are taking place are sometimes not reported in this context. This suggests the need for further development of the NAPs/Inclusion in this important policy domain. We identify four areas in which the NAPs/Inclusion could be developed in order to more clearly articulate the policy measures and actions that are being taken in the member states to facilitate access to decent housing for immigrants and ethnic minorities.

1. Governance issues

While national policies exist their effective implementation requires action at regional and local level and hence an integration and co-ordination of action both vertically and horizontally within government and this needs to be reflected in the presentation of policies in the NAPs/Inclusion. Our review in this report indicates that there is a need, in a number of countries, to develop regional and local housing strategies and to use these instruments as a mechanism to assess the needs of specific groups such as immigrants and ethnic communities. Elsewhere, there is a need to refer to the use made of these existing (or developing) strategies to identify and address the housing the needs of these groups. This issue is linked to the requirement that the OMC placed upon member states to use third-level indicators to specify areas, such as housing, not covered by the primary and second level indicators (see below).

Local housing (and homelessness) strategies in France and the UK are able to provide a robust assessment of needs that can inform policy at local and national level. Elsewhere we cite evidence of recent guidelines issued by government to facilitate this (ODPM, 2004; Haut
Comité, 2003). The Swedish NAPs/Inclusion cites the local development agreements implemented under the Metropolitan Policy as good practice in this regard. However, specific actions in relation to access to housing are not clearly identified. There is some evidence (chapter 4) that regional housing policies in Belgium and Spain are developing (in this policy context). The Slovenian JIMs recognises the need to “improve coordination and cooperation at governmental level, to constantly update the programme and to adapt it to actual situation and needs (sic)” (section 4.4.2.3).

2. Specification of housing policies
Our brief review above and summary of housing policies in the NAPs/Inclusion (Appendix 2) suggests that only one of our case study countries (France) specifically identified policies to improve access to housing specifically for ethnic minorities and immigrants (although Sweden refers to the need to improve the residential districts where immigrants are over-represented). None of the plans identified coherent guidelines or targets in respect of this policy issue. However, we are aware that there are ‘good practice’ examples in a number of countries (see section 5.6). It would be appropriate to include a distinct section in the NAPs/Inclusion specifically on the issue of access to housing for immigrants and ethnic minorities since the importance of setting targets for the prevention of exclusion for this group is specifically referred to in the revised common objectives.

3. Information and monitoring
The lack of housing indicators has been referred to above. Our analysis in previous chapters specifies that local assessments of need (which are undertaken in consultation with immigrant and ethnic communities) are required to develop effective policies to improve access to appropriate housing. The limited number of countries using this approach and the lack of use of this information in the NAPs/Inclusion to establish targets within the framework of the community action programme is referred to above. The Joint Inclusion Report (2004) states that ‘indicators are not used for policy monitoring or planning purposes nor are immediate targets for the time-span of the plan set’ (EC, 2004b: p56); we would endorse these comments in relation to this policy issue. Furthermore, we would suggest that the tertiary indicators recommended in the EU Strategy - decent housing, housing costs and homelessness – are discrimination proofed by dis-aggregation by ethnic or immigrant origin. However, this issue needs further consideration in the light of the differences in approach to ethnic definition across the member states (see chapter 1).

4. Involvement of civil society partners
Our review of the housing circumstances of these target groups and the policy measures existing in each country (chapters 3 and 4) identify the importance of the role of NGOs in service provision and in mediation in the private housing market. We also identify the need to develop community capacity in countries where state involvement in this arena is less well developed. However, the NAPs/Inclusion do not clearly relate the specification of NGO work to the development and implementation of policies. Where the role of the civil society sector is included it tends to be in the identification of ‘good practice’. Nevertheless there are significant areas where NGO agencies are implementing policies commissioned or purchased by local government under national policy framework. A clear example of this relates to the use of supported housing for immigrants and (especially young and older) people from ethnic communities (France, Sweden, the UK). This is not specifically referred to as an axis of implementation of policy in any of the plans. Reference is made in several plans (France, Belgium, Spain) to mediation bodies which offer information and brokerage services for renting accommodation in the private market. However, this is presented as a new initiative
or as an example of good practice or multi-agency working. Our review in this report suggests some concern at the limited role and limited funding of these agencies (De Decker, 2002; Blommaert et al 2004). This indicates the need for the NAPs/Inclusion to more explicitly identify the strategies and funding being targeted on developing the capacity of civil society organisations to respond to the needs of immigrants and ethnic minorities in accessing housing.

Elsewhere in this report we refer to the importance of information and advice in assisting immigrants and ethnic minorities (as well as other vulnerable groups) to understand their housing rights and the opportunities available to them. France is the only NAPs/Inclusion to mention information needs in this context and to specify policies to expand provision (through the ADIL structure).
5.3 PREVENTING DISCRIMINATION IN HOUSING

Summary

- Discrimination in housing is both direct and indirect and includes harassment and instructions to discriminate
- EC directive 2000/43 provides a good framework and has influenced legislation in most of the study countries
- Discrimination is poorly reported and improved and systematic monitoring is required in all countries
- Equality of access to housing is a collective issue as well as an individual right and this requires there to be a basis (in law) for group action and a pro-active role by the state
- Countries with relatively strong social housing sectors have tended to provide mechanisms to regulate and monitor discrimination and equality in housing management practices (though these are not always effective)
- Discrimination by individual action in the private sectors of the housing market (individual landlords, lending institutions) are less well regulated
- Effective action to prevent discrimination requires a range of approaches and initiatives and adequate funding to support these.

Discrimination has been presented earlier in this report as an important barrier to access to housing for immigrants and (some) ethnic minority groups. Council Directive 2000/43/EC implementing the principle of equal treatment between persons irrespective of racial or ethnic origin lays down a framework for combating discrimination. The Directive prohibits discrimination based on racial or ethnic origin, applies to all persons (in both the public and private sectors) and refers to ‘access to and supply of goods and services which are available to the public, including housing’ (Article 3/1h). As part of this work, each Member State must establish one or more bodies with a remit to analyse the problems involved, study possible solutions, make recommendations and provide concrete assistance for the victims of discrimination (Promoting Diversity, 2002).

Recent review of the implementation of the EU Race Directive\textsuperscript{11} suggests that, while all countries have anti-discrimination legislation, the method of implementation of this legislation varies and the effectiveness of enforcement is often in question. Table 5.1 summarises the legislation related to discrimination that has an effect on housing in the eight study countries and illustrates that the Directive has had a direct effect in all of the countries studied (with the exception of Slovenia); Romania is outside the EU and is not covered by the Directive. Our analysis that follows suggests that the issue remains one of the need to improve implementation of the existing legislation in the sphere of housing.

\textsuperscript{11} see http://europa.eu.int/comm/employment_social/fundamental_rights/legis/legln_en.html
Table 5.1: Summary of Discrimination Legislation related to Housing in the Study Countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Discrimination Legislation Reference to Housing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Legislation on racism and discrimination, enacted in 1981, was modified in 1994 to cover housing issues and, most recently, in 2003 to put the burden of rebuttal onto the accused person. In the context of the law of 15 December 1993 founding the Centre for Equal Opportunities and Opposition to Racism, measures having an impact on the right to housing have been adopted. A modification of the Constitution (art. 23) in 1994 has enshrined the right to decent housing by obliging public authorities and especially the Regions to work out policies that assure the effectiveness of this right (Centre for Equal Opportunities and Opposition to Racism, 2003).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>“The Social Modernization Act” (2002; article 158) introduced equality of treatment in the matter of housing access. No one can be refused the tenancy of housing for reasons of their origin, patronymic, appearance, sex, family situation, state of health, handicap, customs, sexual tendencies, political opinions, union activities (membership or non-membership), real or supposed ethnicity, nationality, race, or given religion. In case of a dispute, the person who had been refused the tenancy must show the court the facts demonstrating the discriminatory nature of the refusal, even if there is no hard evidence but only presumption. It is for the landlord to provide the evidence of his innocence and the justification of his decision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>Article 26 Paragraph (1) of the Act on Equal Treatment and Equal Opportunities (Act CXXV of 2003) indicates that, in regard to housing, equality is denied if there is bias in the provision of housing subsidies provided by the state or local authority, or if a person is put at a disadvantage by the established criteria related to the sale and/or rent of flats and/or building plots owned by the state and local authority. Also in relation to housing the Act prevents territorial segregation by stating that the conditions of access to housing should not result in the territorial separation of different groups, unless this is intentional. Judicial and administrative procedures assisting the victims of discrimination in the field of housing were not available until the enactment of this legislation and the establishment of a public administrative authority to assist victims of discrimination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>In August 2000, the Romanian government adopted an Ordinance Preventing and Punishing all Forms of Discrimination (no.137). The ordinance stipulates that the right to housing is based on the principle of equality among citizens without privilege and discrimination. Regulations and orders issued by natural or legal persons, as well as active or passive behaviour that favours or disadvantages one person or a category of people can lead to contravention liability. If someone refuses to sell or rent a piece of land or a house, to grant a bank loan or to make a contract with a person because of race, ethnicity or social/disfavoured category is considered an offence and it is punished accordingly. This law not only punishes discrimination, but also establishes affirmative action in support of national minority groups and disfavoured groups when equal opportunities are not provided. This law covers different aspects of social life including access to housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>According to the ECRI report from 2003 there is no comprehensive body of anti-discrimination legislation which would cover access to housing and that provides for effective mechanisms of enforcement and redress; which is directly recommended by ECRI in the General Policy Recommendation N°7. The Principle of Equal Treatment Act (May 2004) does not explicitly refer to housing but this may be caught by general coverage of access to goods and services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>All the fields mentioned by Article 3 of Directive 2000/43 are covered by the general principle of equality laid down in article 14 of the Spanish Constitution. In fields such as housing, the applicable regulations do not contain explicit anti-discrimination clauses but they are subject to the general principle stated in the Constitution. Law 62/2003 implemented the Racial Equality and Employment Equality Directives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>The Law (2003:307), banning discrimination, specifies areas in which the ban on discrimination is valid and § 9 reads as follows: Discrimination associated with ethnic belonging, religion or other belief, sexual disposition or disabilities is prohibited in professional provision of goods, services or housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The UK</td>
<td>The Race Relations Act 1976 remains the key anti-discrimination Act (with amendment regulations in 2003 to transpose the EC Directive 2000/43). It prohibits discrimination in access to services including housing, defines positive action and established the Commission for Racial Equality (CRE) with powers to conduct investigations and assist individuals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most instances of discrimination or race equality cases pursued in the courts relate to employment rather than housing. Discrimination in housing is poorly reported in all the countries studied. This is unlikely to be related to the scale of the problem of housing
discrimination but rather to the diffuse and indirect nature of instances of discrimination in this area, reluctance to report it and the difficulty of enforcement. The lack of monitoring of this discrimination also leads to an under-reporting of instances.

Discrimination may take different forms (Cachón, 2003) and in relation to housing can be the result of:

- structural factors (due to the situations in housing to which certain groups are driven by the market or by social practices),
- institutional factors (e.g. access to housing services and housing allocation),
- action (or inaction) of individuals (such as occurs in the non-rental of housing to certain groups).

Thus it is important, from a housing context, that legislation in a number of countries (e.g. France, Hungary, Sweden, the UK) conforms to the EU Directive in distinguishing between direct and indirect discrimination and to recognize the importance of harassment (that can lead to people abandoning their homes) (see Box 5.1).

Box 5.1 Summary of Definition of Discrimination – example of Swedish legislation

**Sweden**
The Law (2003:307), banning discrimination defines, “discrimination” as:

1. **direct discrimination:** that an individual is discriminated against through being treated worse than somebody else is treated, has been treated or would have been treated in a comparable situation, if the discrimination is related to ethnic belonging, religion or other faith, sexual attitude or disability,
2. **indirect discrimination:** that an individual person is discriminated against through the application of statutes, criteria or procedures that appear as neutral, but in practice especially disfavours persons with certain ethnic belonging, religion or other faith, sexual attitude or disability, unless the statutes, criteria or procedures can be motivated of legitimate goals and the means are suitable and necessary in order to reach the goal,
3. **harassment:** a behaviour that violates a person’s dignity and that is related to ethnic belonging, religion or other faith, sexual attitude or disability,
4. **instructions to discriminate:** orders or instructions to discriminate against a person according to 1–3 which are given to somebody who is in a relation of compliance or dependence to the one who gives the order or instruction or who in relation to that person has committed himself to fulfil a task.

In the context of housing, it can often be difficult to prove discrimination when a landlord refuses to rent a property to an individual. For this reason it is also important that legislation in some countries determines that the liability of proof lies with the perpetrator. In France for example, the Social Modernisation Act 2002 provides that, in the case of a dispute, the person who has been refused the tenancy must show the court the facts demonstrating the discriminatory nature of the refusal but it is for the landlord to provide the evidence of his innocence and the justification of his decision.

However, the issue of equality in access to housing is a collective issue as well as an individual right. It can therefore be necessary to provide for group action or the protection of collective rights which do not depend for their implementation on the actions of an individual who has been discriminated against. Such an approach is evident in the provisions in some countries. In Hungary and Slovenia, for example, the collective rights of the Roma as an autochthonous minority are prescribed in law giving the state a special role in the protection of those rights. This is not to imply that the state exercises its role effectively in this respect. In Hungary, under the Act LXXVII of 1993 on the Rights of National and Ethnic Minorities,
the Roma have the right to form local- and national self-governments. This Law was amended in 2003, to modify the competencies of elected minority self-governments. However, it is unclear whether this has provided for an effective role in relation to housing.

Similarly, a report that examines the prevention of discrimination against the Roma by the Discrimination Ombudsman in Sweden (DO, 2002) also underlines the need for a multi-perspective approach including an individual and a structural as well as a minority perspective. Recommendations suggest the need for more effective participation in the formation, implementation and evaluation of future measures (DO 2004, p. 49). To overcome the difficulty of obtaining evidence in individual cases the report recommends the use of ‘practice tests’ to confront someone with a fictive case in order to evidence possible discrimination and hence allow for a class action to be pursued.

Perhaps a less controversial recommendation of the Swedish report is to legalise positive differential treatment (DO 2004, pp. 37-39) or affirmative action. This approach is also apparent in Spain where the Constitutional Court has ruled that the principle of equality is not breached by action on the part of the public authorities to counter the disadvantages experienced by certain social groups “even when they are given more favourable treatment, for the aim is to give different treatment to effectively different situations” (Cachón, 2003; p3). However in the UK, where ethnic-led housing associations have been established (BME housing associations), these bodies have to abide by equal opportunities legislation in the allocation of houses and employment of staff in the same manner as non-BME associations and this may militate against a positive discrimination approach.

Discrimination in housing also needs to be understood in the context of the nature of the housing market. Affordable housing is a scarce resource, access to which is determined by the tenure balance of the housing market at the local level. Even in countries with a relatively large social rented or public housing sector, it is predominantly private market decisions that determine the allocation of the housing stock, and in Sweden municipal housing companies select tenants on a similar basis to private landlords. Hence private decisions can be justified on the basis of market criteria and individual discriminatory action is therefore difficult to prove. Thus, while legislation that acts to prevent discrimination by public authorities (e.g. France, Sweden, Hungary, Romania, the UK) is to be encouraged and welcomed, this in itself is an inadequate response to the problem.

Legislation provides for action to be taken against landlords and their agents and, often but not always, provides for assistance to individuals and tenants for that purpose. However, the available evidence indicates that in the field of housing very few cases of action are undertaken against discrimination by landlords and that very few victims obtain recompense. It is thus important that the operation of the housing market is monitored (at different spatial scales) to identify discrimination (in all the factors identified above) and that pro-active policies are developed to react to identified inequities. Only a minority of our study countries provide for agencies to undertake investigations and to report on these (France, Sweden, the UK). It appears to be only in France that this is made effective in relation to housing discrimination on a regular basis (the role of the Haut Comité). Reliance upon individuals knowing and exercising their rights to appeal to an Ombudsman (Sweden), Commission (the UK) or Minister without portfolio (Hungary) is likely to be ineffective in the field of housing and this is borne out by the evidence.
Discrimination can occur in relation to access to housing (refusal to sell or rent a piece of land or a house, to grant a loan or to make a contract), and this is recognised in legislation. However, discrimination can also occur in relation to the conditions of a sale or lease and it can occur in relation to the eviction from a property – and this is perhaps less well recognised. Where there is an overall shortage of affordable rented housing or a rapid rise in house prices (both of which situations occur in different parts of Europe), there has been a discernible rise in the level of evictions in recent years. There is some, if limited, evidence that this has impacted disproportionately upon immigrants and (some) ethnic minority groups. While much of this may be associated with a weaker labour market position, the contribution of discriminatory practices by landlords cannot be ruled out. However, there is no evidence to suggest that this issue is monitored in any of the study countries.

This understanding of the nature of the operation of the housing market and the processes of action and decision involved in the housing market system, demonstrate the need for a more systematic approach to the collation of evidence of discriminatory procedures and decisions at all stages in the process of housing production and consumption and the need to have procedures to regularly monitor outcomes at different levels in the system. This indicates the importance of monitoring equal opportunities legislation in the preparation and implementation of (national and local) housing strategies and housing allocation and production.

In countries with a relatively large public housing sector we may expect action on discrimination to focus on the role of public housing agencies as well as the individual actions of private landlords and finance institutions (i.e. institutional and structural discrimination). In countries where access to housing is predominantly private market-led, discrimination will resolve primarily on individual action. The evidence suggests that in countries with a strong public housing sector the actions of public landlords are being monitored and hence some aspects of structural and institutional discrimination are being addressed. A necessary precondition for such monitoring is, of course, that allocation is guided by non-discriminatory principles, that allocation policies are transparent and that it is possible to relate the handling of individual cases to these guidelines. However, dealing with individual actions of discrimination has proved to be a more intractable problem in all countries.

Examples of action undertaken to improve issues of structural or institutional discrimination in countries with a relatively strong social (or public) housing role are evident both in specific actions (described below) and in the development of organizational procedures and regulation. In France, for example, the ‘Haut Comité’ (Senior Committee) has the task to report to the President annually on issues of poor housing including discrimination. In Sweden, the government established a special Discrimination Committee to consider possible common legislation covering all or most bases for discrimination and all social life areas (Gov. Dir. 2002:118); the final report is due to be delivered in 2005. In the UK, the Commission for Racial Equality, the National Housing Federation, the Federation of Black Housing Organisations and the Housing Corporation established a ‘Race and Housing Inquiry’ in 2001 which made numerous recommendations to improve the performance of housing associations (see Box 5.2).
Box 5.2: Good Practice Suggestions for Social Landlords in the UK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race and Housing Inquiry: 2001</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Areas of Recommendations Good Practice Suggestions:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Action Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Meeting housing Needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Providing housing and support services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Involving tenants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Working with contractors and consultants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The Role of Black Minority Ethnic Housing Associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Staff recruitment, retention and development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Board of management recruitment, retention and development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Our review indicates that, in spite of its recent origin, the EC Directive 2000/43 has had an impact to ensure the existence of a legislative framework within which housing discrimination can be acted upon and that it has influenced the understanding of the nature of discrimination in ways that are helpful in the housing context (i.e. direct, indirect, harassment and instructions to discriminate). However, the legislation that exists is relatively new in all countries and time will be needed to assess the effectiveness of action in the field of housing. Our concern is that the structures and guidance for monitoring the effectiveness of action in the housing field are either inadequate or lacking.

It is arguable that the prevention of discrimination in housing (in all its forms) would be enhanced if member states recognised a right to housing. In 1996, the Social Charter of the Council of Europe was revised, including a new Article 31, which sets out the responsibilities of the signatory States in the application of the Right to Housing:

"With a view to ensuring the effective exercise of the right to housing, the Parties undertake to take measures designed:

i. to promote access to housing of an adequate standard;

ii. to prevent and reduce homelessness with a view to its gradual elimination;

iii. to make the price of housing accessible to those without adequate resources”.

This Article is strengthened by an interpretation of the European Committee on Social Rights of the Council of Europe, which provides a more detailed definition of the Right to Housing. In France, the Haut Comité au Logement des Personnes Défavorisés (Senior Committee on Housing for Disadvantaged People) in its reports from 2002 and 2003 argued that the absence of a “justiciable” right to housing clearly limits the responsibilities of public authorities and continues to perpetuate existing flawed housing policies. Since the publication of these reports, the debate on the ‘justiciability’ of the right to housing has moved to the heart of the discussion of national housing policies to such an extent that the French Prime Minister publicly stated (Spring 2004) that he was in favour of such a justiciable Right to Housing. However, it would require further judicial and procedural innovation at the international level in order to better establish the right to housing (see Kenna, 2004 for detailed discussion).

---

12 Information on the Council of Europe and jurisprudences in Europe are available at: http://www.coe.int
Recommendations

Whether or not the right to housing exists and is justiciable and whether discrimination is banned by legislation, the prevention of discrimination requires evidence in order to pursue the perpetrators and prevent its recurrence. Our analysis suggests that action will be needed to more effectively monitor the housing market and provide evidence. This requires that housing allocation takes place according to publicly known and settled principles and the creation of agencies capable of undertaking the task (where these do not already exist) and the funding to do so. We would further argue that, to be effective, action needs to be proactive rather than solely reliant upon the ability of individuals to report and pursue individual court action. The use of fictive cases, ‘practice tests’ and of class action taken on behalf of a group are possible approaches that are beyond the scope of this study to assess but that merit further consideration.

Our approach has been to recognize that, in the housing market, discrimination can take different forms that include structural, institutional and individual discrimination. To address these different dimensions of the problem will, we would argue, involve action at different levels including provision, regulation and enforcement. This review also suggests that, even where positive action has been taken there are lessons to be learnt in relation to the implementation of policy measures.

First, regulation is not enough in itself. The UK has a strong regulatory framework in relation to discrimination and to the role of public sector bodies including social housing landlords. Despite being subject to the general laws and guidance on race equality, Sim (2000) concluded that many aspects of housing policy and practice in the UK had tended to exclude minority ethnic groups from access to houses they needed and wanted. Moreover, the diversity of their needs and experience needed to be on the policy agenda and there was a need for much better monitoring of practice (pp106-7). For example, all anti-discrimination law and practice applies to access to the home ownership and private rented sectors, but there is much less monitoring and regulation of practice compared to the social housing sectors. There is scope for improved regulation, in addition to legislation, to challenge any form of racial discrimination as well as to develop and support culturally sensitive options for accessing finance for property purchase.

Strengthening the effectiveness of existing race equality law and anti-racism strategies will undoubtedly require an increase in financial resources directed from Central Government to the various institutions charged with implementation, provision and regulation. The Commission for Racial Equality produces good practice guidance in this area, including, recently, guidance on conducting race equality impact assessment on new policy or legislative proposals (Commission for Racial Equality, 2004).

Second, enforcement in the area of discrimination in housing requires pro-active approaches to overcome the problems tenants face in raising their case and winning restitution. Complaints on ethnic discrimination to the Swedish Discrimination Officer were presented in Chapter 3. This confirms that people do experience and report discrimination on ethnic grounds on the housing market by public as well as private landlords. However, results of a (limited) survey of Roma people indicated that only 10 percent of those who claimed that they had been discriminated against on the housing market had reported it to the DO. Furthermore, it is generally rare that a landlord is found guilty of discrimination, since it is difficult to prove the “true” reason why access was denied.
Third, fighting discrimination in housing will require appropriate agencies, adequate funding, regular independent monitoring and effective forms of implementation. This requires different initiatives and approaches rather than relying solely upon legislation or the creation of a single office such as a Commissioner, Ombudsman or Minister. In France, an expressed will to fight discrimination in all fields including housing led to the establishment of independent structures and re-shaping of existing institutions. Thus the FAS became the FASSILD and there was the creation of different tools for monitoring, analyzing and measuring such as the GELD, the CODAC and the free help line 114. In addition, the Haut Comité was tasked with reporting on bad housing and the reality of discrimination. This range of initiatives to fight discrimination in housing is summarized in Box 5.3.

Box 5.3: Summary of the range of initiatives used in France to combat discrimination in housing.

| **FASILD:** (Fonds d’action et de Soutien pour l’Intégration et la Lutte contre les Discriminations) |
| Social Action and Support Fund for Integration and the Fight against Discrimination. With its new name, this organization acquired the additional assignment of fighting discrimination against immigrants or those of immigrant descent. It mainly finances projects in partnership with other public services (State, local and regional authorities). |
| **GELD:** (Groupe d’Etude et de Lutte contre les Discriminations). Group for the Study and Fight against Discrimination was created in April 1999 and started with the name of GED (Discrimination Study Group). Its aim is to study and analyze any discrimination (direct or indirect) in all fields where people suffer because of their foreign background. Its purpose includes providing its results to the authorities and the general public and suggesting means of fighting against such discriminations. |
| **CODAC and help line telephone number 114** |
| The Departmental Commissions for Citizens Access represent the operational part of the public program against discrimination. These committees, created in 18 January 1999, are empowered to collect complaints through a free help line telephone number (the 114) and at the least, act as an intermediary between the victims of discrimination and the “discriminators”. It is still early to draw many conclusions from its activities and from the information it has collected. |
| **Act of social modernization from 17th July 2002, which it forbids all discrimination in housing access** |
| The law called “The Social Modernization Act” of 17th July 2002 claims in article 158 that no one can be refused the tenancy of housing for reasons of their origin, patronymic, appearance, sex, family situation, state of health, handicap, customs, sexual tendencies, political opinions, union activities (membership or non-membership), real or supposed ethnicity, nationality, race, or given religion. In case of a dispute, the person who had been refused the tenancy must show the court the facts demonstrating the discriminatory nature of the refusal, even if they is no hard evidence but only presumption. It is for the landlord to provide the evidence of his innocence and the justification of his decision. |
The importance of successfully integrating third country nationals into society was stressed by the European Council in Tampere. The development of appropriate integration strategies is the responsibility of Member States with authorities and other actors at the local and municipal level having an important role to play. The strategies have to be in accordance with the objectives endorsed by the Nice European Council as regards social inclusion. In this regard Communication 2001/387 established the guidelines for the development of integration policies (see Box 5.4).

Box 5.4 Communication 2001/387, Guideline 6: Ensuring the development of integration policies for third country nationals residing legally on the territories of the Member States

- Identifying priorities and resources for developing a comprehensive policy to ensure the integration of migrants into society.
- Setting up a framework to ensure the involvement of local and regional actors, the social partners, civil society and migrants themselves in developing and implementing the national strategy.
- Promoting the integration of migrants through information and awareness campaigns in co-operation with all those concerned.
- Developing specific measures aimed at the social and economic integration of women and second generation migrants.
- Developing settlement programmes for new migrants and their families including the provision of appropriate language training and information on the cultural, political and social characteristics of the country concerned including the nature of citizenship and of the fundamental European values.
- Developing measures to provide social, health and economic support to victims of smuggling and/or trafficking during their stay on the territory of the EU.
- Exploring the validity of the concept of civic citizenship by identifying the rights and responsibilities, which would ensure the fair treatment of third country nationals legally resident in the Member State concerned.

The definition of integration is ill-defined in terms both of the groups to whom it is addressed and its purpose. A review of the literature suggests that “integration is an umbrella term for summarizing a wide variety of facets of immigrant experience and possible trajectories and
outcomes, including assimilation, incorporation, inclusion, acculturation, settlement, adaptation, adjustment and social inclusion” (Zetter et al, 2002; p99) and that countries, such as France, dedicated to assimilation, interpret the term differently from multicultural countries such as the UK and Sweden. However, it is suggested that member states are moving towards harmonisation on integration issues (Zetter et al, 2002; p104).

Although strategies are commonly understood to relate to the integration of third country nationals it is not always clear who is included or addressed by such strategies. It is often unclear whether integration policies which have been introduced in various countries apply to foreign workers and people under all the forms of subsidiary protection currently available, as well as to Convention and de facto refugees (Zetter et al, 2002). However, apart from people arriving to be reunited with family members with residence permits, asylum seekers now form the bulk of applicants for permanent residence in the countries forming the subject of this study and those who achieve refugee status are the principal recipients of integration support.

In Chapter 3 we identified the increasing concern about the ageing of foreign workers in France. The status of groups of foreign workers often remains ambiguous for many years and while they remain on temporary residence permits and the option of return to their home countries is not discounted, they are often not eligible for integration packages.

Although Guideline 6, described above, refers to second generation immigrants, there is little evidence we could find of integration strategies addressing their needs despite the evidence of increasing levels of homelessness and housing exclusion among this group (see Chapter 3). However, Zetter et al (2002) suggest that “concern is now being expressed in several countries about second and third generation immigrants who have not yet achieved an acceptable level of integration; integration policy in the Netherlands has recently been specifically extended to include long-standing residents ‘oldcomers’” (p105).

It is arguable that integration strategies are also relevant to the needs of specific indigenous minorities – in particular the Roma. The causes of their specific needs should, more normally, be conceptualised in terms of social exclusion and segregation. Nevertheless, strategies to combat social exclusion and poverty among the Roma are often couched in terms of integration both for those Roma who have a nomadic lifestyle and for those with a more settled mode of living. Specific strategies exist in four of the case study countries – Hungary, Romania, Slovenia and Spain. This section will briefly refer to these strategies in the context of access to decent housing.

**The Nature of Integration Strategies**

It is not appropriate in this study to undertake a detailed evaluation of integration strategies; the focus here is on the role of access to decent housing within these strategies. The issue of integration policies for immigrants and of reception and integration of asylum seekers and refugees has been considered in a number of European research reports. The Dutch Refugee Council (2002) has examined the accommodation provision for refugees; the European Refugee Fund Community Action commissioned a study on the policy and practice related to refugee integration (Zetter et al, 2002). In this section we aim to provide a brief summary of integration strategies in order to highlight their main features in relation to housing. A brief description of the housing aspects included in integration strategies in each of the case study countries is contained in Appendix 3.
Zetter’s review of integration strategies in the EU-15 indicates the diversity of approach adopted, the recent chronology of legislation and policy in some countries (especially those who have experienced a recent rapid rise in asylum immigration) and the evolving nature of the strategies (e.g. new strategies have been announced in France and the UK during the period of this study). Thus, in countries still in the early stages of the development of national integration policies statutory service providers, charities, churches and homeless NGOs are a main source of support (Zetter et al, 2002; Edgar et al, 2004). Some countries have well-developed and long-established integration programmes (e.g. France, Sweden, the UK). Here the problems revolve around the issue of a lack of joined-up policies and the lack of co-ordination between housing providers, asylum agencies and social support. In France, according to Zetter et al (2002; p105), there is a philosophical refusal to recognise the separateness of any group within the state and so common provision for migrants and citizens is a matter of principle. However, the new integration policy adopted by France in 2003 establishes a new central agency for reception with a network of regional centres designed to cover the whole country by 2006.

Furthermore, it is suggested (Zetter et al, 2002; p104) that integration programmes in the more advanced countries are currently moving on from a focus on migrants to incorporation in wider agendas targeting social exclusion in areas of deprivation where there are high concentrations of immigrant residents (e.g. projects targeting youth in priority action zones – ZAPs – in the Walloon region of Belgium).

Recent research also suggests that different models of social inclusion and welfare entitlement are significant to the process of integration (Zetter et al, 2002). Differences in welfare models are also important in explaining the housing outcomes of immigrants in the early stages of settlement. The extent to which the process of integration is managed and administered centrally or by local government is also a critical element. Given the high degree of concentration of immigrants, in the early phases of settlement, in the major cities then the strategies and policies of these major cities in the integration process is especially important.

The administration of integration strategies varies between countries. In some a single Ministry or agency processes asylum applications and implements integration measures, in others these functions are kept separate and distinct. Our review suggests that, in the context of housing, single responsibility does not result in greater co-ordination and indeed tends to exacerbate the difficulties faced by immigrants in finding suitable housing as a result of a lack of coordination with housing agencies. NGOs are active in integration in all countries and it is often their action, advice and support that are important in resolving housing outcomes.

Although all policy fields, including housing, tend to be present in integration strategies issues of employment, language training, health and citizenship are more coherently dealt with and funded. Indeed, the indicators identified in Guideline 6 (of Communication 2001/387) do not mention housing. Zetter (2002) confirms this impression when he states that indicators used by member states to measure whether integration has been achieved include “economic independence (i.e. employment), language skills, family reunion, adoption of citizenship, freedom from discrimination, participation in the political life of the state and, more controversially, a commitment to the adopted country” (p107) but excludes housing.
Existing research (Zetter et al, 2002; Dutch Refugee Council, 2002) did not consider the situation in the EU-10. The situation described in Slovenia is probably characteristic of these countries where integration strategies are only weakly developed or are embryonic. While Slovenia has an appropriate legal foundation for integration policies focusing on diverse groups of migrants, it is argued that the lack is not in the regulations but in its implementation (Zavratnik Zimic, 2004). The policies should be “translated” into concrete programmes. Neither the Asylum nor the Aliens Act includes a precise definition of whom, in Slovenia, is responsible for the provision and realization of conditions for the integration of foreigners and of how these conditions should be insured in practice (Bester, 2003 p.284). Slovenia devotes attention primarily to the first two constituents of the immigration policy defined in the Resolution on Immigration Policy in Slovenia, the immigration regulation and asylum seekers, while the integration policy is being neglected (Bester 2003, p.262).

Integration of third country nationals

Although our evidence in relation to housing outcomes (see chapter 3) indicates that disadvantage in the housing market can often be transmitted to second generation migrants, integration strategies tend to focus on asylum applicants and refugee migrants. In general, integration policies are poorly developed in respect to housing and demonstrate little understanding of the significance of housing or its relationship to other aspects of social policy.

A coordinated strategy for reception, induction, placement and support while awaiting the outcome of an application requires available accommodation in strategic locations. In the context of rising numbers of immigrants, accommodation shortages in areas of high demand (Edgar et al 2004) and shifts in policies of reception and dispersal (Greek Refugee Council, 2001) such co-ordination has proved to be elusive. To be effective in terms of integration a co-ordinated housing strategy would require to prevent homelessness, provide access to housing and enable the immigrant household to sustain their tenancy. Our evidence (chapter 3) suggests that policy is lacking in all three of these aspects.

Two distinct approaches operate across Europe in terms of the use of reception centres and dispersal policies for asylum seekers and the approach adopted has changed over time in a number of countries as immigration rules have tightened in the face of increasing numbers (Greek Refugee Council 2001; Edgar et al, 2004). Both have left asylum seekers and refugees vulnerable in the housing market. In the context of broader housing pressures, poor quality temporary accommodation is used for asylum seekers and private landlords can drive up rents. There is evidence that a lack of reception facilities relative to demand has forced asylum applicants onto the private market and led to homelessness among asylum seekers (France, Belgium; see Edgar et al 2004). Dispersal schemes have also worsened the conditions in which asylum seekers are forced to live. The EBO system in Sweden, which replaced the ‘all Sweden’ policy, has had negative effects and is argued to contribute to segregation. The ‘All Sweden’ strategy, which tried to disperse asylum seekers in asylum centres all over the country, helped people integrate on the housing market but not on the labour market. The EBO-system gives asylum-seekers access to networks and support from countrymen and temporary accommodation but leads to difficulties in accessing regular housing when they get permits to stay. In the UK the system of dispersal in local authority accommodation has also been criticised. As in Sweden and other countries, it is generally low demand/vacant property in the poorest areas that is used to house asylum seekers. The re-
housing needs of asylum seekers whose application is accepted are also not well managed. In all countries where dispersal schemes have operated there is evidence of secondary internal migration mainly to areas with immigrant community support networks and employment opportunities – that is areas of high housing demand (Edgar et al, 2004). There appears to be little advice or support mechanisms in place to prevent this or to provide choice to households to stay.

Mandatory (Belgium) and permissive (Sweden) approaches both result in greater reliance upon the private market and the household’s own initiative. In Belgium new laws require residence in reception centres and failure to do so leads to loss of support; in Sweden the Integration Board provides the choice for asylum seekers to find their own accommodation or use the Integration Board’s (poor quality) accommodation. Both result in greater reliance upon private sector housing and individual initiative/solution.

The transition process from asylum to refugee is not well managed in terms of housing security and sustainability. Transition is an important time for refugees who often have a very short time to find appropriate housing in a suitable location and deal with a range of decisions associated with independent living in a new country. The reception process and, particularly, the period following acceptance of their refugee status are critical to their successful integration into the housing market. Review of recent research suggests that the increasing restriction placed on asylum seekers accessing welfare benefits militate against their successful settlement and integration in the long term.

In the UK, for example, asylum seekers are given (a maximum) 28 days notice of acceptance of their application at the end of which time they are expected to leave the NASS (National Asylum Support Service) accommodation. While “a patchwork of transitional support projects is emerging across the country, some funded through the Supporting People framework13, there is no national policy to underpin this important stage and to join up the various agencies involved” (Refugee and Housing Network, 2003). This is not untypical of other countries and suggests at best a lack of coordination or at worst a policy vacuum in relation to the housing needs of asylum seekers once their application is accepted. In terms of housing, the major problem is a general shortage of affordable (temporary) housing in high demand areas.

A brief overview of integration strategies in relation to housing illustrates a range of experience (see Appendix 3 for a description in each country). In the EU-15 countries for example, there is evidence of recent changes in policy and development of new integration initiatives some of which involve housing access directly. However, in Belgium the Centre for Equal Opportunities and Opposition to Racism highlights initiatives and undertook a stock take of projects funded in 2003 (amounting to €7.5million) none of which involved housing. In France the recent reform of integration policy for foreigners is to be implemented at inter-ministerial level and will involve reception, integration and social action (including support to access housing). The inter-ministerial action plan introduced in April 2003 created a new public agency to coordinate action by all relevant bodies and introduces an integration contract for new migrant workers.

13 Supporting People is a package of funding to provide support to enable vulnerable groups to maintain an independent tenancy; this program now funds some tenancy support schemes for refugees
In Sweden, the renewed agenda for integration and diversity (Integration Board Report, 2003) identifies five key areas requiring action. However, the issue of housing is couched in terms of facilitating entry into the labour market, ‘there is a system error in the way the new immigrant’s initial period in Sweden is organised (indicating a)...need for system change. Everything from housing, cooperation between municipalities, organisations… should be designed to facilitate entry into the labour market’ (p24).

In the UK, the Community Cohesion Review Team report (2001) made 67 key recommendations. With respect to housing (pp42-43) it was commented that while much emphasis had been placed on issues of equality in access to housing, there had been less attention directed towards the impact of housing policies on community cohesion. The 2004 report of the Community Cohesion Panel advised that more needed to be done to ‘manage settlement’ as well as ‘managing migration’ (p7). The Community Cohesion Panel drew on the advice of a specialist housing practitioner group. More recently, the review of integration strategies - Integration Matters (ODPM, 2004) - acknowledges the importance of ‘safe and appropriate’ housing for refugees (p.13), and lists current projects across the UK to help secure it by offering, for example:

- rent deposit schemes;
- Supporting People resources;
- extended stay in NASS accommodation;
- move-on accommodation;
- ‘housing brokerage’ with directly managed properties; and
- other direct housing support (p.29).

In Spain, the National Program of Immigrants Integration has remained unchanged since 1994. Since 2001 the GRECO programme distributes public funds to NGO and immigrant association projects devoted to different integration strategies including housing.

In the EU-10 countries and Romania, integration strategies have yet to develop and housing issues relate solely to the accommodation provided for asylum seekers and those granted temporary residency. In Hungary, a policy paper was prepared in 2003 by Dutch experts in co-operation with government, local authorities and NGOs to provide a basis for policy. This Matra paper is the first document to raise the question of integration programs. Although the resolution on immigration policy in Slovenia (in 1999) included an integration policy, this has been honoured more in the breach than in the observance (Bester, 2003). All three countries, however, have integration strategies for the Roma which are described below.

**Meeting the Housing Needs of the Roma**

Previous chapters have described the variability of the housing issues facing the Roma across countries. This includes the factor of the scale of the problems to be addressed (estimated 1.8 million in Romania, 700,000 in Hungary and Spain and 9,000 in Slovenia). It also concerns the nature of the housing problems which varies between rural, urban and semi-urban locations. In the rural (mahala) areas issues relate to a lack of basic infrastructure and poor housing quality; in the urban ghettos poor housing issues are associated with segregation; in the shanty town areas issues of illegal occupancy compound the poor housing circumstances. Hence policies to address the housing needs of the Roma need to be nuanced to reflect these different objective situations as well as the political and social issues they raise.
There is an apparent ambiguity whether the priority lies in addressing the poor living circumstances of the Roma, in situ, or in addressing the social segregation and stigmatization which perpetuate their situation of disadvantage. This is reflected in international opinion – “my empirical conclusion would be that Roma are given ‘Roma social housing’ and this generally radically blocks any integration”\textsuperscript{14}. It is also reflected in debates at national level. For example, in Hungary the Equal Opportunity Government Office\textsuperscript{15} is preparing a ‘Housing and Social Integration Programme’. In interviews conducted for this study it is apparent that the key issue being debated in Hungary is whether the colony elimination program has to be a Roma programme or whether this should be integrated in a general integration programme targeting underprivileged people. The most important argument in favour of the conception of addressing explicitly Roma colony elimination is that, while Roma lack the power to represent their own interests, a targeted policy would probably reach them more effectively. On the other hand, policies targeting explicitly Roma are thought to segregate a problem and could create a back-lash from non-Roma citizens living amidst hard economic conditions. In favour of integrating the colony elimination programme into a general integration policy is the argument that the capacity to address a wider range of problems and to offer a more complex integration programme would secure more sustainable results in the long run.

The policies that address Roma issues are essentially oriented toward short-term objectives of survival. Housing is part of the puzzle and is a prerequisite for decent living, but access to education, to the health system and to the labour market through non-discrimination monitoring and affirmative action are also important and should go hand in hand with any housing policy. An integrated strategy and adequate finance to support policies are lacking.

Review of policies in all the case study countries with substantial Roma populations suggests that lack of funding is a major impediment to progress. This is particularly acute in countries where the existing housing infrastructure is poor. In Romania, for example, the UNECE report suggests that more than half of the population endure housing deprivation (56% of all residential buildings in Romania are fully amortized – i.e. they have theoretically come to the end of their effective life; 53% lack piped water). In Hungary, for example, three of the five operational programmes in the National Development Plan (NDP) relate to colony elimination requiring a planned programme of €52 million; an announcement of competition for funding was made in 2004 amounting to €18.75million (utilizing the European Social Fund).

The scale of investment required presumes a role for European funding if these issues are to be addressed in a reasonable time-scale. There is, to date, a presumption against the use of European Regional Development Funds (ERDF) for housing purposes though they are available for complementary infrastructure investment. However, if an integrated strategy of the type envisaged in Hungary is to be pursued then the review of the Structural Funds will require to address the issue of poor housing in countries such as Hungary and Romania generally and not solely the use ERDF to address the issue of Roma housing. It is unrealistic to open up Structural Funds for housing without limitation in view of the scale of the housing

\textsuperscript{14} Expert assessment by Mr Lac Oreavec (ERRC/Milan Simecka Foundation/COHRE project on housing rights for Roma in Slovakia; quoted in ‘The Situation of the Roma in an Enlarged European Union’, 2004

\textsuperscript{15} In October 2004, the responsibilities of the Equal Opportunity Government Office were transferred to the newly established Ministry of Youth, Family, Social and Equal Opportunity.
crisis and the relatively limited amount of funding available in the Structural Funds. Review of the Structural Funds should therefore be opened to housing carefully through targeted measures, and pilot projects aimed to explore innovative housing integration and renovation measures. Targeting groups of the population experiencing housing exclusion would incorporate the Hungarian policy approach by including but not being limited to the Roma. This would essentially involve a horizontal targeting of people enduring homelessness and housing exclusion.

Lack of institutional capacity is a further hindrance to effective action. Local authorities, especially in rural areas, lack funds to cover minimal public services in the community. They are overwhelmed by the chronic poverty of Roma inhabitants. They operate (particularly in Romania) in the face of a lack of a national strategy or bodies to monitor implementation. Although there are some representative non-governmental organizations acting on behalf of Roma, they are sporadically involved in managing programmes and interventions to improve housing conditions. Solid partnerships between Roma organizations and authorities in both phases of planning and implementation are lacking.

Three further issues arise from our review that raise important issues to be addressed if policies to improve the housing situation of the Roma and to facilitate their integration are to be effective. First, the existence of Roma self-government in Hungary, Romania and Slovenia is an important feature that could be used to ensure the involvement of the Roma in the development and implementation of (local) housing strategies (see Box 5.5). Second, the issue of legalization of Roma settlements needs to be addressed and is a complex matter requiring resolution of legal and financial issues and central-local responsibilities. This issue merits further study. Third, given the structural poverty experienced by Roma populations the experience of good practice in existing projects in employing Roma labour and subcontractors would be an important component of improving community capacity (see Box 5.6).

Box 5.5 Roma Self-government as an instrument for community consultation and involvement

**HUNGARY**
The Roma were recognized as an ethnic minority by the 1993 Act on Rights of National and Ethnic Minorities which provide for the collective right of self-governance. In the 2002 elections almost 1000 Roma self-governments were brought into existence.

- 1990: the Office for National and Ethnic Minorities that operates in the Prime Minister’s Office.
- 1995: the Coordination Council in Roma Affairs
- 1999: the Public Foundation for Roma Living in Hungary
- 1999: the Coordination Council in Roma Affairs is replaced by the Inter-Departmental Committee on Roma Affairs
- 2002: Roma State Secretariat in the Prime Minister’s Office.
- 2003: Roma State Secretariat under the control of the newly established Equal Opportunity Minister.
Recommendations

Our review suggests that the reception procedures for asylum seekers and refugees are not well co-ordinated with integration strategies and that this hinders their assimilation into the housing market. Equally, however, homeless agencies are not well equipped to deal with the specialist needs of immigrants and their re-settlement needs. Despite this there has been an increase in immigrants and foreign born citizens among the users of homeless services. Furthermore, homeless agencies have responded by the development of specialist services to meet the needs of particular groups (see Edgar et al, 2004).

Strategies to meet the housing needs of the Roma need to address the diversity of the issues described above and balance the requirement to improve housing circumstances with the broader goals of social cohesion and social inclusion. Lack of finance and of institutional capacity are major impediments to progress.

A number of basic issues need to be addressed to improve this situation for immigrants. These include:

1. Improving the provision of information and advice on housing and funding housing advice services to undertake this task where appropriate.
2. Linking reception policies with tenancy requirements so that asylum seekers and refugees can access appropriate rented housing. Housing integration must be addressed within the context of other parts of the asylum seeker reception and application process. There is a specific need for improved coordination and support at the point of transition.
3. Housing services need to ensure that the barriers the immigrants and refugees face in accessing housing are taken into account; this relates to homelessness, housing allocation and the use / availability of temporary accommodation.
4. The use of approaches (such as mediation services, social rental agencies and accompagnement sociale) to encourage private landlords to rent to these groups.
5. Improved co-ordination (and multi-agency working) between immigration and asylum agencies and housing agencies and NGOs who provide housing services.
6. Improved information and data collection is a requirement to deliver a housing integration strategy for immigrants and to address issues of support needs to sustain the tenancy.
7. The role of homeless agencies in accommodating immigrants needs to be recognized and addressed within housing and homelessness policies including the development of specific measures to meet the needs of immigrants including refugees.

8. Immigrant NGOs are already active and experienced in providing housing and support. Good practice indicates their experience should be consulted in the development of strategies and policies (at national as well as local level).

A number of basic measures are needed to address the housing needs of the Roma:

1. Programmes to improve Roma housing situations need to be integrated into general housing strategies for the disadvantaged.
2. European Funds will be needed to address the scale of funding required if action is to be effective in a reasonable time-scale.
3. Review of Structural Funds should be opened to housing carefully through targeted measures and pilot projects to explore innovative housing integration measures for those facing housing exclusion rather than focusing only on the housing situation of the Roma.
4. Good practice issues should be addressed in relation to issues relating to illegal occupancy of land, community involvement and community capacity.
5.5 FACILITATING ACCESS TO HOUSING

The housing circumstances of the target groups, their housing needs and the barriers that prevent access to decent and affordable housing were described in Chapter 3 and the existing policy measures to address these issues were described in Chapter 4. This section considers the specific housing policy measures required to address these issues. Removing these barriers in order to facilitate access to housing, and to enable households to exercise choice in the face of changes in family circumstances or needs, requires action to prevent exclusion and support the exercise of individual choice and action that leads to appropriate and sustainable housing outcomes. In brief this requires policies focused on three separate but related aspects:

- Preventing homelessness and housing exclusion
- Facilitating access to appropriate housing
- Sustaining housing outcomes (tenancy or ownership).

The most basic requirement to ensure access to housing, for any individual or household whatever their circumstances, is the ability to exercise choice in the housing market. To exercise choice the individual requires:

- adequate resources (the ability to pay)
- information (knowledge of alternative options)
- competence to contract (equality of status with other actors in the market place) and
- legal protection (from discrimination and exploitation).

An adequate income, information and advice, freedom from discrimination and legal rights are all components of any strategy to improve the ability of individual households to sustain a tenancy. Protection of individual rights and protection from discrimination have been discussed above. Not all immigrants and ethnic minority households lack adequate resources or information – this section considers the needs of those who do and who, as a result, experience exclusion and poverty of opportunity.

HOUSING SUPPLY AND DEMAND

A key feature of the housing exclusion of immigrants and ethnic minority groups, which they share with other disadvantaged and excluded people, is the lack of affordable rented housing. Even if they did not experience discrimination in the housing market this lack of supply, especially in areas of employment opportunity, would be a serious barrier to achieving a satisfactory housing outcome. The lack of rented housing generally is an issue but more importantly, the lack of social (or public) rented housing is a major impediment to improving access to housing for these target groups. If government does not have an instrument of control then households’ only resort is the private market and the government’s resort is the use of indirect measures of regulation and demand-side subsidies or the use of targeted supply or subsidies. There is little evidence of the latter targeted approaches being employed (with the possible exception of France) or, in the current context of immigration control and rising numbers of migrants, of such approaches being politically palatable.

These target groups will benefit from any policy measures undertaken to increase the supply of affordable rented housing but, at this time, there are no signs (with the exception of the UK and France) among our case study countries of this occurring on any scale.
All the case study countries undertake housing planning although in some countries this only occurs at a national level and regional or local housing strategies are absent. Only in the UK are attempts being made to integrate housing planning at national, regional and local levels. However, our review suggests that, in general, there is a lack of understanding of the scale or nature of the housing need among these target groups (or of the diversity of need that exists). The strategic planning of housing investment should be informed by national and local studies and by consultation with ethnic minority communities. From our review it appears that such good practice is only evident in France and the UK and even here there is criticism of the practice and of the failure of many providers (local authorities and housing associations) to be informed by it.

The ability to implement strategies of housing investment and provision of affordable social rented housing relies on an adequate level of institutional, economic and administrative capacity. This capacity, both of the state and of civil society, is lacking in central and east European countries according to recent commentaries (UNECE, 2000; Dandolova, 2003). The implementation of programmes to meet the needs of the Roma and other minority and disadvantaged groups will be undermined by this situation.

One approach to the issue of increasing the supply of housing targeted at ethnic minority groups is to encourage the development of specific agencies and housing providers to address their needs. This has occurred in the UK with the creation of BME housing associations. It could occur by other means such as the use of umbrella organisations (e.g. the Y-Foundation in Finland or the Soziale Wohnraumhilfe in Germany) or intermediary agencies (such as the Social Rental Agencies in Belgium and France or the Provivienda and Prohabitao in Spain) (see Edgar et al, 1999). However, the creation of ethnic-led (housing) agencies presupposes a multi-cultural philosophy and it is not evident that such strategies would be acceptable in countries (such as France) that espouse an assimilationist approach to policy.

Access to available housing, in whatever tenure, requires an adequate income to afford it. Our evidence indicates that the weak labour market position of these target groups leaves them without the required adequacy of income and that, as a result, they pay a disproportionately larger share of their income on housing consumption compared to more affluent citizens. Policy measures designed to make housing affordable for low income groups rely on either supply side subsidies or housing allowances. Where they exist, demand-side subsidies benefit these target groups in the same manner as other low income or disadvantaged groups (and the same dis-benefits of means tested tapers and eligibility criteria will also arise). Refugees and immigrants with appropriate residency status are eligible for such subsidies in the same manner as citizens in all our study countries (with some exceptions in Slovenia). However, this is an area where policy is changing in many countries in the direction of tightening eligibility criteria and reducing public expenditure. Furthermore, households need to know of their rights to obtain such assistance which are not always automatic and rely on the claimant in many instances to take the initiative.
Whether housing is in short supply or is available in the private or public sector, access to it requires an adequate knowledge of the available housing opportunities, of cost and of individual rights. That knowledge has to be available at the point of consumption – at the local level – and in a form that can be understood – in an appropriate and accessible language. Negotiating a tenancy contract and understanding the terms and conditions will also often require advice and support. Although integration strategies stress the need for language training and support in employment matters, there is little evidence we could find of such support being available in relation to housing integration. Best practice in this regard is evident in the UK where housing legislation requires local authorities to develop housing information and advice strategies, and housing management practice guidelines require public landlords to provide information in translation. Furthermore, recent legislation in Scotland requires local authority homelessness strategies to demonstrate provision (including information and advice) for all groups including ethnic minorities.

Access to public sector housing requires allocation policies that are transparent and fair. Where public subsidised social rented housing has been transferred to non-governmental organisations this process requires adequate systems of regulation, monitoring and inspection. This is not evident in all the case study countries. In Flanders (Belgium), for example, there is evidence of a recent debate on the use of language criteria in housing allocation (a basic knowledge of Dutch being put forward as a criterion for allocation to social rented housing). In France, the GELD has recently advocated the creation of a housing inspectorate to regulate the measures and practices of housing organisations. Equally, there is public concern in Sweden about the allocation procedures of housing companies and of tenant-owner cooperatives (Sahlin, 2003). Regulation, inspection and monitoring are a sine qua non of anti-discrimination and social inclusion policies yet these indicators are not mentioned in the NAPs/Inclusion.

Furthermore, public policies focused on social cohesion, neighbourhood renewal and housing management can lead to unintentional discrimination against some ethnic groups. The use of policies such as ‘mixité sociale’ in France and ‘choice-based letting’ in the UK, need to be monitored in this regard. The use of quotas and targets in relation to public sector housing allocation are not uncommon in other countries not included in this study (e.g. Germany, the Netherlands, Denmark). The attempt to achieve social mix by housing allocation is not effective and can be discriminatory and exclusionary (see chapter 3). Social balance or social mix should be achieved by the use of other policy instruments (e.g. land use planning, augmentation of supply and tenure diversification).

Where public sector rented accommodation is in short supply, measures are required to facilitate access to the private rented sector. This requires action related to the cost of the accommodation, tenancy contract and conditions and the alleviation of prejudice or attitude to risk on the part of landlords. This study has identified the existence of a range of measures in this regard. These include the creation of specific (NGO) agencies in Belgium and Spain and the use of rent deposit schemes in a number of countries (including the UK). However, these initiatives tend to be small scale and localised in operation and their effectiveness is often threatened by inadequate or uncertain funding (de Decker, 2002).

We found little evidence of initiatives to use mixed-tenure solutions (e.g. shared-equity, shared-ownership) or low cost ownership initiatives to meet the needs of ethnic groups.
Although there is some suggestion in the literature that borrowing for home purchase is a difficulty for Muslims, we found little corroborating evidence of this as an issue. A recent study in the UK, for example, indicates that half of Muslim households (51%) are home owners, and a significant proportion (33%) are buying with a mortgage or loan despite concern among many Muslims about borrowing money on interest (Sellick, 2004). This is possible in many cases through specialised lenders who offer mortgage products tailored to Muslim beliefs, but these are aimed at the open market and exclude lower income Muslim households who require low cost home ownership options.

MEETING SPECIFIC HOUSING NEEDS

For the most part immigrants and ethnic minority households have the same housing needs as other groups in society. The particular needs of immigrants may arise from the nature of the migratory process and their stage within it. For example, newly arrived migrants have a particular need for temporary accommodation which is often in short supply.

The needs of some ethnic minority communities arise from the demographic composition of the population resulting from the historic patterns of migration involved. This may mean that some communities have higher proportions of young families with dependent children and thus have needs for appropriate larger family dwellings located near to schools and related facilities. Some immigrant communities exhibit (for a time) larger family size and hence require larger accommodation or (more normally) experience overcrowding. The causes of larger families are diverse and require local study to address the nature of the issue. For example, the evidence from France indicates two distinct situations. In some communities children remain in the family home until their late twenties and in part this arises from a lack of appropriate housing in the area for this second generation group. In some communities it arises from extended families and this can often be the result of the lack of reception facilities or temporary housing for newly arrived family or friends. In Hungary, on the other hand, there is evidence of older generation parents joining young immigrants. Policy solutions need to be sensitive to this diversity of experience and this reinforces the argument for local studies (and consultation with ethnic community organisations) to inform housing strategies.

The increasing vulnerability of immigrants, women and young people from ethnic communities to homelessness is presented in Chapter 3 and reported more fully in other studies (Edgar et al, 2004). The reasons for this vulnerability are complex and vary both between countries and between groups. Homeless service providers are reporting an increasing occurrence of immigrants which, to some degree, is a result of the inadequacy of existing reception facilities. This may be a transitional feature of the pattern of immigration and recent rapid rise in asylum applications or in undocumented migrants in some countries. However, there is also evidence of an increase in homelessness among young people from immigrant communities and this suggests both a failure of integration strategies and the inability of policies to respond to the perpetuation of disadvantage of more vulnerable ethnic households. This situation suggests the need for support as well as housing for vulnerable young people from minority ethnic communities. Supported accommodation and the funding of support in housing are particularly under-developed in southern European countries and the EU-10 (Edgar et al, 2000).

A particular problem, both in countries with a longer history of immigration (Belgium, France and the UK) as well as in countries with more recent experience (e.g. Hungary) relates
to the ageing of people in ethnic communities (see Chapter 3). A recent project has been funded by the EC to develop and promote solutions to improve health and social care service delivery for this special target group and to identify strategies and examples of good practice (see http://www.leeds.gov.uk/seem). However, older people from ethnic minority and immigrant communities have particular housing as well as care needs and these are often poorly understood or recognized in policy debates. The issue of older workers in migrant hostels in France is presented in Chapter 3 and the development of sheltered housing for specific ethnic groups (the Chinese, Asians, Afro-Caribbeans) in the UK are also referred to as examples of good practice (Harrison and Philips, 2003). However, the needs of this group of older people are likely to be diverse and solutions in the UK may not transfer well into other welfare contexts. This is an area that merits further research.

IMPLEMENTING HOUSING POLICY

In chapter 4 the description of the evolution of policies in France and of the specific strategies adopted in some regions in Spain illustrate that the creation of specific agencies with a locus of responsibility and targeted remit can be a necessary adjunct to the implementation of housing policies through local government structures. This may also be a mechanism by which partnership or multi-agency working can be encouraged. The effective implementation of strategies to improve access to housing will require multi-agency approaches and co-ordination to prepare and deliver integrated strategies at the local level.

Previous chapters have also demonstrated that in some countries (e.g. France) there has been an evolution of approach from targeted strategies towards strategies in which ethnic minority needs are met through social inclusion policies aimed at all socially excluded and disadvantaged groups. Elsewhere (e.g. Hungary) the relative merits of universalist and targeted approaches are rehearsed in the example of the recent housing and social integration programme. How these issues are resolved will rely in part on the prevailing political attitude to assimilation and multi-culturalism and in part on the assessment of the extent to which complex structural disadvantage can be addressed by targeted initiatives. The use of assimilationist and non-targeted measures assumes that minorities within the disadvantaged will benefit from these measures and not suffer discrimination. It also assumes that there are other measures in place to meet the information deficit faced by migrants and some ethnic minorities. When no special measures are in place for migrants and minorities, there is an absolute requirement that anti-discrimination measures and monitoring are effective.

Whichever approach is adopted the success of policies requires the nature of housing outcomes to be monitored over time. This requires structures and procedures to carry out ethnic monitoring as well as the evaluation of programmes against defined policy objectives. There is little evidence that such monitoring is currently taking place in most countries or that it is being used to inform and bend mainstream policies and procedures in housing and related policy fields. However, this needs to occur at EU as well as national and local level to encourage (and enforce) accountability in this area. Effective monitoring using appropriate and agreed indicators is a necessary but not sufficient condition of policy implementation. Regulation and inspection are also required, as is recognised by practice in France, Sweden and the UK. Although consideration has been given to regulation of the private rented sector in some countries (e.g. legislation on this issue is currently out to consultation in the UK), this has not been an issue reported in the course of this study. The potential of using regulation of private landlords as a mechanism for ethnic monitoring and enforcement of anti-discrimination legislation, in the different legal contexts of our study countries, is thus
not something we can comment on in detail. However, such regulation is likely to be a complex and expensive legal and administrative exercise if it is undertaken de novo.

Bemelmans-Videc (1998) suggests that information instruments are a necessary aspect of policy implementation. The use of guidance on policy development and housing management procedures has a long history and is well developed in countries with a large social rented housing sector. Even there, however, practice has been slow to develop in accordance with good practice guidance. Such guidance is a necessary feature of policy implementation and should form a more explicit and coherent aspect of the open method of coordination of social inclusion policies at EU, national and local level. Peer review of such guidance in this area would allow for mutual learning which is one aim of the open method of co-ordination.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Facilitating access to housing for immigrants and ethnic minorities requires action in relation to both the augmentation of supply and to increase effective demand. These forms of action need to address the barriers that exist, and this implies policies that are informed by appropriate regional and local assessments of need. The capacity to implement policy need to be addressed where this is absent or lacking. In the context where housing opportunities are primarily determined by private market decisions, governance issues of guidance, inspection and enforcement are an important corollary of increased and targeted supply. Housing policies are, in themselves, insufficient to achieve improved access to housing; effective action against discrimination and appropriate support are also essential elements.

1. Facilitating access to decent and affordable housing for immigrants and ethnic minority households can only be adequately met if government has a controllable policy instrument – that is to say a housing supply whose allocation can be influenced and controlled to achieve specific objectives.

2. There is a need to enhance the supply of affordable rented housing (and temporary accommodation) in all areas but especially in areas of high demand where there is ethnic and immigrant concentration.

3. The provision of specialist supply, and ethnic-led (housing) organisations have been beneficial in some countries and are worthy of further consideration.

4. The provision of housing information and advice at the local level is a necessary aspect of informing people of their rights and opportunities (especially with respect to rental allowances). This is generally poorly developed in many countries and requires adequate funding and administration.

5. The monitoring of housing allocations (and evictions) in both the public and the private sectors is a necessary component of implementing anti-discrimination legislation. This is not happening in most countries (with the exception of public sector landlords in some countries).

6. There is a need for further research to consider mechanisms to improve access to home ownership (and to low cost home ownership) especially in countries where this is the dominant tenure.

7. To meet the specific housing needs of ethnic minority households requires local study and consultation to understand the scale, nature and diversity of need to be addressed.
8. Both older people (recent immigrants or people of immigrant origin) and younger second generation immigrants have particular needs that are not well understood or addressed by existing housing policies or housing management strategies. These needs should be addressed by appropriate housing policies based on local needs assessment and research.

9. Improvement in the housing situation of ethnic minority households requires the monitoring of policies against stated objectives using appropriate indicators. The NAPs/Inclusion currently are not good at providing evidence of ethnic monitoring in the housing policy field. However, the appropriate use of indicators for this purpose needs to be carefully considered in countries (e.g. France) where the definition of ethnicity is problematic (see chapter 1)\textsuperscript{16}.

10. Guidance to local government, housing organisations and private landlords and their agents is a necessary adjunct of policy implementation and of the enforcement of equal opportunity and anti-discrimination legislation. While guidance exists in some countries this is an aspect that could benefit from the improved application of the open method of coordination in which social inclusion strategies are developing.

11. Inclusion of the needs of minorities and migrants in the housing planning process at all levels.

12. The potential discriminatory and exclusionary effects of using housing allocation in order to achieve desired objectives of social balance should be monitored and more appropriate policy instruments employed.

---

\textsuperscript{16} The CODAC and GELD in France include racial and ethnic origin as grounds of discrimination; the EC document ‘Promoting Diversity (2002) recommends that such institutions should have sufficient means to ‘make surveys an available tool for analysing the actual level of discrimination’ (p19).
This section examines the issues to be considered in improving policies designed to meet the housing needs of immigrants and ethnic minority communities. The definition of good practice is a notoriously difficult concept to determine especially in a comparative analysis. Indeed, it is probably more appropriate to consider the concept of innovation leading to improvement in practice, and improvement in the situation of those to whom the service provision is targeted. This is a relativist rather than a normative approach but it allows change to be measured against an existing baseline or against agreed organisational objectives. The problem with a more normative approach implied by the term ‘good practice’ is that it is often difficult to determine or agree on the benchmark against which ‘goodness’ of practice can be measured and it is even more difficult to apply this in a comparative political or cultural context (Borrás, 2003; De la Porte, 2002; Dolowitz, 2003). In a context, such as this, where service provision in some countries is embryonic or only weakly developed then application of a model of good practice is problematic. In those situations the provision of basic services for the first time can not be defined as good practice but does represent a significant improvement in addressing social problems and can lead to significant change in the opportunities or choices faced by individuals. It is for this reason that this section considers the factors that may lead to innovation and change in practice.

This section therefore begins by outlining some of the principles by which practice innovation can be measured. Although it is beyond the scope of this report to outline examples of practice innovation in all the case study countries in relation to each of these principles, we provide some examples of innovation in policy development and implementation to illustrate the nature of innovation in different policy areas. Finally, we consider the use of the open method of coordination in the development of the NAPS/inclusion to promote these principles in order to achieve more harmonisation in policy practice across Europe.

**PRINCIPLES OF INNOVATION**

A number of drivers for change that allow innovation and good practice to occur can be identified. A basic driver, of course, will include an adequate legislative framework for race equality (which exists in all member states). However, the literature suggests that new policy practice also requires leadership or an ‘institutional sponsor’ together with the economic, administrative and technical capacity to effect change (Jenkins and Smith, 2001). It is therefore unsurprising that, following the implementation of the Race Equality Directive (2000/43), this has not yet been translated into new or innovative housing practice in most countries.

Consideration of innovation in practice should include all levels of governance. At the strategic level an understanding of housing needs and strategic planning and investment together with guidance (to local authorities and housing providers) will provide a necessary basis for organisational changes to occur. At the organisational level we may expect local assessments of need to inform housing development, project design and service provision (including staffing policies). At the operational level procedures of housing delivery will conform to set benchmarks of performance standards and race equality.

Based on our analysis above we would suggest that certain key principles may denote innovatory (or good) practice in this policy field. The aim of innovation in housing policy
and practice in this regard may be understood, in broad terms, in relation to the spheres of integration to include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sphere</th>
<th>Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>improve choice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>enhance empowerment through consultation and involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil society</td>
<td>improve consultation / involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>increase capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market</td>
<td>prevent discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>promote ability to supply affordable housing and services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>facilitate multi-agency working and policy integration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>augment best practice (performance standards)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>improve accountability (monitoring)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>enable market supply and complement gaps</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Red Cross in Spain has established a range of criteria to assess innovative and good practice projects in relation to projects devoted to the normalised access to housing by people experiencing discrimination, such as immigrants and ethnic minorities (Malgesini, 2004). On this basis the projects they select should complete most, if not all, of the criteria identified in Table 5.2.
Table 5.2 Criteria for Evaluating Innovatory Practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>REFERENCE QUESTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevant</td>
<td>Is the intervention oriented specifically to a defined problem or to a necessity (preferably based on empirical data)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovative</td>
<td>Does the intervention propose creative solutions to the problems of accessing housing that affect immigrants and ethnic minorities? (Do they reach or do they surpass the standard knowledge)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participative</td>
<td>Do members of the target group participate in at least one or more phases of the intervention: initiative, design, execution or evaluation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender oriented</td>
<td>Is the project sensitive to the gender differences?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficient</td>
<td>Are the results obtained with optimum cost-benefit?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>Has the initiative been evaluated (evaluation of the process and of the results)? Has it demonstrated a tangible and positive impact, both at individual as collective levels, so that it can be measured quantitative and qualitatively. If it has not been evaluated, what factors can be used to prove the probable effect of the initiative?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possibility of transferring the hypothesis</td>
<td>In the intervention, are the objectives and the prospective results clearly defined?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability of results</td>
<td>Is the intervention able to contribute to a sustainable reduction of segregation, isolation, discrimination, racism, poverty and social exclusion in general (for a certain target group)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability of the project</td>
<td>Is there a viability plan and continuity of the initiative?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replicable and transferable</td>
<td>Can the intervention generate political initiatives in other areas, and can they be transferred to other local societies in the same and other member states of the EU? Has it previously served as a model, so that others can reproduce it?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**ILLUSTRATIONS OF INNOVATION IN PRACTICE**

This section highlights five examples of innovation in order to illustrate different principles or dimensions underlying good practice in improving access to housing for immigrants and minority groups.

1. **Good Practice Guidance**
   
   One aspect of improving practice and encouraging innovation is to promote organizational practices that conform to models of equality performance. Examples of guidance to housing organizations in this respect are found mainly in countries that have large social housing sectors. The UK is used to illustrate this approach. This approach is significant in a country that espouses a multi-cultural approach and ‘draws great strength from ethnic diversity’ (UK NAPS/Incl, 2003; para 31). It may not be so well developed elsewhere.

   In the UK, the *housing race equality toolkit* has been funded by the Housing Corporation (responsible for registering, funding and regulating housing associations in England) and comprises management tools for housing organisations to conduct race equality audits and benchmark race equality performance as part of a process of continuous organisational improvement. The toolkit also provides an additional resource in relation to investigating
race equality issues for the Housing Corporation in fulfilling its duties as the regulatory body for housing associations. The toolkit is available to all housing organisations and is maintained by De Montfort University (see http://www.dmuracetoolkit.com/indexframe.htm). Part of the components of the toolkit is the provision of good practice matrices to provide organisations with information to benchmark and improve their performance. These cover:

- Governance
- Employment
- Tackling harassment (in service delivery and in employment)
- Contractors and consultants
- The corporate culture
- External communication
- Assessing and meeting housing needs - new homes
- Neighbourhood renewal
- Access to housing
- Maintenance
- Other Housing Management Issues
- Tenant involvement
- Supported housing and supporting people
- Working with partners

The process of using the toolkit recommends that it is essential that housing organisations audit their current race equality performance before drawing up an action plan using the good practice guidance or resources in the toolkit. Without an audit they will not only be unable to identify areas of weakness that need to be addressed, but they will also lack baseline data in order to measure and achieve continuous improvement in their performance. Advice and assistance (partly funded by the Housing Corporation) is available to any housing organisation employing the toolkit.

2. Multi-agency Working

The promotion of access to housing, as we argue above, involves co-ordination between agencies to ensure integrated action and also partnership working between public sector and civil society organisations. It is important to benchmark mainstream policies against race equality standards but this can be difficult to undertake and take a long time to effect. However, targeted policies may require new cross-cutting agencies to introduce profound change or positively discriminate in favour of disadvantaged groups. Hence, both universalist and targeted approaches require improved co-ordination as well as multi-agency working and partnership. France is an example of a country that has created new agencies to lead and implement new initiatives.

The French CODAC (regional citizenship committees) acts at a local level in particular as a network-building institution between its partners and provides an annual forum for the exchange of experience and information (Promoting Diversity, 2002). The intention is to promote civil dialogue and encourage multi-agency working between NGOs and public administration in order to promote integration and combat discrimination in a range of areas including access to housing.

3. Civil Society Capacity

The role of civil society agencies is often critical to improving access to services including housing. Increasing the capacity of NGOs to undertake innovative projects and to respond to local needs requires adequate funding and co-operation. Developing civil society capacity in
this way is an important component of state intervention (especially where social welfare structures are weak) but innovation in practice and the ability to respond to new or emerging problems may often require non-state funding and voluntary action.

In Spain, housing projects for vulnerable immigrants have been funded by private foundations. The Fundación “La Caixa”, a foundation depending on the private savings bank, has fully or partly funded a range of housing projects, reception centres and guided flats for vulnerable immigrant persons. These exist in all the main cities; the following are examples (operating in 2004) in Madrid focused mainly on immigrant women:

- **Congregación de Hermanas Oblatas del Santísimo Redentor**
  The "Shabat" Programme is a reception house for immigrant women, who are victims of trafficking for sexual exploitation; the programme offers social support, psychological and medical treatment, and legal advice.
- **Obra Social de las Hermanas Oblatas**
  This project provides a refuge directed to protect immigrant mothers and their children, to facilitate their autonomy and to support their integration, by means of offering them accommodation, a daycare centre and workshops to provide support and training in job seeking.
- **Religiosas de María Inmaculada**
  This project provides facilities for needy immigrant women. Job training and professional courses are offered together with an ‘employment bag’, in addition to the provision of accommodation. This programme can support some 16,000 people.

4. **Enabling the market / augmenting supply**

Particularly in countries where there is a lack of social housing and where the role of the state in housing provision is only weakly developed, there is a need to encourage or enable market provision for targeted purposes including ethnic minorities. The example of social house construction using a private sector contractor in Hungary is one example of innovatory policy to enable such action to increase housing supply and improve housing infrastructure for the Roma.

The local authority of Szekszárd set out to build 28 social houses, one third of which were to be provided for the Roma. According to the head of the local Social Work Department the prime motive of this action was the demolition of ghetto-type colonies that were located in the centre of the town. The realization of the programme led to the demolition of houses in poor condition in valuable central city building plots; the building contractor charged with the construction of social buildings was granted some of these sites for new house construction and, in return, built social houses in other part of the city. The local authority provided 660 thousand HUF (€2750) to install public utilities.

Furthermore, the building contractor employed Roma subcontractors for the work of demolition and installation of public utilities (Vági, 2000). The allocation of dwellings to those in need was carried out by the local Roma minority self-government and the list of beneficiaries was drawn up in line with the opinion of this body. One prerequisite to be entitled to a social house was that the family has to have at least three children.

5. **Housing integration of immigrants**

Our review in previous chapters suggested that the housing dimension of integration is only weakly developed in most integration strategies in comparison with other issues such as employment, language training and citizenship. However, there is some evidence of recent change and improvement in practice in this regard in a number of countries. Again this appears to be occurring in countries where there is an established housing profession or housing lobby. One recent example of the development of an action plan to involve housing
in integration strategies that was developed after broad consultation is summarized in Box 5.7.

Box 5.7 Draft Action Plan (housing actions) Scottish Refugee Integration Forum

| The Scottish Refugee Integration Forum | was established in January 2002 at the request of the Scottish Executive; it has prepared a Draft Action Plan which identifies key actions in a range of areas including housing. A selection of key housing actions contained in the Plan is summarised here: |
| (22) A pathfinder project developed in Glasgow to ensure that all people have access to independent support, advice and advocacy, to enable them to access appropriate housing; |
| (23) All housing legislation and guidance should be proofed to take account of the barriers which refugees face, and housing services should ensure that issues relating to refugees are mainstreamed. This relates to homelessness, housing allocation and the use of temporary accommodation. |
| (24) The Scottish Executive should commission a third party to develop a report which will outline a basic service specification of what should be expected in the provision of housing support and services to refugees. |
| (26) All local authorities and housing associations should ensure that their housing advice, information and allocation policies, procedures and practices take account fully of the rights and needs of refugees …. staff should be provided with appropriate training |
| (27) Information to enable refugees to understand the housing and welfare benefits systems should be an integral part of provision within any "Welcome Pack" (in appropriate languages and in a range of formats). |

* Nb. Paragraph numbers refer to the Action Plan recommendations *

Source: Scottish Executive, 2004 (http://www.scotland.gov.uk/library5/society/srif-00.asp)
5.7 CONCLUSIONS

This research has aimed to identify and evaluate the mix of policy approaches that can assist in ensuring access to decent housing for immigrants and ethnic minority communities. Since a key element of the brief for the research was to inform further development of the NAPs/Inclusion, these policy approaches have been considered within the framework of the EU strategy to combat poverty and social exclusion. The analysis and recommendations presented throughout this chapter have indicated specific areas of action that could be taken at both EU and national level and have pointed to the need for civil dialogue with the communities involved and agencies that represent their interests. The need for further research at European and national level has also been identified in specific areas of policy.

EUROPEAN LEVEL ACTION

Inevitably improving the effectiveness of policies in this domain will require additional resources as well as prioritisation of existing expenditure. Since housing is a national competence the burden of these costs will fall to the member states individually. However, the key role that decent affordable housing plays in the social inclusion of these groups ensures that this should remain a key objective to be monitored in the context of the EU Strategy to combat poverty and social exclusion. Furthermore, the review of the Structural Funds should take account of the issues raised in this report.

SOCIAL INCLUSION

Our review above indicates the need to make this issue more visible in the NAPs/Inclusion both in the analysis of the issue, in the identification of policy measures employed and in the development of national indicators against which to measure achievement of this important objective of the EU Strategy. Our analysis, though, indicates the information deficit that exists in most countries in relation to this issue, and highlights the need not only for the development of appropriate indicators but also of local assessments of need to inform the development of strategic housing policies and investment decisions. While this is an issue for national and regional governments to address, the EU Strategy could be used to promote a more systematic approach to housing planning given the importance it plays in the social inclusion of vulnerable groups.

The role of the open method of coordination in the implementation of the Strategy to Combat Poverty and Social Exclusion is discussed earlier in this chapter. This section considers the way in which innovation in practice can be stimulated to improve access to housing for immigrants and ethnic minority communities through the process of the national action plans, the use of indicators and national targets, monitoring and peer-review.

Guidelines

Housing is a national competence. However, the EC could encourage the development of housing service performance benchmarking by promoting the development of (national) guidelines and performance standards. These benchmarks (including housing planning and service provision in all sectors) need, of course, to be appropriate to the national housing market context, and could be developed by use of peer review. However, they could take as

17 The revised common objectives of the Strategy (2002) include targeting “the high risk of poverty and social exclusion faced by some men and women as a result of immigration.”
the guiding principle that all housing legislation, guidance and policy should be proofed to take account of the barriers that immigrants and ethnic minorities face and that housing services should ensure that issues relating to these groups are mainstreamed.

**Indicators**

Review of the NAPs/Inclusion indicates that there is no monitoring information in the second round of plans in relation to either public or private sector actors in terms of housing allocation and evictions for these defined groups. The Social Protection Committee has not yet developed housing and homelessness indicators. It would be appropriate to ensure that indicators of housing access, quality and affordability are monitored in relation to the housing circumstances of ethnic minority and migrant communities. Measures of overcrowding and affordability would appear, from our analysis in chapter 3, to be particularly appropriate indicators to consider in this respect. However, the development of appropriate third level indicators would require further research (at national level).

**National Targets and policies**

Review of the second round of NAPs/Inclusion indicates that housing policies for immigrants and ethnic minorities are not mentioned in most plans. At best there is a general policy statement regarding equality of access to services for all citizens. Housing policies, where they exist should be included in the Plans or, where they do not exist, targets should be specified.

**Mobilising all actors**

Multi-agency working is an essential component of the effective implementation of strategies to improve access to housing for disadvantaged groups, including immigrants and ethnic minorities. This involves both the improved coordination of public sector agencies and partnership working between public and voluntary sector agencies. Multi-agency working is likely to have a significant effect in specific areas of local action. This would include:

- the provision of information and advice
- consultation and involvement of immigrant and ethnic minority groups in policy development, implementation and monitoring.

The role of NGOs is significant in all countries but especially where state intervention is more weakly developed. There is therefore a need in these situations to increase civil society capacity. Our review suggests that the role of NGOs is important both in supplementing state provision and in enabling market provision:

- provision of housing and support services
- employment training of ethnic minority groups in housing services
- mediation with private landlords and tenants.

**Peer Review**

The Peer Review process is particularly suited to the further examination and testing of the effectiveness of innovatory practice and to consider the potential for transferring such experience. The Peer Review seminar in United Kingdom, in May 2004 focused on the Rough Sleepers Unit experience in England; the Peer Review seminar in Denmark in 2005 will focus on "Preventing and tackling homelessness". Review of good practice in this specific area of housing and homelessness policy would be a useful means of highlighting the

---

18 However, development of housing and homelessness indicators is identified by the Committee as an urgent issue to be addressed
issue in relation to the setting and monitoring of specific targets for access to housing for immigrants and ethnic minority groups.

**DISCRIMINATION DIRECTIVE**

Our review suggests that the EU directive provides a good framework to define and measure various forms of discrimination that occur in the housing market. The transposition of the two anti-discrimination Directives is monitored by a network of independent experts. This network, co-ordinated by MPG/MEDE (Migration Policy Group) on behalf of the European Commission, produces national reports on old and new Member States that are published by the Commission. However, the anti-discrimination indicators should include indicators on the specific field of housing and enforcement. Furthermore, the Commission could do more to encourage the monitoring of discrimination in housing at the national level by, for example, providing guidance on the use of appropriate monitoring data and encouraging good practice in raising awareness of the issue (such as the French Haut Comité and the UK Race and Housing Inquiry).

Our review indicates the difficulty of proving discrimination in a largely private sector housing market. Overcoming this requires, inter alia, giving the individual more leverage in civil action. The recent initiative in France to place the liability of proof on the perpetrator could be promoted in national legislation to encourage individual action. In an essentially private sector housing market the lack of a justiciable right to housing acts as a key barrier limiting the responsibilities of public authorities and acting as a disincentive to pro-active policies. The EU should act to bring this debate into the centre of policy discussion in relation to both discrimination and housing policy.

**IMMIGRATION POLICY AND INTEGRATION**

The importance of the successful integration of third country nationals has been stressed by the European Council in Tampere. However, more needs to be done to promote the importance of housing measures in relation to integration strategies and the EU has an important role in achieving this. Guidelines ensuring the development of integration policies for third country nationals should refer explicitly to the need for measures to ensure integration into the housing market (see Guideline 6, Communication 2001/387). While previous research has made recommendations in relation to asylum seekers and refugees and existing EU legislation has established benchmarks for accommodation for these groups, little has been said of the needs of other legal immigrants or of the more long-term needs affecting second generation immigrant young people. The development of integration strategies should take account of these issues and good practice highlighted in this report could be disseminated more widely by the European Commission. In particular, the specific recommendations made in this report concerning integration into the housing market suggest the need for civil dialogue and consultation with the affected communities regarding the issues raised here.

---

19 The reports are published at the Commission’s website (Employment and Social Affairs) accessible also via www.migpolgroup.com.
MEMBER STATE ACTION

Throughout the report we have identified the differences between member states in relation to the nature and scale of the issue, the different housing market context and, consequently, the range of policy approaches that are evident. In particular, the distinction between an ‘assimilationist’ and a multi-cultural ethos and ‘universalist’ and targeted approaches have been highlighted. In this context we have identified a clear trend towards policies that address the needs of ethnic minorities and migrants within the general framework of social inclusion. While mainstream policies, and not just specific programmes, are the necessary approach there is a need to ensure that legislation, guidance and policies are proofed to take account of the barriers that minority groups face in accessing decent housing. However, we have also identified that the promotion of equality in access to housing can benefit from minority-led and targeted housing solutions.

HOUSING

Policy measures to ensure access to decent housing for immigrants and ethnic minority communities will require, ceteris paribus, effective universal (mainstream) housing policies. The lack of a controllable public instrument (i.e. publicly provided or allocated housing) is a decisive factor in preventing the achievement of this objective. Equally the use of demand side policies (subsidies and housing allowances) is a blunt instrument that is difficult to target accurately. These housing supply and demand problems are endemic issues affecting economic growth and competitiveness that are recognised in many countries (e.g. recent UK announcements of increased affordable housing provision in economic growth regions, the Spanish concern about house price increases in recent years, the UNECE concerns about the condition of Romanian housing). National action to address these structural issues is essential to meet the needs of all disadvantaged groups in society and acts as a backdrop against which specific policy measures affecting these target groups need to be placed.

Housing Planning, Policy Development and Implementation

Targeted policies, and local policies, are needed to make good deficiencies in the market and to ensure equal access where discriminatory action prevents this from occurring. Our review points to a lack of understanding of the housing needs of immigrants and ethnic minorities in many countries and, in a number of countries, a lack of structures within which such knowledge is routinely collected. Improved information and monitoring is essential both for the effective implementation of discrimination and integration policies and for the effective development of housing policies. However, effective policies require a reliable assessment of housing needs undertaken at local level and, preferably, in consultation with the groups affected. In addition, our recommendations in earlier sections identify the need for research in several specific areas (e.g. the potential of ethnic-led housing organisations, improving access to home ownership) and for specific groups (e.g. the housing needs of older people and transition pathways for younger people).

Regulation of Housing

Innovation to make policies more effective requires both a carrot and stick approach by national governments since in most countries the implementation of housing policy is devolved to the lower executive tiers of government and decisions affecting housing are primarily determined in the market or civil society spheres. Regulation and inspection using established benchmarks of practice and procedure need to be reinforced with appropriate guidance and resources.
Information and Advice
The need for appropriate housing information and advice to prevent homelessness and housing exclusion of vulnerable groups is recognised in a number of countries. Immigrants and some ethnic minority groups (including women, young people of immigrant parents and older people of foreign birth) are at a particular disadvantage as a result of this information deficit. While voluntary organisations play an important role in bridging this gap, the state also has a responsibility to ensure access to appropriate information, advice and support.

Allocation of Rented Housing and Management of Public Housing
The provision of affordable housing and policies to ensure equality of access and transparency of allocation are of course essential. Adequate systems of regulation, monitoring and inspection are needed where public housing has been transferred to non-governmental organisations. Registration and regulation of private sector landlords may allow for more effective monitoring of housing allocation in relation to these target groups but, given the diversity of the sector and of national legislation, this is an area that merits focussed research. Improved communication between (public and private) landlords and tenants and the employment of housing staff from ethnic communities has been shown to assist in the fair allocation and management of housing and should be encouraged.

Co-ordination of Action
However, integration into the housing market and the achievement of sustainable housing outcomes also require coordination of action and will often involve non-housing intervention such as social support. Evidence of coordination and integration of government action (at national, regional and local levels) is difficult to find and indicates that this is an area requiring more focussed effort. Equally, multi-agency and partnership working is a necessary aspect of effective action for these target groups. While we quote some important and interesting examples of such action there is a need for more guidance and investment in this area.

DISCRIMINATION POLICIES
Discrimination has been identified as a key factor in the exclusion of immigrants and ethnic minority groups from access to decent housing. This is often the result of indirect discrimination and can result both from individual actions and from the unintended effects of public policy or weak regulation of public bodies. Our review indicates that the effective enforcement of legislation and the prevention of discrimination require better information and monitoring of the housing circumstances of immigrants and ethnic groups. Good practice in making the allocation of housing by public landlords more transparent has been identified but this needs to be promulgated more widely and extended to cover private sector actors. Enforcement of anti-discrimination legislation has been shown to be difficult to police in the private sector. Anti-discrimination indicators could include indicators on the specific field of housing including enforcement. Reliance upon individual action is an ineffective way of preventing discrimination in access to housing particularly in relation to private landlords. The diversity of the private rented sector in the member states suggests the need for specific research to address this issue. More direction and guidance is required to encourage the use of pro-active policy measures.
INTEGRATION STRATEGIES
Although much work has been undertaken in the development of Integration Strategies in recent years and significant progress has been made, in many countries, in realising these strategies, they remain weak in respect to the development of strategies related to housing market access and in the coordination of employment and housing market issues. Furthermore, very little attention is drawn to the integration needs of second generation immigrants especially in terms of their continued exclusion from the housing market. Recent developments made by some Refugee Integration Forums in relation to housing action plans could be the basis for trans-national exchange and peer review learning.

CIVIL SOCIETY ACTION
The role of non-governmental organisations has been stressed in all countries and especially in those countries where government intervention in the housing market is more weakly developed. In a number of countries housing associations and municipal housing companies are important providers of affordable housing especially in areas of high demand. Their role in housing allocation is referred to in earlier chapters. However, non-governmental organisations also have a role to play in providing information and advice and in the employment of people from ethnic groups both directly and through their selection of contractors. Specialist agencies can also play an important mediation role to ensure access for vulnerable groups to the private sector. Government has a role to play in developing the scale and coverage of such agencies and in influencing their activities in relation to these target groups. Our analysis also indicates that the lack of civil society capacity, in the absence of NGOs and of professionally run and adequately funded agencies, is a serious impediment to the effective implementation of policies to improve access to housing for immigrants and ethnic minority communities in several countries (especially those in central and eastern Europe).
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APPENDIX 2
SECOND NATIONAL ACTION PLAN
SUMMARIES RELATING TO HOUSING AND ETHNIC MINORITIES OR IMMIGRANTS

NOTE: THIS APPENDIX SUMMARISES MENTION OF SPECIFIC POLICIES. SOME NAPS/ICLUSION PROVIDE EXTENSIVE ANALYSIS OF PROBLEMS WHICH ARE NOT INCLUDED HERE.

BELGIUM

In the first chapter of the NAP (trends and challenges), the section on housing does not include any specific reference to the situation of migrants on the housing market. It deals with social housing, the quality of housing, the affordability and homelessness in general.

Chapter 2 gives an overview of the progress made on the NAP incl from 2001 to 2003. The only reference made to migrants concerns a decree in the French speaking community on positive discrimination for the allocation of supplementary subsidies to schools welcoming essentially youngsters from a weak social environment.

Policies are dealt with in chapter 4. A section is dedicated to the adaptation of social services to the situation of the most vulnerable. There are two sections where a reference to migrants is made:
- In the German-speaking region, the Red Cross was asked to set up a 'reception office' and to organize different forms of integration help for asylum seekers, refugees, migrants and any person facing difficulties, with specific attention for women. This project was co-financed by the European Refugee Fund.
- In the Walloon Region, foreigners who are not a subject of the European Union and who legally stay in Belgium or have introduced a regularisation procedure or an asylum request, may be registered as job-seekers and follow professional training.

The section on housing policies does not mention actions to be taken with regards to the position of migrants on the housing market.

In fact, the only section dealing with more details with immigrants is the one on the fight against discrimination in recruiting, referring to the law of 25 February 2003 against discrimination based on sex, a so-called race, skin-colour, origin, sexual orientation, civil status, age, handicap, ... Although this law also applies to goods and services (including housing), the only aspect stressed in the Belgian NAP is discrimination in recruiting.

In the other document containing various indicators, those on housing (and even the others) do not explicitly refer to immigrants.

FRANCE

3.2.2 Preventing the risks of social exclusion

- The reform of the integration policy for foreigners residing in France will be implemented at an inter-ministerial level; it will call upon association networks and include the major initiatives in the areas of reception, integration and social promotion.
- The fight against all forms of discrimination will be intensified, culminating in the creation of an independent authority.

3.2.3 Mobilising all participants

- Effective access if newly-arrived foreigners to ANPE services and local task forces for youth will be improved by appointing specific regional contacts who will act as an intermediary for the platforms receiving foreigners in France and by implementing a monitoring system to ensure that these persons have access to ordinary allowances under appropriate conditions.
4.1.2.2 Implementing policies…universal access to decent housing

Housing offers for large families, young immigrants or young people with immigrant backgrounds, are notoriously insufficient in certain regions and especially Ile-de-France.

- to improve the supply of suitable housing for these groups and provide discrimination free access to housing, specific initiatives will be implemented in 2003.
- On the basis of local needs as assessed by PDALPDs (departmental plan for access to housing for the disadvantaged) and PLHs (local housing programme) the focus will be on the production of large housing units for large families and small housing units in town centres and rural areas (to allow individual housing for young people and to meet the needs of temporary workers such as apprentices and seasonal workers) or large temporary housing units in public residential facilities.

Housing for seasonal workers raises specific problems.

- Housing assistance regulations have been modified to better take into account the resources of seasonal workers under 25.
- Plan to develop integration housing called ‘halfway homes’ was launched in 2003

Habitat diversity will be sought to meet the needs of the populations concerned

- Task force addressing discrimination in access to housing has been implemented under the Conseil National de l’Habitat.
- The five-year programme for migrant workers housing will be extended. The guidelines of the plan, extended to 2006, are being held firm: guarantee of suitable housing for residents, promote their path to independent housing and integrate migrant worker structures in the city.
- Department associations for information on housing (ADIL) in 66 departments…view to extend throughout France.

4.2.2 Implement policies intended to prevent abrupt changes in living conditions…

Women with immigrant backgrounds

- will have better access to rights and social and professional promotions….

The poverty rate for foreign households

- create suitable conditions for foreigners who have legally entered France to help them integrate into French life, encourage integration policies to offer a new perspective to those who have been socially excluded, fight all forms of intolerance.

Inter-ministerial action plan introduced in April 2003:

- Creating integration paths for new migrant workers.
- A universal public agency will be responsible….will coordinate interventions
- An introduction and integration contract has been created.

6.3 Reception and Integration of Foreigners

Services Offered

- The specialised social service assistant draws up a social assessment according to the social auditors notes on the questionnaire and lists the family’s various needs.

SPAIN

In December 2002, immigrants with a residence permit amounted to 3.2% of the total population, and of these 61% were registered in the Social Security system, which means there are more than 600,000 foreign nationals included in that system. Some estimates indicate that the gypsy population in Spain represents from 1.4% to 1.9% of the population, the majority of which are concentrated in Andalusia (over 40%), Madrid, Catalonia, Valencia and Murcia. In a segment of this population, the social exclusion situation persists despite the mechanisms that have been established.
The Disadvantaged Gypsy Population

- Improvement of the situation of the Gypsy population in a situation of or at risk of exclusion is one of the goals of the Gypsy Development Programme of the Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.
- In the years of 2001 and 2002, the integrated social intervention programmes managed by the Public Administrations and by NGOs was equal to over 12 million euros each year.
- In general, the programmes are targeted at improvement of access to and use of public resources: reinforcement and support for required schooling of the Gypsy population, increasing training and entrance into the job market, promoting health education, providing support in forced changes of residence and generalising social aid for families.

The Immigrant Population in a Situation of or at Risk of Exclusion

- Activities in this field were concentrated on improvement of aid for non-accompanied immigrant minors who have received measures of protection.
- The GRECO (Global Programme for Regulation and Co-ordination of Foreign Nationals and Immigration) in Spain has the objective of “easing the entrance (of immigrants) into the labour market”

Chapter 3.- Strategic Proposal: Main Objectives and Key Goals

7. To develop specific programmes for dependent persons and groups with special vulnerability, such as senior citizens, disable people, the Gypsy population, immigrants, children and the homeless.

1.2.3. Access to Housing

To promote an integrating habitat and housing policy for everyone:
- Six policy measures mentioned – none relate specifically to immigrants and ethnic minorities

To improve policies for vulnerable social groups and geographical areas:

1.2.3.7. To support programmes for mediation in rentals of housing for people in a situation or at risk of exclusion.
1.2.3.9. To complement the initial forms of aid for access to housing among the most disadvantaged sectors.
1.2.3.11. To eradicate shack/shanty housing areas through programmes agreed upon by the different Public Administrations.

3.6. To Improve the Situation of the Gypsy population in a situation of or at risk of Social Exclusion.

3.6.1. To improve the standard of living of the Gypsy population in a situation or at risk of exclusion, by ensuring access to and use of social protection systems and promoting living side-by-side in a better way amongst the various social and cultural groups, through the development of integrated social intervention programmes which include simultaneous activities in the fields of education, housing and habitat, health, training and employment, and social services.
3.6.2. To develop activities against discrimination related to equal treatment and opportunities, the training of social agents and the sharing of information and good social practices.
3.6.3. To gather updated information on the Gypsy population through reports and research, and to evaluate the impact of the corresponding social policies.
3.6.5. To carry out training courses for inter-cultural mediators in the fields of social action, education, housing, habitat and health.

3.7. To promote action with immigrants in a situation of or at risk of exclusion.
3.7.1. To carry out programmes co-financed by the bodies of the Public Administration for the social integration of immigrants.
- No specific mention of housing as an issue

3.8. To perform activities for returning emigrants in a situation of or at risk of exclusion.
- No specific mention of housing as an issue

3.9. To promote activities to assist the homeless.
- No specific mention of immigrants or ethnic minorities
1.5 The most disadvantaged
The main focus of the Swedish action plan was a description of the Swedish welfare model and political initiatives …. Combating economic and social vulnerability is an important objective of welfare policy. This perspective is integrated into all government decisions relating to welfare issues.

In recent years Sweden has prepared action plans relating to social inclusion in several areas .. including ..
• measures to combat racism, xenophobia

3.5 Integration
Everyone who lives in Sweden has the same rights, obligations and opportunities regardless of ethnic origin. This is to be taken into account in the design and formulation of government policy in general. The goals and approaches adopted in integration policy are to be applied in all social sectors.

The National Integration Office has overall responsibility for ensuring that the goals and approaches applied in integration policy are implemented in various sectors.

Refugees who arrive in Sweden are offered induction programmes, since they and other persons in need of protection often need a great deal of support during their first months in Sweden.
• The purpose of the package of measures implemented during the first few months after their arrival is to make it possible for them to find accommodation and a regular job
• Local authorities are responsible for providing these programmes with the support of the National Integration Office, which also oversees the programmes.

3.9 Key objectives and specific targets
The main purpose of welfare policy is to give people security and opportunities for development. One policy goal is to substantially reduce the number of people at risk of economic vulnerability by 2010.
• This is to be achieved by reducing the proportion of women and men, irrespective of ethnic background (who are in poverty as measured by a range of benchmarks).

4.7 Good, reasonably priced accommodation
The goal of Sweden’s housing policy is to make it possible, on a sustainable basis, for everyone to live in good, reasonably priced accommodation and in a stimulating and secure environment (in) … equal and dignified living conditions:
• To encourage the construction of new rented accommodation the Government has introduced an investment grant for property owners in places where there is a housing shortage.
• Parliament approved a new grant for small rented apartments and accommodation for students and other groups with great housing needs, which will take effect on July 1 2003.
• Another group is the homeless, who often have multiple social problems.

The large-scale residential districts …. where households with a foreign background .. are over-represented, are in need of special measures:
• The Government is cooperating with some local authorities within the framework of metropolitan policy in order to improve integration and social participation among households in the local authorities’ ‘disadvantaged” housing districts (see also section 6, Examples of good practice).

Strong tenants’ rights
• A proposal is currently being prepared in the Government Offices that would extend the obligation to inform the social welfare committee before a tenant who has been given notice to quit is evicted. The purpose of this proposal is to make it possible for the social welfare committee to intervene more often to avoid the eviction of tenants who might risk becoming homeless.

4.10 Integration
The objectives of integration policy are:
• Equal rights, obligations and opportunities for all irrespective of ethnic and cultural background
• A social community based on diversity
Social development characterized by mutual respect for differences

The main direction of integration policy remains unchanged, but measures will be taken in several different areas:
- No specific mention of housing

In 2001 the Government appointed a special investigator to review the reception and induction of refugees to identify and analyse obstacles to sustainable integration:
- Reviews identified include language training – no specific mention of housing

Metropolitan policy is another area for collaboration. One of the goals of metropolitan policy is to break down the social, ethnic and discriminatory segregation in the metropolitan regions and to take measures to achieve equal living conditions for the inhabitants of these regions:
- implemented through local development agreements, concluded by the Government with seven metropolitan authorities.
- These authorities have in turn identified 24 housing districts that have a large proportion of immigrants. The authorities will contribute the same amount as the Government, which means that the total investment will be over SEK 4 billion.
- The method is described in further detail in section 6, Examples of good practice.

The local authorities have wide experience of implementing local action plans to deal with various issues and of local partnerships. However, implementation often takes place on a sectoral basis. Achieving collaboration that is based on a horizontal perspective on economic and social vulnerability is therefore a new development.

- Disseminating such examples in order to encourage similar processes in other local authorities will be an important element of implementation of the 2003 action plan.
- In Annex 1 representatives of Stockholm, Gothenburg and Malmö describe the principles on which future collaboration between these cities will be based.

This contribution was prepared within the framework of cooperation on the 2003 action plan. Section 6, Examples of good practice, presents some concrete examples of local cooperation.

THE UK

People from ethnic minorities
31. The UK draws great strength from ethnic diversity. However, people from some backgrounds still face substantial disadvantage in certain areas.

32. It is often the case that specific issues impact differently on different ethnic groups. For example, while Pakistani/Bangladeshi women are twice as likely as women generally to have no educational qualifications, children from an Indian background show little educational disadvantage.

4.2.2 Access to decent housing, and tackling fuel poverty

Housing
32. Providing decent homes is about more than bricks and mortar – it is also about ensuring that people have the support they need to live independently in their accommodation. The Supporting People programme provides a co-ordinated framework for housing-related support services. All services receiving Supporting People funding will also be rigorously reviewed by local authorities by April 2006 to ensure that they are meeting people’s needs, are good quality and are cost-effective.

34. In Northern Ireland the outcome of recent reviews provides a basis for improving existing arrangements for dealing with the needs of the homeless. A particular issue is housing for the Traveller Community, where two pilot group housing schemes have been completed with a further two due for completion by 2005.

4.3.13 Asylum seekers and refugees

96. The National Asylum Support Service (NASS) provides financial support and, where necessary, housing, to eligible destitute asylum seekers while their applications are being considered. NASS currently provides local
authority regional consortia with funding to help with the work of co-ordinating services for asylum seekers and planning for the integration of successful asylum seekers.

97. Strategies for refugee integration are based on collaboration with other stakeholders to encourage local communities to support refugees, provide access to suitable English language tuition and promote employment of refugees.
3.2.3. Secure housing

The measure of the Operational Programme for Regional Development (ROP) called ‘Regeneration of urban areas’ is intended to improve on slums in segregated urban areas. The programme includes renovating urban areas that are deteriorating and are populated by disadvantaged groups, using support from the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF). This measure is expected to connect 30,000-50,000 homes to utility mains or to renovate these connections between 2004 and 2006.

HOUSING TARGET
To increase rental housing to 15% of available housing in 15 years.

3.2.8. Disadvantaged regions, regional inequalities

A social land programme has been in operation since 1992. It has helped to improve living conditions for people in backward settlements, mostly Roma families hit by long-term unemployment. The programme is currently running in nearly 250 settlements, involving 30,000 people, half of whose are Roma. In 2003 the possibility for three-year programming was introduced. The goal is to provide a new and more reliable support system guaranteeing continuous operational conditions to the supported settlements.

3.3.1. Programmes to promote Roma integration

Indicators for employment, education, health, income and living conditions of the Roma population, who make up about 5-7% of the overall population, are far below the comparable indicators for non-Roma population. Their employment level is about half as high, their unemployment rate is three to five times higher, the rate of dependants per economically active person is three times that of the non-Roma. Roma children have very poor chances at school: only 44% of 14-year-old Roma children finish the eight grades of primary school. The rate of Roma children who finish secondary school is about 24%, but only 2.2% acquire A level in secondary schools or graduate from college or university. Roma children have very poor chances at school: only 44% of 14-year-old Roma children finish the eight grades of primary school. The rate of Roma children who finish secondary school is about 24%, but only 2.2% acquire A level in secondary schools or graduate from college or university. The poverty rate is about 5-10 times higher than it is for the non-Roma population. Some 20% of Roma live in segregated slums where the utility level is unsatisfactory and 60% live in disadvantaged settlements.

In 2004, the Hungarian government adopted a medium-term package of measures to promote the social integration of the Roma. The package, in addition to laying down a broad series of tasks for the various ministries, states that far more thorough monitoring of implementation is necessary.

It calls for fulfilment of tasks in the following areas:

- **incentives to achieve equal treatment and equal rights** (operation of a Roma Anti-discrimination Client Service Network, and further advancing the network if necessary, operation of a Roma Conflict Management and Legal Protection Fund),

- **improving quality of life** (model programme to eliminate slums followed by evolvement of a complex slum elimination programme, additional surveys of the health status of Roma population, further advances in the social land programmes),

- **education and training** (promoting integrated education, designing reintegration programmes for early school leavers, introducing scholarships for Roma students),

- **employment** (promoting cooperation between county Labour Centres and Roma NGOs, further advancing public work programmes),

- **integration into information society** (training programmes, mentoring system),

- **culture, communication and identity** (learning and nurturing cultural values, Roma Cultural Fund, National Cultural Fund).

“The Decade of Roma Integration” project, coordinated by the Hungarian Prime Minister and established with assistance from the Open Society Institute (OSI), the World Bank, the European Commission, UNDP, the Council of Europe Development Bank and the Finnish and Swedish governments, gets underway in 2005. The programme is offering nine countries of Central and Eastern Europe between 2005 and 2015 the opportunity to implement extensive measures to integrate the Roma and eliminate their isolation and exclusion. The four main
areas of these measures will involve employment, education, healthcare and living conditions. The practical designing of the programme will take place in 2004:

- **Education:** setting up an International Roma Education Fund to promote the partnership between the government and the NGOs in the pilot projects to improve the situation and performance of the Roma in the education system.

- **Employment:** offering incentives to county Labour Centres to cooperate with Roma Minority Self-Governments and NGOs, employment of Roma staff in the Labour Centres, regular evaluation of the public work programmes, starting up training and employment model programmes, expanding social land programmes.

- **Housing conditions:** the programme is supporting a complete mapping of slums and slum-like living conditions and the design of a government implementation plan to eliminate/rehabilitate them.

- **Health:** to improve the health status of the Roma population, the programme aims to promote the dissemination of preventive services and to advance the quality and quantity of healthcare services for the Roma.

The Roma Anti-discrimination Client Service Network is operated by the Ministry of Justice. The Government Office of Equal Opportunities coordinates other programmes promoting Roma integration. It controls the Roma Coordination and Intervention Fund, which funds Roma Minority Self-Governments and Roma organisations in financial crisis. The Office also operates the Conflict Management and Legal Defence Fund, which offers assistance to organisations fighting against Roma discrimination and offering legal protection as well as conflict management and resolution programmes.

The Public Foundation for Hungarian Roma has been in operation since 1996 to support Roma integration programmes. In 2004 the Foundation funds participation in education, training and cultural activity, setting up businesses and participating in the information society.

The Ministry of Health, Social and Family Affairs also operates several support programmes to improve Roma access to social, child protection and healthcare facilities. Outstanding among them is a model programme that supports innovative solutions and developing local initiatives. Training programmes are also offered to local decision-makers and NGOs.

The programme “Tolerance for Health” is a model project being started up in five hospitals to improve care for Roma patients. It will improve hospital social work, provide physicians with sensitivity training in issues related to care for Roma patients, to assure discrimination-free care for Roma patients during the admissions process and through the work of the patients’ rights advocate. Finally, scholarships will be available to Roma young people to train in healthcare and social professions.

### 3.3.5. Promoting the social integration of immigrants and refugees

Compared to other EU member states, the number of foreigners immigrating into Hungary and settling here is low, barely 2% of the population. At the same time, it is expected that the number of immigrants will increase with the country’s EU membership. For that reason it is very important to evolve the institutions and policy tools that support social integration. Act 139 of 1997 on asylum sets the tasks of the social inclusion of refugees, within the framework of which the Office of Immigration and Naturalisation has been offering integration programme packages for refugees since 2002.

In 2003 a pilot integration programme was started up with PHARE support, offering refugees complex assistance in social and labour market integration. A pre-accession programme called MATRA was started up in 2003, aimed at designing the institutional conditions for a comprehensive refugee and “immigrant” integration programme.

In order to develop a complex migration strategy in 2004 the Government established a Migration Inter-ministerial Committee.

To support the social integration of refugees primarily through trainings are at the focus of EQUAL Community Initiative, too. The programme aims to support the social inclusion of refugees through language- and vocational training by developing and piloting innovative methods and integrated services.
A “Twinning Project” that will run for 15 months begins in January 2005. The primary goal is to provide further training for local self-governments and labour centres staff, who come into contact with foreigners during their work, as well as to design a proposal to establish a legislative background.

SLOVENIA

2.4. Housing

After privatisation (1993), a total of 88% of Slovenia’s residential housing was privately owned, and only 12% rented (approximately 81,000 apartments).

- Obtaining non-profit and social housing is almost at a complete standstill. In 2000, only 650 social and non-profit units were built.
- The National Housing Programme 2000-2009 provided for gradual increased construction of this housing, 1,400 units in 2003 … necessary to provide around 4,500 housing units every year
- Recently there has been a shortfall in non-profit housing (including social housing), amounting to 8,500 units.
- In addition, emergency and temporary accommodation, is not available.
- Availability of housing is also inadequate for groups of the population with special needs.

The housing conditions of Roma, of whom there are between 7,000 and 10,000 in Slovenia, are generally still considerably worse than for the rest of the population. In some communities, inadequate housing objects, without sanitary facilities, electricity, mains water, sewerage and waste removal still exist.

4.2.4. Housing

4.2.4.1. The most relevant aspects of the current situation

The main problem in the housing field is the gap between demand and supply.

4.2.4.2. The main policies and institutions

The Housing Act (1991) is the main legislative act; the Ministry of Environment, Spatial Planning and Energy is responsible for policy-making.

- in 2000 adopted a National Housing Programme for the period 2000-2009 … priority is increasing the provision of social and nonprofit rented accommodation.
- The main goal of the National Housing Programme is to stimulate the acquisition of non-profit and social housing for young families, low-income families, large families and also vulnerable groups such as disabled persons, people with mental health problems, Roma and individuals and families that urgently require at least emergency housing (temporary homeless persons).

4.2.4.3. Brief assessment of the key priorities for future policy review

The new Housing Act was adopted in June 2003 and will come into force in autumn 2003.

- a new and effective system of subsidising rents (rent allowance) for low-income tenants will be introduced. This is one of the key innovations of the new Housing Act in the area of social inclusion.
- It is estimated that between 10,500 and 12,000 tenants will receive such a rent allowance, which is a substantial increase on previous numbers of recipients (around 2,700).

4.4.2. The Roma ethnic community

4.4.2.1. The most relevant aspects of the current situation

The Roma, or Romany, ethnic community lives in more or less concentrated groups or settlements in Pomurje (north-east of Slovenia) and Dolenjska, Posavje and Bela Krajina (south-east of Slovenia). According to the 2002 census 3,246 people (0.17% of the total population) declared themselves to be Roma, while estimates show that the community numbers between 7,000 and 10,000.

- The majority of the Roma population in Slovenia live in settlements that are isolated from the rest of population, or at least on the outskirts of urban areas.
- Living standards in these settlements are mostly below the minimum living standards in Slovenia (some of them without running water, electricity, heating or sanitation).
4.4.2. The main policies and institutions
The Roma community does not have the position of a national minority in Slovenia but it has the status of a special ethnic community. In November 1995, the Government adopted a Programme of measures for the assistance of Roma, by which it determined a policy of integration of the Roma community.

- The programme is implemented through the preparation of programmes and measures in the areas of employment, education and housing.

Ministries responsible for different domains are responsible for the preparation of the programmes and measures and for their implementation, while the Office for Nationalities is responsible for coordination and monitoring.

- Concerning housing, some municipalities have already prepared programmes for legalising Romany settlements, thus giving them the possibility to obtain specific financial help, granted by the Government Service for Structural Policy and Regional Development and directed at providing concentrated Romany settlements with basic public utilities. In addition, some special programmes for the employment of Roma have been prepared (the last one in 2000).

With legislative amendments in 2002, Roma have been granted political participation at the local level through the right to elect Roma representatives to the municipal council.

- Up to June 2003, 18 Roma representatives had been elected; there are only two municipalities left which have to hold such elections.

4.4.2.3. Brief assessment of the key priorities for future policy review
For the consistent implementation of the programme from 1995:
- it is necessary to improve coordination and cooperation at government level, to constantly update the programme itself and to adapt it to actual situations and needs.
- The National Housing Programme gives priority to vulnerable groups, as well as to Roma (see 4.2.4.2). A strategy for key areas of Roma life (employment and education) is being prepared (see 4.1.1.3)

4.4.4. Other vulnerable groups
4.4.4.1. The most relevant aspects of the current situation
Apart from the groups that already receive much attention and are targeted with special measures (the disabled, the Roma and the homeless), smaller vulnerable groups include the victims of violence, people with mental health problems, addicts, persons in post-penal treatment and people without a work permit.
Appendix 3
Integration Strategies in the Study Countries – References to Housing Integration

Belgium
A national consensus on the need for an integration policy can be traced to the late 1980s when the Federal Government agreement of 1988 introduced a policy focus on knowledge, housing and work. In 1989, following agreement between the different governments of the country, a Royal Commissioner on Migration Policy was established. Since that time more attention has been given to the integration concept which holds a middle way between segregation and assimilation.

Following the establishment of the Royal Commissioner’s office, in 1993 the Centre for Equal Opportunities and Opposition to Racism was established. This is a federal service where the regions are represented on the board. The creation of this service implies that the responsibility of the opposition to racism remains at federal level. A stock-taking by the Centre for equal opportunities and opposition to racism highlights initiatives (among others) concerning education, experience of religion, ageing of the migrant population, women, the impulse fund, police and diversity.

The impulse fund, founded in 1991 and financed by the National Lottery, finances projects concerning the integration of migrants. In 2003 approximately € 7.5 million was distributed. Note that this stock taking does not highlight any project concerning housing or urban policies.

France
New Integration Policy of the Ministry of Social Affairs, Labour and Solidarity of 8 December 2003: Notre politique d’intégration Ministere des Affaires sociales, du Travail et de la Solidarité, 8 décembre 2003

Integration policy is directed toward three areas:
(1) establishing the procedures of the integration of new immigrants
(2) support of individual social and professional advancement and
(3) acting against intolerance and in support of equality of rights.

The project for the establishing of the mechanism of integration is ambitious. It involves three elements:
- Introducing a public service of reception. In 2004, a new central agency for reception shall be established, as well as a network of regional centres for reception, which shall cover all the territory.
- Creation of a “reception and integration contract”, which will be proposed personally to all newcomers. The contract shall offer immigrants the language education and other training.
- Coherent measures to provide support for incoming families.

In 2003, the programme was introduced as a pilot programme in 12 French departments. By 1 January 2006, the new policy shall include all new immigrants and all departments.

Sources:
http://www.migrationinformation.org, authors of articles: Sylvia Zappi and Patrick Simon

Hungary
There are no integration policies targeting migrants in Hungary. In 2003, with the cooperation of the OIN, the different Ministries, local authorities, labour centres, language schools and civil organizations, a policy paper was prepared (by Dutch experts) on the integration of refugees and migrants in Hungary. This so called Matra project is intended to serve as a basis for OIN to prepare a proposal for the Hungarian government about newcomers’ integration. The Matra policy paper is the first document in Hungary to raise the question of integration programs for migrants.

The Office of Immigration and Nationality (OIN) of the Ministry of the Interior makes available four types of provisions and assistances to promote the integration of refugees:
- personal provisions: accommodation and board in reception centers or in any other place designated by the OIN; health care provisions; education and accommodation in child care institutions; free Hungarian language course
• **financial provisions**: regular allowance to compensate living expenses; travel allowance; allowance to organize the schooling of children; reimbursement of translation costs of the identity papers; housing assistance

• **financial assistances**: one-time settlement benefit; ‘home making benefit’; the assistance of the voluntary final leave of the country

• **access to donations**

These are defined by Act XXXVIII of 2001 on asylum and regulated by the Government Decree 25/1998. (II.18.) on provision of refugees.

The Equal Opportunity Office has prepared a ‘Housing and Social Integration’ program which will address the issue of Roma colonies either in a targeted or general integration program (at the time of writing this remains a policy paper without legal status).

There are three medium term packages to promote the integration of Roma:

- Government Decree 1093/1997 (VII.29.)
- Government Decree 1047/1999 (V.5.)
- Government Decree 1021/2004 (III.18.)

Undertakings related to education and culture focus on Roma as an ethnic minority while social, housing, employment and regional programs target Roma as an underprivileged group.

### Romania

**Short inventory of legislation or national strategies regarding integration of immigrants and ethnic minorities**

1. Government’s Ruling nr.44/2004 regarding the social integration of foreigners who have obtained a form of protection in Romania. It concerns helping these persons in many ways: housing, education, learning Romanian, learning about the culture of Romanians.

2. Law nr.123/2001 regarding the foreigners’ status in Romania- which sets the guidelines regarding foreigners who do not apply for asylum- access in Romania, stay, visas, leaving the country, extradition.

3. Government ruling nr. 102/2000 concerning the status and the regime of refugees in Romania – establishes the legal aspects of asylum seekers, refugees, persons which were granted protection; requests, financial help, housing, petitions

4. Government’s Decision nr. 1191/2001 concerning the approval of the special programme for social and professional integration of foreigners that have gained the status of refugee

5. Law nr.203 regarding work permits – obtaining one, losing it and renewing it.


7. The National Plan of Fighting Poverty- Government’s strategy – special attention being given to the Roma minority, an important part of the members of this minority being affected by poverty;

8. Government’s Strategy for Improving the Situation of the Roma Minority – special measures regarding education, housing, integration;

9. The National Plan to Fight Discrimination – it refers to all types of discrimination, but the measures to fight ethnic and racial discrimination are of this study’s concern.

### Slovenia

In 1999 the foundations of the Slovenian integration policy were laid down with the Resolution on Immigration Policy in Slovenia (Official Gazette 40/1999), with the three constituents of the immigration policy – immigration regulation, asylum politics, and integration policy. The resolution envisaged a pluralistic (multicultural) model of integration policy, which enables immigrants to become included in Slovenian society on an equal basis, while preserving their cultural identity. However, neither the Asylum nor the Aliens Act includes a precise definition of who in Slovenia is responsible for the provision and realization of conditions for the integration of foreigners, and of how these conditions should be insured in practice (2003 p.284). Slovenia devotes attention primarily to the first two constituents of the immigration policy defined in the Resolution on Immigration Policy in Slovenia, the immigration regulation and asylum seekers, while the integration policy is being neglected (Bester 2003, p.262).

### Spain

The first National Programme of Immigrants Integration was launched in Spain in 1994 and has remained unchanged since then. In 2001 the GRECO Programme was launched, with the intention of including social integration as an important governmental commitment. Responsibility for implementing the plan for the social
Integration of immigrants, since 1995, has fallen to IMSERSO (Institute for Migrations and Social Services), with the following main Objectives:

- To eliminate discrimination.
- To promote coexistence based on democratic values.
- To guarantee a legal and socially stable situation.
- To combat the barriers that hinder integration.
- To eradicate any sign of exploitation.
- To mobilize the society against racism and xenophobia.

IMSERSO distributes public funds (coming mainly from 0.5% of annual tax collection) to NGO and immigrant association projects devoted to different integration strategies and areas including housing.

However, regional governments have their own Integration Plans, as most of the welfare policies have been transferred to them by the national government during the last decade. This means that some of them have focused the matter of housing of immigrants, allocating funds for different schemes, and others have not implemented any action. Therefore, it is clear that heterogeneity and disparity are two strong problems in analysing not only policies, but impacts.

**Sweden**

In 1998 the responsibility for integration matters was transferred from the Immigration Authority to the newly-created Swedish Integration Board (Integrationsverket). The intention was to more clearly separate out decisions concerning work permits and residence permits (which remained with the Immigration Authority) from the continuous integration work. Accordingly, the Integration Board has general responsibility for ensuring that newly arriving immigrants receive support in integrating into Swedish society. In addition it is charged with working for equal rights, obligations and opportunities for everyone, regardless of their ethnic or cultural background and the time spent in the country, and with preventing and combating xenophobia, racism and discrimination (www.integrationsverket.se).

**The UK**

*Full and Equal Citizens* (Home Office 2000) documents some of the cross-departmental initiatives which complement existing programmes in education, employment, health, community development and accommodation. These aim to improve access for refugees to services and improved information to service providers on the needs of refugees.

The Refugee Integration Strategy is based upon a ‘partnership’ model of governance, whereby the National Refugee Integration forum (NRIF) is the central coordinating body for a series of reporting subgroups which in turn inform and are informed by the development of regional integration strategies. The latter are to be enabled via the regional consortia set up under the NASS arrangements, which are themselves a ‘partnership’ of local authorities, NGOs, voluntary agencies and RCOs and other ‘stakeholders’.

**The Accommodation sub group**

This subgroup aims to advise NRIF on the housing needs of refugees and to identify good practice in housing provision. A rent deposit guarantee scheme for rented accommodation upon a positive decision has been piloted since April 2001. Effective move-on of recognised refugees from NASS accommodation is currently one of the key issues affecting settlement in the regions. The subgroup is currently working around three key areas: prevention of homelessness (for those under NASS arrangements; access to housing (provision of move-on accommodation) and sustaining a home (the broader social issues of settlement in an area). In July 2004 the Government issued a revised strategy for consultation (Integration Matters, 2004).