

Beyond literal homelessness

Maryse Marpsat, France, National Institute of Demography (INED)
Paper for the 5th CUHP workshop, Milan, 21-22 April 2005

Housing problems, hidden homelessness or at risk of homelessness?

As will be developed in my paper at the CUHP final conference in Brussels (3-4 November 2005), the French statistical definition of homelessness is based principally on housing situation. Most of what follows is to be understood with that perspective in mind. When not otherwise indicated, this paper mainly refers to a housing definition of homelessness, as opposed to a definition in terms of social marginality, for example, or to eligibility criteria for access to social housing.

Literal homelessness and related situations

A classification of all housing situations based on several dimensions: the CNIS classification

- From 1993 to 1996, a group from the French National Council for Statistical Information worked on the methodology for homeless statistics. Among other outputs, there was the INED first homeless survey in Paris, and a classification of all housing situations, including literal homelessness (see <http://www.cuhp.org/parisworkshop.cfm> and <http://www.cuhp.org/admin/EditDocStore/ACF6C42.pdf>).

- The classification of housing situations developed by the CNIS homeless group in its 1996 report was based on four dimensions: housing type, occupancy status, housing quality/comfort (including access to water for people outside a regular dwelling), and stability/insecurity (in the sense of duration). It was considered important to classify all housing situations and not only those defining homelessness. As François Clanché writes: “for the same reasons that the group refused to treat the homeless population as a separate population, it did not want to make a list or classification of situations of exclusion that was distinct from that for “ordinary” situations. Although effective observation of situations of exclusion clearly requires specific procedures, a classification was developed that describes the full range of housing situations, from the most conventional and most stable, to the least secure and least habitable” (p. 2). Besides reasons such as avoiding stigmatisation and the creation of a “statistical ghetto”, this has several advantages. In particular it makes it possible to observe and analyse shifts between “housing” and “non housing” and to study the housing supply accessible to disadvantaged people.

- The definition of literal homelessness used in the INED (National Institute of Demography) and INSEE (National Institute of Statistics and Economic Studies) surveys was restricted to people who, on the night before the survey, had slept either in a place not fit for habitation or in a shelter, hotel or flat provided by a program for the homeless. Hence it used only the first two dimensions of the CNIS classification, namely, housing type and occupancy status.

- For the purposes of international comparisons of housing situations, the spirit of the CNIS classification could be kept (classifying all situations and having several dimensions), even if situations in different countries would require classification items of a more general nature and less specific to France. Each country could later develop its own understanding of broad categories.

Another proposal introducing a “social” dimension

- Meert *et al.* (see <http://www.enhr2004.org/delegates.asp>) propose a definition of homelessness developed by the European Observatory on Homelessness, a research group set up by the European Federation of National Organisations Working with the Homeless (FEANTSA). This definition is based on three dimensions, the first two being “physical domain” and “legal domain” (very close to the “housing type” and “occupancy status” of the CNIS classification) and a third which is the “social domain”, i.e. the ability to maintain privacy and enjoy relations (Meert *et al.*, 2004). This third dimension is an interesting proposal, but the question is whether it relates to the household or to each individual in the household (the degree of privacy that can be maintained is not the same for all household members), and how to implement questions in surveys that could help explore this dimension. The wording of such questions, and the interpretation of the answers, requires caution, because this dimension no longer deals with dwelling characteristics, but with social perceptions, which can vary greatly, even within the same country, depending on age, sex, social class, culture, etc. and is difficult to summarize in a quantitative indicator.

The “physical domain” dimension contains an idea of “adequate dwelling”, which must be defined nationally (see below), and could be said to include the “comfort” dimension of the CNIS definition, as well as some other criteria, such as floorspace. The authors also included the idea that in order to be adequate, the dwelling must not be shared with another household, which seems to belong more to the “occupancy status” dimension. The “legal domain” also includes the idea of security of tenure (akin to the fourth dimension of the CNIS classification, which we have already said was important to know but difficult to measure, since respondents themselves are not always aware of the precariousness of their situation).

Other dimensions that could be taken into account

- Even when assessing housing situations, other dimensions could be added in order to define other kinds of housing problems, such as mismatch between the characteristics of the dwelling and those of the household (price/income, dwelling size/household size, etc.), or the location of the dwelling, i.e. in terms of access to transport and services, etc. (see first French paper on definitions, Paris workshop). Note that different households (in terms of size, for example) would not be in the same situation though living in the same kind of dwelling, i.e. the same dwelling would be adequate for some households, but not for other (larger) ones.

- The EU-SILC - European Statistics on Income and Living Conditions - is a statistical system devised by Eurostat that provides data produced by the member states from surveys or registers. Data collection began in 2003 in some states. To establish a measure of poverty, the European Commission seeks to estimate the benefits of being an owner-occupier and of living in social housing or other low-rent dwellings. EU-SILC therefore contains a definition of an occupancy status to cover tenants renting at a price below the market price¹ (the CNIS version, adapted to the case of France, lists various situations where the price is below the market, such as social housing and housing provided by charities). For the SILC, all member

¹ Owner-occupiers; tenants and sub-tenants renting at the market price; tenants and sub-tenants renting below the market price; and occupants housed free-of-charge.

states (all national statistical offices) have to define which is the best (national) way to define these dwellings.

- Some other agencies may use other dimensions. For example, New Zealand's national statistical office defines "six dimensions of housing adequacy": 1. affordability, 2. suitability, 3. habitability, 4. tenure security, 5. freedom from crowding, 6. freedom from discrimination.

The first four dimensions are thus detailed:

Affordability: "It is not enough to simply measure affordability by identifying housing costs and calculating residual income to ascertain whether or not people live in adequate housing and have a reasonable standard of living. Affordability only becomes a useful dimension when investigated in the context of: a. geographical location and the state of the local housing market; b. income and housing costs in relation to the composition of, and number of people in, the household, and c. the element of choice in a given housing situation."

Suitability: "Housing suitability relates to the ability of the household to access: housing which is appropriate to their current needs; housing which is sufficiently flexible to cater for future requirements and long term goals; preferred tenure and dwelling type; local opportunity (such as employment and education); local infrastructure and public amenities."

Habitability: "Housing habitability relates to the physical condition of the dwelling (structurally, internally and externally); the existence of basic household amenities (such as cooking, washing and heating facilities); the conditions of the environment surrounding the home."

Tenure security: according to the classification: "dwelling owned without mortgage; dwelling owned with mortgage; dwelling provided rent-free; dwelling rented (State); dwelling rented (private); transitionally and episodically homeless; chronically homeless."

Some difficulties and remarks about estimates

Double-counting: when trying to estimate the number of households experiencing housing problems, one must be careful not to double-count them: hence the need to cross-tabulate using the different dimensions of housing situations. The same household might experience several difficulties at the same time, for example, they could be living in an overcrowded and dilapidated dwelling without a lease, and therefore should not be counted three times. Another difficulty is the risk of undercounting them: the statistics on some housing situations, such as living in squats or in hotel rooms, are of poor quality and the sources are not consistent.

Count unit: which unit should be counted, individuals or households? Sometimes, families have to split to be housed separately by different friends or relatives, or to be accepted in shelters. The number of people is the same, but for policy issues it is important to take the family situation (the household) into account. On the other hand, all people living in the same dwelling do not automatically enjoy the same occupancy status. Some could be "guests", for example, without security of tenure, even if the dwelling is rented with a lease.

Defining marginal situations means defining a norm, which must be country-specific

- The concept of "housing problems" or "marginal housing situations" implies the existence of a housing norm, which inevitably varies from one country to another, or from one period to another (and could even, within the same country, differ from one social class to another and from one place to another; however, we will consider national spaces as homogeneous from the point of view of a "housing norm" even if this is clearly simplifying reality). Before identifying housing problems, we must first identify what, in a given society at a given time, represents the "housing norm". Of course, the fact that this norm varies from one country to

another makes international comparisons more difficult (for example, the need for adequate heating and the concept of a well-lit dwelling posed some difficulty for the wording of the EU-SILC versions for northern Europe). It would be possible to have a norm like the measure of poverty, which differs from one country to another. This would set what is considered “adequate” and could then be used to measure the number of households whose housing situation is worse than this norm. The problem is that whereas a national “poverty line” is determined by the statistical distribution of incomes, a “normal housing” threshold would be a social decision, determined by national legislation and the statistical system for recording data. This kind of decision has to be taken each time a classification at European level has to be adapted nationally. For example, the SILC occupancy status that covers below-market rental situations was translated by French statisticians as “social housing, protected tenants (Act of 1948), and housing with a long-standing lease”.

See also the concept of “decent housing” in French law, below.

A proposal:

- Keep the idea of classifying all housing situations.
- Be careful not to double-count or underestimate.
- Keep several dimensions, among which at least housing type (physical) and tenure (occupancy status), which present both in the CNIS and the Observatory of Homelessness definitions (and most others).
- Set a “housing norm” that refers to the physical condition of the accommodation, defined by each country (or a list of situations that could be considered as “in the norm”). The norm could include the criteria relating to security, comfort and overcrowding, bearing in mind that the idea of comfort might require several questions in a survey to be adequately described. Some of these items could be European norms (e.g. exposure to lead), others national norms (e.g. heating and light). The housing-type dimensions should be classified according to this norm (simply: above or at the norm versus below the norm; and in more detail: a score to reflect the number of items on which the housing situation differs from the norm). In order to be used effectively, these various concepts should be accessible via a questionnaire or registers.
- Have an “occupancy status norm”, defined by each country according to its own system. The situations “in the norm” could be divided, as in the SILC classification, by level of rent.

Countries could develop detailed classifications as long as they regroup in a generally agreed one.

Cross-tabulations could be used to define various housing difficulties and levels according to various interests.

Besides these two dimensions (physical type and occupancy status), should other dimensions of housing be used? This depends on what housing is supposed to be and to provide people: social aspects, as in the Observatory of Homelessness definition, environmental aspects (including access to various facilities, transport, etc.), or security as in the British definition? The position of the French team, not necessarily shared by all members of the network, is to limit the number of dimensions used, especially those that deal more with the social aspects of housing. Some situations such as “being threatened by domestic violence” (which is included in the British definition of homelessness) increase the likelihood of becoming homeless, but so does being a foster child or an ex-serviceman or an ex-prisoner who has nowhere to go. The list of possible at risk situations is endless. Attention should be given to these issues either in surveys of the general population, in specific surveys (e.g. of prisoners), or in

registers in countries that keep them, on the condition that anonymity is respected. However, not including these situations in a definition of housing hardship does not mean that they should not be given priority in terms of eligibility for social housing.

The relationship between homelessness and other issues

These are a few of the questions that were asked by our Italian organiser in order to stimulate our discussion.

- Can all “housing problems” be identified as “hidden homelessness”?

First, the meaning of this question is not obvious for French people, since housing problems are more often expressed in terms of “housing hardship” (*mal logement*) than in terms of hidden homelessness, as in the UK.

“Hidden homelessness” could be understood as a departure from a housing “norm” (defined socially, historically and nationally) and be used to label any housing problem.

For countries that have adopted a definition of homelessness based on housing type and occupancy status, the term could also be understood as a departure from the “norm” but restricted to the dimensions of physical type and housing status. In this case, if the norm for “housing type” is a house or a flat, then residing in a hotel, a hostel for migrants or a rented room would be considered as “hidden homelessness” (housing types that differ from the “norm”); if being an owner-occupier or tenant with a lease is the occupancy norm, living with relatives or friends would be considered “hidden homelessness” (occupancy type that differs from the “norm”). In the latter case, it has sometimes been added “temporarily and not through choice”, since the concept of hidden homelessness applying to all people put up by friends seemed too broad. The word “temporarily” reminds us that there is a concept of time in these definitions of housing situations; the word “choice” suggests opportunities that may or not be available and cultural factors. So perhaps the concept of “housing norm” should be more detailed.

If “hidden homelessness” were restricted to housing type and occupancy status, other departures from the norm (on the other dimensions, for example overcrowding) could be referred to as “other housing problems” or “other marginal housing situations”. This raises the difficulty of finding a common vocabulary (in English), i.e. of creating an equivalence (by using the same expression, such as “homelessness”) between things that are perceived differently in each country and for which there is no exact equivalent in different languages.

- Can all “housing problems” be identified as “risks of homelessness”? If risk is taken in the sense of a situation in which the probability of becoming homeless is higher, the answer is certainly no. On the one hand, only a fraction of marginal housing situations result in homelessness. On the other hand, and although further studies need to be conducted on the last dwelling of homeless people to ascertain what kind of housing situation they came from, a majority of homeless people were previously tenants or owner-occupiers of flats or houses. In the national French survey of users of services (2001), approximately one-third of the homeless said that they had never had any dwelling of their own (in the sense of owned or rented). They included young people who had left their parents’ home or institutions and people who had always lived in very precarious forms of housing. In the 1995 Paris survey, where the questions were worded differently, about 30% came from accommodation shared with relatives or friends, with 10% having previously been tenants or owner-occupiers. A little more than 10% declared they had always had precarious housing. It seems the rest (60%) had lived in “ordinary” dwellings, at least as far as type of housing and occupancy status are

concerned (there were no questions in the French homeless surveys about overcrowding, for example).

- ***But some housing situations can lead to a high risk of homelessness***, such as being accommodated by relatives or friends. As we just saw, 30% of the Paris homeless had previously been accommodated by relatives or friends. Here is another local example:

At the request of councillors in Seine-Saint-Denis (a suburb of Paris with a high rate of poverty and many social problems), a study was conducted between 15 September and 30 October 2002 on all applications for emergency accommodation (“*situations de rupture du logement*”) filed with the social workers in the 29 social service areas for the county. Six-hundred-and-eighty-one applications for housing were filed with the social workers, who completed the same number of questionnaires, usually after an interview with the clients. One of the interesting results of this local study is that the situations of the households were: housed by friends or relatives in their dwelling (57%), living in a hotel or hostel (8%), in a squat (6%), homeless (4%); only 20% were owner-occupiers, tenants or living with their parents. Therefore, although being accommodated by relatives or friends does not always result in homelessness, it increases the risk.

- ***Other situations or characteristics could be identified as linked to a higher probability of homelessness***. Living in a place where the local housing market is characterized by very few inexpensive dwellings leads to a higher risk of homelessness for all people who are either unemployed or who have a precarious, part-time or low-paid job. The combination of a very tight housing market and a labour market where precariousness is frequent is a major factor in homelessness. In this context some situations (or some periods in the life cycle) can be considered as increasing the probability of homelessness: for example, having to leave the place where one lives rapidly, such as in the case of domestic violence, end of enlistment in the Army (Marpsat, Firdion, 1996), coming of age of foster children or children in residential care (Marpsat, Firdion, 2001)²; or having characteristics that can be discriminated against by landlords, such as coming from a foreign country. Some other characteristics (or resources) can decrease this risk, such as having a social network (which at least enables people to stay in a “hidden homelessness” situation and not a “literal homelessness” one).

How are these marginal situations covered by official statistics in France?

The final report of the homelessness working group of the French National Council for Statistical Information (CNIS, 1996) recommended improving the coverage of various situations of marginal housing. Since the report, progress has been made on knowledge of people staying with relatives or friends and of previous homeless episodes. Other situations still need investigation. The INED research program for 2005 includes a survey of sources on marginal housing situations, their qualities and shortcomings, and recommendations to be made on what should be done about neglected issues (see Djirikian, Laflamme, Marpsat, forthcoming).

Hotels, makeshift shelters and furnished rooms

The number of these marginal forms of housing is decreasing³, but this is tending to make things even worse for people who cannot afford regular housing, and could be one of the explanations for increasing recourse to being housed by relatives or friends.

² Qualitative research confirms this result: according to Isabelle Frechon, who has studied the trajectory of young women who had been in residential care, residential instability is significant during the first three years after the end of the period of residential care. However, after that initial period of difficulty, the young women tend to gain access to stable housing (Frechon, 2001, p.209).

³ For the pattern of various forms of marginal housing between 1984 and 1992, see Arbonville, 2000.

To date, we can say that:

- The most detailed data on housing type can be found in the Census (the last one was conducted in 1999, and has since been replaced by a permanent survey), or, more precisely, the 5% census sample. However, the categories must be clearly understood: for example, people are classified as living in hotels if the hotel is their permanent dwelling; people who only spend part of the month in a hotel (and the rest, for example, in a shelter) are not counted here; collective housing is not very detailed, and is broken down into large categories where shelters for the homeless, for example, are not a separate item (Cécile Brousse estimates these (see Brousse *et al.*, Insee-Méthodes in print) using the age of the clients). Makeshift shelters (*habitations de fortune*), huts, etc. are in the Census data only if they have been listed by the census counters when they were surveying the area they would be in charge of.
- Occupancy status is also in the Census, but is not very detailed. For example, people living in a flat provided by a charity cannot be distinguished from other tenants. Likewise, people living with relatives and friends “not through choice” cannot be told apart.
- The Census only gives a limited number of variables on the household and the dwelling (e.g. there is no data on income), and therefore cannot be used for very detailed studies.
- Among the surveys conducted by INSEE, the Housing Survey and the 1999 Family Survey (now called the “history of family survey” – *enquête sur l’histoire familiale*) are used to study marginal housing. The Family Survey is conducted on a subsample of the Census and at the same time (it is a supplement to the questionnaire). The other surveys use the sample frame derived from the Census and, the farther one is in time from the Census, the fewer precarious forms of housing will still exist. It remains to be seen what will happen with the new continuous census (which began in 2004).
- INSEE’s Housing Survey (*enquête Logement*), which is conducted every four or five years (the last two were in 1996 and 2001-2002 and the next one is in 2006) on a sample of about 40,000-45,000 people provides detailed data on dwellings and household characteristics. The problem with the Housing Survey is that, despite its size, there are few marginal situations and it is difficult to study them in detail.
- Cécile Brousse has also used the Family Survey (1999, on a subsample of 160,000 people from the sample of 380,000), which has a larger sample, to study marginal housing situations, although the survey does not break them down into as many categories as one would wish.
- The statistical service of the Social Affairs Department (DREES) conducts a survey of some accommodation services (see the Paris long French paper on this issue). Other data exists on special accommodation such as shelters for asylum seekers.

Questions on people accommodated by relatives or friends

One must not forget that if a household has to share its dwelling with another one, this can create problems for both households, including overcrowding.

Since the CNIS recommendations (i.e. since the 1996 survey), questions about this situation have been added to the French national Housing Survey. These questions, and the evolution of the results between 1996 and 2002, have been studied by Anne Laferrère (2003). The next survey will be conducted in 2006, and the issue of accommodation will no longer be addressed on the basis of the concept of household (where there was one household for each dwelling, among which the accommodated persons had to be distinguished) but on those of primary and secondary living units (*unités de vie principale et secondaire*). However, since people who live in social housing are not allowed to accommodate other people, it is possible that these statistics will underestimate the phenomenon. This may also be the case for people

who are accommodated by their relatives or friends because they are residing illegally in France (after having been refused asylum, for example).

Other questions in general surveys: previous episodes of homelessness

Questions on previous episodes of homelessness have been included by various countries in surveys of the general population and at European level in the Eurobarometer Survey. Prevalence rates – either life prevalence or period prevalence (e.g. over the past five years) – can be deduced from them.

In the short paper by the French team for the Copenhagen meeting *Longitudinal Perspectives on Homelessness: Some French and American Examples*, we gave details about some of these surveys, the first of which seem to have been developed in the USA in the late-1980s. The United Kingdom, particularly Scotland, incorporated this kind of question in large national surveys from the early 1990s, and the Eurobarometer first included three such retrospective questions in 1993 for 13 European Union countries. In France, the Research Centre for the Study and Observation of Living Conditions (CREDOC) included one such question in a 2001 survey, but the sample was small (2,059 interviewees) and led to the following result: among people aged 18 and over, 1% declared they had been on the street or without housing at one time in their life, and 5% knew someone who had, either a relative or a friend.

The first national French survey with a large sample where questions on previous episodes of homelessness were asked was the French National Health Survey conducted in 2002-2003 on a sample of 16,000 households and where all people in the household aged over 18 were interviewed, which resulted in 24,000 people answering those questions (see Brousse 2004 and appendix for the questions).

All people aged 18 and over should also be asked a set of questions on previous homeless episodes in the next French national Housing Survey (see appendix for the questions).

One of the problems with this kind of question is the definition of housing situations to be taken into account, particularly for situations other than sleeping in public places, such as living in collective housing (which kinds fit the “homeless” definition?) or in dwellings provided by charities. The problem would be compounded in attempts at international comparisons, since an equivalence would have to be established between various kinds of shelters, hostels, homes, etc. covered by different policies in the countries being surveyed (the same problem arises when comparing estimates of the number of homeless people).

Another difficulty, this time with the interpretation of the results, is that people who left homelessness did not necessarily enter an “ordinary” dwelling, and are more likely than other people to die at an early age or to be in places not covered or less well covered by general surveys such as collective housing.

A few results on the case of France

The 1999 Census estimates the number of people living in a mobile dwelling (such as a caravan or a boat) at 129,032 (13,110 in the Paris conurbation); the number of people who reside permanently in a hotel room at 51,406 (23,924 in the Paris conurbation); and the number of people living in a temporary dwelling (such as a building still under construction) or a makeshift shelter (such as a hut) at 41,408 (5,192 in the Paris conurbation) (Brousse *et al.*, 2002; see also www.recensement.insee.fr, table PRINC1). Other more detailed results using a cross-tabulation of housing type and occupancy status with some data on comfort will be published later this year in *Economie et Statistique* (Brousse, 2005).

Anne Laferrère (2003) has studied people who share a dwelling with relatives or friends, using both the 1996 and the 2001-2002 Housing Surveys.

	2001-2002	1996
Children who have left for their own dwelling (occupied more than 3 months) and returned for a reason other than completion of studies	457,000	415,000
Relatives other than ascendants and descendants; friends	472,000	405,000
Lodger, sub-tenant	64,000	88,000
Live-in employee	6,000	14,000
Total	999,000	922,000

Source: Insee, Housing Survey.

Cécile Brousse has analysed the results of the French national Health Survey in a report for Eurostat. Further results will be published, but a provisional estimate is that 1.6% of people in France have experienced homelessness (approximately 800,000 people). Of course this has to be interpreted carefully, since some homeless people either remained homeless or left homelessness for a kind of accommodation other than the “ordinary housing” surveyed in the National Health Survey (e.g. an old people’s home), with a higher probability than other people of dying earlier than people who had not experienced homelessness.

Besides these results from the French National Statistics Institute (INSEE), some researchers have conducted studies on various forms of marginal housing. For example, Claire Lévy-Vroelant has studied *meublés* and *garnis*, i.e. furnished rooms without/with other services such as breakfast or room cleaning, and the way they are counted in the French Census (Lévy-Vroelant, 2003a and b).

Marginal housing, policies and charities

- The decree of 30 January 2002 enabling the law on solidarity and urban renovation (*solidarité et renouvellement urbain*) No.2000-1208 of 13 December 2000) defines the concept of “decent housing” (*logement décent*). Under the law, landlords must provide housing that does not present safety or health hazards, that is equipped with a given list of amenities (heating, running water, bathroom facilities, etc.), and that has a minimum floor area or volume. This applies only to rental of a primary residence to a tenant, and not to hotels, hostels, rented holiday accommodation or accommodation for seasonal workers. The decree thus contains the idea of a “norm” for housing type (since it excludes hotels, etc.), occupancy status and level of comfort.

For an attempt to translate the conditions listed in the decree into a list of variables for the National Housing Survey, see Chesnel, 2004.

- Forms of transitional housing have developed where people are accommodated by various services without the “normal” occupancy status of tenants with a lease, and with a limited duration of stay. Given the limited supply of social housing in France and the very high prices on the private market, people often stay beyond the duration limit. Attention should be paid to these special housing programs and the role they play for their residents. The INED research program for 2005 has included a feasibility study by Claire Lévy-Vroelant on a particular form of transitional housing, *résidences sociales*.

A few reports on these issues highlight some problems:

- The annual report of the National Observatory of Poverty and Social Exclusion gives details on the cost of housing for various categories and points to the lack of social housing. Between 1998 and 2002, rents increased more for poor tenants than for others: the average rent by square metre increased by 80% in current euros for households in poverty (37% at constant euros), versus 71% for all tenants (30%). Before taking the housing allowance into account, in 2002 rent accounted for 40% of the income of poor households (more specifically 33% in the social sector and 51% in the private sector) compared with 20% for all tenants. When the housing allowance is taken into account, rent accounts for a comparable share of income of both poor and other households, at around 16%, but it remains much higher for the poor in the private sector (26%) than in the social sector (10%). However, applications for social housing have increased dramatically in recent years: from 855,100 in 1996 to 1,042,700 in 2002. Moreover, the poor living in social housing are housed in the oldest buildings, and complain about the deterioration of their living conditions.

There is less mobility among households living in social housing than before (hence fewer vacancies for new tenants) and one of the obstacles to new construction are “NIMBY” reactions. However, the solidarity and urban renovation law passed on 13 December 2000 obliges municipalities to have at least 20% of social housing, otherwise they have to pay a fine; and new urban renovation projects for 2004-2008 (in the Plan for Social Cohesion) should include new construction. However, charities worry that, given the amount of social housing slated for demolition and the difficulty finding land to build new social housing, there might not be as many new dwellings as anticipated.

- In the 2005 report of the Fondation Abbé Pierre pour le Logement des Défavorisés (the 2005 version of an annual report called *L'état du mal logement en France*), the charity has chosen people put up by relatives or friends as one of the main themes of the year. It also expresses its concerns about the Plan for Social Cohesion.

- There is also an annual report from the Haut Conseil pour le logement des personnes défavorisées, this year on emergency shelters. The council, made up of representatives of charities, makes recommendations.

These three reports mention the increased length of stay in shelters for the homeless and other transitional housing, the lack of long-term social housing solutions, and the high number of migrants and asylum seekers who are using shelters for the homeless since those for asylum seekers are full.

Bibliography

Arbonville, Denise, “Normalisation de l’habitat et accès au logement entre 1984 et 1992. Une étude du ‘parc social de fait’” in *La rue et le foyer. Une recherche sur les sans-domicile et les mal-logés dans les années 90*, edited by Maryse Marpsat and Jean-Marie Firdion. Paris: PUF/INED, 2000 : 31-62.

Brousse, Cécile, Bernadette de la Rochère and Emmanuel Massé. *L’enquête auprès des personnes fréquentant les services d’hébergement et de distribution de repas chauds*. Insee-Méthodes, forthcoming.

Brousse, Cécile, Bernadette de la Rochère and Emmanuel Massé. “Les sans-domicile usagers des services d’hébergement ou de distribution de repas chauds”. *Les Travaux de l’Observatoire National de la Pauvreté et de l’Exclusion sociale*. Paris, 2002 : 395-431.

Brousse Cécile. *The Production of Data on Homelessness and Housing Deprivation in the European Union: Survey and Proposals*. Eurostat, 2004. http://epp.eurostat.ec.eu.int/portal/page?_pageid=1073,1135281,1073_1135295&_dad=portal&_schema=PORTAL&p_product_code=KS-CC-04-008

Chesnel, Hélène. “La qualité des logements. L’humidité est le défaut le plus fréquent”. *Insee-Première*, 971 (June 2004).

Clanché, François. *Classifying Housing Situations: Homeless People in General Classifications*, www.cuhp.org. See “definitions”.

CNIS. *Pour une meilleure connaissance des sans-abri et de l’exclusion du logement*, Report No.29 (March 1996).

Frechon, Isabelle. *Etre placées à l’adolescence... et après?* Ministère de la Justice, collection Etudes et Recherches, No. 4 2001.

Laferrère, Anne. “L’hébergement d’après les enquêtes Logement”, *Les personnes sans-domicile*, dossier MIPES, réunion du 16 mai 2003, <http://www.ile-de-france.pref.gouv.fr/mipes/publications.htm#>.

Lévy-Vroelant, Claire. Entries “garni” and “héberger” in *Dictionnaire critique de l’Habitat et du Logement*, edited by Marion Ségaud. Paris : A.Colin, 2003.

Lévy-Vroelant, Claire. “Les avatars de la ville passagère: de la location meublée à l’hébergement incertain”. *Annales de la Recherche Urbaine*, No.94 (December 2003).

Marpsat Maryse, and Jean-Marie Firdion. “Devenir sans-domicile: ni fatalité, ni hasard”. *Population et Sociétés*, No.313 (May 1996).

Marpsat, Maryse, and Jean-Marie Firdion, eds. *La rue et le foyer. Une recherche sur les sans-domicile et les mal-logés dans les années 90*. Paris : PUF/INED, 2000.

Marpsat, Maryse, and Jean-Marie Firdion. “Les ressources des jeunes sans domicile et en situation précaire”. *Recherches et prévisions*, No.65 (September 2001): 91-112.

Meert, Henk, Bill Edgar and Joe Doherty Joe. *Towards an Operational Definition of Homelessness and Housing Exclusion*. ENHR International Housing Conference, Cambridge, UK, 2-6 July 2004.

Appendix

National Health survey, 2002

- (1) *Since the age of 18, have you ever been accommodated by a charity or in a hostel because you no longer had a place to live? (for women : a centre for mothers)?*
- (2) *For how long?*
- (3) *In what year was the last time?*
- (4) *For which month(s) of the year?*
- (5) *Since the age of 18, have you ever had to sleep in the street, in a vehicle, the entrance of a building or a makeshift shelter because you no longer had a place to live?*
- (6) *For how long?*
- (7) *In what year was the last time?*
- (8) *For which month(s) of the year?*

Housing Survey, 2006 (provisional)

XV.A - EPISODES SANS DOMICILE

INTRO

Dans cette partie, nous nous intéressons aux difficultés d'accès au logement dans des périodes particulièrement difficiles de l'existence : difficultés financières, professionnelles, personnelles...

⇒ Pour le groupe de référence et les individus de 19 ans ou plus en dehors des enfants et des petits-enfants du groupe de référence

SDP

Vous est-il arrivé depuis l'âge de 18 ans de ne pas avoir de domicile personnel ?

Aide : on s'intéresse ici à l'absence durable et non choisie de lieu de vie. Les situations d'hébergement momentané par des amis en attendant la disponibilité d'un logement loué ou acheté ne doivent par exemple pas être prises en compte.

1. Oui
2. Non

⇒ Si Oui

SDA

Qu'avez-vous fait ? (plusieurs réponses possibles)

1. Vous avez été hébergé par des amis ou de la famille
2. Vous avez séjourné dans des logements d'urgence ou temporaire (ex : foyer, asile de nuit, centre, centre médical, hôtel payé par une association)
3. Vous avez séjourné dans un logement sans autorisation du propriétaire ou sans autorisation légale
4. Vous avez séjourné dans un lieu non prévu pour l'habitation (rue, véhicule, hall d'immeuble, abri de fortune...)

SDA	SDT	SDTA	SDTM
	Combien de temps au total ?	En quelle année était-ce la dernière fois ?	En quel mois de l'année ?
SDA = 1 à 4			

II C - HEBERGEMENT

⇒ POUR TOUS LES ENFANTS OU PETITS-ENFANTS DU MENAGE (NLIEN=3 ou 4) DE 18 ANS ET PLUS

Ligne LIENF [i] (i = numéro de la personne dans le tableau de composition du ménage)

EPAS1 M. a-t-il* déjà vécu dans un LOGEMENT INDEPENDANT pendant PLUS DE TROIS MOIS ?

L'autre logement où M. vit plusieurs jours par semaine n'est pas considéré comme indépendant ^{1}*

AIDE : Ne prendre en compte que les situations où M. était OCCUPANT EN TITRE du logement (on dit qu'une personne est OCCUPANT EN TITRE du logement, si elle est la personne de référence du ménage constitué, ou son conjoint, ou encore si elle est l'un des colocataires du logement). Par exemple, ne PAS considérer les périodes d'hébergement dans la famille, chez des amis ou en collectivité

1. Oui
2. Non

⇒ Si Oui :

EPAS2 Pendant COMBIEN DE TEMPS au total M. a-t-il* vécu dans un logement indépendant ?

1. Moins de 6 mois
2. Entre 6 mois et un an
3. De 1 an à moins de 2 ans
4. Deux ans et plus

ERET1 A quelle occasion M. est-il* revenu* vivre ici après avoir eu un logement indépendant ?

1. Lors de la perte d'un emploi (licenciement, démission y c. pour chercher du travail, retraite...)
2. Lors d'un changement de lieu de travail (y c. reprise de l'exploitation, de l'entreprise)
3. A la suite d'une rupture familiale (divorce, séparation), ou d'un deuil
4. A la suite de problèmes financiers
5. A la fin de ses études (y c. fin de stage)
6. Au retour du service militaire ou de la coopération
7. Pour s'occuper de la PR, du conjoint ou d'un autre membre du ménage (rapprochement familial)
8. Pour raisons de santé
9. Pour des raisons liées à son logement (insalubrité, trop petit, trop éloigné de son travail...)
10. Autres raisons

¹ seulement pour ceux qui ont un autre logement plusieurs jours par semaine : PRES = ailleurs.

⇒ Si "Autres raisons" :

ERET2 Précisez ces raisons : ...

EPROJ1 **M. ENVISAGE-T-IL* d'aller habiter dans un logement indépendant dans les six mois qui viennent ?**

1. Oui
2. Non
3. La personne qui répond ne sait pas

⇒ Si EPROJ1 = Oui :

EPROJ2 **M. a-t-il* actuellement les moyens financiers lui permettant d'avoir un logement qui lui convienne ?**

1. Oui, par ses propres moyens
2. Oui, mais seulement grâce à l'aide de sa famille
3. Non
4. La personne qui répond ne sait pas

⇒ Si EPROJ1 = Non ou "Ne sait pas" :

EPROJ3 **M. aurait-il* les moyens financiers d'obtenir un logement indépendant qui lui convienne ?**

1. Oui, par ses propres moyens
2. Oui, mais seulement grâce à l'aide de sa famille
3. Non
4. La personne qui répond ne sait pas

⇒ POUR TOUS LES MEMBRES DE LA FAMILLE (SAUF CONJOINTS, DESCENDANTS ET ASCENDANTS DE LA PERSONNE DE REFERENCE OU DE SON CONJOINT) ET LES AMIS DE 16 ANS OU PLUS (NLIEN=6 OU 7 ET AGE > 15)

Ligne LIENI [i] (i = numéro de la personne dans le tableau de composition du ménage)

EAMI1 Depuis quand M. vit-il* chez vous ?

1. Depuis 10 ans et plus
2. De 3 ans à moins de 10 ans
3. Entre 1 et moins de 3 ans
4. Entre 6 mois et moins d'un an
5. Depuis moins de 6 mois

EAMI2 M. est-il* chez vous ...

**** AIDE ****

Modalité 5 - Relation familiale ou amicale avec l'un des membres du ménage : il peut s'agir de gendre, belle-fille (non mis en lien=3), concubin d'un enfant, demi-frère/sœur, ascendant ou descendant d'un autre membre du ménage

1. [pour être plus près du lieu de ses études²] [pour être plus près du lieu de son service militaire³] [pour être plus près de son travail⁴] [pour être dans de meilleures conditions pour chercher un emploi⁵] ?
2. suite à une rupture familiale (divorce, séparation) ou un deuil ?
3. à cause de difficultés financières, même momentanées ?
4. parce qu'il* est co-locataire ou occupant au même titre que la P.R* ?
5. parce qu'il* a une relation familiale ou amicale avec l'un des membres du ménage
6. parce qu'il* est en attente de logement (retour de l'étranger, arrivée d'une autre région)
7. pour raison de santé (handicap, invalidité)
8. pour une autre raison ?

⇒ Si "Autre raison" :

EAMI3 Quelles sont les raisons de sa présence dans votre foyer ?

⇒ Si M. n'est pas co-locataire (EAMI2 ≠4) et si M. n'a pas de relation familiale avec l'un des membres du ménage (EAMI2 ≠ 5) :

EAMI4 M. est-il* actuellement à la recherche d'un logement indépendant ?

1. Oui
2. Non
3. La personne qui répond ne sait pas

⇒ Si Non ou "Ne sait pas" et si M a moins de 60 ans :

EAMI5 M. aurait-il* les moyens financiers d'obtenir un logement indépendant qui lui convienne ?

1. Oui
2. Non
3. La personne qui répond ne sait pas

⇒ Si EAMI4 = Non ou "Ne sait pas" et EAMI2 = 1

EAMI6 Est-il prévu que M. parte de votre foyer [lorsqu'il aura fini ses études²] [lorsqu'il aura fini son service militaire³] [lorsqu'il changera de lieu de travail⁴] [lorsqu'il aura trouvé du travail⁵] ?

1. Oui
2. Non

² Si OCCUPA = 3 (étudiant)

³ Si OCCUPA = 4 (militaire du contingent)

⁴ Si OCCUPA =1 (actif occupé)

⁵ Si OCCUPA = 2 (chômeur)