

Homelessness in Denmark:
"Freak Houses for Freak People"
or
"Unusual Housing for Unusual Lifestyles"

April 2005



FEANTSA

European Federation of National Organisations Working with the Homeless
Fédération Européenne d'Associations Nationales Travaillant avec les Sans-Abri

Contents

1. **Shadow Peer Review** p. 3
Aims and procedures
Main findings

2. **Peer evaluation** p. 4
A. Overview of the “Freak houses for freak people” p. 4
B. “Unusual” aspects of the Danish practice p. 5
Narrow target population
No reintegration
Catering for specific needs
Responsibility of the individual
Strong social networks
C. Problematic aspects of the Danish practice p. 8
NIMBY – Not In My Back Yard
Isolation
Sustainability
Flexibility

3. **Transferability** p. 10
Danish culture
Target population
Monitoring and evaluation
Quality standards
Small-scale projects
Central location
User involvement

4. **Conclusion** p. 12

ANNEX 1 **Peer organisations** p. 13

ANNEX 2 **Questionnaire** p. 14

ANNEX 3 **ETHOS** p. 15

Shadow Peer Review

Aims and procedures

The Danish practice “freak houses for freak people”¹ was selected by the European Commission as an example of good practice in the area of social inclusion for its alternative approach to tackling homelessness through provision of alternative forms of housing in small communities, and taking into account the specific needs of homeless people with alternative lifestyles. This practice is currently being evaluated in the framework of the EU Social Inclusion Peer Review Programme 2005².

The Danish ministry for social affairs will host the peer review meeting in Copenhagen on 26 and 27 April, and 7 “peer countries” (Poland, Czech Republic, Estonia, Latvia, Germany, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg) have been invited to review the practice together with representatives from service providers (FEANTSA) and from local authorities (Eurocities and RETIS)). The outcome of the discussions during the peer review meeting will serve to draw up an evaluation report on the Danish practice which will be disseminated widely.

FEANTSA has therefore carried out a “shadow” peer review at service provider level through consultation of its members, and the outcome will feed into the official EU Peer Review meeting. A questionnaire was circulated to members with a summary of the Danish practice and a questionnaire (see Annex 1) in order to receive feedback and evaluation of:

- > The aims and results of the freak houses for freak people
- > The transferability of this approach in their different national contexts

Unlike the official peer review, the shadow peer review is carried out at stakeholder level by collecting the opinions of Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs) which are generally important actors in implementing any homeless strategy and have extensive experience of working closely with homeless people. The methods used in the FEANTSA peer review were similar to the EU Peer Review, although involved many more countries.³ The peer organisations welcomed FEANTSA’s suggestion to assess the effectiveness and transferability of the “freak houses” through peer review methods, and to encourage such transnational exchanges within FEANTSA.

Main findings

The feedback gathered during this peer review exercise has created awareness of the innovations and lessons learnt from these “Freak houses”. This should enable countries across Europe to draw relevant information and adapt it to their respective national contexts and needs. The findings have highlighted the following elements:

1. This Danish practice is characterised by “unusual” elements which do not necessarily exist in the approaches of other EU countries:
 - > The population targeted is very narrow (aiming only at the hardcore of the homeless population)
 - > The aim of the practice is not necessarily reintegration but an improvement of the living situation of the individuals
 - > This practice caters for specific needs of the hardcore population rather than providing one typical pathway for reintegration
 - > The individuals have more responsibility linked to the maintenance of their own home and living area
 - > The community environment is favourable to the development of strong social networks

1 The translation “freak housing for freak people” has been chosen by the Danish authorities for “skæve huse til skæve existenser”. Click [here](#) for background information on the policy.

2 Under this programme, the European Commission selects 8 different good practices each year to be examined in individual peer review meetings which involve a wide range of stakeholders: national ministries, national experts, European experts, service providers, service users, regional and local authorities.

3 Denmark, Estonia, Czech Republic, Hungary, France, Luxembourg, Spain, Portugal, the UK, the Netherlands, Poland, Germany, Austria, Ireland, Russia, Sweden and Italy.



Peer evaluation

2. The findings highlight certain problematic aspects of the Danish practice:
 - > The NIMBY attitude as a barrier to creating “free zones” for individuals with alternative lifestyles
 - > The creation of areas of socially marginalized groups and the potential isolation from society at large
 - > The issue of sustainability of these projects for the service providers and for the individual
 - > The lack of flexibility to adapt to changing situations of the residents

3. It is important to take into account specific elements of the policy in the Danish context when considering any transfer:
 - > Danish culture of tolerance for different lifestyles
 - > The narrow target population
 - > The importance of monitoring and evaluation
 - > Quality standards for the housing
 - > Keeping this approach for small-scale projects
 - > Location in central areas
 - > User involvement for planning and improvement of the living area

A. Overview of the “Freak houses for freak people”

Debates and pilot projects in Denmark throughout the 1990s have developed into a formalised model of housing: freak housing for freak people. This programme has been referred to in many ways: “special housing for alienated people”, “freak housing for freak people”, “alternative housing for alternative living”, “unorthodox housing for unorthodox living”. The basic idea in this programme is to provide unusual forms of housing to cater for special needs of homeless people who find it difficult to settle in mainstream homeless services and consequently conventional residential housing. The term “freak” chosen by the Danish authorities is important since it demonstrates that this form of housing is aimed at persons who, despite excellent welfare services, cannot or do not want to reintegrate in mainstream society and clearly live in opposition to the rest of society. However, the term “freak” has negative connotations in the English language and, we believe, can only serve to reinforce negative attitudes towards homeless people. Therefore, for the purpose of this analysis, the term “unusual housing for unusual lifestyles” will be used.

The programme developed by the Danish authorities takes up the recommendation resulting from the study carried out in 1993 by Per Lorang Sørensen⁴ on the phenomenon of unconventional housing forms and localities that have arisen naturally in parts of Copenhagen and other places in Denmark, and which offer housing possibilities to people who would otherwise be roofless.

The Danish government granted subsidies from 1999 to 2003 (and has extended the programme for another four years) to projects that differ from conventional services or housing. The programme is based on a “housing first” approach - the aim is to provide a home first and then other services once the person has reached the stability needed to benefit fully from such services. These are generally small-scale projects (less than 20 dwellings per project) where homeless people live in a community and each have their own “home” with a

⁴ Sorensen, P. L. (1993) “Drommennes Port”. *Undersogelse af usoedvanlige boligomrader (SUS, Socialt udviklingscenter Storkobenhavn), Copenhagen*

conventional tenancy agreement, and where they are free to continue their habits (e.g. drugs, alcohol, etc) without any threat of losing their homes. These homes can take the form of caravans, sheds, etc. There is no permanent staff living with these communities, but social workers pay regular visits, monitor progress of the tenants, and provide services (health, employment) where possible and necessary. This is effectively a form of “permanent” supported housing.

The governmental programme covers the costs of initial construction and setting up of the project, but the costs of the keep-up of the project over time is the responsibility of the applicants for the project. The actors who can apply for funding under this programme include housing companies, public authorities such as municipalities or regions, institutions, private actors and private organisations, unions etc. Independent homeless service providers have been among those to apply.

B. “Unusual” aspects of the Danish practice

NARROW TARGET POPULATION

This Danish practice provides specialised services which are aimed at people under the first conceptual category of ETHOS⁵: the roofless. These are people who have no roof over their heads and are forced to live in public places. There seem to be no statistics on the profile of roofless persons living in these unusual houses, but the official target group of the Danish government programme includes chronic homeless people, mentally ill people, alcoholics and people addicted to illegal drugs.⁶ This target group encompasses people who have failed to be integrated into conventional housing or other forms of supported housing created for different target groups.

In general, these are rough sleepers who have been on the streets for such a long period and who are unable (or do not want) to live in normal houses, institutions or shelters and enter a pathway reintegration process. This can be due to problems with house rules (for example substance misuse, or presence of dogs), or because they constitute a threat to

other service users. So the idea is to create a space where such rough sleepers can continue their lifestyle with a home of their own. The peer organisations generally draw attention to the fact that the decision to give up on reintegrating homeless individuals through a pathway of help is only really acceptable in countries like Denmark with excellent services for homeless people which have tried in every way to integrate the person in question.

It seems that the kind of people who are targeted to live in these unusual housing communities already have a developed identity in their tendency to live in complete opposition to the rest of society. These unusual houses are clearly aimed at one single category of the homeless population - the hard core (as opposed to shelter users, ex-prisoners, eviction victims, domestic violence, people living in slums, etc).

There was a general feeling from the peer organisations that the programme should not be extended to other categories of people than it was originally meant for - the hardcore of the homeless population - since this is only a solution of last resort after failure of other more classical methods of reintegration. Some peer organisations stressed the importance of distinguishing between the hardcore population in different categories of homeless people (immigrants, women, youth, elderly, etc) and the need to adapt the support where necessary. However, the users of such unusual houses should continue to remain as narrow as possible.

NO REINTEGRATION

The ultimate objective of the intervention is not the reintegration but the improvement of quality of life. This Danish policy adopts a pragmatic approach aimed at *creating housing* for all rather than *reintegrating* all - given that housing is a basic need for any person to have stability. Indeed, for many residents of such projects, this represents the first time in many years that they have a fixed point in their lives and a sense of security created by having their own place. Once their housing needs are fulfilled, social services can work on the other integrative aspects (namely health and employment).

Most peer organisations acknowledge that this approach is positive since it helps them out of the vicious circle of temporary accommodation and rough sleeping. The aim is to provide permanent rather than transitional housing. The tenancy contract is not linked to any social reintegration system - but social assistance is still provided. The status of this type of special housing is the same as a normal apartment. So there are no demands on the tenants to follow special activities,

5 *European Typology on Homelessness and housing exclusion - see Annex for full typology.*

6 [Danish NAPIncl 2003-2005](#)



reintegration programmes, employment programmes. They will not lose their homes for lack of compliance with specific reintegration programmes. These communities basically provide the tenants with a form of long-term housing.

There are mixed feelings amongst homeless service providers in Europe. In some countries service providers recognise that, for some homeless people, reintegration is an ideal and not always realistic. For these people, the choice is generally living in classic hostels for the rest of their life with many other service users. This Danish practice however provides an alternative solution where the person is supported as an individual. This is a realistic and pragmatic option for cases where reintegration is so unattainable and provides the residents with acceptable housing solutions (although some would argue that some of the homes in these residential villages are not always of an acceptable standard). Moreover, some organisations believe that if the tenants in these unusual houses manage to live for a long period of time in such environments, then they can in many respects be considered “reintegrated”, since integration does not necessarily mean to live as the average citizen does. Indeed, these unusual houses can potentially become accepted as part of society if these alternative lifestyles become “normalised”.

For other peer organisations, the Danish approach is unacceptable: rehabilitation should always be the objective of any homeless service. The contrary would effectively be a form of active ghettoisation. Some believe it would be unethical to give up the objective of reintegration, but generally agreed that using these sort of methods are useful as a means of attracting and motivating the residents to take further steps. Therefore these unusual houses should only be perceived as a first step in the process of reintegration rather than as a definitive arrangement. In general, this approach was accepted but only as a last resort solution, provided that *all* the other less drastic options have been explored, and never giving up the ultimate aim of reintegration.

CATERING FOR SPECIFIC NEEDS

This approach to tackling homelessness implies a recognition that some people cannot be accommodated in mainstream societies and that for some people reintegration is unrealistic. Too often, the needs of homeless people are put into one specific group and services are provided in a “blanket” manner where one service must fit all. To provide such “specialised” accommodation in Denmark recognises that homeless people are individuals with specific needs. This is indeed a positive recognition that substance abuse, medical problems, psychological disorders can create a situation where homeless people cannot settle into “normal” accommodation services and need their own type of “space” so that they can live their life, have a home to call their own, have their own private space (unlike in institutions and certain shelters). Some people can be refused from institutions and shelters because they do not fulfil requirements or social behaviour standards. Access to help becomes harder, can further aggravate the situation, and make it more and more impossible for the person to regain motivation to start a reintegration process. In this light, it is important to provide possibilities for regaining self-esteem, exploring their potential, and possibly then improving their relation with society at large. Homeless people have very diverse problems and pathologies. The more targeted the solutions offered are, the better the results they are likely to achieve. All peer organisations recognise that this Danish practice provides an option for a group of people who would otherwise be judged impossible to house or reintegrate. This Danish model is consequently characterised more by a last attempt at harm reduction for a problematic hardcore of homeless people, rather than an approach promoting active reintegration. So this should certainly stay specific and not be generalised to all categories of homeless people.

C. Problematic aspects of the Danish practice

NIMBY PHENOMENON

According to research⁷, the problem of NIMBY attitude towards the projects has been a problem since the outset. The Danish programme aims to set up these communities in social and geographical areas characterised by a high degree of tolerance. The idea is to build the communities in places where the residents can behave differently (in opposition to society, and dealing with their multiple problems and challenging behaviour) without causing problems with neighbours. This is especially sensitive given that the idea is in reality to create a “free zone” where they are free to have alternative lifestyles.

Usually the possibility of having your own home is linked to the application of certain social behaviour standards. The people targeted for this unusual housing are usually people who live on the fringe of society and who tend to cause problems when living in “normal” neighbourhoods. In these unusual housing communities, homeless people with disturbing or challenging social behaviour are given a “free zone” where no citizens can be bothered by their alternative lifestyles, and where they will not be criticised for not mowing a lawn, for playing loud noise day and night, for leaving garbage in the front yard, etc. Moreover, people with a drug or drinking habit who have difficulty in changing this aspect of their lifestyles will not be forced out of their “home” in these communities since the Danish Constitution states that anyone’s home is inviolable. They can be fined or go to jail, but cannot lose their home.

The alternative to this unusual housing could be to place people with disturbing behaviour in jail or in a psychiatric hospital, but this does not necessarily solve the problem. So this idea of having a “free zone” where no one is bothered seems more workable according to certain peer organisations, even if it raises issues of safety for neighbouring areas. However, the NIMBY phenomenon may potentially lead to the isolation of such residential villages.

ISOLATION

Using this type of housing gives homeless people the freedom to live differently, but also allows them to live isolated and away from society. The peer organisations have expressed their concern in this respect: segregation and ghettoisation should be avoided at all costs. The link between the “two worlds” should ideally be maintained through adequate support services provided to the communities and through regular consultation. Such projects should be developed in order to promote the interests of those involved and in no way imply a lowering of standards or an exclusion from existing homeless services.

This is especially important given that creating zones of tolerance, enabling the hardcore of the homeless population to readapt to living in a community in their own time, can be potentially problematic - as seen above. If there is resistance from neighbourhoods to setting up such communities, it is likely that some communities will be located in isolated areas (such as on former vacant land, near railway intersections or motorways). This is indeed the case for some of the current Danish unusual housing projects.

This could potentially reinforce the exclusion of the people concerned since such isolated areas generally lack access to adequate public transport and other basic facilities. This inevitably has repercussions on the contact of these people with society at large, on their opportunities of finding employment, and will affect their desire to move on from the community once they have built strong social networks. Such locations should ideally not be chosen to set up such unusual housing communities. However, for those projects which are already situated in the outskirts of cities, there should be regular monitoring of the community, and transport services should be provided where they are lacking. Some organisations believe that such isolated communities should even be abolished altogether.

⁷ Volker Busch-Geertsma, “Tolerance of unconventional housing forms and the programme freak houses for freak people” in *Homelessness policies in other EU countries (2001)*

SUSTAINABILITY

The issue of sustainability has been raised by the peer organisations on two different levels: for the service provider and for the individual.

Firstly, from the point of view of the *service providers*. It is important to consider the impact that these alternative projects have on their work. The flexibility of such programmes, creating free zones and allowing residents to adapt in their own time, is not always easy for social support workers to manage. These unusual housing surroundings may require additional training and qualifications since the working conditions are different to work in institutions or shelters. The social workers carry out the work alone, as opposed to work in institutions or shelters where they are surrounded by colleagues. Unlike in institutions and shelters, the residents of these unusual houses have their own home and a regular tenancy agreement, and therefore have formal rights over their home. The service provider therefore has less competence to take decisions for the homeless persons involved, and has to adapt to the specific needs of the individual tenants, who may be more demanding given the shift towards individual responsibility. Some peer organisations have drawn attention to the potential problems of leaving all decisions in the hands of the tenants, since some homeless people (especially those with multiple behavioural problems who would qualify for the unusual houses) are not always able to assess their own needs, and social workers would have to deal with demands which do not always reflect the real needs of the tenants.

It is also important to consider that this form of support could be required indefinitely. This is considered as permanent rather than transitional housing - residents of these unusual houses often need support for a longer time, maybe even for the rest of their lives. This clearly raises issues of sustainability. Residents of unusual houses have certain responsibilities as individuals for the maintenance of the living area, however regular social support and permanent monitoring are needed. In some cases, the residents move on into more conventional forms of housing, but many also remain in these unusual houses for very long periods. It is important to consider these unusual houses from a dynamic perspective whereby the residents change during their stay in the community, and eventually even choose to move on. However, there is always the risk of seeing these unusual housing communities become an accepted part of “normal” society, and consequently seeing residents remain in this situation indefinitely.

Secondly, the peer organisations have raised the issue of sustainability for the *individual*. These projects aim to create a reasonable social environment by building strong social networks and promoting social integration. However, the security in these projects was also perceived as a potentially problematic aspect of this strategy by the peer organisations, since the risk of violent behaviours is very high when you put for example homeless veterans with mental illnesses or drug and alcohol problems to live together with the regular supervision of a social support worker. This could potentially pose a danger for the other residents as well as for the social workers. The long-term effectiveness of this approach remains to be seen. But there is a question of sustainability for the individual i.e. for how long can individuals sustain such a lifestyle without damage to their emotional or physical health and well-being.

FLEXIBILITY

The peer organisations have acknowledged the advantages of the alternative Danish approach providing for specific needs of a specific group of homeless people who have had no success with conventional forms of care and are consequently considered impossible to reintegrate. However, many have stressed the importance of making the unusual housing approach more flexible and allowing for residents to move on more easily if they feel ready. Individuals do change - just because someone cannot reintegrate the wider community this month does not mean that they will not be capable of progress the next month. If people change, make progress and find motivation, they should be provided with the possibilities to move on into regular accommodation. The worry of the service providers of FEANTSA is that this is considered primarily as a *permanent* form of housing, an element which may restrict the flexibility of the projects. These unusual houses are a positive start for the target population in question, but as needs are identified, there needs to be the flexibility to adapt the support to changing situations.

Transferability

In many countries of Europe, governments are consulting homeless service providers and taking initiatives to treat the phenomenon of homelessness (declared a priority action by the Council of Ministers of Social Affairs in March 2005- see Council press release). Peer organisations therefore currently have opportunities to make specific proposals to their national governments, and will naturally look into the possibility of setting up similar projects in their national and local contexts. Some countries already have similar projects such as the “maisons-relais” in France, or other similar projects in Hungary, Poland, the UK, the Netherlands. Other countries are currently looking into setting up pilot projects using this approach (Luxembourg, Romania). The peer organisations felt that, in principle, this Danish practice can be transferred to other national contexts, but such transfers always require thorough analysis, expertise and changes in order to reflect local needs and possibilities. It is therefore important to take into account specific elements of the policy in the Danish context when considering any possible transfer.

DANISH CULTURE

First of all, there is a historical reason that explains the attitude of tolerance of Danish society towards these alternative housing forms⁸. During the urbanisation process (which dates back to the 1950s) due to housing shortages, it was common practice for families to live for a time in self-built structures around the centre of the city. The accommodation in these areas was often small and self-constructed. Additionally, Danish political culture is characterised by a spirit of compromise. This is evident in the Danish alternative approach to combating homelessness, but is also evident in the police’s more tolerant approach to use of drugs, for example.

It is important also to emphasise that this sort of solution is only acceptable in countries which already have very developed welfare services, and integrated homeless policies and service provision. Only in such a context would it be acceptable to consider certain people impossible to reintegrate.

TARGET POPULATION

This unusual housing targets a very specific and narrow part of the homeless population. The peer organisations felt that this target group should certainly not be widened to other categories of homeless people. This cannot be a solution for houseless people and certainly not for the inadequately housed (see ETHOS). Models based on the Danish unusual housing cannot become a generalised solution to homeless-

ness. The greater part of the homeless population can be reintegrated. Some of the peer organisations fear that the unusual housing model could be transferred to some countries as a general way of solving the problem of homelessness by creating ghettos for homeless people.

Moreover, targeting the hardcore specifically is all the more important since a more targeted approach generally allows for better service quality. This should be aimed only at people with multiple problems who have been on the streets for years - and certainly not involve people who are clearly motivated to make changes in their lives. A social mix (e.g. women/men) can have beneficial effects, but the residents have to be selected with care.

MONITORING AND EVALUATION

The solution proposed by the Danish government can be effective but it needs to be closely monitored. The success of these projects is measured in terms of the achievement of a satisfactory quality of life for the residents. However, the project should be ambitious for the residents and should always seek to help them move towards reintegration. Assistance and social workers must never forget about the objective of re-integration. It is important to periodically review with each individual if such provision continues to offer the right sort of service as individuals change - just because a person is not able to reintegrate in a given moment that does not mean he/she will never be able to reintegrate.

Monitoring is crucial if personalised assistance is to be offered to cater to specific needs. It is crucial that personal help and support be made available for those residents in need of it, providing access to mainstream social, health and employment services. The social workers should not only liaise with the housing associations and municipalities, not only provide help with the practical aspects (paying bills, rent, etc) but also seek to establish a relationship of trust with the tenants. If the Danish unusual housing approach is transferred to other national contexts, it must go with equivalent welfare support: people living in these unusual housing communities receive housing benefits or a pension that provide them with enough money to pay either normal housing or special housing.

⁸ See analysis by Volker Busch-Geertsma (2001)

Conclusion

The peer organisations compared the Danish “unusual housing for unusual lifestyles” approach and the UK integrated pathway approach of the England “Rough Sleepers Strategy” (RSS) which was examined under the 2004 Peer Review programme.¹⁰ The strength of the Rough Sleepers Strategy was that it prioritised accommodation, health, addiction and other support services for the most marginalized. It facilitated access to services for those who wanted to change to their behaviours or deal with their drug and/or alcohol issues and secure long-term housing either independent or supported. This approach to tackling rooflessness should always be the first option in any country, and will succeed in most cases if the whole process is started early enough and kept up continuously. The Danish residential villages of “unusual housing” provide possibilities for people who cannot handle life in a normal housing community and who would otherwise be left to constantly move around between institutions for the homeless and the street. These are places where such people have the same right to a home as all other tenants in Denmark, but where there is more room for “otherness” and where there is greater tolerance and freedom. The main objective is not reintegration, but to ensure that the residents attain a lifestyle that they find satisfactory.

Many peer organisations do not perceive the UK and Danish approaches as very different, but rather as complementary. The Danish model is perceived as one of the lower steps in the reintegration pathway approach of the RSS, even if the aim is not reintegration. The “unusual housing” can therefore be complementary and fill in gaps in reintegration processes, as long as it is not used as a general solution but as a last resort. Rough sleepers should always have the option of access to regular housing, but if this is not appropriate they should be able to go for other options to satisfy their specific immediate needs. The Danish approach should not affect already established reintegration services and possibilities, but rather give a further option to those who have unsuccessfully exhausted all options. The Danish approach is positive in many respects: the Danish government is willing to consider unusual alternatives, to use creative and pragmatic approaches to tackling a certain type of homelessness, and has made a great investment to build a considerable amount of “unusual” dwellings.

In the Danish context, homelessness is not necessarily about lack of housing since the welfare state aims to provide housing for all and has homeless services which provide ample possibilities of reintegration. The hardcore of the homeless population therefore generally suffers from behavioural problems which prevent them from using the conventional housing offered by the Danish authorities. This is not the case in some other countries where the assistance provided to homeless people by the public authorities is limited to emergency solutions (soup kitchens, night shelters, etc). In such national contexts, the “unusual housing” approach cannot be an option. The Danish model needs to be implemented in an appropriate context and for the right reasons. This approach to tackling homelessness leaves the individuals to their own devices instead of insisting on normalising and socialising efforts. These residential villages could potentially be used as a cheap and easy way to hide these people instead of being confronted with them on a daily basis.

The objective of homeless services should be to provide services and accommodation for the range of needs that emerge among the homeless population. Many peer organisations would consider developing some innovative pilot projects based on the Danish model, taking care however that the projects promote the interests of the individuals involved, providing services in a safe, secure and quality environment which will not jeopardise their chances of reintegration.

¹⁰ See [FEANTSA Shadow Peer Review 2004](#)

ANNEX 1

Peer organisations¹¹

Armáda spásy

(Czech Republic)

Arrels Fundació

(Spain)

BAWO

(Austria)

Caritas España

(Spain)

Confédération Caritas Luxembourg

(Luxembourg)

FAPIL

(France)

Federatie Opvang

(The Netherlands)

FILOS

(Spain)

FIOpsd

(Italy)

Focus Ireland

(Ireland)

Hungarian Maltese Charity Service

(Hungary)

Pomeranian Forum in Aid of Getting Out of Homelessness

(Poland)

Prohabitatge

(Spain)

RAUXA

(Spain)

ReFoMix

(Hungary)

SAD

(Czech Republic)

Salvation Army in Hungary

(Hungary)

SBS §94

(Denmark)

Serviço Jesuíta aos Refugiados

(Portugal)

St Mungos

(UK)

Swedish Network on housing and homelessness issues

(Sweden)

Tallinna Hoolekande Keskus

(Estonia)

Udenfor

(Denmark)

Zebra Foundation

(Russia)

¹¹ See [FEANTSA website](#)

for more information on the individual peer organisations

ANNEX 2

Questionnaire

TARGET POPULATION

This policy seems to be tackling the hard core of homeless people - those who are generally rough sleepers and have very little or no chance of fully reintegrating Danish society due to their multiple problems. Do you believe this supported housing programme should be extended to other categories of "homeless" people (in temporary accommodation, immigrants, homeless youth, etc)?

ADAPTATION TO INDIVIDUAL NEEDS:

This practice of providing "alternative housing" aimed at meeting the complex needs of certain individuals is considered innovative. Is this form of supported housing (not necessarily aimed at reintegration) a real solution? Is this an effective way of helping the service users?

USER INVOLVEMENT:

Do you consider user participation a positive aspect of the programme? The Council for socially marginalised people is an important element of Danish Social policy - would this be useful in your country? Does this already exist in your country?

TRANSFERABILITY TO OTHER NATIONAL CONTEXTS:

Do you believe such a programme would be compatible in your national context (taking into account the numbers and profile of homeless people in your country)? What forms of supported housing exist in your country?

ROUGH SLEEPERS STRATEGY:

While the England Rough Sleepers Strategy (1999-2002) promotes a pathway or step-by-step approach, this programme for "alternative housing for alternative living" promotes a needs approach which may not necessarily lead to reintegration. What is your opinion on these two different approaches (objectives, methods, results)?

ANNEX 3

ETHOS

| conceptual category | OPERATIONAL CATEGORY | sub category | DESCRIPTION |
|--|--|--|--|
| Roofless | 1 Living in a public space (no abode) | 1.1 | Sleeping Rough |
| | | 1.2 | Contacted by outreach services |
| Roofless | 2 Stay in a night shelter and/or forced to spend several hours a day in a public space | 2.1 | Low-threshold / direct access shelter |
| | | 2.2 | Arranged (e.g. low budget hotel) |
| | | 2.3 | Short-stay hostel |
| Houseless | 3 Homeless hostel / temporary accommodation | 3.1 | Short stay homeless hostel |
| | | 3.2 | Temporary housing (no defined time) |
| | | 3.3 | Temporary housing (transitional defined) |
| | | 3.4 | Temporary (longer stay) |
| | 4 Women’s shelter / refuge | 4.1 | Shelter accommodation |
| | | 4.2 | Supported accommodation |
| | 5 Accommodation for asylum seekers and immigrants | 5.1 | Reception centres (asylum) |
| 5.2 | | Repatriate accommodation | |
| 5.3 | | Migrant Workers Hostels | |
| 6 Institutional Release | 6.1 | Penal institutions (period defined nationally) | |
| | 6.2 | Institutions (care and hospital) | |
| 7 Specialist supported accommodation (for homeless people) | 7.1 | Supported accommodation (group) | |
| | 7.2 | Supported accommodation (individual) | |
| | 7.3 | Foyers | |
| | 7.4 | Teenage parent accommodation | |
| Insecure Housing | 8 No tenancy | 8.1 | Living temporarily with family or friends (not through choice) (Housing /Social Service records) |
| | | 8.2 | Living in dwelling without a standard legal (sub)tenancy (excludes squatting) |
| | 9 Eviction Order | 9.1 | Legal orders enforced (rented housing) |
| 9.2 | | Re-possession orders (owned housing) | |
| 10 Violence | 10.1 | Living under threat of violence from partner or family (police recorded incidents) | |
| Inadequate Housing | 11 Temporary structure | 11.1 | Mobile home / caravan (which is not holiday accommodation) |
| | | 11.2 | Illegal occupation of a site (e.g. Roma / Traveller / Gypsy) |
| | | 11.3 | Illegal occupation of a building (squatting) |
| | 12 Unfit Housing | 12.1 | Dwellings unfit for habitation under national legislation (occupied) |
| | | 13 Extreme Overcrowding | 13.1 |

In 2005 FEANTSA conducted a shadow peer review of the Danish "freak houses" by circulating a summary of the Danish approach and a questionnaire to its Members asking them for feedback and evaluation of:

1. The aims and results of the "freak houses"
2. The transferability of the "freak houses" in their different national contexts

The work of FEANTSA is supported financially by the European Commission.