LA FONDATION ABBÉ PIERRE EN EUROPE

Inequality and... HOUSING



www.fondation-abbe-pierre.org





HOUSING EXCLUSION IN EUROPE: THE KEY STATISTICS 24,177,37

203,171,221

NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS IN THE EUROPEAN UNION







OVERCROWDED HOUSING



SEVERE HOUSING DEPRIVATION



DIFFICULTY ACCESSING



PUBLIC TRANSPORT



RENT OR MORTGAGE ARREARS

DIFFICULTY MAINTAINING ADEQUATE HOUSEHOLD TEMPERATURE

AT RISK OF HAVING TO MOVE

DUE TO HOUSING COSTS

HOUSE IN THE NEXT SIX MONTHS









Inequalities on housing costs

AVERAGE PROPORTION OF HOUSEHOLD BUDGET SPENT ON HOUSING* IN 2013 (BY PROPORTION FOR THE POPULATION AS A WHOLE, IN PURCHASING POWER PARITY - PPA)

	POOR		TOTAL POPULATION		INEQUALITY - POOR/NON-POOR
COUNTRY	2013 (%)	Change since 2008 (in points)	2013 (%)	Change since 2008 (in points)	Change in the gap between the poor and the non-poor since 2008 (in points)
Greece	71.0	16.60	39.9	9.40	10.40
The Netherlands	49.4	2.40	29.5	1.10	1.40
Denmark	60.6	8.50	30.5	-0.10	9.80
Germany	50.1	-3.20	28.2	-3.60	0.90
Czech Republic	47.7	1.90	24.6	-0.60	2.50
Hungary	39.0	-4.70	24.7	-0.10	-4.90
Bulgaria	36.7	0.90	24.5	1.00	-0.20
Romania	40.8	-2.60	25.4	-2.70	-0.20
New Member States (12 countries)	38.7	0.00	23.3	0.20	-0.20
Poland	37.9	0.90	22.7	0.60	0.50
European Union (28 countries since 2010)	41.0	0.50	22.2	-1.10	1.80
Sweden	45.6	-1.70	22.4	1.20	-2.60
European Union (15 countries)	41.7	0.60	22.0	-1.30	2.30
Slovakia	36.6	2.30	20.5	2.40	0.40
Latvia	39.6	8.10	21.7	3.70	3.80
Belgium	39.5	-3.80	20.8	-2.30	-1.60
United Kingdom (compared to 2012)	38.3	2.10	20.7	0.90	1.40
Lithuania	34.1	4.50	19.5	4.20	0.50
Finland	36.1	1.70	18.2	0.20	1.30
France	35.1	4.00	18.0	1.00	3.60
Croatia (compared to 2010)	38.2	-8.30	19.8	-5.50	-3.80
Austria	43.0	4.60	19.2	0.90	4.10
Estonia	35.6	8.90	18.3	3.40	6.50
Spain	40.1	6.60	19.5	1.60	6.30
Portugal	36.4	9.30	18.3	1.60	9.40
Slovenia	32.5	2.20	16.8	1.80	0.80
Italy	34.2	2.80	17.4	-0.10	3.60
Ireland	33.8	8.10	15.7	1.00	8.00
Cyprus	20.3	3.60	13.1	1.80	2.10
Luxembourg	28.6	0.60	13.8	0.10	1.10

BEING EXPOSED TO THE MARKE OR PROPERTY OWNERS WITH A	MORTGAGE),
N COMPARISON WITH NON-POC	1.23
e i l'accorde unorme	
Slovenia	1.22
Slovakia	1.20
Luxembourg	1.18
Croatia	1.13
Austria	1.09
Greece	1.09
Spain	1.09
France	1.04
German y	1.01
Cyprus	0.98
Sweden	0.97
Malta	0.97
Hungary	0.97
The Netherlands	0.96
Denmark	0.96
Italy	0.96
Belgium	0.83
Latvia	0.79
Portugal	0.73
United Kingdom	0.71
Ireland	0.67
Finland	0.61
Estonia	0.58
Lithuania	0.57
Poland	0.55
Romania	0.48
Bulgaria	0.22

CHANGE IN LEVEL OF EXPOSURE TO THE MARKET ACCORDING TO LEVEL OF POVERTY, 2006-2015 (GAP BETWEEN THE INCREASE OF POOR HOUSEHOLDS AND THE INCREASE IN NON-POOR HOUSEHOLDS EXPOSED TO THE MARKET)

Denmark	14.10
France	12.60
Spain	10.90
United Kingdom	10.90
Czech Republic	7.10
Cyprus	7.00
Croatia (compared to 2010)	5.70
Bulgaria	5.50
The Netherlands	5.30
Greece	4.10
Austria	4.10
Sweden	3.20
Estonia	2.40
Ireland	2.30
Latvia	2.20
Lithuania	1.90
Portugal	1.00
Malta	0.70
Romania	0.60
Hungary	-0.10
Finland	-0.20
Slovenia	-0.20
Italy	-0.50
Belgium	-0.70
Luxembourg	-1.50
Slovakia	-2.60
Germany (compared to 2010)	-3.10
Poland	-4.80

Housing fosters inequalities: a natural disaster?

Evolution of housing cost between poor and non-poor households (2008-2013)

Within 5 countries where difference increased most, 4 were under « memorandum of understanding ».

Institutions need to be more clearly contributive to social justice.

(Luxembourg, 11th, with +4,50)

Grèce	+18,90
Estonie	+15,30
Danemark	+14,40
Irlande	+11,20
Portugal	+11,00
Slovaquie	+8,80
Lettonie	+8,40
Autriche	+7,50
Allemagne (comparaison avec 2010)	+6,30
Lituanie	+6,30
France	+6,30
Bulgarie	+5,70

Three key factors for housing exclusion

Speculative bubbles. Crash every ten years : evictions,

prices drop, construction stops ,junk bonds, all economy in a mess. New Bubble. (7 million repossession in USA (2007-2011), 92 000 jobs lost in France (2012-2016).

Demographic change. Life expetency, divorce, migration from shrinking areas. 7,2 million households move each year. External migration have a residual impact on demand.

Homeless by restriction on rights

- Young people (no access to minimum income)
- **Migrants** (barriers in access to social housing, to welfare State)
- Disable people (desinstitutionnalisation, without adapted provisions)

Chances to be deprived when you are poor **Chances to** be evicted (general population)

PAYS	Rapport pauvres/nor pauvres 2013
Estonie	1,41
Irlande	1,46
Royaume-Uni	1,61
Malte	1,90
Croatie	1,96
Gréce	2,15
Lettonie	2,27
Italie	2,51
Pologne	2,63
Portugal	2,65
Slovênie	2,71
Lituanie	2,80
Roumanie	3,15
Chypre	3,20
Hongrie	3,40
Union européenne (28 pays depuis 2010)	3,46
Espagne	4,00
Autriche	4,07
République tchéque	4,26
Allemagne	4,80
Bulgarie	5,10
Finlande	5,40
Suéde	5,44
Slovaquie	6,04
France	7,00
Danemark	7,79
Luxembourg	13,33
Pays-Bas	18,67
Belgique	23,50
Hongrie	45,70
Roumanie	52,90

Expulsions en % de la population	2013
Lituanie (LT)	0.00
Rumanie (RO)	0.00
Bulgarie (BG)	0.01
Croatie (HR)	0.02
Hongrie (HU)	0.02
Slovaquie (SK)	0.02
République Tchèque (CZ)	0.03
Danemark (DK)	0.03
Slovénie (SI)	0.04
Autriche (AT)	0.06
Pays-Bas (NL)	0.07
Malte (MT)	0.07
Suède (SE)	0.08
Grèce (EL)	0.09
Irlande (IE)	0.09
Portugal (PT)	0.10
Allemagne (DE)	0.10
Italie	0.11
Espagne (ES)	0.12
Finlande (FI)	0.12
Lettonie (LV)	0.12
Estonie (EE)	0.12
Pologne (PL)	0.13
Union Européenne (28)	0.14
Chypre (CY)	0.18
France (FR)	0.24
Belgique (BE)	0.27
Royaume Uni (UK)	0.28
Luxembourg (LU)	0.41

Risk to live in a cold home when you are poor Indice d'inégalité face au logement froid GEO/TIME Rapport Pauvres / non Evolution de l'écart pauvres 2013 pauvre - non pauvre depuis 2008 Lituanie 1.2 -4,5 Malte 1.6 7,7 1.8 12,2 Bulgarie 1.9 -5,4 Portugal 1.9 1,8 Chypre Lettonie 2.0 -4,1 2.0 Grèce 6,4 2.3 6,2 Irlande Roumanie 2.3 3,1 2.5 1,1 Estonie 2.5 0.5 Pays-Bas 2.6 Royaume-Uni (comparaison avec 2012) Trop court Espagne 2.6 1,3 **République tchèque** 2,7 -2,6 2.7 -2,2 Pologne Finlande 2.8 -1,0 Italie 2.8 8,1 3.0 3,1 Union européenne 3,2 9,7 Hongrie Danemark 3.3 2,0 3.5 5,5 France 4,1 Croatie (comparaison avec 2010) 3.7 3.7 -0,4 Slovénie 4.2 3,5 Slovaguie 4,5 1,1 Luxembourg -0,7 Autriche 4,6 5,1 2,4 Belgigue 5.3 0,1 Allemagne 1.2 12,3 Suède

Access to public transportation in low density area

(income interquartile rate)

Eastern and mediterranean countries

Pays-Bas	0,83
Belgique	0,86
Allemagne	0,87
Danemark	0,89
Finlande	0,96
Luxembourg	0,97
Royaume-Uni	0,98
Suède	0,98
Grèce	1,00
France	1,01
Autriche	1,02
Espagne	1,03
Union européenne (28 pays)	1,03
Chypre	1,04
Irlande	1,09
Hongrie	1,09
République tchèque	1,09
Italie	1,13
Bulgarie	1,15
Slovaquie	1,16
Roumanie	1,16
Nouveaux Etats membres (12 pays	1,18
Slovénie	1,19
Estonie	1,20
Pologne	1,21
Portugal /	1,25
Lettonie	1,25
Lituanie	1,25
Greatie	1,33

Gender effect

Generally not a huge gender effect, less risk for women to be in severe deprivation, but more risk to be under cost overburden. Differences between countries would justify a sight on wlefare systems and update criteria for allowances...

RISK FOR WOMEN OF SEVERE HOUSING DEPRIVATION COMPARED TO MEN, AMONG POOR HOUSEHOLDS

ige -13

COUNTRY	2013	Chan 2008
Malta	0.53	-0,
Belgium	0.70	-0.3
Finland	0.75	-0.3
The Netherlands	0.78	-0.3
Denmark (compared to 2011)	0.79	-1.1
Cyprus	0.80	0.0
Spain (compared to 2011)	0.84	0.0
United Kingdom (compared to 2012)	0.88	-0.3
Luxembourg	0.89	0.6
Slovakia	0.91	0.3
Latvia	0.92	-1.5
Italy	0.92	-0.
Romania	0.93	-0.1
Greece	0.94	-0.
Portugal	0.95	0.0
Poland	0.96	0.2
New Member States (12 countries)	0.96	0.1
European Union (28 countries)	0.96	-0.
European Union (15 countries)	0.97	0.0
Hungary	0.98	0.6
Bulgaria	0.99	0.2
Ireland	1	-0.
France	1	0.2
Austria	1	-0.5
Lithuania (compared to 2011)	1.01	1.1
Croatia (compared to 2010)	1.01	0.6
Estonia	1.04	0.1
Sweden	1.07	0.2
Czech Republic	1.08	0.2
Slovenia (compared to 2011)	1.10	0.6
Germany	1.13	0.1

RISK FOR WOMEN OF HOUSING COST OVERBURDEN COMPARED TO MEN, AMONG POOR HOUSEHOLDS

COUNTRY	2013	Change
Spain (compared to 2009)	0.95	-0.6
United Kingdom (compared to 2012)	0.96	0.7
Ireland	0.98	-0.2
Luxembourg	0.98	-0.9
Estonia	1.03	0.0
Slovenia	1.03	-0.1
Portugal	1.04	0.1
The Netherlands	1.06	0.2
Greece	1.09	1.1
Denmark	1.09	0.7
Hungary	1.10	-0.6
Finland	1.11	-0.1
Slovakia	1.11	-1.5
European Union (15 countries)	1.12	0.2
Malta	1.13	-0.1
European Union (28 countries since 2010)	1.13	0.1
Belgium	1.15	-0.5
Romania	1.15	-0.7
Austria	1.17	-0.2
France	1.17	-0.2
Italy	1.18	-0.1
New Member States (12 countries)	1.18	-0.1
Poland	1.18	-0.2
Croatia (compared to 2010)	1.18	-0.6
Сургиз	1.20	0.2
Germany (compared to 2010)	1.22	1.3
Bulgaria	1.24	1.3
Latvia	1.25	-0.3
Czech Republic	1.28	0.4
Lithuania	1.33	1.5
Sweden	1.34	0.6

European Index on Housing Exclusion

(overburden, arrears, overcrowding, deprivation, fuel poverty)

Luxembourg on top...



No overlap between social models and housing justice.

Inequality mainly in South and East, but exceptions (Estonia, Denmark) and need to see future trends (i.e. impact of reforms from PM Cameron in England)

5 countries in a worrying situation : Latvia, Romania, Bulgaria, Hungary and Greece.

1.	Luxembourg	37
2	Finlande	42
3	Belgique	47
	Pays-Bas	47
5	Suède	49
6	Malte	53
7	Allemagne	62
8	Autriche	64
9	Estonie	66
10	Irlande	76
11	Royaume-Uni	77
12	France	79
13	Chypre	80
	Danemark	80
15	Espagne	81
16	Slovénie	86
17	Croatie	96
18	Slovaquie	100
19	Lituanie	102
	Portugal	102
21	Rep. Tchèque	103
22	Pologne	110
23	Italie	112
24	Lettonie	123
25	Roumanie	126
26	Bulgarie	131
27	Hangrie	147
28	Grèce	149

Pros and cons in Luxembourg

- Good on share of householdds overburden (6th), but worrying trend (20th on evolution from 2008)
- Average 9th on housing arrears (rent/mortgage), but excellent 2nd on bill arears. Weird 28th on forced eviction...(?)
- 3rd on capacity yo warm one's home, but 10th on severe material deprivation.
- Very good to limit over-risk due to age, (3rd) to fall in severe deprivation, same for women (4th). Not as keen with youg people (14th)

What can we do ?

- Land collective control
- Urban planning and architecture revolution.
- Community development vs. social work : the Welfare Ourselves.
- Share the wealth: taxation revolution.

Why not build our own cathedral ?

\$1.000bn worldwide investment fund for sustainable housing

- Need to foster productive economy
- Need to spread low qualified jobs
- Need to stabilize demographic moves
- Need for a « climate friendly » construction sector
- Need for more visibly useful institutions for citizens
- Investment public tools, savings, sovereign funds : means are not far.

A Russian puppet to start at a EU level...?

Thank you muhry@fap.fr



In memory of Christine, for whom I was too long to find a solution, as for too many others...