

Nordic Journal of Surveying and Real Estate Research 15:1 (2020) 7–37

submitted on 11 January 2020

revised on 31 March 2020

revised on 2 June 2020

accepted 2 July 2020

Meeting a Growing Homelessness: How Could Three Swedish Affordable Housing Initiatives Be Analysed from Perspectives of Social and Economic Sustainability?

Anna Granath Hansson

Department of Real Estate and Construction Management,
KTH Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm, Sweden

Contact: agh@kth.se

***Abstract.** Homelessness has increased substantially in Sweden in the last decade with an emphasis on structural homelessness. Further, municipalities have the responsibility to house a certain number of newly arrived immigrants under the Settlement Act. Many municipalities have had difficulties in meeting the acute housing need, as well as its costs, and have started to look at new types of housing solutions. Initiatives of the civil society and private developers have been encouraged. This paper investigates three civil society and private housing developments and how they might contribute to socially and economically sustainable housing solutions for households in or on the verge to homelessness. In order to operationalize social and economic sustainability in relation to these local projects, a definition and an analytical set of questions have been developed based on the literature and project data. It is concluded that all three projects are socially and economically sustainable at the outset, but that certain traits of the project set-ups make them more uncertain in the longer run. The concept of sustainability proved fruitful in analysing the projects, but in many cases, non-physical factors will be person dependent and therefore difficult to generalise. As it is expected that this new type of housing in the Swedish setting will increase in numbers, the definition and analytical set of questions should be tested in relation to more projects and be developed further.*

***Keywords:** affordable housing, homelessness, social sustainability, economic sustainability, project development*

1 Introduction

As many other countries around the world, Sweden has in recent years experienced an affordable housing shortage. Households with low or no income from employment face major difficulties in entering the regular

housing market, despite a relatively generous welfare system. The number of households facing homelessness has increased substantially and at the time of the last national survey, 33,000 grown-ups were recorded as homeless (Socialstyrelsen 2017). A distinction is made between ‘social homelessness’ and ‘structural homelessness’. Social homelessness is typically caused by social problems such as drug abuse or psychosocial difficulties, often accompanied by an economically strained situation. Structural homelessness appears when households that do not have any outspoken social problems cannot access the housing market on their own merits. This group represents the major share of the increase in homelessness in recent years (Socialstyrelsen 2017). Immigrants are over-represented in the statistics of the three larger cities (Stockholm 2018; Göteborg 2019; Malmö 2019). Further, municipalities have the responsibility of housing a certain number of recent immigrants according to the fair share scheme in the Settlement Act of 2016.

The main tools of municipalities to house vulnerable households are their housing companies and/or municipal social contracts with private property owners. However, the use of these tools is limited by the number of vacant apartments and demand from other groups in the case of municipal housing companies, and by private property owners’ willingness to sign social contracts. As some municipalities have had difficulties in providing housing for the growing number of homeless or potentially homeless, a few private and civil society pilot initiatives have been initiated in an attempt to close part of the gap. Municipalities have often played a central role in this development as they have encouraged private actors to develop new concepts. This has raised the question of how private and civil society initiatives might complement public housing provision and make an addition to sustainable housing concepts. An extensive international literature discusses private and civil society participation in various housing systems, for instance related to faith-based housing (e.g. de Souza Briggs 2004), inclusionary housing (e.g. de Kam et al. 2014) and mixed-income housing (e.g. Vale and Shamsuddin 2017). However, to the knowledge of the author, there is a very limited recent literature on the topic of private initiatives connected to housing for social purposes in the Nordic context. The aim of this paper is to close part of the research gap by describing and analysing three civil society and private initiatives in Sweden.

The fruitfulness of analysing the projects from a sustainability perspective will be tested, as sustainability is at the core of Swedish policy and debate on urban development. Public bodies use the concept in planning and evaluations and private actors include these perspectives in their business plans and work related to corporate social responsibility (CSR). Further, the herein presented projects might be seen as a combination of the UN Millennium Development Goals *11.1: Safe and affordable housing* and *17: Partnerships for the goals* (Global Goals 2019). Three research questions have been formulated as follows: 1) How might the projects be understood from perspectives of social and economic sustainability?; 2) How could sustainability be operationalized?, and finally; 3) Is sustainability a fruitful approach to analysing the projects?

After this introduction, the methods section describe the research design and data extraction. The following literature review on social and economic sustainability is undertaken to narrow down how the sustainability concept can be operationalized in relation to the projects. Thereafter follows the description of the three cases and the analysis and discussion. Last, conclusions are drawn.

2 Methods and data

This multiple case study analyses three different pilot projects that aim to increase affordable housing supply through initiatives of the civil society and private developers. Case studies might be used ‘*to examine a small number of empirical cases holistically to grasp the causal processes leading to observed similarities and differences*’ (Pickvance 2001, p. 15). Further, Thomas (2011, p. 515) suggests that case studies are ‘*about discovering and testing tools of explanation*’. However, as case studies are delimited in space and time, generalizability will be limited accordingly.

Case selection was limited by the scarcity of such projects in Sweden and therefore a strategic sampling or information-oriented selection (Flyvbjerg 2006) was made, based on expectations regarding information content and maximising information utility in small samples. As the three cases address households that face similar difficulties on the housing market, but have different agents and solutions, it was deemed interesting to compare the three as to their similarities and differences and to extract certain vital characteristics. The data was collected in three different processes and research contexts in the period August 2018 – May 2019, as follows.

Case 1: Charity developing housing for socially vulnerable singles and pairs. Data for Case 1 (hereinafter referred to as Case Stockholm City Mission) was extracted through a form of action-based research. In 2018, the author was contacted by a charity that wishes to develop a pilot housing project and asked for advice in certain housing policy, real estate economic and legal matters. It was agreed that the project responsible at the charity and the author would meet regularly and discuss project possibilities and difficulties as the project evolved. Most of the data is hence based on four project development discussions, detailed notes from these meetings and e-mail exchanges connected thereto, as well as documentation written by the project responsible. During the project meetings, the author had the opportunity to ask semi-structured questions related to this study.

Case 2: Social entrepreneur developing rental housing for vulnerable and established families. Data for Case 2 (hereinafter referred to as Case Sire) was extracted when the author participated in a research project initiated by a social entrepreneur and partly funded by Vinnova, a Swedish state research fund. The developer had engaged a group consisting of four municipal representatives, one representative of Save the Children, three researchers, one service designer consultant and two representatives of the developer. The group met for two full day and two half-day workshops during the autumn of 2018 to jointly discuss and

test the prerequisites and development possibilities of the housing project. The project conclusions were summarized in a report. Further, representatives of Sire and the author met at two occasions to discuss project prerequisites more in detail. The author then had the opportunity to ask semi-structured questions on topics related to this study and take detailed notes.

Case 3: Commercial project developer mixing tenant-ownership apartments and municipal rental housing for former refugees. The author first came into contact with Case 3 (hereinafter referred to as Case BoKlok) when engaged by the developer to hold a workshop on social initiatives in housing development. Data on Case BoKlok was extracted through a traditional case study. Documents connected to the housing supply strategy of the municipality were studied, as well as project documentation in the form of the agreement between the municipality, the tenant-ownership association and the developer, documentation related to the set-up of the tenant-ownership association and the developer’s marketing material. To complete the picture given by the document study, interviews were made with the contract responsible within the municipality and with the developer’s responsible for social sustainability in January and March 2019. Both interviewees had participated in project negotiations. The two semi-structured interviews were conducted in the offices of interviewees and recorded.

Table 1. Data overview.

	Case Stockholm City Mission	Case 2 Sire	Case BoKlok
Documents	Internal project reports	Final report of the innovation project funded by Vinnova, workshop material	The cooperation agreement between the tenant-ownership association, BoKlok Housing and the municipality, the economic plan of the association, marketing material, municipal documents related to housing policy
Verbal data	Interviews with the project developer	Interviews with the project developer, participation in workshops arranged by the project developer including municipal representatives	Interviews with the municipality and the project developer

The case study used a fixed design, first describing each case in some detail, then analysing the three cases in relation to a proposed definition (see section 3.1) and a set of analytical questions (see table 2) and finally discussing and trying to explain the project drivers and how they affect social and economic sustainability.

The data analysis was made in steps: 1) What were the answers to the analytical questions for each project? Could some questions only be answered tentatively or not at all?, and; 2) Did the project fulfil the prerequisites of the proposed definition? If not, what were the missing components? Data from discussions, workshops, interviews, and documents were analysed according to the same method. Only tangible facts related to the analytical questions and the definition were extracted as it provided sufficient material for the scope and purpose of this limited study. Intangible information expressed by participants in meetings and interviews have not been included, even though this might have further diversified the analysis.

Researcher bias has been considered, especially in relation to Case Stockholm City Mission and Case Sire, as the author of this paper worked with the project teams on developing the concepts. However, the basic structures of the projects were set before the author came into the projects and the author had no major influence on the project details as they are described in this paper. Although the seminars and interviews with project teams gave full pictures of project structures, as well as potential weaknesses (points of discussion), the aim of the author's participation was to work on details, such as the potential for community building in Case Sire and institutional hurdles such as rent-setting principles in Case Stockholm City Mission. These detailed discussions, and the potential influence of the author's contributions to them, are not deemed to influence neither the structure of the housing projects at the time of data collection, nor the results of the research project. The author has been aware of potential bias in analysis and has therefore taken a critical stance in all three cases. Flyvbjerg's (2006, p. 237) claim that '*the case study contains a greater bias towards falsification of preconceived notions than toward verification*' was evident as the research project evolved and the many hurdles to realising the three pilot housing projects and upholding sustainability over time became explicit.

In order to increase data reliability, project descriptions were verified by developers as they were invited to read part of the paper before publication. Internal validity or credibility (Shah and Corley 2006) was enhanced by making sure to collect as much available data as possible about the pilot projects and by using different types of data, through peer debriefings within the academy and member checks (informal soundings with members of the housing industry, public bodies and interest organisations). Transferability or external validity was ensured through the thick description of the cases.

3 Sustainability in the literature and the operationalisation of sustainability in the study

Sustainability considerations have a long history, also related to urban planning and development (for example Scanlon et al. 2014; Opp 2017). The three sustainability dimensions, environmental, social and economic (and sometimes a fourth, institutional), are today widely accepted and argued to be interlinked. However, there is no common understanding of the relationship between the different dimensions of sustainability or how to measure them (Griessler and Littig 2005). There might also be a tension or imbalance between the sustainability dimensions,

which ask for a compromise between them (Rashidfarokhi et al. 2018). Moreover, there are no generally accepted definitions of social and economic sustainability. Boström (2012) points both to theoretical concerns regarding the lack of distinct definitions and to practical concerns regarding operationalization in concrete projects. In this section, literature on social and economic sustainability relevant to the study will be reviewed, and then used to operationalize these concepts in the study.

3.1 Social sustainability

Social sustainability has been defined in a number of ways, which has both contributed to a better understanding of the variety of the concept and to confusion as to what it really means. Vallance et al. (2011, p. 346) refer to social sustainability as a “rather messy conceptual field in which there is a good deal of uncertainty about the term’s many meanings and applications”. Weingaertner & Moberg (2011) point to that interpretations of social sustainability are context dependent and that aspects used to define it are often closely interrelated. Moreover, variations in scoping and context as well as whether a life cycle perspective is taken or not further complicates a common understanding. However, several attempts to clarify the term have been made:

Shirazi and Keivani (2017) conducted a meta-analysis of the theory and practice of social sustainability in the built environment from the 1990s until today. Their results indicate seven central principles associated with social sustainability: 1) equity, 2) democracy, participation and civic society; 3) social inclusion and mix; 4) social networking and interaction; 5) livelihood and sense of place, 6) safety and security and 7) human well-being and quality of life. Key themes pointed out by Bramley et al. (2009) are accessibility, such as access to services, recreation, public transport, jobs and affordable housing, and experiential outcomes, such as social interaction, security, stability and satisfaction with the home and the environment. Much in the same line of thought, Dempsey et al. (2011) focus on social sustainability at the scale of the neighbourhood and highlight claimed connections to the built environment. The key themes of social sustainability are expressed as equitable access and the sustainability of the community itself. Opp (2017) highlights equal access and opportunity, environmental justice, community and the value of place, as well as basic human needs. She supports Bramley et al. (2009) when it comes to accessibility, but add local environmental quality. Eizenberg and Jabareen (2017) express social sustainability as equity, safety, sustainable urban forms and eco-presumption. From this, three relevant themes were brought into this study: 1) basic human needs (safety and security; access to decent affordable housing); 2) access to society (a variety of factors such as services, employment and transport), and; 3) sustainability of the community itself (for example social interaction and inclusion, creation of social capital and stability), factors that to a large extent have experiential outcomes.

Further, Dempsey et al. (2011) make a distinction between non-physical factors, such as employment and social inclusion, and predominantly physical factors, such as decent housing and an attractive public realm. Eizenberg and

Jabareen (2017) also argue for a combination of physical and non-physical factors when addressing social sustainability. It is claimed that there has been a bias towards physical factors as those are more tangible and measureable and therefore easier to evaluate. Non-physical factors such as social cohesion, participation, education and training, on the other hand, are described as dynamic, difficult to anticipate, identify and measure, as well as implement through planning and policy. Nevertheless, it is argued that both are needed to catch the whole scope of the social sustainability complex. When addressing non-physical factors, Opp (2017) points to the importance of inter alia education, social capital, social segregation as well as safety and security. The distinction between physical and non-physical factors was deemed relevant and brought into the present study.

Weingaertner & Moberg (2011) advocate a life-cycle perspective, for example to identify risk, but also point to the importance of distinguishing between what can and cannot be influenced by the agents involved. It is also acknowledged that sustainability is a dynamic concept that change over time in a place (Dempsey et al. 2011). Shirazi and Keivani (2017) point to the importance of any evaluation framework to take goal and scale of the study into consideration. Further, they emphasize that results related to social sustainability are place-specific and sociocultural-driven, which has implications for generalization. All these considerations are brought in to the study, with emphasis on the life-cycle perspective and agents for change versus agents affected by change.

Vallance et al. (2011) introduce development, bridge and maintenance sustainability. Development sustainability is said to address basic needs and the creation of social capital et cetera, bridge sustainability is described as behavioural change to achieve biophysical goals, while maintenance sustainability addresses sustention of sociocultural characteristics. The present paper focuses on development sustainability, but bridge sustainability might also be used to develop thinking in relation to behavioural change that would enhance housing opportunities. Further, maintenance sustainability might become interesting in a long-term perspective, both in relation to neighbours' reactions to projects and to reactions of residents themselves.

3.2 Economic sustainability

Just as for social sustainability, there is no consensus on the definition of economic sustainability. Two major lines can be traced, either economic sustainability is understood as economic development that does not negatively affect environmental or social sustainability, or it is equated with economic growth irrespective of its influence on the two other parameters of sustainability (KTH Sustainability 2019). Economic sustainability is often measured at the macro level e.g. in terms of economic growth, equity, efficiency, the rights of current versus future generations or as part of corporate social responsibility (CSR) policies (for example Spangenberg 2005). These broad concepts are however difficult to operationalize on the local project scale. Instead, alternative methods have been sought.

Several indices exist that intend to go beyond GDP growth and measure well-being, economic welfare and sustainability, e.g. ISEW and GPI (Bleys 2013).

Economic welfare is then based on costs and benefits of the economic process, as 'the economic dimension of well-being' (Bleys 2013, p. 498). Although indices are not applicable on the local project scale, cost-benefit analysis might be applied to a certain extent, depending on data availability.

Spangenberg (2005) points to a number of criteria for sustainable system development: 1) Existence and reproduction: The system must be able to continuously exist and reproduce itself in the normal state of the system environment; 2) Effectivity: The system must be effective (not necessarily efficient) in providing essential resources; 3) Freedom of Action: As the system environment is not homogenous, the system must be able to cope with diversity of supplies, and also of challenges; 4) Security: As the system environment is not constant, the system must cope with variability, i.e., states of the environment distant from the normal state; 5) Adaptability: As the system environment evolves, the system must cope with changes in the normal state of its environment by adapting its own structures, and ; 6) Co-existence: Every system is dependent on exchange with its environment. Undermining the viability of the system environment is thus a lethal strategy. According to Bossel (1999), maintaining the viability of a system is equivalent to its sustainability, and viability is maintained if a system is able to react adequately on changes in its system environment.

Zalejska-Jonsson (2018) discusses life cycle costing (LCC), a concept often used in construction research. LCC is described as the assessment of investment efficiency. Limitations of the method as to timeframe, difficulties in predicting vital components of calculus (for example maintenance strategies), differing conditions for participants (for example time value of money or consumption preferences) and uncertainties related to technical innovation etcetera are pointed out. Further estimation of cost, risk and viable income may differ depending on what actors are engaged in the project.

The literature review on economic sustainability pointed to two perspectives deemed relevant to the study: cost-benefit considerations and a life-cycle perspective. Further, considerations on system existence and reproduction, effectivity, security, adaptability and co-existence were brought into the study.

3.3 The operationalization of sustainability in the study

Shirazi and Keivani (2017, p. 1539) argue that '*the lack of solid definition and conceptual framework is not a disadvantage: it reflects the complexity of the social dimension of sustainability and also allows researchers to develop case-specific and place-specific formulations.*' Following this thought, a tool for analysis suited to the context of this paper has been developed, based on thoughts raised by the literature review and the project data. The tool consists of two components: a list of analytical questions and a definition.

To be able to apply the concept of social sustainability in practice context-specific information is necessary, as well as 'questions to help narrow down what is relevant for social sustainability in that particular context or project' (Weingaertner and Moberg 2011, p. 130). In the present context, questions such as "what", "why", and "for whom" (Weingaertner and Moberg 2011) clearly need

an answer, also related to the economic perspective. In order to operationalize the sustainability concept in this research project, a list of project-related analytical questions is included in Table 2. The questions were structured according to principles derived from the literature, as follows:

Aspects of social sustainability were separated from aspects of economic sustainability as such a distinction facilitates understanding of what the two concepts might signify on project level. Further, it was deemed important to take a stakeholder perspective and look at both agents for change and those affected by change (Weingaertner & Moberg 2011). It is hypothesized that agents for change will be project developers, while agents affected by change will be households. However, indications of households acting as agents for change will be sought, as *inter alia* participation, empowerment, social interaction and community building are seen as cornerstones of social sustainability (for example Bramley et al. 2009, Dempsey et al. 2011 and Shirazi and Keivani 2017). The ability of the household to take control over its life situation is also emphasized as short and long-term affordability, contract terms and incentives to improve the housing situation are considered.

Following Dempsey et al. (2011) and Eizenberg and Jabareen (2017), both physical and non-physical factors are analysed. First, the very basic physical factors reflecting basic human needs related to the housing situation of the household were incorporated in the list (present risk exposure, potential to come out of homelessness and potential future housing standard). Thereafter, other factors, which were not deemed essential, but would add significantly to sustainability, were added. Here, also economic parameters connected to affordability and household incentives were added. As it is acknowledged that impact of non-physical factors related to the sustainability of the community itself will be dynamic, difficult to anticipate, identify and measure, as well as implement (Dempsey et al., 2011; Eizenberg and Jabareen, 2017), the related question has been formulated as “potential for social integration through non-physical factors”. Although physical factors related to access to society might be easier to evaluate, perceived impact is in many cases bound to be person-dependent. Therefore, also impact of physical factors (other than the most basic as described above) are formulated as “potential for social integration”.

The life cycle approach (Weingaertner and Moberg 2011; Zalejska-Jonsson 2018) is incorporated as both short and long term perspectives are considered. It is deemed important to analyse whether the housing solution is temporary or long-term and what conditions influence housing security. Perspectives on existence and reproduction, as well as effectiveness (Spangenberg 2005) of housing models, also have to be considered. It is deemed important not to study the three pilot projects only at completion (or some other point in time), but from a life-cycle perspective to assess their ability to cope with a changing world (Bossel 1999). Moreover, the potential to reproduce projects is deemed an important indicator of sustainability. It is hypothesised that reproduction relies heavily on effectiveness, which has been a guiding principle when formulating the project developer questions. Last, the measurement scale, here the development project and its

Table 2. List of analytical questions.

<p>SOCIAL SUSTAINABILITY</p>	<p>Attendant questions for the household:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To what risks is the household exposed? What problem(s) need to be solved? 2. To what degree does the project provide an opportunity to come out of homelessness? 3. What housing standard does the project provide compared to the preceding housing solution? 4. What terms and conditions does the household have (short and long term)? 5. What incentives does the household have to maintain or improve its housing situation? 6. Does the project offer a path to a self-sustained housing solution or to enhanced chances on the regular housing market? 7. What is the potential for social integration through the physical factors? 8. What is the potential for social integration through the non-physical factors?
<p>Overarching question: Is the housing solution socially sustainable for involved agents in the short and long-term?</p>	<p>Attendant questions for the project developer:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Why is the housing concept created? What problem is it intended to solve? 2. What vision does the project developer have for the housing concept? What physical factors are considered? Does it include non-physical factors? If yes, which and to what extent are they measurable? 3. To what risks are project developers exposed? What problem(s) need to be solved? 4. To what degree does the project structure contribute to a long-term solution to the identified problem, such that there is an interest in repeating the project, both from the project developer's and other actors' perspectives?
<p>ECONOMIC SUSTAINABILITY</p>	<p>Attendant questions for the household:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Does the household afford the housing created, based on their present vs. future incomes? 2. What assumptions are made regarding the income development of households? How do these assumptions influence the long-term sustainability of the project structure? 3. What incentives do the households have to improve their economy and housing situation without assistance? Are there lock-in effects in the project structure?
<p>Overarching question: Is the housing solution economically sustainable for involved agents in the short and long-term?</p>	<p>Attendant questions for the project developer:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the project economically viable in the short and long run? 2. What risks are present in the economic structure of the project? What safety margins exist? Is there identified potential added value? 3. How do financiers assess the project? What risks do financiers identify in relation to their potential participation in the project?

surroundings in relation to agents, determines the number and nature of measuring indicators (Shirazi and Keivani 2017).

The second component of the tool is a definition. Social and economic sustainability in the context of this paper is hypothesized to mean:

A housing solution providing a reasonable quality dwelling within the economic limits of the household under predictable conditions such that the household can plan for the future, and which also facilitates access to and integration into the surrounding community. Moreover, the solution must be deemed effective and the organisational effort and cost to the project developer must be within the limits of the project developer, such that there are incentives to repeat the project.

4 Case studies

This section presents the three case studies, first in an overview (see Table 3) and thereafter more thoroughly case by case. For each case the background, the project idea and implementation are described, as well as the discussion points that have been identified in relation to social and economic sustainability.

Table 3. Case descriptions.

Case	Stockholm City Mission	Sire	BoKlok
Project developer type	Charity	Social entrepreneur	Commercial project developer
Project	Rental apartments for socially and structurally homeless households.	Rental apartments for structurally homeless households with children and other households with children.	Municipal social contracts in a tenant-ownership association.
Target group	Grown-ups with access problems on the regular housing market, incl. Housing First	Structurally homeless, newly arrived immigrant families with children, women with children that are homeless due to violence in the family and established households with children to create social mix and integration	Households that have been assigned to the municipality through the Settlement Act
Type of contract	Rental contract between the property owner and the tenant, separate rent subsidy contract	Rental contract between the property owner and the tenant with reduced rents	Rental contract between the property owner and the municipality, sublease between the municipality and the tenant, the tenant has a buy option

Parties	The property owner and the tenants	The property owner and the tenants	The tenant-ownership association, the tenants, the municipality and the project developer
Partners in development of the model	The charity develops the model on its own, but has an intense exchange with municipalities and other housing market actors	The developer, the municipality, Save the Children and researchers	The developer and the municipality
Project stage	Business model under development	Business model under development	Completed in 2019

4.1 Case Stockholm City Mission

The number of homeless grown-ups in contact with the city of Stockholm or some of the charities working within the city decreased between 2004 and 2016, however a slight increase was noted between 2016 and 2018 (Stockholm 2018). In September 2018, the city counted 2,439 persons as officially homeless (Stockholm 2018). Substance abuse is the most common reason for homelessness, followed by a need of economic support and psychosocial problems. Eighteen percent are deemed not to have any other need of support but to get access to housing, which can be interpreted as a structural homelessness according to the city (Stockholm 2018).

Stockholm City Mission (*Stockholms Stadsmission*) is an independent organisation working with social relief based on a Christian ethos. The organisation, which was founded in 1853, has a long experience of working with people in or on the verge to homelessness. Stockholm City Mission 'steps in when public efforts are inadequate' (Stockholm City Mission 2019) (translation by the author) and has a variety of operations that complement public services, also contracted work for the city. In the years 2015–2018 Stockholm City Mission ran the project 'Särskildnyttan' with the goal of creating innovative housing solutions to decrease homelessness. When the project ended in 2018, outcome did not match goals and expectations in terms of number and quality of dwellings. The advantages of an owned housing stock to dispose of were discussed and it was decided to carry on the work with the goal to build or buy 50–100 apartments and find a social and financial model for the management of such a housing stock.

4.1.1 Project idea and implementation

The goal of the Stockholm City Mission pilot project is to build and manage rental housing in which rents can be adjusted to the tenant's life situation over time. The target groups are both households with a need of social and monetary support as well as structurally homeless singles or pairs. To start with, the organisation plans to build around 50 apartments of 45 square metres each. An application to acquire land for the project from the city of Stockholm was submitted, but not awarded. New applications in the suburbs of Stockholm are planned. The future buildings

are envisaged to be built in already developed and well-functioning parts of the city or in larger development areas where there is a good supply of services, public transport and a proximity to workplaces. Moreover, architects will be hired to optimize the architectural quality in relation to costs. As the buildings are to be kept and managed long-term, advantageous life-cycle costs are deemed more important than minimizing investment cost.

The apartments shall be reserved for households that have difficulties to set foot on the housing market. The tenants can be divided into three categories: fully paying tenants (45%), tenants that receive a rent subsidy (45%) and social apartments for which the municipality and the Stockholm City Mission have social support contracts (10%). Parts of the latter category will be based on the Housing First-model. The fully paying tenants will partly consist of households with a sufficient income to pay the rent in new apartments, but that do not have sufficient housing references, for example due to previous rental payment defaults. The different categories provide a possibility to create a mix of households and may vary over time.

The rent level will initially be set in the lower end of the interval applying to similar newly built rental apartments. The rent is then subsidised according to the need of the household and for a period of time that is deemed relevant to the household. A maximum subsidy period of three years is foreseen. Hence, the rent will not be tied to a specific apartment but will be entirely based on the need of the household. The rental contract and the rent subsidy contract will accordingly be two separate contracts. The rental subsidy will be gradually phased out with a certain time lag in relation to income increases in order to reduce lock-in effects. A corresponding model with a gradual increase of subsidy in case of income reductions is also being considered. A follow-up and test of the rent subsidy will be made on a yearly basis. The subsidy can be cancelled if the apartment is sublet, if the tenant takes on a lodger, if the rent is not paid, if disturbances occur or if the tenant does not declare all his or her income.

Stockholm City Mission will have their own housing queue with the possibility to give priority to certain households in acute situations. When the eligibility of a household is tested a generous assessment of the household's economy and payment history will be made, but the rent should never exceed fifty percent of the household income (including benefits).

Under Swedish rental law (Jordabalk (1970:994) 12:35), tenants have a right to exchange their rental contract for a right to use another dwelling (rental or owned). This right is not possible to bargain away for permanent dwellings, but can be made subject to certain conditions. This has two implications for the project: 1) it is important to separate the rental contract and the rent subsidy such that the subsidy is tied to a person in need and cannot be transferred to a tenant that have different needs or might not be in need and, 2) irrespective of the rent level, the landlord wishes to have control over what categories of households that live in its stock, again to be sure to target households in need. Different models that implement the basic thoughts behind the project over time are being tested.

The rent subsidies are to be financed through profits made on the letting of the apartments for which full rents are paid. On top of this, the project is expected to generate a limited profit as a buffer for unexpected events. Initial project calculus shows that both rent subsidies and a limited profit are feasible.

4.1.2 Points of discussion

In the Swedish setting, rent subsidies are usually tied to an apartment and not to a specific tenant. In this model, it is an explicit goal to tie the rent subsidy to the tenant and be able to adjust the subsidy in relation to the tenant's income over time. This is a new and untested model, which implies a need to analyse how the model can be implemented both in relation to the tenant and within the frame of the Swedish rental, tax and housing allowance systems. A couple of different variants are under discussion.

The most important question in relation to the tenant is how the rent subsidy contract can be written such that it is very clear under what circumstances the tenant can receive a rent subsidy and what conditions that apply during the rental term. This particularly applies to the conditions when the subsidy is phased out or cancelled.

In order to handle the Swedish rent setting system and get a foreseeable base rent for the buildings in the stock to base the economic calculus on, rents equivalent to the lower interval of rents in comparable newly built buildings will be set for all apartments. Then the individual rent subsidies are decided. It needs to be investigated whether the subsidies are considered a gift or a benefit according to Swedish tax law. If they are considered a benefit, they will be taxed, which will make the model more difficult to implement. If they are considered a gift, they will not be taxed. Another point that needs to be clarified is the eligibility for housing allowance. The question is if the rent subsidies will be included when the amount of housing allowance is calculated. Should that be the case, the rent subsidies will replace public transfers. Would the rent subsidies be possible to combine with housing allowance, the project could reach households on very low incomes.

An additional administrative question that needs to be decided upon within the pilot project is how the right of exchange is to be handled. To summarize, the model contains a number of components that are new to the Swedish housing market and need to be tested before a sustainable long-term solution can be implemented. Moreover, should project calculus not hold, or the need of rent subsidies be larger than presumed, the project might be exposed to a liquidity risk. Compromises between project goals and project economy might then have to be made.

4.2 Case Sire

The city of Malmö has a growing complex of homelessness problems and at present 1,959 grown-ups and 1,347 children live in acute homelessness (Malmö 2019). A large proportion of the households in acute homelessness have lived in Sweden for less than three years and have not managed to establish themselves on the labour and housing markets. These households are classified as structurally

homeless by the municipality, as they are not deemed to have any social problems. Moreover, the municipal homelessness report describe an increase in the number of women with children that have been victims of violence in the family and therefore have become homeless. The total costs of the municipality for the acute homelessness has increased considerably in recent years, among other things as households are placed in expensive temporary accommodation, for example in hostels or hotels. As the cost of homelessness has become untenable to the municipality, the possibility to lower costs and increase quality of the housing solutions provided are looked into, which also include non-municipal initiatives (Malmö 2018).

Sire is a new social entrepreneur set up by two architects with a long experience of housing development. The company focuses on developing scalable business models for housing solutions that address social issues without public subsidy. Sire is supported in their work to develop the business model by the state entrepreneurial fund Vinnova and the city of Malmö.

4.2.1 Project idea and implementation

In the project Low cost living (*Lågkostbo*), Sire has developed a business model to build rental housing with low rents without subsidies from the municipality (Sire 2019). The apartments will be let on standard rental contracts to families with children in three different life situations: structurally homeless immigrant families, women with children that are homeless due to prior violence in the family and households with children that are socially established in society, also on the job market. The latter group is envisaged to add to the socioeconomic mix and be a bridge in the establishment process of the other households. The pilot project consists of 45 apartments, of which 30 are planned for immigrant families, five for women with experience of violence and their children and ten for established households.

The apartments are to be situated in attractive new housing districts where the municipality allocates land. A built-out social and commercial service and good public communications are expected to enhance integration and possibilities to study and work. Moreover, common meeting places and interaction between different housing projects and people living in the area is enhanced when new housing districts are created.

The rent levels in the newly built apartments shall, according to the project calculus, be set at the same level as the medium rent in the whole Malmö housing stock, which is far lower than normal rents for newly built apartments. This is made possible through cross-subsidy with a commercial operation that generates a surplus that can be used to finance the low rents. The savings for the city in comparison to the housing solutions for the structurally homeless that are used today amounts to approximately six million SEK (600,000 EUR) a year.

The commercial operation is expected to have a connection to the apartments as the buyers of space and services in the commercial operation partly do this to support the housing project within their corporate social responsibility (CSR) policy in their home market. There is an option to connect part of the common

areas in the project such that these can be used by both the tenants and the users of the commercial operation. This could result in possibilities to create work places, a sharing economy and social exchange. The commercial operation might also be separated from the apartments if this is deemed more advantageous considering the social situation of the households and their need for security. The choice can be made project by project depending on the local prerequisites connected to target groups and location in the city.

As the project idea was developed, a rich flora of ideas connected to the possibility to create social interaction between the tenants, between the tenants and the users of the commercial operations and between the tenants and people living in the surrounding area were discussed. Four lead words were set for the discussions: 'the children in focus', 'meeting', 'sharing' and 'security'. Sharing services that could lead to a simpler and cheaper everyday life and possibly create work places were studied, as well as how the design of the property could enhance natural meetings and exchange between tenants (and users). In the end, it was however emphasized that the project focus should be to create the low rent apartments, that this is a sufficiently important and challenging goal and that the additional services should be focused to a few fields where they make a distinct difference. As Sire themselves express it after interviews with potential tenants and all the meetings with the project group: 'The strongest insight connected to the tenants' needs is that they first and foremost want a permanent dwelling. This basic need is so strong that the other services are subordinate.' (Sire 2019, translation by the author.)

4.2.2 Points of discussion

The project is deemed to face two larger challenges, the first connected to the target groups and the second connected to the economic set-up. A central thought behind the project is to create a housing project that enhances integration. The project developer formulates the goal as 'a socially and economically mixed society which can contribute to the cohesion of the city as a functional and social entity and decrease the increasing polarization in society' (Sire 2019). To attain social integration within the project and outwards, toward the surrounding society, the presence of anchor tenants that can be the driving forces in interaction was emphasized. The thought was that the anchor tenants would belong to the already established tenants and would be able to act as a bridge between all tenants and tenants and the surrounding society. However, when the interest in this type of mixed housing was tested on households on the central housing waiting list in the city interest was very limited. If the project developer would keep the idea of anchor tenants, a thorough work to identify this type of tenant would have to be made. Further, there is a number of discussion points connected inter alia to the distribution of tenants, the ethnical combination, the bridging of cultural differences and sufficient language knowledge for a functioning interaction. The level of ambition when it comes to integration can be discussed in relation to the basic need of a permanent home.

Further, the project economy foresees a match of payment streams between the housing and the commercial operation. An absolute precondition for the low rents is that there is interest in a sound commercial operation that generates a surplus on a certain level over time. Should a mismatch between incoming and outgoing payments occur in the commercial operation, a deficit would arise that, if it continues with large probability will drive the project into bankruptcy. A secure set-up of the commercial operations is therefore of outmost importance.

Swedish residential rental contracts run until further notice with a strong security of tenure that does not allow for fast rent increases. Commercial rental contracts however, are time limited. The conditions of the subsequent contracts, that is the outcome of a rent negotiation for the time after expiry of the first contract or with a new tenant, can be difficult to predict. Further, extra costs might arise, should the commercial tenant have payment difficulties, especially if a new tenant has to be found. Accordingly, the task of securing the economic situation of the landlord, such that the low residential rents can be secured over time, is of outmost importance.

4.3 Case BoKlok

In the years 2014–2015, there was an extensive immigration to Europe, including Sweden. As the geographical dispersal of immigrants was uneven in Sweden, a fair share law was introduced in 2016 (*Bosättningslagen 2016:38*). As a result of the law, the municipality of Haninge has been assigned 806 persons in 2016–2019 (Länsstyrelserna 2019), for which the municipality shall arrange housing for the period of their establishment. The municipality has met this obligation through different solutions, inter alia social rental contracts to which the municipality holds the tenancy and then sublets to households selected by the social authorities.

In 2016, the municipality had difficulties to contract enough apartments for newly arrived immigrants that had been assigned to the municipality. A dialogue on one possible solution was initiated by the company BoKlok (Haninge 2019; BoKlok 2019a). BoKlok is a commercial housing developer which brand is owned by Skanska and Ikea. The present production volume is approximately 1,200 apartments a year. BoKlok had recently received a municipal land allocation in Haninge and communicated that they wished to develop their business in a social direction.

4.3.1 Project idea and implementation

The newly established tenant-ownership association Geografin 1 comprises 68 apartments, of which 61 are tenant-ownership and seven rental. The municipality has rented the seven apartments for newly arrived immigrant families with children that have received residence permit and been assigned to Haninge municipality. The municipality has offered the apartments to families that have lived in other types of establishment housing for six months to a year and have a first basic contact with the Swedish society, including basic language skills. The aim of the project is to enhance establishment and integration.

The project is situated in Jordbro, a part of Haninge municipality located in the southern part of the Stockholm region, 30 minutes with the commuter train from central Stockholm. In Jordbro, the largest tenure is rental housing of which ninety percent was built in the 1960s and 70s (Haninge 2016). The households in Jordbro have the lowest medium incomes and the lowest rate of employment in the municipality (Haninge 2016). Jordbro is one of totally 60 areas that have been listed by the police as vulnerable areas, which means that they are deemed to have socioeconomic problems and that criminals have influence on the local society (Polisen 2019).

In the area, there is a range of services, including public transport with commuter trains and buses, day care, schools and a small shopping centre with a grocery store. A number of sport associations are active in the area and were invited by the developer to present themselves when the project was inaugurated. The tenants are given the opportunity to book a job interview at Ikea. The developer also arrange a course on living in a tenant-ownership association. Further, the rental contracts include an obligation of the tenants to participate in the common management of the tenant-ownership association on the same terms as the owners.

The parties to the business setup are the tenant-ownership association, the developer and the municipality. The tenant-ownership association was set up by the developer and thereafter shares in the association were sold to private persons. After project completion, the members of the tenant-ownership association owns the property jointly and severally and the individual members have the right to use specific apartments within the property. The members of the association appoints a board that represent the association and manages the property. The association is in this case also the landlord of the municipality for the seven rental apartments under a block rental contract (BoKlok 2017). The contract runs for 10 years and gives the municipality the rights to sublet apartments on time-limited municipal social contracts. The presence of the contract with the municipality has been included in the sales and marketing material from the beginning of sales. Owners and tenants moved in at the turn of the year 2018/2019. Sales prices, monthly fees and rents are outlined in Table 4.

The sales price of apartments amount to 41,755 SEK/sq.m. (4,175 EUR), but due to that part of the debt can be booked on the tenant-ownership association only 28,000 SEK/sq.m. (2,800 EUR/sq.m.) has to be paid by the household at the time of purchase (BoKlok 2018b). The association debt is then serviced as part of the monthly fee to the association, beside the cost of amenities and other common outlays of the households in the association. The rental level corresponds to the cost the association has for the apartments, including the higher than usual debt level as not all apartments are sold at completion and a certain safety margin. A comparison with some other comparable projects in Haninge was made to verify the rent.

The municipality pays the tenant-owner association the rent, without any connection to payments made by tenants, such that the tenant-ownership association only has credit risk on the municipality. Tenants then pay the rents to the municipality, for the most part out of received establishment benefits. Leases are time limited to three years. Thereafter, tenants have the option to buy the

Table 4. Sales prices, monthly fees and rents. (BoKlok 2018a; BoKlok 2019b.)

	Total number of apartments	Number of social apartments	Size (sq.m.)	Price SEK (EUR ¹)	Fee to the tenant-owner association SEK/month (EUR)	Rent social apartments SEK/month (EUR)
Total	68	7				
2 room apartment (one bedroom)	22	2	53	1,420,000–1,770,000 (142,000–177,000)	2,870 (287)	7,906 (790)
3 room apartment (two bedrooms)	22	3	69–70	1,970,000–2,170,000 (197,000–217,000)	3,792 (379)	10,442 (1044)
4 room apartment (three bedrooms)	24	2	81	2,170,000–2,370,000 (217,000–237,000)	4,388 (439)	12,083 (1208)

1 Exchange rate EUR/SEK 1:10

apartment they live in at market price, however not at a lower rate than that which was offered at completion. Tenants that do not buy are expected to find a new lease contract on the regular housing market and are replaced by new households in need. The municipality is obliged to renovate apartments when the lease period expires. Should the tenants choose not to buy, the association is exposed to market risk (BoKlok 2017).

After completion, the developer continues to be a party to the cooperation agreement for a certain period and is thereafter expected to stay in dialogue and participate in a yearly evaluation of the project. When the engagement of the developer is phased out, the board of the tenant-ownership association steps in and take over the responsibility as landlord under the rental contract. The social authority has taken on to stay in regular contact with their tenants, support them when needed and check that they fulfil their obligations under the lease contract with the municipality. Should any of the households chosen by the municipality not live up to the rules of the contracts or, generally cause disturbances, the tenant-ownership association has a contact person at the municipality to turn to (BoKlok 2017).

4.3.2 Points of discussion

The developer has had the goal of protecting their clients, the owners of the tenant-ownership association, against unexpected events. A tenant-ownership association is expected to manage the buildings and service the common debt. In

this project, the board is expected to manage a higher debt than usual as well as the lease contract with the municipality. Moreover, the tenant-owners are hoped to act as drivers of integration for the tenants. The developer acknowledges that the success of management and integration will be person-dependent and cannot be foreseen. However, the developer has tried to create good preconditions for the tenant-ownership association to fulfil expectations in the project set-up inter alia through a thought-through handover of responsibility from the developer to the board of the association. Moreover, the association is exposed to a certain market risk when the lease expires after ten years and it is impossible to predict whether the value of the property will be lower or higher at the time of sales of the rental apartments.

Tenants are expected to either find housing on their own on the regular housing market or buy the apartment they live in within three years. In the current situation on the housing market, with long queues for rental housing and credit restrictions that make it difficult for households on low incomes and with small savings to get debt financing, both these alternatives probably are a challenge unless tenants in a later stage of their establishment might be able to activate previous life savings.

5 Analysis and discussion

Below, we return to the analytical questions and the literature and analyse the three projects in relation to the definition of a socially and economically sustainable housing solution:

A housing solution providing a reasonable quality dwelling within the economic limits of the household under predictable conditions such that the household can plan for the future, and which also facilitates access to and integration into the surrounding community. Moreover, the solution must be deemed effective and the organisational effort and cost to the project developer must be within the limits of the project developer, such that there are incentives to repeat the project.

Similarities and differences between the projects are first outlined in Table 5, and then discussed in more detail from the perspectives of the tenants and the project developers.

5.1 Perspectives of the tenants affected by change

5.1.1 Coming out of homelessness

The majority of households that would be eligible as tenants in the projects today live in temporary housing solutions provided by the respective municipality, often in hostels, hotels or shelters- or on the street. Others sublet on unsecure terms and for shorter periods or stay with friends. From a short-term perspective, the herein presented projects provide an opportunity to come out of homelessness and start a normal life. As all three projects will be built with normal Swedish standard for permanent housing in locations that provide all basic services and communications,

Table 5. Case comparison.

	Stockholm City Mission	Sire	BoKlok
TENANTS			
<i>Coming out of homelessness</i>	Yes	Yes	Yes
<i>Good housing standard</i>	Yes	Yes	Yes
<i>Time-limited solution</i>	Yes	No	Yes
<i>Incentives to maintain and improve the housing situation</i>	Yes/No	No/No	Yes/Yes
<i>Enhances chances on the regular housing market</i>	Yes	Yes	Yes
<i>Potential for social integration through physical factors</i>	Yes	Yes	Yes
<i>Potential for social integration through non-physical factors</i>	Yes	Yes	Yes
<i>Short-term affordability</i>	Yes	Yes	Yes
<i>Long-term affordability</i>	Yes, but depends on the success of the cross-subsidy model	Yes, but depends on the success of the cross-subsidy model	Subleases end after three years, buy option
<i>Potential lock-in effects</i>	Uncertain	Yes	No
PROJECT DEVELOPERS			
<i>Dependent on municipal support of project</i>	Land, urban planning, social benefits of tenants	Land, urban planning, social benefits of tenants	Land, urban planning, rental contract
<i>Economic stability of the project setup</i>	Depends on cross-subsidy model	Depends on cross-subsidy model	Low risk based on municipal rating, market risk at end of lease
<i>Potential institutional hurdles</i>	Rent-setting principles, taxes, social benefit rules	None identified so far	None
<i>Financing</i>	Stable	Uncertain	Arranged
<i>Track-record of the project developer</i>	New in housing	New project developer, but experienced owners	Long
<i>Potential for repetition of the business setup</i>	Depends on ability to finalise pilot project and future financing	Depends on success of cross-subsidy model	Depends on willingness of municipalities to sign lease contracts
<i>Conscious inclusion of physical factors for social inclusion</i>	Yes	Yes	Yes
<i>Providing potential for social inclusion through non-physical factors</i>	Yes	Yes	Yes

housing quality will be satisfactory and a distinct improvement compared to the housing solutions that the households live in today. The satisfaction of basic human needs and the right to be protected and secured in situations of vulnerability are reached (for example Vallance et al. 2011; Eizenberg and Jabareen 2017).

A majority of the households face structural homelessness, which means that getting access to long-term housing will solve their situation. However, some of the households also face potential social problems and need varying levels of support or at least a generous view when it comes to temporary deviations from expected behaviour. Such a view is granted in Case Stockholm City Mission, where targeted households are selected from groups that can at least partially be exposed to such situations. In Case Sire, target groups are expected to be well functioning and deviations from expected behaviour have not been much discussed. In Case BoKlok, target groups are also expected to be well functioning and there are rules in the rental contracts related to expected behaviour. Should the tenant not fulfil the contract, a move to another municipal housing solution might be the result. Such clauses are deemed necessary to protect the private persons that own the project. Although the risk exposure of tenants (compare Eizenberg and Jabareen 2017) is considerably reduced, it still exists. The above corresponds to the first part of the proposed definition 'A housing solution providing a reasonable quality dwelling within the economic limits of the household'.

5.1.2 Chances of sustaining the improved housing situation over time

Two of the projects have time limits for how long the household can stay (Case BoKlok) or how long they are granted a lower rent (Case Stockholm City Mission). In these cases, the municipality and the charity respectively share the view that there shall be clear incentives to leave this protected housing after a certain period and get established on the regular housing market, as the housing shall be reserved for households in need. In both projects, the time limit has been set to three years. Case Sire has not been involved in such discussions as of yet. After the three years, households included in Case Stockholm City Mission and Case BoKlok are expected to manage their housing situation on their own, which can be a challenge on tight housing markets. The chances of the households have however improved, as they can refer to a record of accomplishment as tenants. Case Sire does not apply any time limits as of yet, which leads to a predictable, no stress situation for the households. However, this approach does not provide any incentives to leave this more protected housing situation and might lead to that households no longer in need of low-rent apartments stay in the building to the detriment of other households in need.

The projects are designed such that the apartments are affordable to the envisaged target groups when they move in. However, households are expected to improve their income during the first three years in Case Stockholm City Mission and Case BoKlok. Should the household not manage to improve its income, or rent levels approved by social services are changed, long-term affordability might be compromised. For Case BoKlok, the household knows from the start that it will have to move out of the apartment after three years unless it is able to buy. To buy

or even to find a rental flat with a first-hand contract (no sublet) will be a challenge on the Stockholm housing market today. To buy or to rent will demand a certain income and a good record of accomplishment, which can be seen as a very strong incentive to fulfil expectations and to gain employment.

Both time limits and potential long-term affordability problems compromise social and economic sustainability, but can also work as incentives for tenants to improve their housing situation without assistance (if possible). As Rashidfarokhi (2018) points out compromises between sustainability goals, here long-term stability and empowerment are not always easy, especially when considering projects out of life-cycle perspectives (Weingaertner and Moberg 2011). It is concluded that the second part of the proposed definition 'A housing solution [...] under predictable conditions such that the household can plan for the future' is only partially fulfilled.

5.1.3 Potential for social integration

When it comes to social integration through the physical and non-physical factors of the projects (Bramley et al. 2009; Dempsey et al. 2011; Opp 2017), it is clear that the most elementary components, such as satisfaction of basic needs and a sense of security, have a great chance of being fulfilled within the scope of all three cases. In addition, access to the surrounding community and society at large are provided through satisfactory public transport, everyday services, as well as day care and schools. The access to higher education and workplaces is a question mark, as it depends on skills and exact location of suitable education providers and employers in need of new employees. Case BoKlok provides a start in the search for a paid employment through the invitation to a job interview at Ikea. Green spaces and some sports facilities exist in all neighbourhoods. The creation of social capital can be achieved through new relations, education, work experience and building up a housing record of accomplishment. For the children, the possibility to build new friendships and do homework is enhanced with a better housing standard that allow for indoor activity. The potential exposure to youngsters at risk in the neighbourhood is also reduced.

When it comes to sustainability of the community itself, the eligible households will be surrounded by citizens that for the most part are leading ordinary lives, such that there should be standard chances for social integration. However, social integration is always person dependent. Integration within the projects will depend on various factors: for Case Stockholm City Mission on tenant mix, for Case Sire on the anchor tenants and for Case BoKlok on how well owners and tenants cooperate. The small share of social flats in Case BoKlok along with the need to cooperate in the practical management of the association provide a good starting point for social integration, provided that owners and tenants are able to find a common ground. The fact that Jordbro is listed by the police as a neighbourhood at risk, creates incentives to cooperate further in order to stem possible negative experiences related to criminality in the neighbourhood. However, should owners and tenants not be able to cooperate conflicts might arise. Depending on the reactions of the local community to the herein described type

of housing, also Case Stockholm City Mission and Case Sire have an uncertain future when it comes to integration within the neighbourhood. For Case Sire, the role of anchor tenants and its development over time is crucial to the potential success of the project.

The projects all have the goal of providing a new start, a sense of protection, empowerment and good quality housing, as well as access to society and established groups. Shirazi and Keivani (2017) point to that social sustainability might mean harmonious civil society, cohabitation of socially and culturally diverse groups, social inclusion and interaction, sense of place as well as residents' involvement and empowerment among other things. There is a potential for all these values to be met in the projects and the project developers have all had these values in mind when creating the projects, but in the end, experiential outcomes will be individual and depend on very personal experiences and tastes of the tenants. The fulfilment of the third part of the definition 'A housing solution [...] which also facilitates access to and integration into the surrounding community' will depend on the outcome of projects over time and will to a certain degree be based on experiential outcomes and hence be person-dependant.

5.2 Perspectives of the project developers and agents for change

5.2.1 Incentives to create and implement housing projects

The need for the herein discussed housing solutions are closely tied to developments on the local housing market and municipal economy. Considering the tight housing markets for the target households in Stockholm and Malmö, and in Malmö the acute need to reduce municipal costs, it is deemed probable that alternative housing solutions will continue to be of interest in the foreseeable future. However, it should be kept in mind that Sweden has a strong tradition of public dominance in welfare provision with a relatively small engagement of the civil society compared to other European countries. As this type of housing is in the grey zone between welfare provision and the general housing market, negative reactions might come from interest organizations and politicians. On the other hand, the present situation and possible positive experiences might induce a shift to a more positive view on civil society engagement. Further, the principle of equal treatment of all citizens under the Swedish Local Government Act might negatively influence municipal engagement in projects as such engagement might be viewed as too advantageous for certain groups of households, which might influence particularly Case Stockholm City Mission and Case BoKlok. Further, all of the projects are in their present set-up dependent on municipal land allocation and urban planning. The realisation of projects will hence be subject to political will and availability of suitable municipal land. Benefit levels will also be decisive to project realisation.

The second part of the definition 'Moreover, the solution must be deemed effective and the organisational effort and cost to the project developer must be within the limits of the project developer, such that there are incentives to repeat the project.' mainly relates to strategic choices of municipalities and project

developers. As pointed out above, it is yet too early to say how project effectiveness will be viewed by municipalities and project developers in the longer run.

5.2.2 Chances of sustaining the created housing solution over time and repeating the project

The economic sustainability of the project setup is essential for innovation reproduction, that is the willingness of the project developer to repeat the project (compare Spangenberg 2005). Case BoKlok is the most robust project in this respect. As long as a municipality is willing and able to sign a lease contract, the project can be implemented. Case Stockholm City Mission and Case Sire are dependent on cross-subsidy models that need more thought and work to result in a secure setup over time. It will be interesting to follow how the models might be implemented in the Swedish setting. In Case Sire, a business model depending on investments by local companies in their CSR profile is tested, which is new to the Swedish housing market. In Case Stockholm City Mission, the institutional setting is challenged and more than one potential administrative hurdle has to be overcome. However, in case of success, the project has the potential to reach households on very low incomes.

The robustness of the economic setup will be vital to access to construction financing and then long-term mortgage-backed financing. Case BoKlok has managed to secure both financing phases, as well as an offer to apartment buyers. However, prior to success, there was a need to describe the project setup thoroughly to the financing institution. The project developer of Case Sire will also have to consider carefully how to package information to potential financiers. Financing for Case Stockholm City Mission will be secured through asset sales such that no external funding will be necessary, although external funding for the project most probably could be secured based on the project setup and the strong brand of the charity in combination with interest in CSR intensive projects.

The potential to repeat and/or scale up the models in case of success of the pilot project depends on the economic robustness of project developers and the project, their professionalism and record of accomplishment, but also on demand and risk willingness of financiers. Should the initiator of Case Stockholm City Mission be able to build up a professional organisation and complete a successful pilot project, only demand should set the limits for expansion (although there is a hope that demand will be low). Case Sire has a natural geographical limit, as it probably would be difficult to implement numerous commercial operations with a CSR-profile in one location. However, there is a potential to implement the business model in a number of cities and towns in Sweden and possibly also abroad. Case BoKlok is easily repeatable in as many locations as there is demand. One limiting factor might be the accepted profile of the tenants, including whether they are structurally or socially homeless. In addition, the ability of the business setups to adapt to changing circumstances are key to their survival and hence to their sustainability (compare Bossel 1999).

As discussed above, the fulfilment of the last part of the definition ‘the organisational effort and cost to the project developer must be within the limits

of the project developer, such that there are incentives to repeat the project' is uncertain. This especially applies to Case Stockholm City Mission and Case Sire.

5.2.3 Potential for social integration

All three project developers have high ambitions when it comes to the integration of tenants into society and have included multiple integration enhancing measures in the project setups, as described above. The success of these measures are difficult to measure at this stage, but should be followed-up when the projects have run for a certain period of time. As pointed out in section 5.1.3., the fulfilment of the third part of the definition 'A housing solution... which also facilitates access to and integration into the surrounding community' will depend on the outcome of projects over time and will to a certain degree be person-dependant.

Looking ahead, the question of who could be the agents of change, with a focus also on the households and their empowerment, could add to the social sustainability of all the three project set-ups. Experiences of collaborative housing models could be brought into the planning of future projects (for example Gruber and Lang 2018; Lang et al. 2018). The herein presented projects are not collaborative in the sense that the future residents are involved in project design or implementation, although the outcome of at least Case Sire and Case BoKlok are highly dependent on the roles of the anchor-tenants and the tenant-owners respectively. Here, the basic need of coming out of homelessness and improving chances on the regular housing market is in focus. However, in future projects attempts to involve future residents at an earlier stage, to build social capital before completion of construction, might be an option. Although project developers strive to provide the best possible prerequisites for the models to function well, there is today built-in uncertainty about how residents will act. Starting to prepare for resident involvement at an earlier stage might improve chances of success. Further, collaborative mechanisms of presumption (community or IT-based) might be developed to further enhance project outcome, as suggested by Eizenberg and Jabareen (2017) and the initiators of Case Sire. On the other hand, this would engage project developers in yet another large task in a stage when a lot of practical tasks need to be solved related to other parts of the project or the identity of future tenants are unknown and could thus prove to be a too large challenge, especially for smaller project developers. Further, the targeted types of households have a very strained life situation and might not prioritize a housing project that might take years to realize. Again, the project goal of bringing people out of homelessness must be in focus. Further, simple models might be easier to adapt when institutional and other preconditions change (compare Spangenberg 2005).

5.3 Evaluation of the study

The concept of sustainability is deemed interesting as a base for analysis. The definition and the list of analytical questions proved to be fruitful when analysing the projects from a sustainability perspective, as it allowed for a practical approach to the project data, as well as put the light on questions that will be more difficult

to analyse or might need a longer research perspective. One aim of this paper was to present the definition and the list of analytical questions to other researchers to test and comment in order to develop an accepted framework. It is anticipated that the herein presented kind of housing initiatives will increase in numbers and it would be useful to develop an analytical tool suited to research connected thereto. To develop the list of questions and its applicability in future studies, the thoughts of Spangenberg (2005) and Zajeska-Jonsson (2018) on economic sustainability might be studied further. When developed, the set of analytical questions might also assist practitioners when structuring projects with regard to social and economic sustainability.

The projects are in early phases or have been completed not long ago, and this limits the possibility to analyse some of the topics suggested by the literature, especially non-physical factors. However, as results are bound to be place and time specific (Shirazi and Keivani 2018), it is of interest to analyse the projects at the outset, although not all questions might be answered, in order to be able to follow-up on the projects as they evolve.

The success of the projects from a social integration perspective depends on experiential outcomes and is hence person-dependant. This makes projects difficult to analyse and compromises generalizability of project results. The conclusion might be related to the observation by Eizenberg and Jabareen (2017) that there has been a bias towards physical factors when addressing social sustainability as such factors are more tangible and measurable and hence easier to evaluate. However, in line with the argumentation of Eizenberg and Jabareen (2017), also non-physical factors should be highlighted to get a more complete picture of a project's sustainability, although an allowance might have to be made for that conclusions in some cases are tentative. The reference to the human factor for success or failure of complex socioeconomic models is deemed interesting to incorporate in future research.

6 Conclusions

The overarching aim of the projects, to achieve stable, good quality housing for targeted households at an affordable level, is reached in all three project set-ups for a certain period of time. All solutions last for at least three years, which give the households a chance to improve their life situation under stable housing conditions. Further, there are incentives of project developers to repeat the pilot projects, provided that the cross-subsidy models work as intended. Hence, it is concluded that all three projects live up to the herein presented definition at the outset. Although all of the projects have challenges and possibilities of improvement, it must be kept in mind that all of them significantly improve the housing and life situation of the eligible households to a cost that is bearable to all agents, which must be seen as the prime goal of the projects.

However, in the long run, not all of the visions of the projects might be fulfilled to the wished-for extent. Compromises between different goals will probably have to be made. One potential compromise might for example arise between rent subsidy levels and the economic security of project developers in the cross-subsidy models.

The resulting implications for affordability might limit economic sustainability. The main limitation as to the social sustainability of the projects is the time frame households are given to live in a protected housing situation, which is relatively short considering their life situation and the present state of the housing market. When they need to leave the protected housing situation or conditions change, their housing situation will be uncertain, which might compromise their possibility to plan for the future in the longer run. Time limited solutions are however in line with standard Swedish social assistance policy when it comes to housing. At present, there are no plans to change such policy.

Future research could follow up on this initial analysis and investigate the success of the various project set-ups from all dimensions of sustainability. The three sustainability dimensions, social, economic and environmental, are closely linked and it is often argued that they should be evaluated equally and jointly to reach sustainable results. In this study, the environmental aspects have been left out, as information on the technical solutions chosen by developers have not been substantial enough for a well-founded evaluation. In a next step, when more data is at hand, the quality of chosen solutions and their effect on long-term social, economic and environmental sustainability could be evaluated to complement this study. The study of other Swedish and international private or civil society initiatives in housing for social purposes would also enhance understanding of this new form of housing in the Swedish context. Especially in times of austerity, it would be useful to identify socially and economically sustainable housing provision models that minimize public risk exposure. In relation to policy, it might also be interesting to point to institutional hurdles that these projects face during the early phases and initiate a discussion on how these might be overcome such that projects are not delayed or even cancelled.

References

- Bleys, B. (2013). The Regional Index of Sustainable Economic Welfare for Flanders, Belgium. *Sustainability*, 5, 496–523, <https://doi.org/10.3390/su5020496>.
- BoKlok (2017). Samarbetsavtal 2017-06-14 (cooperation agreement between Haninge municipality, BoKlok Housing AB and the tenant-ownership association BoKlok Geografín).
- BoKlok (2018a). Hej Jordbro! (marketing material for the project Geografín). Stockholm: BoKlok.
- BoKlok (2018b). Ekonomisk plan för bostadsrättsföreningen BoKlok Geografín (the financial plan of the tenant- ownership association). Stockholm: BoKlok.
- BoKlok (2019a). Interview with Peter Nyberg, responsible for business development social sustainability, January 9, 2019.
- BoKlok (2019b). Lägenhetsförteckning och försäljningsstatistik Geografín 1, Haninge. Retrieved from <https://www.boklok.se/hitta-bostad/jordbro-geografín/> (March 8 and August 13, 2019).
- Bossel, H. (1999). *Indicators for Sustainable Development: Theory, Method, Applications*, IISD international Institute for Sustainable Development, Winnipeg, Canada.

Boström, M. (2012). A missing pillar? Challenges in theorizing and practicing social sustainability: introduction to the special issue. *Sustainability: Science, Practice and Policy*, 8:1, 3–14. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15487733.2012.11908080>

Bramley, G.; Dempsey, N.; Power, S.; Brown, C.; Watkins, D. (2009). Social sustainability and urban form: evidence from five British cities. *Environment and Planning*, 41 (9), 2125–2142. <https://doi.org/10.1068/a4184>

De Kam, G., Needham, B., Buitelaar, E. (2014). The embeddedness of inclusionary housing in planning and housing systems: insights from an international comparison. *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment*, 29:389–402. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10901-013-9354-5>

Dempsey, N.; Bramley, G.; Power, S.; Brown, C. (2011). The social dimension of sustainable development: Defining urban social sustainability. *Sustainable Development*, 19, 289–300. <https://doi.org/10.1002/sd.417>

De Souza Briggs, X. (2004). Faith and mortar: Religious organizations and affordable housing strategy in urban America. Building the organizations that build communities, 43. *Urban Studies*, Volume 45, Issue 10.

Eizenberg, E.; Jabareen, Y. (2017). Social Sustainability: A New Conceptual Framework. *Sustainability*, 9, 68. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su9010068>

Flyvbjerg, B. (2006). Five misunderstandings about case-study research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, Vol. 12, No 2. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800405284363>

Global Goals for Sustainable Development (2019). The seventeen goals. Retrieved from globalgoals.org (August 8, 2019).

Griessler, E.; Littig, B. (2005). Social sustainability: a catchword between political pragmatism and social theory. *International Journal for Sustainable Development*, 8(1/2), 65–79. <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJSD.2005.007375>

Gruber; Lang (2018). Collaborative housing models in Vienna through the lens of social innovation. In *Affordable Housing Governance and Finance: Innovations, partnerships and comparative perspectives*, Eds. Van Bortel, G.; Gruis, V.; Nieuwenhuijzen, J.; Pluijmers, pp. 41–58. <https://doi.org/10.1201/9781315112350-3>

Göteborg (2019). Hemlösa och utestängda från bostadsmarknaden april 2019 (Homeless people and people shut out of the housing market April 2019). Göteborg: Göteborgs stad.

Haninge (2016). Bostadsstrategi för Haninge kommun (The municipal housing policy of Haninge). Haninge: Haninge municipality.

Haninge (2019). Interview with Jesper Schönberg, project responsible at the property management department of Haninge municipality on March 11, 2019.

KTH Sustainability. Economic sustainability (2019). Retrieved from <https://www.kth.se/en/om/miljo-hallbar-utveckling/utbildning-miljo-hallbar-utveckling/verktygslada/sustainable-development/ekonomisk-hallbarhet-1.431976> (August 9, 2019).

Lang, R.; Carriou, C.; Czischke, D. (2018). Collaborative Housing Research (1990–2017): A Systematic Review and Thematic Analysis of the Field. *Housing, Theory and Society*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14036096.2018.1536077>

Länsstyrelserna (2016–2019). Aktuella läns- och kommunal (Current county and municipal fair share numbers) Retrieved from <http://extra.lansstyrelsen.se/integration/Sv/bosattning/Pages/Aktuella-lans-och-kommunal.aspx> (March 8, 2019).

Malmö (2018). Årlig uppföljning och analys av bostadsförsörjningen, lägesrapport mars 2018 (Yearly follow-up and analysis of housing provision). Malmö: Stadsbyggnadskontoret.

Malmö (2019). Kartläggning av hemlösheten och insatser för hemlösa 2018 (Mapping of homelessness and efforts for the homeless 2018). Malmö: Arbetsmarknads- och socialförvaltningen.

Opp, SM. (2017). The forgotten pillar: a definition for the measurement of social sustainability in American cities, *Local Environment*, 22:3, 286–305. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13549839.2016.1195800>

Pickvance, C. (2001). Four varieties of comparative analysis. *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment*, 16: 7–28. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1011533211521>

Polisen (2019). Kriminell påverkan i lokalsamhället- En lägesbild för utvecklingen i utsatta områden. Nationella operativa avdelningen, Underrättelseenheten.

Rashidfarokhi, A; Yrjänä, M., Wallenius, S.; Toivonen, A.; Ekroos, A.; Viitanen, K. (2018). Social sustainability tool for assessing land use planning processes. *European Planning Studies*, 26:6, 1269–1296. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09654313.2018.1461811>

Scanlon, K.; Fernández Arrigoitia, M.; Whitehead, C. (2014). *Social housing in Europe*, Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.

Shah, SK. and Corley, KG. (2006). Building better theory by bridging the quantitative-qualitative divide. *Journal of Management Studies*, 43:8. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6486.2006.00662.x>

Shirazi, R.; Keivani, R. (2017). Critical reflections on the theory and practice of social sustainability in the built environment – a meta-analysis. *Local Environment*, 22:12, 1526–1545. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13549839.2017.1379476>

Sire (2019). Bostäder med låga boendekostnader för resurssvaga hushåll som bidrar till en ökad boendeintegration i samhället (final project report). Stockholm: Vinnova.

Socialstyrelsen (2017). Hemlöshet 2017- omfattning och karaktär (Homelessness 2017 – extent and character). Stockholm: The National Board of Health and Welfare.

Spangenberg, JH. (2005). Economic sustainability of the economy: concepts and indicators. *Int. J. Sustainable Development*, Vol. 8, Nos. ½. <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJSD.2005.007374>

Stockholm (2018). Hemlösa personer i Stockholms stad 26 september 2018 (Homeless persons in Stockholm on September 26, 2018). Stockholm: Socialförvaltningen.

Stockholm City Mission (2019). Final report on the housing development program 'Särskildnyttan'. Stockholm: Stockholms stadsmision.

Thomas, G. (2011). A typology for the Case Study in Social Science Following a Review of Definition, Discourse and Structure. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 17(6), 511–521. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800411409884>

Vale, L.J.; Shamsuddin, S. (2017). All Mixed Up: Making Sense of Mixed-Income Housing Developments. *Journal of American Planning Association*, Vol. 83, p. 56–67. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01944363.2016.1248475>

Vallance, S.; Perkins, HC.; Dixon, JE. (2011). What is social sustainability? A clarification of concepts. *Geoforum*, 42, 342–348. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2011.01.002>

Weingaertner, C.; Moberg, Å. (2011). Exploring Social Sustainability: Learning from perspectives on Urban Development and Companies and Products. *Sustainable Development*, 22, 122–133 (2014). <https://doi.org/10.1002/sd.536>

Zalejska-Jonsson (2018), A. *Applying sustainability in practice: An example of new urban development in Sweden*. In: *Routledge Handbook of Sustainable Real Estate*, Eds. Wilkinson, S.; Dixon, T.; Miller, N.; Sayce, S., pp. 381–394. UK: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.1201/9781315622750-25>