

**RESEARCH PROJECT
ON PEOPLE EVICTED FROM
DUBLIN CORPORATION HOUSING UNITS
IN 1997 AND 1998 FOR
ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR**

FINAL RESEARCH REPORT

STEPHEN ROURKE

MARCH 2001

CONTENTS PAGE

FOREWORD	i
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Context	1
1.2 Terms of Reference	2
1.3 Methodology	2
1.4 Structure of Research Report	4
2. 1997 HOUSING (MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS) ACT	5
2.1 Rationale and Aim	5
2.2 Provisions Within the Act	6
2.3 Excluding Orders and Evictions	8
3. EXPERIENCES OF EVICTED PERSONS/FAMILIES	10
3.1 Introduction	10
3.2 Profile of Evicted Persons/Families	10
3J Experiences of Interviewees	12
3.4 Summary of Experiences	27
4. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	29
4.1 Introduction	29
4.2 Conclusion	29
4.3 Recommendations	34

FOREWORD

In 1998, Community Services in conjunction with the Social Development Department in the Eastern Health Board and Dublin Corporation identified a possible gap in service provision to those persons and families who were subject to the eviction process for anti-social behaviour arising from the new Housing (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1997. This Act was introduced by the Oireachtas to deal with, inter alia, the then worsening drug situation evident in some local authority estates in particular. At the time there was also a growing awareness by staff and policy makers of the benefits of better integration and co-ordination of services by public agencies, particularly in the delivery of services to the most vulnerable and marginalised in society.

The decision to evict persons and families for anti-social behaviour under the 1997 Act is not taken lightly by local authorities and is only used as a last resort. Nevertheless, those engaged in this form of behaviour are not necessarily cared for or advocated by statutory and voluntary organisations. They may, therefore, acutely need the statutory services to be provided in a more co-ordinated manner. A more co-ordinated approach may also obviate the need for eviction in certain types of cases. In certain cases conflict can arise between the two statutory organisations because of their differing responsibilities.

Dublin Corporation and the then Eastern Health Board commissioned a researcher to follow up on those who had been evicted since the 1997 Act came into force. A protocol was developed which allowed the researcher to directly contact the evicted persons which respected their confidentiality and dealt with the issues in a non-judgmental manner. The time-scale was extended on three occasions to allow the researcher to engage with the persons, for the work to be conducted in as sensitive a manner as possible and for the commissioning authorities to sign off on the findings and recommendations.

To a certain extent some of the recommendations of the report have been incorporated into the work practices of the respective organisations. It is also worth noting that the years covered by the report, 1997 and 1998, represented a peak of activity in the Dublin Corporation area in direct response to the newly enacted 1997 Act. There has been a significant reduction in the number of evictions for anti-social activity in the subsequent years, eg., 67 evictions in 1997 compared to 15 in the year 2000 for example.

The recommendations highlight the need for co-ordination, co-operation and joint training across the health, personal social services and housing staffs. In addition, the

Integrated Services Process and the up-coming 'RAPED Initiative should give more opportunities to develop new and meaningful, mutually beneficial relationships across the agencies.

This excellent research report will be an important tool in guiding the development of such relationships. We would like to acknowledge and thank the people who took part in this study and whose views shaped a vital part of the work. We would also like to thank the researcher and the Consultative Committee for their commitment and enthusiasm for reaching consensus and getting the balance right between the various responsibilities of the agencies involved.

Mr. Pat Bennett
Assistant Chief Executive Officer
South Western Area Health Board

Mr. Gilbert Power
Assistant Principal Officer
Dublin Corporation

On behalf of the joint EHB/Dublin Corporation Consultative Committee.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 CONTEXT

The Housing (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1997 was a response to the worsening drugs crisis and, in particular, to the level of drug dealing which was taking place within some local authority housing estates and flats complexes. The 1997 Act, together with the 1966 Housing Act, provided local authorities with the legal instrument to evict tenants for anti-social behaviour.¹ It was anticipated that provisions within the Act would reduce the availability of drugs within local authority housing estates/flats complexes through evicting drug dealers from their houses/flats. This process would help to cut off the supply of drugs into local communities and make it more difficult for people to access illegal drugs. In addition the Act enabled local authorities to evict tenants for other types of anti-social behaviour eg. serious violence, persistent disturbances, intimidation.

In late 1999, Dublin Corporation and the South Western Area Health Board commissioned a piece of research in relation to the Housing (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1997. The main focus of this research relates to people who were evicted from Dublin Corporation housing units in 1997 and 1998 for anti-social behaviour (within the provisions of the 1997 Act and the 1966 Housing Act). The research aimed to track the progress of people evicted in this two year period with a view to determining what has happened to them following their eviction, the level of support and assistance which they have received from relevant agencies/organisations and their current status (in relation to issues like accommodation and family circumstances). The South Western Area Health Board and Dublin Corporation were particularly concerned about the situation of families with children and the impact which the eviction (and subsequent developments/events) had upon the integrity and cohesion of the family unit. It was anticipated that the research project could help to inform future policies, practices and procedures in relation to the implementation of the 1966 Housing Act and the 1997 Housing (Miscellaneous Provision)

¹ 'Section 1(1) of the Housing (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1997 defines anti-social behaviour within the following two categories:

(a) the manufacture, production, preparation, importation, exportation, sale, supply, possession for die purposes of sale or supply, or distribution of a controlled drug (within the meaning of the Misuse of Drugs Acts, 1997 and 1984).

(b) any behaviour which causes or is likely to cause any significant or persistent danger, injury, damage, loss or fear to any person living, working or otherwise lawfully in or in Ac vicinity of a housing authority under the Housing Acts, 1966 to 1997, or a housing estate in which the house is situated and, without prejudice to the foregoing, includes violence, threats, intimidation, coercion, harassment or serious obstruction of any person.'

Act and the supports which are provided to people who have been evicted from their homes within the provisions of these pieces of legislation.

1.2 TERMS OF REFERENCE

The terms of reference for this research project are as follows:

- To track the progress of a selected number of clients who have been evicted from local authority housing units in 1997 and 1998.
- To detail the ways in which statutory agencies dealt with the clients who were evicted.
- To consider the services (statutory and voluntary) which were made available to evicted clients.
- To consider the level of co-ordination and co-operation which took place between statutory agencies, both at the pre-eviction and post-eviction stages.
- To determine if there are ways in which the issue of evictions from local authority housing units might be managed and handled in a more co-ordinated and effective manner.

1.3 METHODOLOGY

In the period from September 1999 to November 2000, the following research actions have taken place:

- Interviews with 27 people who were evicted from Dublin Corporation housing units in 1997 and 1998. These 27 people were involved in 23 individual evictions -in four cases, the researcher interviewed the two people who were named in the eviction notice/order. The figure of 23 evictions (where interviews took place with the evicted persons) represents 34.3% of the total number of evictions carried out by Dublin Corporation in 1997 and 1998 for anti-social behaviour (within the provisions of the 1966 and 1997 Housing Acts). Sixty seven evictions took place in this two year period for anti-social behaviour.
- Interviews with eight Community Welfare Officers.
- Analysis of the Area Health Board files. These files contain useful information on what happened to these people following their eviction. Information has been collected on a total of 45 people (through direct interviews, through interviews with Community Welfare Officers and through analysis of files) who were named/cited in eviction notices/orders expedited by Dublin Corporation in 1997

and 1998. This figure represents 57.6%” of the overall number of people named/cited in these eviction notices/orders – 78 people were named/cited in the 67 eviction orders which were issued and actioned in 1997 and 1998.

- Meetings with representatives from Dublin Corporation and the Area Health Boards in the eastern region.
- Seven meetings of the inter agency committee which was set up to oversee and manage the research project. This committee comprised representatives from relevant sections/departments within Dublin Corporation and the Area Health Boards in the eastern region.
- Familiarisation with the 1966 Housing Act and the 1997 Housing (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act
- Analysis of documentation and reports which have been produced in relation to the implementation of the 1966 Housing Act and the 1997 Housing (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act

The research project was managed and supported by an inter agency committee comprised of the following members:

Mr. Gilbert Power, Assistant Principal Officer, Ballyfermot Regional Office, Dublin Corporation.

Mr. Gerard Byrne, Regional Housing Officer, Ballyfermot Regional Office, Dublin Corporation.

Mr. Michael Ryan, Administrative Officer, Estate Management Section, Dublin Corporation.

Mr. Pat Bennett, Assistant Chief Executive, Planning and Development, South Western Area Health Board.

Ms. Michele Clear, Director of Care, Childcare Services, South Western Area Health Board.

Mr. Michael Hennessey, Superintendent Community Welfare Officer, South Western Area Health Board.

Mr. Noel Barry, Superintendent Community Welfare Officer, South Western Area Health Board.

Ms. Carmel Dunne, Director of Mental Health, Addiction and Social Inclusion, Northern Area Health Board.

Mr. Frank Mills, General Manager of Special Projects (homelessness, asylum seekers). Northern Area Health Board.

Mr. Gerry Kenny, Superintendent Community Welfare Officer, Northern Area Health Board.

Mr. Stephen Rourke, Researcher.

1.4 STRUCTURE OF RESEARCH REPORT

This introductory section of the report will be followed by a description of the background to, and provisions within, the 1997 Housing Act (Section 2). Section 3 will consider the experiences of the evicted people who were interviewed during the course of this research project – these experiences particularly relate to the period of time since the eviction took place. Section 4 of the report details a number of outcomes and conclusions which have emerged from the collective experiences of people who have been evicted from local authority housing units for anti-social behaviour. This section of the report also sets out a number of policy recommendations and suggestions in relation to the ongoing implementation of the 1966 Housing Act and the 1997 Housing (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act.

2. 1997 HOUSING (MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS)

2.1 RATIONALE AND AIM

In the mid 1990s the government and the general public were becoming increasingly concerned about the worsening drugs situation and about the criminal activity and other and-social behaviour associated with the drugs problem. The government recognised the need to adopt an integrated and multidimensional approach to the drugs issue. This approach, as articulated in the Report of the Ministerial Task Force on Measures to Reduce the Demand for Drugs (1996), contained three main strands or elements: a preventative, educational strand (through which young people could be educated about the dangers of drug abuse/misuse), a treatment, rehabilitation strand (through which drug users could be provided with appropriate treatment and rehabilitation options), and a supply reduction strand (through which the supply of drugs into local communities could be reduced).

In relation to the supply reduction element within the anti drugs strategy, it is recognised that An Garda Síochána has a key role to play in curtailing the supply of drugs and in apprehending drug dealers. It is also recognised, however, that estate management initiatives can play an important role in reducing the supply of drugs within local communities i.e. through ensuring that houses/flats are not allocated to drug dealers, through local residents/groups identifying drug dealers within their community and passing this information onto the relevant authorities, through making estates/flats complexes safer places with less possibilities for open drug dealing. It was within the context of these anti drugs and estate management initiatives that the government introduced the Housing (Miscellaneous Provisions) Bill in December 1996. It was considered that the provisions within this bill would provide local authorities with the legal device to evict drug dealers and other persons involved in serious anti-social activity/behaviour from their local authority housing units. Through the provisions contained in the bill, the local authorities would be complementing the work of An Garda Síochána and local community groups/organisations and would be helping to ensure that evictions take place within a solid legal and constitutional framework (rather than people being evicted as a result of marches on their houses/flats and being given no recourse to due process or fair procedures).

The 1997 Housing (Miscellaneous Provisions) Bill proceeded through the Dail and the Seanad in the first half of 1997 and it was enacted in July 1997. The main aim of the

1997 Housing (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act-is described in the circular which was produced by the Department of the Environment to coincide with the arrival of the new Act.

'The primary purpose of the Act is to provide for a range of measures to assist housing authorities and approved voluntary housing bodies in addressing problems arising on their housing estates from drug dealing and serious anti-social behaviour. The Act forms part of a -wider range of measures undertaken by Government to deal with the issue of drugs and related crime.'

2.2 PROVISIONS WITHIN THE ACT

There are 23 sections within the 1997 Housing (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act:

Section 1 describes the scope of the Act with particular reference to defining what constitutes anti-social behaviour.

Section 2 provides for the more efficient procedures in relation to the issuing and serving of summonses.

Section 3 describes the excluding order procedures through which a local authority tenant has the right to apply to the District Court for an excluding order against a member of a household who is engaged in anti-social behaviour or the local authority has the right to apply to the District Court for an exclusion order against a tenant who is engaged in anti-social behaviour.

Section 4 contains a provision through which the court may make an interim excluding order where there is immediate risk of significant harm to a tenant or other occupant pending determination of an application for an excluding order.

Sections 5 to 12 of the Act contain necessary supporting provision for the operation of the excluding order procedure, including offences of contravening, an order, taking effect of orders, notification of orders, appeals, discharges of orders, court jurisdiction, discretion for the court to hear excluding order cases in camera and power of Garda to arrest without warrant in the event of an offence of contravening an excluding order or an interim excluding order.

Section 13 extends the application of the excluding order procedure to houses provided by voluntary housing bodies.

Section 14 empowers local authorities, on the grounds of anti-social behaviour or good estate management, to refuse or defer the letting of a dwelling to a tenant under a purchase scheme.

Section 15 provides for the exchange of information between relevant agencies: housing authorities, the Criminal Assets Bureau, An Garda Síochána, the Department of Social Community and Family Affairs, Health Boards and voluntary housing bodies.

Section 16 provides, by way of amendment of the Social Welfare Acts, discretion for Health Boards to refuse or withdraw Supplementary Welfare Allowance rent or mortgage interest supplementation for private housing in the case of persons evicted, excluded or removed from, or refused housing on grounds of anti-social behaviour or in the interests of good estate management.

Section 17 amends the Social Welfare Acts to enable the Minister for Social Welfare, after consultation with the Minister for the Environment, to make regulations to allow deduction of local authority rents at source from social welfare incomes, where rent is unpaid for a certain period or arrears exceed a certain level.

Section 18 provides for an offence of intimidation *of*, or other interference with, staff of a housing authority or a Health Board or members of their family or witnesses in proceedings under the Act or under Section 62 of the 1966 Housing Act

Section 19 provides that any payment offered to or accepted by a housing authority or other person acting in the capacity of a landlord by an illegal occupant of a dwelling or a former tenant whose tenancy has been terminated but who still remains in occupation of a dwelling, will not create any tenancy rights in the dwelling.

Section 20 provides a new power for gardai, on notification by the housing authority, to direct people squatting in local authority accommodation and engaged in anti-social activity to leave the accommodation.

Section 21 provides for acceptance by courts of statements by gardai, housing authority or Health Board officials as evidence of anti-social behaviour in proceedings for repossession or excluding orders where the court is satisfied that there are reasonable grounds for doing so and that other possible witnesses would be prevented from giving evidence due to intimidation.

Section 22 is a technical amendment to put beyond doubt that a housing authority's general power under section 11 of the Housing (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act,

1992 to repossess a dwelling, in the event of default on a loan, applies to certain loans made prior to 1986 under section 5(2) of the Housing Finance Agency Act, 1981.

Section 23 contains a minor amendment of section 3 of the 1966 Housing Act to provide that documents such as notices and orders under the Housing Acts may be served by ordinary post where a registered letter is returned undelivered.

2.3 EXCLUDING ORDERS AND EVICTIONS

Section 3 of the 1997 Housing (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act is the main piece of the legislation which deals with the issues of excluding orders and evictions. In the guidelines which accompanied the legislation (guidelines which were circulated to all local authorities), the following points were made in relation to Section 3 of the Act:

- *Excluding order proceedings may be taken by a housing authority only after consultation with the tenant and the local Health Board. The Act does not require that the housing authority obtain the express agreement of the tenant to seek an order. Housing authorities should consider, in appropriate circumstances, the possibility that the excluding order procedure might be used as an alternative to seeking repossession of the dwelling and the eviction of an entire household.*
- *It will be necessary, when considering making application for an excluding order, that the circumstances of the case are fully and carefully investigated, including consultation with relevant authorities such as An Garda Síochána, as necessary, in addition to consulting the tenant and Health Board.*
- *An excluding order may be sought against a joint tenant (eg. a spouse or other household member) who is engaging in anti-social behaviour or against a person who is not a member of the tenant's family but who might, for example, be using the dwelling for drug dealing. A tenant can only seek an excluding order in respect of his or her own dwelling.*
- *The duration of an excluding order will be a matter for the court, subject to a maximum period of three years, but a further order may be made with effect from the date of expiration of the first order. There is provision for variation and discharge of orders where appropriate. An excluding order is not, therefore, a permanent or once and for all measure and the parties concerned, including a housing authority where appropriate, may apply to the courts to have an order discharged where the circumstances no longer require that it should continue in*

force. For example, where the housing authority consider that a person subject to an excluding order which was sought by the authority is not likely to engage in anti-social behaviour in the future, the authority could consider the appropriateness of applying to have the excluding order discharged.

In relation to the issue of evictions from local authority housing units, section 62 of the Housing Act 1966 provides local authorities with the power to evict their tenants, and anyone residing with them, on the basis that the tenancies are periodic and can be terminated by a 28 day notice to quit. Therefore it is evident that the local authorities had the power to evict tenants (for rent arrears, anti-social behaviour etc) even before the 1997 Housing (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act. However, it is also apparent that the 1997 Act placed local authorities in a stronger position to evict tenants for anti-social behaviour -the legislation clearly defined what anti-social behaviour is, it allowed for the more effective and efficient exchange of information between relevant statutory agencies, it determined the basis for evicting people for anti-social behaviour, and it put in place the procedures and arrangements (fiscal, legal, administrative) which were needed to implement eviction orders and excluding orders.

3. EXPERIENCES OF EVICTED PERSONS/FAMILIES

3.1 INTRODUCTION

This section of the research report will consider the experiences of persons/families who were evicted from Dublin Corporation housing units in 1997 and 1998 for anti-social behaviour within the provisions and definitions contained in the 1966 Housing Act and the 1997 Housing (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act. A total of 67 evictions took place in this two year period, with 78 people being named in the eviction notices/orders – 56 of these evictions/orders cited one person and 11 of the eviction orders/notices cited two persons. This section of the report will initially profile the 78 people named in the eviction orders/notices and will then focus more specifically on the 27 evicted tenants who were interviewed during the course of this research project.

3.2 PROFILE OF EVICTED PERSONS/FAMILIES

All of the evictions which took place in 1997 and 1998 were initiated within the context of the 1966 Housing Act and the additional provisions contained within the 1997 Housing (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act. It is interesting to note that only one excluding order was expedited in this two year period i.e. within the framework of the 1997 Act which allows for one named person within an individual dwelling to be barred from re-entering that dwelling and/or the estate/flats complex within which he/she previously resided. Reasons for this negligible number of exclusion orders include fear of intimidation or retaliation from the person against whom the excluding order is taken, family bonds/ties and concerns about the viability of enforcing the excluding order. Therefore, the main focus of this section of the report is on persons/families who were evicted for anti-social behaviour within the legislation contained in the 1966 Housing Act and the 1997 Housing (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act.

Earlier reference has been made to the 67 evictions which took place from Dublin Corporation housing units in 1997 and 1998. This figure accounts for evictions which involved full court proceedings and is thought to be less than the total who could have been evicted if the process of evicting all tenants involved in anti-social behaviour had ended up in the courts. It is apparent that some tenants voluntarily surrendered their houses/flats when they realised that court proceedings were about to be initiated – through surrendering their houses/flats they extricated themselves from the full legal process and the consequences of a court order for eviction i.e. they would be de-listed from the Dublin

Corporation housing list and would have to wait for a reasonably lengthy period of time before being considered for re-housing by Dublin Corporation. It is also evident that a large number of pre-eviction agreements were worked out between Dublin Corporation and the tenants involved in anti-social behaviour. Through these agreements and arrangements Dublin Corporation decided not to proceed with formal court orders on the understanding that the tenants involved would desist from any future involvement in antisocial behaviour

In relation to the 67 evictions which were expedited by Dublin Corporation in 1997 and 1998, it is estimated that approximately 42 (62.6%) were for drug dealing whilst the balance of 25 (37.4%) were for other types of anti-social behaviour eg. violence, intimidation, coercion, persistent public order offences. The profile of the persons cited/named in the eviction notices/orders is as follows:

- 20 (29.9%) were single men without children.
- 2 (3.0%) were single women without children.
- 33 (49.2%) were single women with children.
- 1 (1.5%) was a single man with children.
- 8(11.9%) were couples with children.
- 3 (4.5%) were couples without children.

On the basis of the interviews carried out and the files analysed it is evident that the high proportion of single women with children who were evicted from Dublin Corporation housing units in 1997 and 1998 may be accounted for, in part, by the fact that they were co-habiting/living with drug using/dealing partners and boyfriends. Although the drugs related activity of the boyfriend/partner might have been the reason for the eviction, the tenancy arrangement with Dublin Corporation was in the name of the female partner – therefore she was cited/named in the court order. In this context, it is also important to recognise that all local authority tenants are responsible, for the activities which take place within their local authority dwelling. The high number of single women with children who were evicted is also a reflection of the relatively large proportion of single parents who have tenancy arrangements with Dublin Corporation (single parent families are given a certain priority with local authority housing lists).

In relation to the age profile (at the time of eviction) of the adults cited/named in the eviction orders the oldest man was 74 years of age and the youngest man was 22 years of age. The oldest woman was 64 years of age and the youngest woman was 21 years of

age. The average age of the men who were evicted was 39 years of age whilst the average age of the women who were evicted was 31 years of age.

In relation to family composition 42 of the evictions involved parents) with children. These 42 families had a total of 103 children living with them prior to the eviction taking place i.e. an average of 2.45 children per family. The ages of these children ranged from less than one year of age to 21 years of age. The age categories of the children, at the time of eviction, was as follows:

Age range	Number of children
0-5	26 (25.2%)
6-10	37(35.9%)
11-15	28(27.2%)
16-21	12(11.7%)

The impact which the eviction and subsequent, related events had upon individual families will be considered at a later stage in this research report.

3.3 EXPERIENCES OF DINTERVDEWEES

In the course of the research project 23 interviews took place with people who had been evicted from Dublin Corporation housing units in 1997 and 1998 for anti-social behaviour. These 23 interviews involved 27 interviewees. In four cases, interviews took place with the two people who had been named/cited in the eviction orders – the other 19 interviews were with single individuals who had been named/cited in the eviction orders. In relation to the 23 evictions which were discussed during the various interviews, the following represents a breakdown of the different types of family units/structures:

- 6 interviews (26.1 %) were with single men without children.
- 1 interview (4.3%) was with a single woman without children.
- 12 interviews (52.2%) were with single women with children.
- 4 interviews (17.4%) were with couples with children.

These categorisations relate directly to the status of the individuals/families which was detailed in the eviction notices/orders. The balance/mix of interviewees corresponds reasonably closely to the overall profile of the 67 individuals/families evicted by Dublin Corporation in 1997 and 1998 for anti-social behaviour (see 3.2.)

In considering the experiences of the 27 evicted people who were interviewed during the research project, this section of the report will consider these experiences under the following headings:

- **Pre-eviction**
- **Time of eviction**
- **Post eviction – accommodation and re-housing**
- **Post eviction – family structures**
- **Post eviction – access to specialist/support services**
- **Post eviction – payments/benefits**

(i) Pre-eviction

At the pre-eviction stage there were varying levels of support and assistance provided by relevant statutory agencies. In some situations research interviewees said that representatives/officials from statutory agencies had worked closely with the tenants on whom notices to quit/court orders had been served, in order to determine if there were ways in which the tenants could continue to live in their local authority accommodation – this process might have involved the tenants making firm commitments to desist from any future involvement in anti-social or criminal activity. Most of the cases where there was a multi-agency intervention prior to the evictions taking place involved families with young children. It is evident that there was a certain level of concern about the impact which the eviction might have on the cohesion and unity of these families. Many of these families would have had an ongoing relationship with the Area Health Boards/social services, and officials from relevant agencies were conscious of the detrimental impact of the eviction on families who were already experiencing considerable levels of stress/crisis. A number of research interviewees felt that there was genuine and real commitment from officials/workers employed by statutory agencies to help resolve and work through the difficulties which had emerged and especially those difficulties being cited as grounds for eviction.

It is also evident, however, that in a significant number of other cases there was little communication from representatives of statutory agencies and negligible levels of co-operation between relevant agencies/organisations – rather than these agencies/organisations coming together to devise or compile comprehensive care plans for the individuals/families in danger of eviction, they tended to work in isolation from each other. On the basis of the feedback provided by these research interviewees, there are very few examples of meetings which involved a number of the relevant agencies and the individuals/families in danger of eviction. This is

unfortunate given the potential benefits and outcomes which could emerge from a multi-agency approach that would aim (i) to determine if there were ways in which the tenants could be allowed to remain within their local authority dwelling and (ii) to work out suitable and appropriate post eviction arrangements for tenants who were definitely going to be evicted. It is suggested that in future a greater emphasis should be placed on establishing cross-agency procedures and protocols at the pre-eviction stage, procedures/protocols which would involve a number of relevant agencies working closely with the individual/family in danger of eviction and which might result in the eviction decision being cancelled/deferred or suitable post eviction arrangements being made for those individuals/families against whom the court orders will be actioned. It is estimated that the timescale between the initial notice to quit and the actual eviction (i.e. a period of 12-18 months) should provide the relevant agencies and the tenants to be evicted with the time and the space to organise appropriate post eviction arrangements.

There were different views about the level of information and advice which was provided in relation to the eviction procedures. Whilst some interviewees said that they were fully informed about the various stages involved in the eviction process, others said that they received insufficient information about the process, about their rights and about accessing legal representation (in order to contest the claims/allegations of anti-social behaviour). In the opinion of some interviewees, the relevant authorities had decided at an early stage that they were going to expedite the eviction and were not prepared to listen to mitigating arguments or counter arguments in relation to the alleged anti-social behaviour. In this type of context they considered themselves to be at a distinct disadvantage – whilst the local authority had the necessary legal instruments to pursue the eviction through the courts and had the advice/guidance of legal professionals, this type of back-up support was not always made available to the tenants who were contesting the decision to evict them from their local authority homes. Whilst it is recognised that the formal letters issued by Dublin Corporation made clear references to a legal process and that the tenants had the option to utilise the services of solicitors, the feedback from some of the interviewees would suggest that they were not made aware of this option or encouraged to use this option. In a number of cases, they claimed that they had to present their own defence and were overwhelmed by the legal arguments presented by Dublin Corporation and its legal representatives.

In relation to this issue it should be recognised that all of the cases considered in this research report resulted in evictions being endorsed/approved by the courts and that in other instances pre-eviction settlements would have been worked out between Dublin Corporation and individual tenants (with tenants agreeing to desist from alleged anti-social behaviour and being allowed to remain within their houses/Hats). In other situations, the tenant might have successfully appealed the eviction decision of Dublin Corporation (with the appropriate and necessary legal back-up and support). On the basis of the interviews carried out during the research project with tenants who were evicted as a result of a court order, there does seem to be a need to ensure that greater consistency exists in relation to informing tenants who are in danger of eviction of their civil/legal rights and encouraging these tenants to access the appropriate legal services (so as to ensure that their case/argument can be presented in a fair and reasonable manner).

(ii) Time of eviction

At the immediate time of the eviction, a large majority of the research interviewees said that they received little or no support/guidance and advice from relevant statutory agencies. Interviewees said that they were not made aware of the options which existed in relation to issues like accommodation, impact on social welfare entitlements and secondary benefits. In a significant number of cases, it appears as if they had to fend for themselves and work their own way around the options which existed. In some instances, evicted tenants had already established good and positive relationships with social workers, counsellors, community welfare officers, public health nurses, community workers etc., and these individual workers helped them to access the services which were required. The nature of the support and advice provided seemed to depend, however, on the goodwill and commitment of the individual workers. There does not seem to have been any systematic procedure or system for advice and guidance to be offered to evicted tenants and their families. At a time of extreme trauma and stress when these people need support in relation to what they should do and where they should go in the period immediately following the eviction, these supports were often not made available. There was a sense, expressed by a number of interviewees, that they had been evicted for alleged anti-social behaviour and that

on account of their involvement in this anti-social behaviour they were expected to live with Ac consequences; and sort out their own arrangements in relation to issues like accommodation, social welfare benefits/entitlements, education of their children, family support services, accessing other specialised support services to deal with matters relating to alcohol/drug addiction. This assertion is strongly disputed by Dublin Corporation who have stated that its Eviction Officers have provided information on future accommodation options to all tenants evicted for anti-social behaviour (both at the pre-eviction and actual eviction stages of the process). In addition, Dublin Corporation are of the opinion that sufficient time exists between the notice to quit and the eviction taking place (i.e. a period of 12-18 months) for tenants to make new/alternative arrangements in relation to issues concerning accommodation, education and welfare of children etc.

When asked about the types of supports, -advice and guidance which were provided when the eviction orders were being actioned, over two thirds of the evicted tenants interviewed during this research project said that they received negligible levels of assistance from relevant statutory agencies. They also stated that there were minimum levels of co-operation between these agencies in responding to the multidimensional needs of individual tenants/families at the time when the evictions took place. There is little evidence, on the basis of the interviews which took place during the research project, of representatives from key agencies coming together to construct care plans for the evicted individuals/families – care plans which would respond to the housing, medical, emotional, addiction, educational, financial and employment/training needs of these individuals and families. Many of the interviewees said that they did not know how to work their ‘way around the system’ and who they should be approaching for help and advice. In addition, some of the interviewees who felt that they had low levels of self esteem and educational competencies said that they did not feel confident or comfortable about approaching relevant statutory agencies and voluntary organisations, about making an adequate presentation of their circumstances and needs, about filling in forms and dealing with bureaucracy. In this type of context it is evident that they needed some type of advocate and a person/organisation who would help them to work through the various options and to negotiate/mediate with appropriate government departments, statutory agencies and voluntary organisations. The experiences of the evicted tenants consulted

during this research project would suggest that, in many cases, this type of support and advocacy was not provided in a pro-active or structured manner.

At the tune of their evictions, the majority of interviewees stated that they were not given any clear guidelines and advice about how long it would take to be accepted onto the Dublin Corporation housing list or what criteria/conditions they would have to fulfil in order to be re-housed by Dublin Corporation. In the opinion of one interviewee this amounted to '*a double sentence*' – in addition to being evicted from their house/flat for anti-social behaviour, this person was also not given any indication of when her family might be re-housed by Dublin Corporation in the future. When asked about the guidance which had been provided in relation to re-housing by the local authority, over 70% of the evicted tenants consulted during this research project claimed that they did not know what they had to do or how long they had to wait before, they might be re-considered for re-housing by Dublin Corporation. In some instances evicted tenants adopted a pro-active approach in asking officials from Dublin Corporation about re-housing possibilities and a number of these requests elicited positive responses with Dublin Corporation officials saying that since it appeared that the tenants had desisted from anti-social behaviour they would be eligible for re-housing and would be reinstated on the Dublin Corporation housing list

It appears, however, that clearer guidelines need to be produced in relation to the eligibility criteria for re-housing by the local authority; and that, at the time of eviction, tenants/families need to know what they have to do to be re-housed and the period of time which they will be debarred from the local authority housing list on account of alleged anti-social behaviour (i.e. six months, one year, two years). It is considered that these types of guidelines would provide evicted tenants with an opportunity to plan for the future; and to set a series of personal goals/targets which would enable them to be re-housed in local authority accommodation within the shortest possible period of time. This review procedure does not automatically mean that the evicted tenants would be re-housed. Local authorities can still reserve the right to extend the period of time that evicted tenants will be debarred from housing lists (if the local authority is of the opinion that the evicted tenants are still involved in anti-social behaviour and/or pose a danger to other residents in the community in which they might be re-housed).

It is also recognised, however, that Dublin Corporation is reluctant to set a time limit within which the re-housing requests of evicted tenants might be considered. Dublin Corporation feels that the establishment of a specific time limit is unrealistic (given the different rehabilitation and re-integration needs and circumstances of evicted tenants); and that this type of time limit might result in a ‘revolving door’ syndrome (with tenants reverting back to their drug dealing/antisocial lifestyle when they have secured tenancy of another local authority dwelling within a specified period of time). In the context of this re-housing issue it also needs to be recognised that Dublin Corporation has put in place a procedure through which evicted tenants can apply to the local authority for re-entry onto Dublin Corporation’s housing list

(iii) Post eviction – accommodation and re-housing

In relation to the accommodation and housing movements of the 27 evicted tenants interviewed during this research project (involved in 23 separate evictions), the following represents the number of accommodation/housing moves which have been made by these people between the time of their eviction (in 1997 and 1998) and the time of the research interviews (between July 2000 and November 2000):

• 7 changes in accommodation	–	2 (7.4%)
• 6 changes in accommodation	–	3 (11.2%)
• 5 changes in accommodation	–	4 (14.9%)
• 4 changes in accommodation	–	7 (25.9%)
• 3 changes in accommodation	–	6 (22.2%)
• 2 changes in accommodation	–	2 (7.4%)
• Staying in the same location since the time that they were evicted	–	3(11.2%)

In considering these figures it is evident that the people who have had the largest number of accommodation changes between the time of their evictions and the time of the research interviews have been people who have experienced difficulties in settling into various types of accommodation and/or whose behaviour has forced accommodation providers (eg. bed and breakfast proprietors, hostel owners) to terminate the accommodation arrangements. It is also apparent that those people who have moved less frequently have been linked into extended

family networks (i.e. moving between -the homes of their parent(s) and brothers/sisters). The overall figures in relation to accommodation trends would suggest that the persons evicted from local authority housing units for anti-social behaviour have had a transient and migratory existence over the last 2-3 year period. Their accommodation circumstances are largely determined by a combination of availability of accommodation, decisions by relevant statutory agencies about the type of accommodation which is most appropriate to their needs and circumstances and the personal behaviour/attitude of the evicted tenants.

It is also apparent that the transient nature of the accommodation being accessed by these people present particular problems and difficulties in relation to issues like social welfare payments, accessing support/addiction services, education and welfare of children – the constant accommodation movements often make it difficult for statutory agencies to develop positive and meaningful relationships with the evicted tenants (as these tenants move from one administrative area to another) and for the evicted tenants to develop a sense of stability and permanence within their own lives (being unsure of how long they will remain at one address and where they will be accommodated in the future). This sense of drift and uncertainty about accommodation/housing issues has had a detrimental effect on many aspects of the lives of the evicted tenants – it has exacerbated physical and mental health problems, it has impacted upon their capacity to participate in alcohol/drug addiction programmes, it has led to relationship difficulties with partners and children, it has effected the overall morale, self-esteem and well-being of the evicted tenants. Whilst it could be argued that these negative consequences of the constant accommodation shifts are self-inflicted (i.e. largely due to the anti-social behaviour which precipitated their evictions) and that problems/difficulties existed prior to the time of eviction, it is also apparent that the transient nature of their lifestyles and accommodation patterns makes it less likely that they will re-integrate into mainstream society.

In analysing the accommodation movements of evicted tenants between the time of their eviction and the time of the research interviews, it is apparent that these can be divided into two main categories:

- *People who have lived in a combination of hostel and bed/breakfast accommodation.* Following their eviction many of these people would have visited the Homeless Persons Unit in Charles St. Staff in the Homeless

Persons Unit would have assessed the accommodation needs/requirements of these clients and tried to place them in hostel and bed/breakfast accommodation which was available within Dublin. The feedback from the evicted tenants interviewed during this research project would suggest that the staff within the Homeless Persons Unit have generally been helpful and supportive. The feedback would also indicate, however, that the hostel and bed/breakfast accommodation provided through the Homeless Persons Unit is often very basic and unsatisfactory. Particular reservations were expressed about the unhygienic and unsafe nature of much of the accommodation and the difficulties of maintaining the family unit and family relationships (many of the hostels are gender specific and some of the bed/breakfasts will not facilitate families with teenage children, especially boys). The restrictions and conditions applied by various hostel and bed/breakfast providers do not always facilitate or support the ongoing integrity and maintenance of the family unit. This issue of the impact of evictions on families with children will be considered in more detail later in this section of the research report.

- *People who have lived with extended family members eg, parents, brothers/sisters.* The experiences of people fortunate enough to have relatives in the Dublin area who are prepared to accommodate them has been varied. Whilst a small number of the research interviewees have been fully integrated back into their extended families, a larger number of interviewees said that this move had been stressful and difficult. In some instances, the evicted tenants together with their children had moved into the already overcrowded home of the extended family and tensions had emerged between family members on account of the additional people who were now living within the house. The merging of two families (i.e. the sitting tenants/householders and the family of the evicted person) has often been a difficult process and has resulted, in a number of occasions, in the family of the evicted person moving out of the parents home to live for a period of time with brothers, sisters and other relatives. It is evident that a key issue in relation to these various family relationships concerns the length of time which the extended family will be expected to provide accommodation for the family of the evicted person – in the absence of

clarity and guidelines about the' processes and the procedures for re-housing, and these processes/procedures being communicated to the evicted persons, it seems on occasions that they might have to stay with their extended family for an indefinite period of time. It would considerably ease the pressures/tensions on the evicted persons and their extended family, if there were clearer criteria and guidelines about when and how the evicted people might be considered for re-housing by the local authority.

The current accommodation status of the 27 evicted people interviewed between July 2000 and November 2000 is as follows:

- 6 (22.2%) are living in hostel accommodation.
- 6 (22.2%) are living in bed/breakfasts.
- 5(18.6%) are living within their extended family.
- 3 (11.1%) are living in accommodation provided by housing associations.
- 3 (11.1 %) are living in private rented accommodation.
- 4 (14.8%) have been re-housed by Dublin Corporation.

(iv) Post-eviction – family structures

In the course of this research project interviews took place with 27 evicted tenants who were involved in 23 individual evictions. Seven of these evictions involved single people without children – the other 16 evictions involved children (with 12 of the evictions relation to single women with children and 4 of the evictions relating to couples with children). These 16 families comprised a total of 34 children under the age of 18. In considering the experiences of these families between the time of their eviction (in 1997 and 1998) and the time of the research interviews (between July 2000 and November 2000) it is evident that the eviction and its consequences had a significant impact on the integrity/unity of virtually all of the 16 families with children. The aforementioned movements between different accommodation bases and the conditions applied by the proprietors/owners of these accommodation bases (eg. men only hostels, women only hostels, bed/breakfasts which do not welcome teenage children) placed enormous strains on the evicted families. It is estimated that only four of the evicted families succeeded in staying together for the entire duration of the period between the time of the eviction and the time of the research interviews (a period of 2-3 years). In all

of these four situations, the evicted persons' and their children had moved in with an extended family of parents and/or brothers and sisters. In relation to the other 12 families with children, they largely depended on a combination of hostel and bed/breakfast accommodation, m considering the experiences of these 12 families the following outcomes emerged:

- There was a period of separation in all 12 cases between individual family members. In some instances the father stayed in a men only hostel with the mother and her children staying in a womens only hostel whilst in other situations single women stayed in hostel or bed/breakfast accommodation and their children resided with extended family members. It is also apparent, however, that in approximately seven cases, the separation between parent(s) and their children was more long-term and severe. In these cases, the children were placed into care (residential care, foster care, care of grandparents and other relatives) on account of the inability of parents to adequately cater for the physical, emotional, educational and psychological needs of their children. The feedback from the evicted tenants consulted during the research project would suggest that the eviction process and the consequences of the eviction were significant contributory factors in the care orders which were taken out in relation to their children. The problems and pressures associated with a transient existence (moving between different locations and different hostels/bed and breakfasts), combined with other problems which might have existed, made it extremely difficult to maintain the integrity and cohesion of the family unit. The parent(s) were experiencing significant levels of stress as they tried to sort out their lives on a day-to-day and week-to-week basis and were often not in a position to provide the type of stability and support which are required by children and young people going through formative and important stages in their development. On the basis of the feedback provided by the research interviewees it is evident that the eviction process (and its consequences) has had a particularly negative and serious impact on families with children. This impact has related both to families who have experienced some type of short term separation and families where children have been taken into care in the best interests of child(ren) and their parent(s).

- The children of the evicted tenants interviewed during this research project have experienced significant levels of change, upheaval and disruption in their young lives. A number of the research interviewees said that their children had been badly affected by the events of the last 2-3 year period and that this had been reflected in personality difficulties and disorders within their children – some children had become very aggressive and angry whilst other children had become very withdrawn and subdued. These personality concerns have resulted in approximately 8 children of evicted families being referred to support services eg. educational psychologists, counsellors. It is also evident that the educational progress of many of the children within evicted families has been disrupted through the upheavals and changes which have taken place in the last 2-3 year period. The various accommodation movements have often made it difficult for parents to maintain their child's attendance in the school which they were attending at the time of the eviction and has resulted in many children being transferred to other schools (closer to the new accommodation addresses of their parents). This process had placed additional pressure on the stability and happiness of the children as they leave their old schools (and their friends within these schools and other friends within the communities from which their families were evicted) and try to integrate into a new school environment (within which most of the pupils and teachers would already have known each other for a number of years). It is natural to assume that these types of important life changes will have a disruptive, unsettling and detrimental impact on the children of parents who were evicted from their local authority houses/flats for antisocial behaviour.

In the context of the experiences of families with children who have been evicted for anti-social behaviour, it is evident that two key requirements relate to (i) the establishment of family friendly hostel, bed/breakfast and social housing options which will enable the full family unit to remain intact in safe, secure and comfortable accommodation; and (ii) a more holistic, integrated and co-ordinated approach to the needs of evicted persons and their families, an approach which would take full account of all of the needs of parents and their children.

(v) Post-eviction – access to specialist/support, services

A number of the evicted tenants interviewed during this research project said that they had received support, advice and assistance from workers employed by relevant statutory agencies and voluntary organisations. Many of the evicted tenants were heroin/opiate drug users – on the basis of information provided during the research interviews it is estimated that approximately 15 of the 27 people interviewed had a serious drug problem. Through the support and guidance provided by workers from key agencies and organisations 12 out of the 15 serious drug users had accessed drug treatment and rehabilitation programmes/projects (eg. detoxification programmes, methadone maintenance programmes, addiction counselling, drug rehabilitation programmes). The feedback from these 12 people would suggest that the drugs services responded in an efficient and expeditious manner to their particular needs and that there was not any undue delay in these people being provided with opportunities to access relevant drugs services/supports.

The experiences of evicted tenants who have serious drug problems would also indicate, however, that the transient and unsettled nature of their lifestyle (following the eviction) was not conducive to successful completion of drug treatment or drug rehabilitation programmes. A number of interviewees said that they relapsed during their participation on these programmes – they did not turn up for various sessions/meetings, they reverted to heroin usage. These interviewees felt the various crises in their lives (around issues like accommodation, health and welfare of themselves and their families, a sense of hopelessness about the future) increased the possibilities of drug dependency and lessened the possibilities of a drug free lifestyle. These people suggested that if there was some more clarity and direction about their future re-housing opportunities (*what* they had to do to be considered for re-housing by Dublin Corporation and *when* they might eventually be re-housed), it would provide them with the incentive and impetus to engage fully in drug treatment and drug rehabilitation programmes. In the absence of any clear sense of hope or direction about accessing permanent accommodation, evicted tenants with a serious drugs problem are more vulnerable to maintaining their drug habit/lifestyle and be less motivated to sustain their participation in drug treatment and drug rehabilitation programmes.

In addition to linking into drugs services, evicted tenants have also utilised specialist/support services provided by relevant statutory agencies and voluntary organisations – psychological services, relationship counselling, family support services, occupational therapist services, childcare services. From the experiences of the evicted tenants consulted during the research project these services tend to be provided on a reasonably ad hoc, reactive and uncoordinated manner. It is evident that many of the evicted tenants and their families face a number of multiple problems in their lives (eg. accommodation problems, addiction problems, medical problems, financial problems, parenting problems, relationships problems, domestic violence problems psychological problems). In the context of the multidimensional nature of the problems and difficulties which exist, it is also reasonable to assume-that the responses to these problems/difficulties should also be multidimensional (with an integrated and co-ordinated approach by relevant statutory agencies and voluntary organisations). The experience of most of the evicted tenants interviewed during this research project would suggest that the required level of co-ordination between these agencies/organisations did not always exist Whilst individual workers from individual agencies and organisations might provide help and support in relation to particular issues/concerns, the research interviewees did not feel that all of their needs and requirements were being addressed in a co-ordinated manner by all of the key agencies and organisations.

Furthermore, many interviewees said that agencies/organisations tended to react to various problems which were presented and did not adopt a pro-active approach in working with the families of the evicted tenants. It is apparent that many of these families could be considered vulnerable and at risk (on account of the eviction and subsequent difficulties) and that their progress following the period of eviction should be reviewed and monitored on a regular and ongoing basis. Whilst it is recognised that resource/staff constraints restrict the capacity of key agencies to engage in intensive, pro-active review and monitoring activities, some further consideration should be given to developing procedures which would enable key agencies to regularly check on the progress being made by evicted tenants and their families.

(vi) Post-eviction – payments/benefits and employment

A large majority of the evicted tenants interviewed during this research project were in receipt of state benefits and entitlements eg. unemployment assistance/benefit, child benefit, disability allowance, medical cards etc. In addition, the costs involved in the provision of hostel and bed/breakfast accommodation were often paid directly by relevant statutory agencies to the owners/proprietors of these accommodation centres. On the basis of the feedback provided by the research interviewees it appears that evicted tenants were not generally financially disadvantaged as a result of their anti-social behaviour and that they received the same type of entitlements as other people who were categorised as unemployed, homeless and in need of financial support from relevant statutory agencies. Their anti-social behaviour did not act as a barrier or an obstacle to these people linking into state benefits and entitlements.

In addition to the standard state entitlements, 16 of the 27 evicted people interviewed during this research project also succeeded in accessing exceptional needs payments from community welfare officers employed by the Area Health Boards in the eastern regions – payments relating to expenditure items like clothing, costs incurred in travelling to addiction centres and visiting children who were involved in care orders, the purchase of household items (eg. fridges, cookers, bedding materials). The feedback provided by some research interviewees would suggest that community welfare officers have generally been fairly flexible and positive in responding to the immediate needs of the evicted tenants/families and that these community welfare officers have not made moral judgements on the basis of anti-social behaviour — rather, the community welfare officers have tended to deal with every case on its merits and have not discriminated on the basis of the anti-social behaviour which had led to the original eviction decision. In other cases, however, evicted tenants felt that they had not been fully informed about their statutory benefits/entitlements and had not been made aware of the exceptional needs payments which could be made available for individuals/families who were confronted with outstanding financial demands and outgoings. On the basis of the experiences of the evicted tenants interviewed during this research project, there appears to be a need to clearly explain, at the earliest stages of the eviction and post-eviction process, the types of statutory benefits and entitlements which are available to people who have been evicted from their local authority houses/flats.

In relation to the issues of employment, it is estimated that 6 people out of the 27 people interviewed during this research project were engaged in productive and meaningful employment. Whilst a number of the interviewees would admit to difficulties in accessing and sustaining employment (on account of their chaotic, drug related lifestyle), it is also apparent that the eviction process has often acted as a barrier or obstacle to other evicted persons securing some type of meaningful and productive employment. The absence of a permanent address (no fixed abode), the personal pressures presented through constant accommodation movements and the day-to-day existence of many of the evicted persons/families have often made it difficult for evicted people to seriously consider the option of linking into sustainable, permanent employment. Although some of the evicted persons have linked into Community Employment schemes and other more permanent jobs, the overall experiences of the evicted people would suggest that some of the more basic life needs (eg. accommodation, care and welfare of children) need to be resolved prior to serious consideration of employment, training and educational options. A number of interviewees, for instance, made reference to the issue of childcare – when they are living in hostel or bed/breakfast accommodation (on limited income), it is simply not possible to organise childcare arrangements which would enable them to access employment, training and educational opportunities. In the context of the employment and self development needs of people who have been evicted from local authority housing units, it is considered that greater consideration needs to be given to ways in which they can become more integrated into the overall labour market and become more economically self sufficient. It is apparent that the transient and drifting lifestyle of many of the evicted people is not conducive to securing permanent and stable employment, and that measures need to be put in place (eg. jobs/employment counselling, affordable and accessible childcare, more secure accommodation) which would enable these people to progress into employment, training and educational opportunities.

3.4 SUMMARY OF EXPERIENCES

This section of the research report has aimed to describe and articulate the experiences of a cross-section of people who have been evicted from Dublin Corporation housing units in 1997 and 1998. It has not attempted to make any moral judgements about the reasons and the rationale for the decisions to evict – rather, it has tried to describe the

life experiences of the evicted tenants (and their families) since the time when the eviction orders were expedited. In considering these experiences, it is evident that it has been a difficult and traumatic time for many individuals/families and that they have had to cope with wide variety of life changes – changes in accommodation, changes in family structures, changes in relationships within these family structures, changes in relation to the education and well-being of family members. In many cases, these changes have exacerbated and intensified difficulties which already existed. Whilst there is a recognition of the support and advice provided by workers employed by relevant statutory agencies and voluntary organisations, there is also a sense that these agencies and organisations, as institutional units, have not adopted a pro-active or positive response to the needs of evicted individuals/families.

It is evident that the people evicted from Dublin Corporation housing units do not represent a homogenous grouping and that there are clear distinctions between the recent experiences of evicted persons with no children and evicted persons with children, and between the experiences of evicted persons who have been accommodated by extended family members and evicted persons who have had to depend on hostel and bed/breakfast type accommodation. On account of the differing needs and circumstances of the evicted people/families it is not considered feasible or sensible to develop any single strategy which will provide an appropriate response to all of their needs and requirements. Rather, it is necessary to consider the circumstances and lifestyles of each individual person/family and to devise appropriate responses to their own particular needs eg. the need for reasonable accommodation, the need for family stability, the need for advice and support.

Above all, the experiences of evicted tenants/families over the last 2-3 year period have served to highlight the central importance of secure, comfortable and affordable housing; and the impact which deprivation of this type of housing 'has upon the welfare and well-being of people who are homeless and/or who have to link into unsatisfactory, insecure, short-term housing arrangements (eg. with extended family members, in hostels and bed/breakfasts). It is apparent that satisfactory and reasonable housing is an important foundation stone and catalyst in relation to key issues like securing and retaining employment, maintaining the integrity/unity of the family, ensuring that children progress through the educational system, providing comfort and warmth to family members, having a sense of stability and security in one's life. The experiences of the evicted tenants/families over the last 2-3 year period would suggest that the lack of appropriate

accommodation has had a major impact on these types of issues, with many of the family units breaking up and becoming more dysfunctional and with individual people becoming increasingly vulnerable and less likely to re-integrate into mainstream society. Whilst recognising that there were valid reasons for the evictions being expedited, it is also important to recognise the experiences of the evicted people following these evictions and the need to provide guidelines and advice to these people about when and how they might be re-housed in reasonable, safe and secure local authority accommodation.

4. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1 INTRODUCTION

The previous section of this research report had profiled the people who were evicted from Dublin Corporation housing units in 1997 and 1998 for anti-social behaviour; and it has focused particular attention on the experiences of the 27 people interviewed during the course of this research project. Section 4 of the report will now draw together these experiences, with a view to determining the main conclusions which have emerged since 1997 in relation to the implementation and consequences of the evictions which were carried out by Dublin Corporation in 1997 and 1998. This section of the report will also make a number of recommendations in relation to ways in which the evictions processes and procedures, within the framework of these two pieces of legislation, might be enhanced and improved in the future.

4.2 CONCLUSIONS

- * The 1966 Housing Act together with the 1997 Housing (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act have been effective instruments in evicting Dublin Corporation tenants for anti-social behaviour. A clear legal framework/basis now exists for evicting tenants involved in anti-social behaviour and the cases taken over the last three year period would suggest that the provisions contained in the 1997 Housing (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act have placed Dublin Corporation and other local authorities in a stronger position to initiate eviction proceedings against tenants involved in anti-social behaviour. The definitions of anti-social behaviour contained in the 1997 Act, in conjunction with the fiscal, legal, administrative and exchange of information arrangements/procedures contained within this piece of legislation, have served to facilitate the process of evicting local authority tenants for anti-social behaviour – the effectiveness of the legislation is evidenced by the significantly larger number of evictions which took place in 1997 and 1998 for anti-social behaviour (following the enactment of the 1997 Housing (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act) than took place in the preceding five year period. On the basis of the experiences of implementing the 1997 Act over the last three year period, there can be little doubt that it has the potential to remove people involved in serious anti-social behaviour from local authority housing estates and flats complexes.

- * There appears to have been varying levels of co-ordination and co-operation between relevant statutory agencies in the period of time which preceded the evictions taking place. There seems to be a general consensus that it is far more appropriate and sensible to try and sort out the anti-social problems and difficulties at the pre-eviction stage with the hope/intention that the final sanction (i.e. the actual eviction) might not need to be applied. In this type of context, the individual tenants and the relevant agencies (eg. Health Boards, local authority. An Garda Síochána) should work closely together in defining the nature of the problems to be resolved and in constructing solutions to these problems. These solutions might, for instance, involve the tenants agreeing to desist from alleged anti-social behaviour and/or the tenants committing themselves to participating in drug treatment and drug rehabilitation programmes. Whilst it is evident that, in some cases, the tenants and the agencies did strive to ‘reach some type of pre-eviction agreement, the feedback from other evicted tenants could suggest that there were minimal levels of support, advice and encouragement provided by relevant statutory agencies.

The experiences of the evicted tenants, and the significant repercussions of the eviction decision (as described in the previous section of this research report) would suggest that it is imperative for all relevant agencies to work together with the local authority tenants in order to develop strategies/plans which might allow these tenants to remain in their houses/flats and which negate the need for evictions to be carried out. Whilst it is recognised that these types of discussions and negotiations do take place, it is necessary to ensure that they become common practice in relation to potential eviction proceedings.

- * For people who have been evicted from local authority housing units for antisocial behaviour, there is some confusion and uncertainty about what they need to do to be re-considered for re-housing by Dublin Corporation and how long they will have to wait before they are allowed to re-enter the local authority housing list. A large number of evicted tenants consulted during this research project said they were not given any clear indication, at the time of eviction, about the procedures involved in being re-considered for local authority housing – they said that there were no clear criteria about the conditions which they would need to meet in order to be re-considered for local authority housing (eg. to become drug

free, to participate in drug treatment and drug rehabilitation programmes, to desist from involvement in anti-social behaviour) nor were they informed about how long they might have to wait to be re-housed by the local authority. On the basis of information provided by Dublin Corporation it is evident that a five stage procedure for re-housing does exist:

i.e. Stage 1 – Person informs Dublin Corporation that he/she wants to get back on the housing list.

Stage 2 – The Housing Welfare Officer will examine the case.

Stage 3 – The applicant will be interviewed by allocations welfare and estate management officials.

Stage 4 – A case conference will be conducted involving, all parties listed at stage 3.

Stage 5 – Decision will be made about whether to place the person on the housing list.

Whilst this type of procedure appears to be reasonable and fair, many of the evicted tenants interviewed during this research project would claim they did not know about this procedure. Furthermore, they said that they did not know how long they would have to wait before approaching Dublin Corporation in relation to potential re-housing possibilities. In this context there is a clear need to make the procedure for re-housing more publicly available (i.e. Tenants Handbooks, information leaflets etc.) and, more specifically, to directly inform evicted tenants about this procedure and the likely timescale which will be involved (both in relation to the period of time that they will be excluded from local authority housing lists and the period of time which it will take to progress their application for re-housing). It is recognised that Dublin Corporation has made significant progress in the last 2-3 year period in relation to the formulation of procedures and protocols concerning evictions for anti-social behaviour – these procedures/protocols now need to be disseminated to a wider audience of tenants and workers from relevant statutory agencies and voluntary organisations.

* The eviction process places particular pressure and strain on families with children. Earlier references have been made in this research report to the levels of family break-up and separation which have taken place following the eviction process – with family members living in different accommodation units (on

account of the rules which are being applied by hostel and bed/breakfast establishments), with children being taken into care (on account of concerns about the parents capacity to look after their children and the unsatisfactory and ‘unhygienic nature of some of the short-term accommodation which is currently available). It is also evident that the post-eviction experiences of the families profiled in this research report have had detrimental impacts on the health, education and emotional well-being of children, and that the children have not had the necessary levels of stability, continuity and consistency which are often required to make an effective progression through childhood and adolescence.

Whilst recognising the potential benefits of the 1966 Housing Act and the 1997 Housing (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act as mechanisms for removing people involved in anti-social behaviour from local communities, it is apparent the enactment of these pieces of legislation has also impacted upon other family members (in addition to the person who has been identified as being involved in anti-social behaviour). There is some concern, in this context, that the application of the legislation is an overly ‘blunt instrument’ which serves to penalise innocent parties (eg. adult family members who are not engaged in anti-social behaviour, children) as well as targeting the identified culprit/offender. In considering the number of people affected by the eviction process who were profiled during this research report (i.e. 27 adults named in the eviction orders, and 34 child dependants of the 16 families with children) it is evident that more children than adults have suffered through the implementation of the eviction legislation.

It appears that there is a clear requirement to strike the appropriate balance between the needs of local communities (who want to live in a peaceful, drug free environment) and the needs of families/children (who have a need for stability and consistency within their lives). It is recognised that this can be an extremely fine balance to strike and that there are only limited options in removing the anti-social offender whilst also maintaining the integrity of the rest of the family unit within the family home. This issue also serves to highlight the different priorities of the local authorities and the Health Boards i.e. whilst the priority for the Health Boards relates to the care and protection of families, the priority for the local authorities relates to the safety and security of tenants and the maintenance of local authority estates/flats complexes.

An additional conclusion, in relation to the experiences of families with children, relates to the absence of appropriate short-term accommodation units which can facilitate families who have been evicted from their local authority houses/flats. The existing range of short-term accommodation is considered to be unsuitable and inappropriate for families with children. The gender specific nature of much of this accommodation often results in a period of separation (with adult males and adult females living apart) and the substandard and unhygienic nature of some of this accommodation is not suitable for children (especially young children under the age of 10). On the basis of the interviews carried out during this research project, and the direct experiences of this researcher visiting a number of the short-term accommodation units, it is apparent that living in these units is not conducive to the positive welfare and well-being of children – there are no play or recreational outlets for children, these units often accommodate a high proportion of drug users/addicts, families with young children are often living in extremely cramped and confined accommodation (eg. 2-3 children living with their parents in a one bedroom flat). The outcomes from the research project have clearly indicated the urgent need for family friendly short-term accommodation units to be developed, units which would aim to cater for the various needs of children and their parents within a safe, secure and-comfortable environment.

- * There have been varying levels of support and assistance provided to evicted tenants/families since the time of their eviction. Statutory agencies and voluntary organisations have generally responded positively to requests which have been made by these evicted tenants – requests for exceptional needs payments, requests for participation on drug treatment and rehabilitation programmes, requests for assistance in relation to the health and welfare of their children. The experiences of the evicted tenants/families would suggest that the frontline workers employed by relevant agencies and organisations have been positive and sympathetic to the circumstances of these individuals/families and have tried, as far as possible, to be flexible in their responses to the problems and difficulties which have been presented. Complaints and grievances which were aired during the research interviews have primarily related to the short-term accommodation which was offered to the evicted tenants/families and, in more particular terms, the type and standard of accommodation which was available for families with children. It is

recognised, however, that the reasons for these grievances and complaints have more to do with the lack of appropriate accommodation options (eg. family hostels, safe and secure bed and breakfast accommodation) than with the unwillingness of statutory agencies to place evicted families in decent, reasonable accommodation.

There seems to have been a limited amount of monitoring and tracking of the people who were evicted from their local authority houses/flats for anti-social behaviour. Whilst relevant statutory agencies have generally re-acted positively to requests for help and assistance from these people, there is no evidence that procedures and systems have been put in place for regularly and systematically monitoring what has happened to evicted tenants/families following their eviction. It would seem that these individuals/families are at a particularly vulnerable stage in this post-eviction phase in their lives as they try to cope with the realities of securing new accommodation, making educational arrangements for their children, sorting out their financial/benefits arrangements, coping with the emotional and psychological consequences of losing their homes. In this context, it would seem reasonable to assume that relevant statutory agencies and voluntary organisations should be working closely together with the evicted tenants/families so as to ensure that the transition to a new set of life circumstances is handled in a sensitive, empathetic and co-ordinated manner. A number of research interviewees said that there had been no contact from statutory agencies since the time of their eviction whilst others stated that each agency provided its own response to individual needs (when a more co-ordinated and integrated response involving a number of relevant agencies might have been more appropriate and necessary). On the basis of this feedback^ key statutory agencies should review the systems and procedures which currently exist for working with evicted tenants/families following the time of their eviction, and they should try to develop more pro-active and co-ordinated policies which aim to provide integrated responses to the multifarious needs of many of the evicted tenants/families.

4.3 RECOMMENDATIONS

(i) Pre-eviction

1. All relevant agencies and organisations should work closely with the tenants who are in danger of being evicted from their houses/flats, with the aim of constructing

an agreement which would enable these tenants to continue living within their local authority houses/flats.

2. Tenants in danger of being evicted from their local authority houses/flats should be provided with the legal services and supports which will often be required to contest the eviction order. Tenants should be made aware of the fact that this type of legal support is available if they wish to challenge the eviction notice.

(ii) At time of eviction

3. Evicted tenants need to be informed about the systems and the procedures which exist in relation to being re-housed by the local authority. They need to receive clear information about how long they will have to wait before being considered for re-housing and any conditions which might apply in relation to future rehousing by the local authority (eg. desisting from anti-social behaviour, participation in drug treatment and drug rehabilitation programmes).
4. Relevant agencies and organisations should work closely with evicted tenants and their families at the time of eviction in order to ensure that appropriate arrangements can be made in relation to immediate issues concerning accommodation, financial entitlements/benefits, welfare and education of children.
5. There is a need to ensure that the procedures which have been established for the transfer of information between local authorities and the Health Boards about evicted tenants at the time of eviction is implemented in an effective and satisfactory manner, with relevant agencies being made aware of the background to and circumstances involved in individual eviction cases.

(iii) Post-eviction

6. The progress being made by evicted tenants/families following the eviction should be reviewed and monitored on a regular and ongoing basis. This review and monitoring process should involve all of the relevant agencies and organisations which have responsibility for the welfare, care and well-being of vulnerable/at risk adults and children.
7. Each eviction case should be reviewed six months after the eviction has taken place in order to determine whether there are good reasons for the re-instatement of evicted tenants onto local authority housing lists. This review process should continue to take place at regular six monthly intervals (for the period of time that the evicted tenants are refused admission onto the housing lists'). Local authorities

would still reserve the right to exclude evicted tenants from housing lists if it is considered that these tenants are still involved in anti-social behaviour and/or pose a danger to the residents of the community where they might be re-housed.

8. New accommodation options need to be developed for evicted families with children. The current range of short-term accommodation is often unsatisfactory, unsafe and unhygienic. There is a need to establish family friendly accommodation units which will incorporate sufficient living/bedroom space for parents and their children, which will have play and recreational outlets for children and which will be safe and secure from negative and pernicious influences (eg. there should not be a culture or a lifestyle of drug abuse within these family accommodation units).
9. Some consideration should be given to the placing of evicted tenants on local authority housing lists when they have been accepted for re-entry onto these lists -will they be placed at the bottom of these lists or will the period of exclusion from local authority housing be taken into consideration when determining the length of time which they have been waiting for housing?

(iv) Other recommendations

10. Clear and unambiguous guidelines and information needs to be produced in relation to the operations and implementation of the eviction procedure (within the context of the 1996 Housing Act and the 1997 Housing (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act). These guidelines should be distributed to a wide audience of local authority tenants (through their Tenants Handbook) and to officials/workers employed by relevant statutory agencies and voluntary organisations.
11. Training courses and programmes organised by relevant agencies and organisations should strive to ensure that workers employed by these agencies/organisations have a good, solid understanding of key issues relating to the legislative framework for anti-social evictions, the rationale for anti-social evictions taking place and the procedures which need to be applied at the pre-eviction, actual eviction and post-eviction stages within the overall eviction process. These courses/programmes should build upon the training activities already being delivered by Dublin Corporation (for officials and tenants) and other agencies/organisations.
12. Joint training courses/programmes should be organised for officials employed by local authorities and Health Boards. The purpose of these courses/programmes

should be to try and ensure that there is a shared, common understanding around issues relating to evictions for anti-social behaviour.

EASTERN REGIONAL HEALTH AUTHORITY – ANALYSIS OF 1996 SMALL AREA POPULATION STATISTICS

No. of persons per DED in South Western Area Health Board, by epidemiological age groups

Tuesday, July 03, 2001

-----EHA_AREA=South Western Area-----								
Code DED Name	<1	1-4	5-14	15-24	25-44	45-64	65+	Total
501 ATHY EAST URBAN	31	142	391	364	660	407	296	2291
504 ATHY RURAL	18	73	248	254	449	433	190	1665
502 ATHY WEST URBAN	32	115	308	381	493	464	378	2171
505 BALLAGHMOON	2	8	36	24	67	45	22	204
301 BALLINASCORNEY	7	44	88	96	125	110	44	514
608 BALLINGUILE	3	5	13	9	30	13	20	93
506 BALLITORE	9	41	106	112	169	137	75	649
302 BALLYBODEN	107	465	918	824	1864	901	181	5260
507 BALLYBRACKEN	9	21	95	75	119	77	37	433
556 BALLYMORE EUSTACE	18.	83	246	209	399	284	146	1385
542 BALLYNADRUMMY	3	33	90	97	138	102	60	523
557 BALLY SAX EAST	41	152	529	485	690	365	111	2373
558 BALLY SAX WEST	11	53	173	167	251	190	92	937
508 BALLYSHANNON	11	56	130	85	218.	132	91	723
533 BALRAHEEN	12	63	394	453	328	261	87	1598
609 BALTINGLASS	34	98	301	240	467	303	251	1694
509 BELAN	0	8	34	32	47	31	25	177
510 BERT	1	3	24	36	35	31	22	152
610 BLESSINGTON	48	190	492	432	875	495	184	2716
559 BODENSTOWN	18	67	268	270	392	325	118	1458
303 BOHERNABREENA :	27	138	670	510	745	462	129	2681
611 BURGAGE	11	43	119	99	177	140	48	637
511 BURTOWN	2	15	54	45	75	82	27	300
543 CADAMSTOWN	7	31	142	128	166	143	66	683
544 CARBURY	16	94	274	263	393	234	125	1399
560 CARNALWAY	13	77	222	225	375	266	114	1292
561 CARRAGH	7	48	128	137	191	164	60	735
545 CARRICK	3	12	39	32	50	35	31	202
512 CARRIGEEN	7	20	83	69	133	106	68	486
513 CASTLEDERMOT	14	63	194	230	300	237	116	1154
534 CELBRIDGE	238	1025	2484	1405	4337	1256	398	11143
37 CHAPELIZOD.	20	36	86	161	373	246	304	1226
38 CHERRY ORCHARD A	42	105	334	312	429	102	74	1398
39 CHERRY ORCHARD B	40	140	508	486	853	515	507	3049
40 CHERRY ORCHARD C	75	316	1231	775	1008	480	56	3941
514 CHURCHTOWN	3	26	84	73	144	72	51	453
562 CIANE	87	322	728	614	1361	671	229	4012
535 CLONCURRY (CELBRIDGE NO. 1 R.D.)	16	55	181	156	267	161	87	923
546 CLONCURRY (EDENDERRY NO. 2 R.D.)	2	17	54	43	52	47	14	229
310 CLONDALKIN VILLAGE	173	605	1559	1085	3276	972	453	8123

Health Information Unit, Dr Steevens Hospital, Tel 6352749

SAPS96; EHA5_SouthWest

Note; Ward 037 (Chapelizod) is shared with Northern Area H.B.

EASTERN REGIONAL HEALTH AUTHORITY – ANALYSIS OF 1996 SMALL AREA POPULATION STATISTICS

No. of persons per DED in South Western Area Health Board, by epidemiological age groups

Tuesday, July 03, 2001

		-----EHA_AREA=South Western Area-----							
Code	DED Name	<1	1-4	5-14	15-24	25-44	45-64	65+	Total
304	CLONDALKIN-BALLYMOUNT	35	148	412	212	709	211	85	1812
305	CLONDALKIN-CAPPAGHMORE	25	128	493	363	482	249	85	1825
306	CLONDALKIN-DUNAWLEY	158	702	2385	1937	2771	1148	188	9289
307	CLONDALKIN-MONASTERY	142	593	1556	1445	3049	1406	442	8633
308	CLONDALKIN-MOORFIELD	143	585	1588	1310	2138	822	111	6697
309	CLONDALKIN-ROWLAGH	95	369	1272	1328	1377	748	49	5238
51	CRDMLIM A	54	188	524	580	1090	929	587	3952
52	CRUMLIN B	39	139	456	485	901	755	555	3330
53	CRUMLIN C	33	99	292	389	622	524	386	2345
54	CRUMLIN D	63	227	537	640	1210	900	542	4119
55	CRDMLIN E	42	149	389	457	760	660	468	2925
56	CROMLIN F	83	187	394	434	868	635	485	3086
57	DECIE3	33	153	529	559	855	713	422	3264
536	DONADEA	9	14	87	65	133	87	40	435
537	DONAGHCUMPER	32	138	571	495	756	496	183	2671
612	DONAGHMORE	2	16	62	51	83	68	42	324
613	DONARD	3	13	86	56	96	73	53	380
563	DONORE	9	38	110	63	188	99	44	551
564	DOWN INGS	20	62	276	285	372	280	104	1399
547	DREHID	6	9	21	20	65	37	22	180
565	DROICHEAD NOA (NEHBRIDGE) RURAL	2	37	173	158	239	211	79	899
566	DROICHEAD NUA (NEWBRIDGE) URBAN	98	421	1169	1175	1966	1183	574	6586
61	DRUMFINN	40	168	565	537	1131	714	832	3987
548	DUNFIERTH	8	25	109	98	162	93	48	543
614	DUNLAVIN	16	70	240	211	304	228	100	1169
515	DONMANOGUE	8	37	94	65	130	82	46	462
567	DUNMURRY	5	22	50	53	80	69	29	308
615	EADESTOWN	2	8	19	20	37	28	20	134
311	EDMONDSTOWN	83	349	1174	726	1675	668	188	4863
568	FEIGHCULLEN	4	25	94	128	131	119	38	539
314	FIRHOUSE VILLAGE	128	506	1323	1083	2603	1027	189	6859
312	FIRHOUSE-BALLYCULLEN	150	501	824	420	2211	399	98	4603
313	FIRHOUSE-KNOCKLYON	42	233	964	1000	1194	1042	154	4629
516	FONTSTOHH-	5	17	66	53	91	68	37	337
569	GILLTOWN'	6	30	124	102	211	144	78	695
517	GRANEY	5	46	69	50	116	85	62	433
518	GRANGEMELLON	7	29	94	95	144	96	60	525
519	HARRISTOWN	3	12	74	52	64	70	30	305
616	HARTSTOWN	2	13	31	37	58	53	32	226
617	HOLLYWOOD	5	36	97	89	141	105	51	524

Health Information Unit, Dr Steevens Hospital, Tel 6352749
SAPS96; EHA5_SouthWeat

EASTERN REGIONAL HEALTH AUTHORITY – ANALYSIS OF 1996 SMALL AREA POPULATION STATISTICS

No. of persons per DED in South Western Area Health Board, by epidemiological age groups

Tuesday, July 03, 2001

-----EHA_AREA=South Western Area-----

Code DED Name	<1	1-4	5-14	15-24	25-44	45-64	65+	Total
618 HUMEWOOD	2	12	56	30	80	42	46	268
619 IMAEL NORTH	4	7	40	35	57	49	25	217
620 IMAEL SOUTH	3	9	38	40	60	44	29	223
520 INCHAQUIRE	1	9	31	27	48	43	22	181
78 INCHICORE A	23	81	215	312	572	506	436	2145
79 INCHICORE B	24	93	277	283	536	390	380	1983
521 JOHNSTOWN	2	9	24	25	32	44	25	161
522 KILBERRY	6	30	121	154	148	111	38	608
621 KILBRIDE (BALTINGLASS NO. 1 R.D.)	8	48	163	154	229	185	66	853
538 KILCOCK	40	175	436	360	690	364	173	2238
570 KILCULLEN	22	88	265	321	401	379	206	16B2
523 KILDANGAN	2	13	46	44	81	61	21	268
571 KILDARE	85	279	987	1053	1479	975	485	5343
524 KILKEA	7	32	94	80	89	79	45	426
572 KILL	22	123	396	382	645	466	144	2178
573 KILLASHEE	2	6	70	32	58	63	25	256
549 KILLINTHOMAS	3	20	47	47	84	41	21	263
83 KILMAINHAM A	32	109	353	386	658	527	380	2445
84 KILMAINHAM B	7	54	118	210	377	250	156	1172
85 KILMAINHAM C	69	229	463	523	973	638	551	3446
574 KILMEAGE NORTH	22	78	231	194	377	229	81	1212
575 KILMEAGE SOUTH	11	75	236	160	324	200	57	1063
550 KILPATRICK	3	40	128	110	186	131	52	650
551 KILRAINY	3	27	62	76	105	93	39	405
525 KILRUSH	7	31	58	57	93	65	31	342
576 KILTEEL	3	26	95	78	131	111	15	459
90 KIMMAGE A	31	97	305	332	604	449	365	2183
91 KIMMAGE B	47	183	594	648	1059	949	557	4037
92 KIMMAGE C	23	80	199	787	1080	494	362	3025
93 KIMMAGE D	23	98	271	338	761	523	361	2375
94 KIMMAGE E	39	154	423	507	1149	601	570	3443
95 KYLEMORE	26	147	503	456	845	619	469	3065
526 LACKAGH	10	31	103	75	141	94	60	514
622 LACKAN	11	34	111	110	197	151	64	678
577 LADYTOWN'	11	36	78	101	159	130	44	559
539 LEIXLIP	179	794	3013	2702	4128	2338	431	13585
316 LUCAN HEIGHTS	72	282	982	1145	1662	1322	352	5817
315 LUCAN-ESKER	245	695	836	941	3929	640	165	7451
317 LUCAN-ST HELENS	102	388	1344	1276	2201	1279	325	6915
623 LUGGLASS	2	7	33	15	42	12	16	127

Health Information Unit, Dr Steevens Hospital, Tel 6352749
SAPS 96; EHA5_Southwest

EASTERN REGIONAL HEALTH AUTHORITY – ANALYSIS OF 1996 SMALL AREA POPULATION STATISTICS

No. of persons per DED in South Western Area Health Board, by epidemiological age groups

Tuesday, July 03, 2001

-----EHA_AREA=South Western Area-----

Code DED Name	<1	1-4	5-14	15-24	25-44	45-64	65+	Total
552 LULLYMORE	1	2	28	23	34	34	9	131
96 MANSION HOUSE A	30	145	435	834	844	500	351	3139
97 MANSION HOUSE B	8	42	103	160	287	105	65	770
540 MAYNOOTH	146	572	1207	2590	3187	1147	437	9286
98 MERCHANTS QUAY A	22	85	186	303	551	206	160	1513
99 MERCHANTS QUAY B	22	56	138	563	925	396	256	2356
100 MERCHANTS QUAY C	23	75	215	343	569	409	445	2079
103. MERCHANTS QUAY D	21	71	188	344	611	426	399	2060
102 MERCHANTS QUAY E	23	46	80	371	573	206	164	1463
103 MERCHANTS QUAY F	118	192	290	427	743	310	216	2296
527 MONASTEREVIN	44	172	493	485	824	561	241	2820
528 MOONE	7	20	61	36	91	58	43	316
578 MORRISTOWNBILLER	106	500	1401	1475	2212	1342	362	7398
579 NAA5 RURAL	7	38	129	93	220	131	50	668
503 NAA5 URBAN	276	1009	2326	2273	5038	2275	877	14074
529 NARRAGHMORE	8	25	85	84	123	88	41	454
318 NEWCASTLE	19	87	303	500	557	654	254	2374
580 NEHTOWN	4	25	82	67	116	88	36	418
530 NORNEY	7	46	122	78	167	85	50	555
581 OLDCONNELL	6	33	137	126	142	142	84	670
582 OUGHTERARD	5	28	99	107	151	152	51	593
319 PALMERSTOWN VILLAGE	45	161	461	594	1145	1049	506	3961
320 PALMERSTOWN WEST	136	640	2071	1597	2744	976	285	8449
110 PEMBROKE EAST A	62	190	602	775	1361	797	562	4349
115 PEMBROKE WEST A	17	52	126	289	587	328	249	1648
583 POLLARDSTOWN	2	14	35	34	66	57	18	226
531 QUINSBOROUGH	0	6	28	14	32	11	8	99
553 RATHANGAN	24	78	239	242	357	269	130	1339
321 RATHCOOLE	33	145	557	845	783	887	198	3448
624 RATHDANGAN	5	17	51	50	87	94	69	373
584 RATHERNAN	7	12	68	72	98	84	27	368
127 RATHFARNHAM	40	173	486	874	1460	858	629	4520
326 RATHFARNHAM VILLAGE	29	125	341	393	804	576	489	2757
322 RATHFARNHAM-BALLYROAN	19	105	328	466	718	812	455	2903
323 RATHFARNHAM-BUTTERFIELD	27	98	389	626	800	936	447	3323
324 RATHFARNHAM-HERMITAGE	71	292	830	729	1403	671	288	4284
325 RATHFARNHAM-ST ENDAS	52	228	693	849	1313	994	364	4493
132 RATHMINES WEST A	31	87	165	1304	1556	469	487	4099
133 RATHMINES WEST B	23	83	151	1136	1283	361	301	3338

Health Information Unit, Dr Steevens Hospital, Tel 6352749

SAPS96; EHA5_SouthWest

Note: Ward 115 (Pembroke West A) is shared with East Coast Area H.B.

EASTERN REGIONAL HEALTH AUTHORITY – ANALYSIS OF 1996 SMALL AREA POPULATION STATISTICS

No. of persons per DED in South Western Area Health Board, by epidemiological age groups

Tuesday, July 03, 2001

-----EHA_AREA=South Western Area-----

Code DED Name	<1	1-4	5-14	15-24	25-44	45-64	65+	Total
134 RATHMINES WEST C	23	73	183	765	1025	393	224	2686
135 RATHMINES WEST D	23	108	286	739	1167	429	299	3051
136 RATHMINES WEST E	40	96	268	736	1328	503	409	3380
137 RATHMINES WEST F	15	76	149	927	1123	380	307	2977
585 RATHMPRE	17	65	170	115	280	158	72	877
625 RATHSALLAGH	3	14	42	47	75	47	24	252
586 ROBERTSTOWN	16	77	250	301	439	287	140	1510
140 ROYAL EXCHANGE A	9	61	148	580	809	404	256	2267
141 ROYAL EXCHANGE B	10	63	119	366	639	246	170	1613
327 SAGGART	11	48	187	220	333	348	261	1408
532 SKERRIES	4	18	69	93	103	70	33	390-
143 SOUTH DOCK	119	61	216	747	1350	428	386	3307
142 ST KEVINS	40	102	172	993	1308	503	379	3497
541 STRAFFAN	11	66	272	233	369	300	107	1358
626 STRATFORD	5	22	59	59	88	66	25	324
627 TALBOTSTOWN	1	17	79	52	82	46	49	326
328 TALLAGHT-AVONBEG	21	89	303	443	535	503	73	1967
329 TALLAGHT-BELGARD	20	82	398	506	530	460	71	2067
330 TALLAGHT-FETTERCAIRN	121	575	1559	1129	1560	511	58	5513
331 TALLAGHT-GLENVIEW	18	59	222	392	317,	373	49	1430
332 TALLAGHT-JOBSTOWN	161	700	2007	1513	2257	567	89	7294
333 TALLAGHT-KILLINAKDAM	78	397	1334	1212	1251	643	55	4970
334 TALLAGHT-KILNAMANAGH	80	328	1242	1170	1783	913	117	5633
335 TALLAGHT-KILTIPPER	123	446	1417	940	1688	552	71	5237
336 TALLAGHT-KINGSWOOD .	65	272	1082	892	1446	672	110	4539
337 TALIAGHT-MILLBROOK	46	203	602	1128	1066	1301	162	4508
338 TALLAGHT-OLDBAWN	52	216	918	1259	1264	1168	163	5040
339 TALLAGHT-SPRINGFIELD	114	483	1563	2085	1987	1454	117	7803
340 TALLAGHT-TYMON	57	282	1225	1716	1466	1271	272	6289
346 TEMPLEOGUE VILLAGE	9	50	187	281	378	471	352	1728
341 TEMPLEOGUE-CYPRESS	24	126	549	730	788	841	195	3253
342 TEMPLEOGUE-KIMMAGE MANOR	20	129	413	517	981	781	679	3520
343 TEMPLEOGUE-LIMEKILN	47	199	522	907	1143	1127	316	4261
344 TEMPLEOGUE-ORWELL	19	112	512	691	644	764	129	2871
345 TEMP.L.EOGUE-OSPREY	34	158	601	626	867	637	106	3029
144 TERENCE A	33	148	289	579	1306	663	502	3520
145 TERENCE B	36	158	370	509	1159	688	594	3514
146 TERENCE C	16	75	250	262	460	388	382	1833
147 TERENCE D	5	17	116	161	196	215	162	872
347 TERENCE-CHERRYFIELD	15	102	230	345	654	506	489	2341

Health Information Unit, Dr Steevens Hospital, Tel 6352749
SAPS96; EHA5_SouthWest