

THE URBAN BOOK SERIES

Daniel Baldwin Hess · Tiit Tammaru
Maarten van Ham *Editors*

Housing Estates in Europe

Poverty, Ethnic Segregation and Policy
Challenges

The Urban Book Series

Series Advisory Editors

Fatemeh Farnaz Arefian, University College London, London, UK

Michael Batty, University College London, London, UK

Simin Davoudi, Newcastle University, Newcastle, UK

Geoffrey DeVerteuil, Cardiff University, Cardiff, UK

Karl Kropf, Oxford Brookes University, Oxford, UK

Marco Maretto, University of Parma, Parma, Italy

Vítor Oliveira, Porto University, Porto, Portugal

Christopher Silver, University of Florida, Gainesville, USA

Giuseppe Strappa, Sapienza University of Rome, Rome, Italy

Igor Vojnovic, Michigan State University, East Lansing, USA

Jeremy Whitehand, University of Birmingham, Birmingham, UK

Aims and Scope

The Urban Book Series is a resource for urban studies and geography research worldwide. It provides a unique and innovative resource for the latest developments in the field, nurturing a comprehensive and encompassing publication venue for urban studies, urban geography, planning and regional development.

The series publishes peer-reviewed volumes related to urbanization, sustainability, urban environments, sustainable urbanism, governance, globalization, urban and sustainable development, spatial and area studies, urban management, urban infrastructure, urban dynamics, green cities and urban landscapes. It also invites research which documents urbanization processes and urban dynamics on a national, regional and local level, welcoming case studies, as well as comparative and applied research.

The series will appeal to urbanists, geographers, planners, engineers, architects, policy makers, and to all of those interested in a wide-ranging overview of contemporary urban studies and innovations in the field. It accepts monographs, edited volumes and textbooks.

More information about this series at <http://www.springer.com/series/14773>

Daniel Baldwin Hess · Tiit Tammaru
Maarten van Ham
Editors

Housing Estates in Europe

Poverty, Ethnic Segregation and Policy
Challenges

Editors

Daniel Baldwin Hess
Department of Urban and Regional Planning,
School of Architecture and Planning
University at Buffalo, State University
of New York
Buffalo, NY
USA

Maarten van Ham
OTB—Research for the Built Environment
Delft University of Technology
Delft, Zuid-Holland
The Netherlands

and

Tiit Tammaru
Department of Geography,
Centre for Migration and Urban Studies
University of Tartu
Tartu
Estonia

School of Geography and Sustainable
Development
University of St Andrews
St Andrews
UK

and

OTB—Research for the Built Environment
Delft University of Technology
Delft, Zuid-Holland
The Netherlands



ISSN 2365-757X

ISSN 2365-7588 (electronic)

The Urban Book Series

ISBN 978-3-319-92812-8

ISBN 978-3-319-92813-5 (eBook)

<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-92813-5>

Library of Congress Control Number: 2018943382

© The Editor(s) (if applicable) and The Author(s) 2018. This book is an open access publication.

Open Access This book is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if changes were made.

The images or other third party material in this book are included in the book's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the book's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

The publisher, the authors, and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, express or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made. The publisher remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

This Springer imprint is published by the registered company Springer Nature Switzerland AG
The registered company address is: Gewerbestrasse 11, 6330 Cham, Switzerland

We dedicate this book to our patient and loving spouses—Alex, Kaidi, and Peteke.

We also dedicate our work to those who designed, constructed, and have resided in Europe's vast collection of housing estates. From them we have learned much about communal living, urban progress, and social change.

Preface

Our scholarly engagement with housing estates began in 2012, when we first talked in depth about planned residential districts and their place and function in cityscapes in Europe and, following two decades in the post-transition era, in Estonia, our research home base. A successful application for a Marie Skłodowska-Curie international fellowship funded Daniel Hess' academic stay at the University of Tartu (during 2016 and 2017) and sponsored a collaborative research programme with Tiit Tammaru, who already worked with Maarten van Ham on the ERC funded DEPRIVEDHOODS project. During the course of the fellowship, various publications were produced that dealt centrally with modernist housing estates, with topics ranging from the historical evolution of housing estates, ambitions for transport and access components of housing estates, and outcomes of housing estate renovation programmes and social and ethnic segregation. We were joined at the University of Tartu by Coline Dalimier, from Lille University 1 in France, a motivated student who participated in an internship with us in Estonia as part of her master's degree studies. She delivered a seminar to the research group in April 2016 about the evolution and afterlife of housing estates in France. This presentation inspired us to think more deeply about comparing the condition of housing estates across various urban centres in Europe, and thus the idea for the book was born.

As we proceeded working on this book, tragedy struck in June 2017 when the Grenfell Tower in a London housing estate caught fire killing 71 people, and only a few months earlier, officials in Moscow had announced large-scale demolition of Soviet-time khrushchëvka apartment buildings, resulting in a projected loss of 10 percent of the urban housing stock. But we also knew that various other newsworthy events were linked with housing estates in Europe over the last 2 decades, including a series of riots in 2015 in the banlieues of Paris. In reaction, local and state governments in Paris (and in other cities and countries) have poured billions of euros into renovation programmes. Through our work on this book, we therefore seized the opportunity to assess the current status of housing estates—and to measure changes since 1990—in their physical condition and social status. We especially wanted to characterise the trajectory of housing estates in various national settings and in various conditions related to their establishment in the

decades following World War II. This book thus offers a timely overview of the current status of large housing estates in Europe, their trajectories and future outlook, which we have summarised in ten takeaway lessons.

The book would not have been possible without contributions from author teams from Athens, Berlin, Birmingham, Brussels, Bucharest, Budapest, Helsinki, Madrid, Milan, Moscow, Paris, Prague, Stockholm and Tallinn, along with two key subject-area specialists. We are indebted to Annika Väiko for her expert assistance and endless patience in preparing the final manuscript and Alex Bitterman, Susan June, Brendan Seney and Diane Ivancic for editing. Our research approach was developed through conversations with Kadri Leetmaa, Anneli Kährik, Petra Špačková and Coline Dalimier. Our progress benefitted from presentations of work-in-progress by the co-editors at the Seventh International Urban Geographies of Post-Communist States Conference (in Kiev, Ukraine, September 2017), the Dorpat Dozentenabend Lecture Series at the University of Tartu (in Tartu, Estonia, December 2017) and presentations in Helsinki linked to the URMI project, and presentations at Delft University of Technology as part of Tiit Tammaru's Visiting Professorship. During the effort to produce this edited volume, Daniel Hess was Visiting Scholar and Director in the Centre for Migration and Urban Studies, University of Tartu.

The research leading to this work has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement number 655601. Support also came from three grants from the Estonian Research Council: Institutional Research Grant IUT2-17 on Spatial Population Mobility and Geographical Changes in Urban Regions, Infotechnological Mobility Observatory, and RITA-Ränne. The European Research Council funded this research under the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme (FP/2007-2013)/ERC [Grant Agreement No. 615159] (ERC Consolidator Grant DEPRIVEDHOODS, Socio-spatial inequality, deprived neighbourhoods and neighbourhood effects). Delft University of Technology supported this research through the Visiting Professors programme of the Faculty of Architecture and the Built Environment.

Buffalo, NY, USA
 Tartu, Estonia/Delft, The Netherlands
 Delft, The Netherlands/St Andrews, UK
 April 2018

Daniel Baldwin Hess
 Tiit Tammaru
 Maarten van Ham

Contents

Part I Introduction

- 1 Lessons Learned from a Pan-European Study of Large Housing Estates: Origin, Trajectories of Change and Future Prospects** 3
Daniel Baldwin Hess, Tiit Tammaru and Maarten van Ham

Part II Thematic Lenses for Scholarly Inquiry

- 2 Beyond an Ugly Appearance: Understanding the Physical Design and Built Environment of Large Housing Estates** 35
Frank Wassenberg
- 3 Who Is to Blame for the Decline of Large Housing Estates? An Exploration of Socio-Demographic and Ethnic Change** 57
Gideon Bolt

Part III Case Studies of Housing Estates in European Metropolitan Areas

- 4 Exceptional Social Housing in a Residual Welfare State: Housing Estates in Athens, Greece** 77
George Kandylis, Thomas Maloutas and Nikolina Myofa
- 5 Large Housing Estates of Berlin, Germany** 99
Florian Urban
- 6 Decline and Response? Lifecycle Change and Housing Estates in Birmingham, England** 121
Alan Murie
- 7 Sprouted All Around: The Emergence and Evolution of Housing Estates in Brussels, Belgium** 145
Rafael Costa and Helga de Valk

8	The Many (Still) Functional Housing Estates of Bucharest, Romania: A Viable Housing Provider in Europe's Densest Capital City	167
	Vera Marin and Liviu Chelcea	
9	Persistence or Change: Divergent Trajectories of Large Housing Estates in Budapest, Hungary	191
	Zoltán Kovács, Tamás Egedy and Balázs Szabó	
10	Experience of a Preventive Experiment: Spatial Social Mixing in Post-World War II Housing Estates in Helsinki, Finland	215
	Mari Vaattovaara, Anssi Joutsiniemi, Matti Kortteinen, Mats Stjernberg and Teemu Kemppainen	
11	The Diversity of Trajectories of Large Housing Estates in Madrid, Spain	241
	Pedro Uceda, Daniel Sorando and Jesús Leal	
12	Social and Ethnic Transformation of Large Social Housing Estates in Milan, Italy: From Modernity to Marginalisation	265
	Petros Petsimeris	
13	Path-Dependent Development of Mass Housing in Moscow, Russia	289
	Maria Gunko, Polina Bogacheva, Andrey Medvedev and Ilya Kashnitsky	
14	Impoverishment and Social Fragmentation in Housing Estates of the Paris Region, France	313
	Christine Lelévrier and Talia Melic	
15	Long-term Development and Current Socio-Spatial Differentiation of Housing Estates in Prague, Czechia	339
	Martin Ouředníček, Petra Špačková and Lucie Pospíšilová	
16	The Stockholm Estates—A Tale of the Importance of Initial Conditions, Macroeconomic Dependencies, Tenure and Immigration	361
	Roger Andersson and Åsa Bråmås	
17	Population Shifts and Urban Policies in Housing Estates of Tallinn, Estonia	389
	Kadri Leetmaa, Johanna Holvandus, Kadi Mägi and Anneli Kährik	
	Index	413

Editors and Contributors

About the Editors

Daniel Baldwin Hess is Professor and Chairperson of the Department of Urban and Regional Planning in the School of Architecture and Planning at the University at Buffalo, State University of New York. He earned a doctoral degree in urban planning from the University of California, Los Angeles. While this book was in progress, he was Visiting Scholar and Director of the Centre for Migration and Urban Studies at the University of Tartu, Estonia, where he was a Marie Skłodowska-Curie International Fellow funded by the European Commission. His research addresses interactions between housing, transportation, land use and other public concerns, and he develops new pathways for understanding the complex socio-economic and ethnic landscape of cities and spatial inequalities. In his scholarship, he explores metropolitan form and urban planning practice and policy, sometimes interactively and sometimes separately, but always as a means to improve city functions and urban life. He is a former Fulbright Scholar at Tallinn University of Technology in Estonia, a National Endowment for the Humanities Fellow at Columbia University, and winner of an Eisenhower Fellowship.

Tiit Tammaru is Professor of Urban and Population Geography in the Department of Geography, University of Tartu. He leads the development of longitudinal linked censuses and registers data for urban and population geographic studies in Estonia. He was trained in human geography and received a doctoral degree from the University of Tartu in 2001. Since then, he has worked as a Lecturer, Researcher, Senior Researcher and Professor at the Department of Geography, University of Tartu. He has also worked as a Guest Researcher at the Department of Geography, University of Utah, and Department of Geography, Umeå University. Currently, he is a Visiting Professor at the Neighbourhood Change and Housing research group at the Department OTB—Research for the Built Environment, Faculty of Architecture and the Built Environment, Delft University of Technology.

Maarten van Ham is Professor of Urban Renewal at Delft University of Technology in the Netherlands, and Professor of Geography at the University of St Andrews in the UK. In Delft, he is Head of the Urban and Neighbourhood Change research group at the Department OTB—Research for the Built Environment, Faculty of Architecture and the Built Environment. He studied economic geography at Utrecht University, where he obtained his Ph.D. with honours in 2002. In 2011, he was appointed Full Professor in both St Andrews and Delft. He has published over 80 academic papers and 8 edited books. He is a highly cited academic with research projects in the UK, the Netherlands, Germany, Sweden, Lithuania, Estonia, Spain and China. He has expertise in the fields of urban poverty and inequality, segregation, residential mobility and migration; neighbourhood effects; urban and neighbourhood change; housing market behaviour and housing choice; geography of labour markets; spatial mismatch of workers and employment opportunities. In 2014, he was awarded a 2 million Euro ERC Consolidator Grant for a 5-year research project on neighbourhood effects (DEPRIVEDHOODS).

Contributors

Roger Andersson Chair in Human Geography, Institute for Housing and Urban Research, Uppsala University, Uppsala, Sweden

Polina Bogacheva Glorax Development, Moscow, Russia

Gideon Bolt Department of Human Geography and Spatial Planning, Utrecht University, Utrecht, The Netherlands

Åsa BråmÅ Institute for Analytical Sociology, Linköping University, Linköping, Sweden

Liviu Chelcea Professor and Chair, Department of Sociology, University of Bucharest, Bucharest, Romania

Rafael Costa Interface Demography, Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Brussels, Belgium

Helga A. G. de Valk Theme group leader of Migration and Migrants, Netherlands Interdisciplinary Demographic Institute; Professor of Migration and Life Course, University of Groningen, Groningen, The Netherlands

Tamás Egedy Senior Research Fellow, Geographical Institute of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Budapest, Hungary; Associate Professor, Budapest Business School, University of Applied Sciences, Budapest, Hungary

Maria Gunko Institute of Geography, Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow, Russia

Maarten van Ham Professor of Urban Renewal, Delft University of Technology, Delft, The Netherlands; Professor of Geography, University of St Andrews, St Andrews, Scotland, UK

Daniel Baldwin Hess Professor and Chair, Department of Urban and Regional Planning, University at Buffalo, State University of New York, NY, USA

Johanna Holvandum Doctoral Student, Centre for Migration and Urban Studies, University of Tartu, Tartu, Estonia

Anssi Joutsiniemi Aalto University, Helsinki, Finland

George Kandylis National Centre for Social Research, Athens, Greece

Anneli Kährrik Senior Researcher, Centre for Migration and Urban Studies, University of Tartu, Tartu, Estonia

Ilya Kashnitsky University of Groningen and Netherlands Interdisciplinary Demographic Institute, Groningen, The Netherlands; National Research University Higher School of Economics, Moscow, Russia

Teemu Kempainen Doctoral Candidate, University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland

Matti Kortteinen Professor of Urban Sociology, Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland

Zoltán Kovács Research Professor, Geographical Research Institute, Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Budapest, Hungary; Professor, Human Geography, University of Szeged, Budapest, Hungary

Jesús Leal Professor and Chair, Department of Applied Sociology, Universidad Complutense de Madrid, Madrid, Spain

Kadri Leetmaa Senior Researcher, Centre for Migration and Urban Studies, University of Tartu, Tartu, Estonia

Christine Lelévrier Director, Lab'urba Research Centre; Professor, Paris Urban School of Planning, University Paris-Est-Créteil, Marne-la-Vallée, France

Kadi Mägi Doctoral Student, Centre for Migration and Urban Studies, University of Tartu, Tartu, Estonia

Thomas Maloutas Professor of Social Geography, Department of Geography, Harokopio University, Kallithea, Greece

Vera Marin Department of Urbanism, University of Architecture and Urban Planning Ioan Mincu, Bucharest, Romania

Andrey Medvedev Institute of Geography, Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow, Russia

Talia Melic Doctoral Student, University of Melbourne, Melbourne, Australia; Lab'urba Research Centre, University Paris-Est-Créteil, Marne-la-Vallée, France

Alan Murie Emeritus Professor of Urban and Regional Studies, University of Birmingham, Birmingham, England

Nikolina Myofa Doctoral Candidate, Harokopio University, Kallithea, Greece

Martin Ouředníček Associate Professor, Department of Social Geography and Regional Development, Faculty of Science, Charles University, Prague, Czech Republic

Petros Petsimeris Professor of Geography, University Paris 1 Panthéon-Sorbonne, Paris, France

Lucie Pospíšilová Assistant Professor, Department of Social Geography and Regional Development, Faculty of Science, Charles University, Prague, Czech Republic

Daniel Sorando Researcher, Department of Applied Sociology, Universidad Complutense de Madrid, Madrid, Spain

Petra Špačková Assistant Professor, Department of Social Geography and Regional Development, Faculty of Science, Charles University, Prague, Czech Republic

Mats Stjernberg Senior Researcher, City of Helsinki Urban Facts, Finland; doctoral candidate, University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland

Balázs Szabó Research Fellow, Geographical Institute of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Budapest, Hungary

Tiit Tammaru Professor of Urban and Population Geography, University of Tartu, Tartu, Estonia

Pedro Uceda Lecturer and Researcher, Department of Applied Sociology, Universidad Complutense of Madrid, Madrid, Spain

Florian Urban Professor and Head of Architectural History and Urban Studies, Mackintosh School of Architecture, Glasgow School of Art, Glasgow, Scotland

Mari Vaattovaara Professor of Urban Geography, University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland

Frank Wassenberg Senior Project Leader, Platform31; Guest Researcher, OTB Research Institute for the Built Environment, Delft University of Technology, Delft, The Netherlands

Chapter 9

Persistence or Change: Divergent Trajectories of Large Housing Estates in Budapest, Hungary



Zoltán Kovács, Tamás Egedy and Balázs Szabó

Abstract In post-socialist cities of Central and Eastern Europe, large housing estates became dominant features of post-war housing development. Unlike in Western Europe, these neighbourhoods were not developed for immigrants and the poorest segment of society. Instead, they provided homes for lower middle class and working class families with stable incomes. After the change of regime, however, these neighbourhoods experienced different development trajectories not only on the international but also on national and city levels. With regard to contemporary developments of housing estates, Budapest provides a typical post-socialist case where housing estates are continuously re-evaluated by the people and the market, while socialist legacies leave their imprints on the actual socio-economic developments. This chapter focuses on the development of large housing estates in Budapest and in Hungary before and after the transition. Today, one-fifth of the Hungarian population and one-third of Budapest's residents live in housing estate neighbourhoods. The main objectives of the study are to display the spatial distribution of different generations of housing estates at the national and city level with special emphasis on their physical and social characteristics. The chapter also sheds light on the consequences of the post-socialist transition on the recent developments of housing estates in Budapest. After almost three decades of transition, debates about housing estates and their future possibilities are still relevant in Hungary and Budapest, because some of these neighbourhoods are experiencing a renaissance in the housing market, attracting younger and better off strata, whereas others show symptoms of socio-economic decline.

Z. Kovács (✉)

Department of Human Geography, University of Szeged, Szeged, Hungary
e-mail: zkovacs@iif.hu

Z. Kovács · T. Egedy · B. Szabó
Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Budapest, Hungary
e-mail: egedy@gmx.net

B. Szabó
e-mail: szbazs@gmail.com

Keywords Housing estates · Post-war housing development · Housing policy
Urban regeneration · Budapest, Hungary

9.1 Introduction

Similar to other post-socialist cities of Central and Eastern Europe, housing estates became dominant features of the urban structure in Budapest after World War II (Sýkora 2009). Providing shelter for about one-third of the city's population, housing estates represent a significant part of the local housing stock and they satisfy the needs of a great variety of socio-economic groups, but mainly the less affluent segments of society. After the demise of state-socialism, liberalisation of the housing market as well as changing residential preferences of people created new opportunities for housing markets. Dwellings located in housing estates became re-evaluated and they generally tended to lose their previous prestige (Kovács and Herfert 2012). The global financial crisis and the subsequent shrinkage on the demand side of the housing market further exacerbated the downward process. However, housing estates are not at all homogeneous. We can identify substantial differences among them, according to age, size, building technology, accessibility and the quality of the built environment (Kovács and Douglas 2004).

The main aim of this chapter is to shed light on the main socio-economic changes of large housing estates that have taken place in Budapest since the change of regime. Our analysis builds on data from three previous censuses (1990, 2001 and 2011) and relevant media and policy documents referring to recent developments of large housing estates. The main research questions are as follows: How has the post-socialist transformation affected the housing estates of Budapest and whether the socialist heritage still persists or not? To what extent is physical and social decline typical for housing estates? How have the different generations of housing estates been affected by decline or upgrading? Focusing on these questions, we outline the overall development trends of housing estates in Budapest and discuss the socio-economic, structural and environmental challenges that have affected them in the last three decades. We also try to conceptualise our findings and place them in the wider context of urban development in Budapest dominated by urban sprawl (i.e. suburbanisation) and most recently urban regeneration (i.e. gentrification).

9.2 The Evolution of Housing Estates in Hungary with Special Attention to Budapest

In Hungary, the first housing-estate-like neighbourhoods appeared before World War I. These early estates were garden-city type compounds with primarily small dwellings built for the working class. They were built by state companies (e.g.



Fig. 9.1 Wekerle garden city, built at the beginning of the 20th century at the then urban fringe of Budapest. *Source* Kovács, Egedy and Szabó

national railway) or large municipalities like Budapest, which, for instance, erected the Wekerle-estate at the fringe of the city after 1908 (Fig. 9.1).

In the interwar period, housing shortages and overcrowding of dwellings became serious challenges in Budapest. In the 1920s, several low-quality barrack estates were built in order to ease the housing shortage and provide shelter for Hungarian refugees expelled from territories acquired by Romania, Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia. By 1932, there were 18 barrack estates in Budapest containing nearly 6,400 homes and housing about 40,000 people, mainly in low-quality one-room flats without running water and sanitation (Gyáni 1992; Györi 1996). Housing estates meeting modern criteria appeared in Hungary only after World War II. The first project was launched in 1948 and it was the continuation of a smaller scale housing estate (Fiastyúk utca) planned and partly constructed before WWII. The general notion of housing estates applied in Hungary followed very much the concept of Clarence Perry's neighbourhood scheme, though without size limits. Housing estates had to form coherent neighbourhoods with strict internal organisation, separated from the surrounding neighbourhoods by arterial streets with distinct names. Taking into account their construction period, size, physical layout and the building materials used, we can define four generations of housing estates in Hungary and Budapest.

9.2.1 Housing Estates of the 1950s

In the late 1940s and early 1950s, there were few housing estates built in Hungary since the communist regime designated the majority of state revenues for post-war reconstruction and forced industrialisation, including the development of socialist new towns (e.g. Dunaujváros, Várpalota, Komló, Kazincbarcika). At the same time, housing received low priority in the economic plans of the late 1940s and 1950s; thus, housing construction fell below the level of the interwar period and the population grew faster than the housing stock. These conditions raised serious tensions within Hungarian society. In urban areas, especially in Budapest and other major cities, the mismatch between supply and demand in the housing market was even more severe due to high immigration from rural areas. In 1949, the estimated national housing shortage was around 265,000 dwellings (and 63,000 dwellings or 23.7% in Budapest) (Sillince 1985). Public money spent on housing construction started to rise significantly after 1953 when the orthodox communist leader of the country, Mátyás Rákosi, was replaced by Imre Nagy. By the end of the decade, the proportion of dwellings built in housing estates in Budapest rose from the previous 20 to 40% (Preisich 1998).

Housing estates in the 1950s were most often developed on sites close to the inner-city, which had already been provided with public utilities or were easily accessible. These housing estates could be characterised by their ‘human scale’ physical form and a relatively small size comprising between 300 and 800 dwellings. Buildings were made of bricks arranged in a frame structure surrounding courtyards and squares. The height of houses did not exceed 3–4 levels. These estates became tangible symbols of the new system and the architectural style (sometimes popularly referred to as ‘Stalin baroque’) left distinct traces on the cityscape (Fig. 9.2).

Housing estates built in the 1950s undoubtedly improved the quality of urban life. Although the share of one-room apartments was extremely high (52%), the comfort level of the apartments was significantly better than average as most of the dwellings were equipped with running water, bathroom and toilet (Fóti 1988). Residents of housing estates of the 1950s could be characterised by a strong working class profile and were loyalists to the communist system.

9.2.2 Housing Estates of the 1960s

In the 1960s, the principles of modernist architecture spread all over Hungary and standardisation in housing construction became commonplace. The construction of large housing estates at the urban edge was adopted as a major strategy for urban growth. Thanks to the block construction technology, apartment buildings in housing estates started to ‘rise’. In addition to the 3- to 4-storey buildings typical of the 1950s, 9- to 10-storey blocks appeared in the second half of the decade. It was



Fig. 9.2 Gubacsi housing estate in the 20th district of Budapest, built in the 1950s. *Source* Kovács, Egedy and Szabó

no surprise that the first pioneering reports on the sociological problems of large housing estates were published in the late 1960s (Szelényi and Konrád 1969) though without much resonance.

State housing policy changed in 1960, when the so-called ‘15-year housing development programme’ was launched in Hungary, which aimed at building one million new dwellings in Hungary (with a population of 10 million), out of which 250 thousand was foreseen for Budapest. The succeeding years saw a rapid increase in state housing expenditure and construction. Eventually, the plan was fulfilled, primarily thanks to a substantial overshoot in private construction. Within the framework of the programme, a total of 187,000 apartments were built in Budapest, of which about 106,000 were built in the 1960s (Preisich 1998). However, the overall housing situation did not improve since the number of households grew faster than the number of dwellings.

In the 1950s, the share of public and private sectors in new housing construction was more or less balanced, but in the 1960s, 68 % of new dwellings in Budapest were built by the state. Compared to the previous decade, the composition of dwellings was more favourable since the share of two-room apartments with bathroom and central heating considerably increased. At the same time, the average size of housing estates also increased, requiring more urban space. Consequently, the majority of housing estates in the 1960s were built further from the city centre in

the so-called transition zone, and housing estate construction gradually shifted towards the periphery (Pieniżek 2010).

Throughout the 1960s, block construction was gradually replaced by point and line houses, inner courtyards disappeared and large amounts of undeveloped space dominated the layout (Fig. 9.3). The average size of housing estates also increased to 1,000–2,000 dwellings. The prestige of these housing estates was considerably higher than the existing housing stock, thus, they became very much favoured by young middle-class families with children who often moved away from the outdated inner-city dwellings to new housing estates (Csanádi and Ladányi 1992; Szelényi and Konrád 1969).

By the mid-1960s, it became obvious that the ambitious objectives of the 15-year housing development programme could not be fulfilled by conventional construction technologies. Therefore, the decision was made to adopt the technology of the Soviet housing factories (the first were produced in Budapest in 1965). Housing factories made housing construction faster and more economical and permitted buildings of various sizes and heights (Benkő 2015).



Fig. 9.3 József Attila housing estate, built in the 9th district of Budapest using mixed building technology in the 1960s. *Source* Kovács, Egedy and Szabó

9.2.3 Housing Estates of the 1970s

The 1970s marked the peak of housing construction in Hungary during state-socialism, due to the proliferation of pre-fabricated technology. By 1976, 10 housing factories and 6 panel plants were in operation, producing 35,000 dwellings per year in the country. With this technology, a large number of dwellings could be built quickly and at reasonable cost, mainly in the form of large housing estates. It became an important aspect of the state-socialist welfare system that the urban population could expect sooner or later to obtain access to public dwelling if they wished. This never applied to the rural population, however, which was expected to solve its housing problems through private and ‘self-help’ channels.

Housing estate development concentrated mainly in Budapest and other larger regional centres (e.g. Miskolc, Debrecen, Szeged, Pécs). In Budapest, the number of newly constructed dwellings reached its apex in 1975 with close to 20,000 new units (Fig. 9.4). More than 70% of the new dwellings were built by the state with pre-fabricated panel technology. Huge housing estates were established, often in 5-year-run periods, with 5000–15,000 flats housing 30,000–40,000 people.

The layout and architectural character of the 1970s housing estates was increasingly determined by the Soviet type large-panel technology. Ten-storey high strip houses became dominant, mostly with five (and sometimes 10) staircases (Iván 1996). A permanent tension arose between architects and the representatives of the state investors, as cost considerations influenced all aspects of planning. There was very little opportunity for variation in the building composition, the interior




Fig. 9.4 New dwellings constructed in Budapest, 1884–2015



Fig. 9.5 Havana housing estate in the 18th district of Budapest, built using pre-fab technology in the late 1970s. *Source* Kovács, Egedy and Szabó

organisation of flats, and other details. Reducing costs alone was possible with the abandonment of the construction of public institutions, which became one of the most serious deficiencies in these housing estates. The large pre-fabricated housing estates ensured housing quantity, but the quality of living conditions for the population at large became an enduring topic of discussion (Hall et al. 2005; Benkő 2015). Simultaneously, new housing estates increasingly shifted to the periphery of the city, where excessive un-urbanised areas offered cheap construction opportunities (Fig. 9.5).

Compared to the previous decade, the share of one-room flats significantly decreased in housing estates, while the proportion of two- and three-room apartments increased. The level of comfort also rose; central and district heating became widespread and full comfort remained, for a long time thereafter, the most important quality feature of these apartments. The 1970s also brought about changes in the social composition of housing estates. The Housing Act of 1971 made the state-led delivery of dwellings dependent on income level and social conditions, primarily on the number of children. Thus, poorer and less educated people could have better access to public housing, and the average social status of new housing estates decreased accordingly (Rietdorf et al. 1994; Farkas and Szabó 1995; Rietdorf 1997).

9.2.4 *Housing Estates of the 1980s*

Economic difficulties in the late 1970s drove the government to revise and modify its welfare policy, which soon meant vigorous changes in housing policy too. New measures, introduced in 1983, effectively set out to abolish the previous extensive subsidies for housing. The number of dwellings built by the state gradually decreased and the dominant form of new housing became privately owned single-family homes.

In the 1980s, thanks to efforts to ‘humanise’ the environment of housing estates, planners managed to break through the schematism characterising the estates in the previous decades. Housing factories gradually produced more varied types of buildings. Lower buildings of 4- to 5-storeys appeared again in housing estates, and tentatively even 1- to 2-storey row houses were built. The size of housing estates rarely exceeded 2,000–3,000 dwellings. The quality requirements for panel technology also changed. As new technological standards came into being, the efficiency of thermal insulation had to be increased. In the 1980s, the construction spread of more attractive panel buildings with pitched roof (Fig. 9.6).

The share of dwellings built by the contribution of private capital steadily grew, either as cooperative housing or as condominiums with the support of OTP (state bank of Hungary before the change of regime). This had positive effects on the



Fig. 9.6 Gloriette housing estate built in the late 1980s in the 18th district of Budapest. *Source* Kovács, Egedy and Szabó

composition of dwellings: the size of flats generally increased and their internal division became more varied. As a consequence, these housing estates were much more popular than their counterparts from the 1970s; their prestige clearly exceeded those built in the previous decade.

In the early 1990s, the construction of housing estates ceased in Hungary and a new era of development began in the housing market with the mushrooming of residential parks and other upmarket residential compounds (Kovács and Hegedűs 2014). These homogeneous residential enclaves are perceived by some scholars as the newest generation of housing estates, symbolising the advent of global capitalism and its dominant lifestyle (Csizmady and Csanádi 2009).

We can conclude that housing construction between 1950 and 1990 was characterised by the increasing predominance of housing estates. Especially in the 1970s, the proportion of dwellings built in housing estates was extremely high. Towards the end of the period, the construction of housing estates gradually declined and abruptly ceased. While housing estates of the 1950s still embodied considerable social expectations, their prestige declined in the following decades and only the elite housing estates in the late 1980s restored a positive image.

9.3 Housing Estates in Hungary and Budapest

9.3.1 *Distribution of Housing Estates at the National Level*

Official statistics about housing estates were first published by the Hungarian Central Statistical Office after the 1980 census. At that time, 15.2% of the Hungarian housing stock was located in housing estates. The definition of housing estates applied was: ‘a group of mid-rise and high-rise blocks and rows of houses built mostly by pre-fabricated technology in the last decades.’ Since the construction of new dwellings in housing estates ceased by the early 1990s, the micro-census carried out by the Central Statistical Office in 1996 provides compelling information about their overall significance. In 1996, approximately 786,000 (or 20%) of the Hungarian housing stock was situated in housing estates (Table 9.1).

The average size of housing estates in Hungary is relatively small compared to other East Central European (especially post-Soviet) countries, and 71% of Hungarian housing estates have fewer than 1,000 dwellings. Giant housing estates, having more than 10,000 apartments, are very rare; only 9 such giant estates were recorded and only two of them are located outside Budapest (in Miskolc and Pécs).

Figure 9.7 shows the spatial distribution of larger housing estates with over 1,000 dwellings in Hungary. There were 173 such estates in 1996, and the overwhelming majority of them were located in: (i) Budapest, (ii) the county seats and (iii) the so-called ‘socialist new-towns’ (Dunaújváros, Ajka, Komló, Ózd etc.). The geographic distribution of housing estates in Fig. 9.7 is uneven in Hungary; cities of the more industrialised northern and western regions are well supplied with this

Table 9.1 Size distribution of housing estates in Hungary. *Source* HCSO Micro-census 1996 and author-conducted survey

Size (number of dwellings)	Number of housing estates	Total number of dwellings	Ratio (%)	Total population	Ratio (%)
10.000<	9	121,900	15.5	342,900	15.2
7.500–10.000	7	61,400	7.8	164,300	7.3
5.000–7.500	21	131,800	16.8	388,800	17.2
2.500–5.000	41	137,900	17.6	375,900	16.6
1.000–2.500	95	149,100	19.0	440,600	19.4
1.000>	~ 430 ^a	183,400	23.3	549,700 ^a	24.3
Total	~ 600 ^a	785,500	100.0	2,262,100 ^a	100.0

^aEstimates




Fig. 9.7 Spatial distribution of large housing estates (1,000 or more dwellings), 1996, Hungary. *Source* HCSO Micro-census 1996 and author-conducted survey

form of housing, whereas in the predominantly agricultural south-eastern regions, only the major administrative centres (e.g. Szeged, Debrecen) have large housing estates.

Hungarian housing estates are dominated by two-room flats with 50–59 m² (44%), while apartments larger than 80 m² are rare (1.8%). A trend emerges: the younger the housing estate, the larger the average floor space. The average level of comfort of the housing estates has always been higher than the rest of the housing stock. This has been the main factor that attracted younger and better educated people to housing estates in the state-socialist period. However, housing estates

built in the 1970s and 1980s with central heating became very costly by the 1990s due to dramatic energy price increases. Not surprisingly, younger and more mobile residents departed housing estates and moved to the suburbs in the first years of the transition (Kovács and Tosics 2014).

9.3.2 Characteristics of Housing Estates in Budapest

In Budapest, there are 121 officially recognised housing estates (Micro-census 1996). For the sake of the present study, we identify a housing estate as group of 1,000 or more dwellings in mid-rise or high-rise buildings, developed as a coherent and compact planning unit. Altogether 62 estates, ca. half of the 121 officially recognised housing estates, meet these criteria. According to the 2011 national census, there were 239,750 dwellings located in these housing estates in Budapest, i.e. 30.5% of the total housing stock, providing home for 29.5% of the population.

In terms of the time of construction, 63.1% of the dwellings in housing estates were constructed in the 1970s. This is the most dominant group of housing estates with uniform style buildings erected by pre-fabricated systems. Housing estates of the 1980s comprise 16.2%, while housing estates of the 1960s encompass 13.6% of the housing stock. The smallest group is made up of small-scale housing estates built in the 1950s, where only 7.1% of the housing estates dwellings are concentrated. This categorisation of age will reappear later in our analysis on the trajectories of the various generations of housing estates in Budapest (Fig. 9.8).

In terms of size, housing estate dwellings are generally below the city's average. While the share of smaller dwellings (i.e. below 40 m²) is about the same (ca. 17%) as in other parts of Budapest, larger apartments are nearly completely missing. Apartments above 80 m² comprise only 1.6% of the dwelling stock in housing estates while it is 28% in the rest of the city. As opposed to size parameters, the level of comfort is very favourable in housing estates. 89% of flats have full comfort (central heating and full sanitation) while in the rest of the city, only 64% of dwellings fall into this category.

As far as tenure is concerned, in 2011 4.1% of the dwellings in housing estates were owned by local governments (i.e. district governments) and used as public rentals. This figure is below the city's average (5.1%). In 1990, the share of public rental dwellings in housing estates was higher (48.4%), but due to large-scale privatisation programmes, their number radically decreased. After 1990, in the transformation of the housing market, privatisation of public dwellings played an important role. Privatisation of state housing in Budapest meant a pure 'give away' type of privatisation to sitting tenants, at remarkable low prices (Hegedüs 2013). The 1993 Housing Law made privatisation of public housing compulsory with the




Fig. 9.8 Spatial distribution of four generations of large housing estates (1,000 or more dwellings), 2011, Budapest. *Source* HCSO Census 2011

introduction of the Right to Buy. As a consequence, the share of public housing in Budapest decreased from 51% to a mere 5.1% by 2011.

Regarding the age structure of residents, housing estates have a fairly similar profile to the city’s average, however, younger age groups (below age 20) are slightly underrepresented, and older cohorts (above age 60) are slightly over-represented. Differences in the demographic profile of residents are more pronounced among the various generations of housing estates. In terms of educational attainment, residents of housing estates are generally less educated, the share of those having a university diploma in the adult (20+) population was 24.1% in 2011, whereas it was 36.2% in the rest of the city.

The spatial distribution of housing estates is very much determined by the physical geography of the city. East of the Danube, on the plain Pest side of Budapest, there are favourable opportunities for housing estate construction, while on the hilly Buda side, only limited areas near the river could accommodate housing estates. Consequently, the share of housing estates within the housing stock is somewhat higher on the Pest side (32%), than on the Buda side (27%). In terms of the socio-economic status of residents, it is also important to emphasise that housing estates located on the environmentally more attractive Buda side have always had higher prestige.

9.4 Socio-economic Changes in Housing Estates in Budapest After 1990

In this section, we focus on the position of housing estates in the housing market, with special emphasis on how the demographic and socio-economic profile of housing estates changed after 1990. Our findings are based on comparative analysis of data from the three most recent censuses (1990, 2001 and 2011). We also provide an overview of how the different generations of housing estates developed during the post-socialist transition.

The share of population living in large housing estates has decreased in Budapest since 1990 (Table 9.2). On the eve of the political changes, 33.9% of the city's population lived in housing estates, which decreased to 29.5% by 2011. After 1990, Budapest experienced substantial population loss due to suburbanisation and natural decline, however, the loss in housing estates was more in relative terms than in the rest of the city.

In terms of the demographic structure of the population, like other post-socialist cities, Budapest has been strongly affected by ageing. This is also true for housing estates, but the pace of ageing in housing estates was faster than the city's average. In 1990, the share of younger age groups (i.e. below 20) was much higher, and the proportion of older age groups (above 60 years) was significantly lower in housing estates than elsewhere (Fig. 9.9). These differences practically disappeared by 2011, and even the share of older generations (above 40 years) became somewhat higher in housing estates than in Budapest.

Demographic change and most notably ageing affected the various generations of housing estates differently. Census data suggest that the generations of the 1970s and 1980s are most affected by ageing, whereas the share of elderly (above 60 years) decreased in the 1950s estates from 35.1 to 29.7% between 1990 and 2011. Although previous research from the 1990s determines a linear correlation between the age of housing estate and ageing of the local population (Egedy 2000; Csizmady 2003), this trend seems to have changed since the turn of the millennium. We suggest a reason for this change: the mobility of people. Even though housing estates have below average mobility rates, 30.5% of the residents had moved to the

Table 9.2 Share of housing estates in Budapest, 1990–2011. *Source* HCSO Census 1990, 2001, 2011

	1990		2000		2011	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Number of people	683,556	33.89	580,046	32.73	509,461	29.49
Number of dwellings	250,199	31.51	240,347	32.69	239,718	30.45
Public rental dwellings	121,171	30.61	12,400	19.50	9,831	24.40
ISCO7-8-9	122,658	36.69	66,239	37.98	57,256	35.62
Unemployed	25,427	30.93	17,105	34.57	28,077	31.26
Large households (5-)	16,011	38.86	10,589	28.57	7,119	23.36




Fig. 9.9 Demographic structure of population, 1990–2011. *Source* HCSO Census 1990, 2001, 2011

present dwelling before 1990, whereas it is only 22.8% for the rest of the city. Residential mobility induced robust population change. The most remarkable population change took place in the housing estates of the 1950s where the proportion of newcomers significantly increased after 1990. This finding is also confirmed by changes in household structure. The share of single-person households grew in each generation of housing estates after 1990, however, higher growth rates were clearly evident in the housing estates of the 1950s and 1960s. A decreasing share of elderly and a growing share of single-person households suggest the arrival of younger, single people to the oldest generations of housing estates and a possible socio-economic upgrading.

To measure the socio-economic status of local residents and the level of segregation, we use data for education and occupation. But beforehand, we must note two important features which make the situation of housing estates in Budapest different from Western cities. First, as opposed to the West, housing estates in Hungary were not constructed for the lowest socio-economic strata (as in social housing programmes). In fact, the exact opposite is true: in the 1960s and early 1970s, housing estates had a clear middle-class profile (Szelényi and Konrád 1969). Second, Hungary (and other post-socialist countries) was not affected by large-scale immigration from former colonies or other less developed countries after World War II. Thus, ethnically and culturally, Hungarian society remained fairly homogeneous. Indicators for ethnicity used in other (predominantly Western) cities are inappropriate in measuring segregation in Budapest. Census data indicate a growing gap between housing estates and the rest of Budapest as far as educational attainment is concerned (Fig. 9.10).




Fig. 9.10 Share of residents with a university or college degree, 1990–2011. *Source* HCSO Census 1990, 2001, 2011

Figure 9.10 depicts that the share (in 1990) of those with a university or college degree among people 20 years or older was fairly similar in housing estates and in the rest of Budapest; by 2011, however, a gap arose. On the eve of the last census, 32.6% of Budapest residents (older than 20 years) had earned a degree, but it was only 24.1% in the housing estates. Thus, the global trend of professionalisation of the labour force was slower in housing estates than in the city. Different generations of housing estates followed very different pathways. In 1990, the share of graduates was the lowest in the housing estates built in the 1950s. However, by 2011, the situation in these housing estates had improved considerably due to population change, and the proportion of people with the highest qualifications nearly reached the level of the 1980s generation, which otherwise was very much favoured by young intellectuals in the time of construction. On the other hand, the share of graduates is lowest in housing estates dating from the 1970s, and the gap compared to other generations has clearly grown since 1990.

To detect changes in the socio-economic status of housing estates and the level of social segregation, we use occupational data for the economically active population, according to the occupational categories of ISCO (International Standard Classification of Occupations). In order to simplify the analysis, we aggregated the top two (managers, professionals) and bottom three (industrial workers, machine operators, unskilled workers) categories, and refer to them hereinafter as ‘intellectuals’ and ‘workers’.

The general trends are clear: in 1990, the share of intellectuals was somewhat lower and the share of workers was slightly higher in housing estates than the city’s average. The professionalisation of the labour force progressed in housing estates resulting in higher shares of intellectuals and lower shares of workers, however the pace of changes was less dynamic than in the rest of the city. As a consequence, occupational differences between housing estates and the rest of the city increased, and the working class character of housing estates strengthened. In 2011, the share of workers was 24.6% in housing estates, whereas only 19.2% in the rest of the city.

Among the different generations of housing estates, the share of workers was highest in the housing estates of the 1970s. Housing estates of the 1950s managed to change their working class profile after 1990, since the proportion of intellectuals increased more rapidly than in other generations. Consequently, the prestige of these housing estates has continuously grown.

We conclude that housing estates in Budapest have been affected considerably by ageing and lowering socio-economic status in relative terms since 1990. Nevertheless, different generations of housing estates followed very different trajectories. Housing estates of the 1950s had a disadvantageous position in 1990 with ageing population, and a less educated, predominantly lower class population. However, after the change of regime, these housing estates were considerably re-evaluated by the city's inhabitants; they attracted younger and better educated residents and their prestige started to grow. As a consequence, the working class profile of these estates gradually changed and their population became demographically more balanced. Housing estates of the 1960s started the post-socialist transition from a better position than the 1950s generation, and their prestige and social status was generally higher. Since the turn of the millennium, this generation has been characterised by similar trends in social transformation like the 1950s, and these two older generations seem to be attractive options on the housing market. The biggest losers of the transformation were housing estates of the 1970s, built by pre-fabricated technology. These estates have been hit by a downward spiral where younger, more educated people gradually moved out; at the same time, the elderly, lower class profile of these estates strengthened. However, this group is not homogeneous either: the largest, more monotonous housing estates built in working class neighbourhoods with poor image are in the worst position. Housing estates of the 1980s were in the most favourable position in 1990 as far as their prestige and social composition were concerned. They were highly appreciated by younger, middle-class families, and consequently, their status was higher compared to other generations. However, between 1990 and 2011, social transformation processes were not as favourable as previously (Kovács and Douglas 2004). Higher social status of this generation is still detectable, but its favourable position is diminishing.

9.5 Post-socialist Transition and the Challenges of Large Housing Estates

During the post-socialist transition, various phases of development could be distinguished in housing estates. In the first period (early 1990s), the most important factor affecting the development of housing estates was privatisation (Sailer-Fliege 1997; Hegedüs 2013). By the late 1990s, only 5–6% of the housing stock in housing estates remained in the hands of local governments. Increasing private home ownership paved the way for market-led property development and residential mobility. A high level of comfort was one of the main advantages of

pre-fabricated housing estates before 1990. That very same feature became the main disadvantage after 1990, due to rapidly rising housing costs, especially energy costs (Egedy 2000). After privatisation, the new owners living in pre-fabricated housing estates had to face a difficult situation: the relative value of apartments in pre-fabricated buildings declined while running costs drastically increased. As a consequence, lower status residents in housing estates often became trapped: they could not sell their flats or buy another one of similar quality; thus, their housing career ended (Hegedüs and Tosics 1998). Rapidly rising housing costs were connected with inefficient central heating systems and the insufficient insulation of houses, therefore, rehabilitation interventions were needed urgently.

The second development period started with the rehabilitation of housing estates in 1997. In 1996, the Ministry of Economy, the Hungarian Development Bank and the German Creditanstalt für Wiederaufbau created a 30-million deutsche mark (ca. 3 billion HUF at the current exchange rate) credit facility in order to support energy saving renewal (Government Decree 105/1996). It was the first important intervention in the history of pre-fabricated buildings organised by the state. Under the scheme, 75% of the renovation costs in panel buildings could be financed by the credit construction. The loan programme was extended several times until 2001, yet only about one-third (950 million HUF) of the budget was drawn, because of the strict conditions. Also in 1997, the Energy Saving Loan Program was launched, whereby municipalities could get a loan totalling of 800 million HUF. The programme continued with an additional one billion HUF credit facility in 1998. These early regeneration programmes paved the way for a large-scale, nationwide intervention called 'Panel Programme' where the European Union took a lion's share.

The Panel Programme, signalling the third development phase of housing estates, was launched in 2001. The EU-funded renovation programme targeted the improvement of energy efficiency in pre-fabricated buildings. It has been renamed and restructured several times since its start, but it is still the most prominent and largest state-financed residential rehabilitation programme in Hungary (Panel I, 2001–2008; Panel II, 2009–2013; Panel III, 2014–2020). Unfortunately, it is extremely difficult to obtain accurate and tangible data on the number of renewed apartments and the amount of public subsidies used in the programme, as there are different numbers in government (national and local) and other professional documents. According to the latest data, a total of 320,000 pre-fabricated dwellings have been renovated in Hungary in the Panel Programme between 2000 and 2014. Within the framework of Panel Program III, which has been underway since 2014, a total of 380,000 flats are planned to be included in the energy efficiency renovation (lasting until 2020), or 75% of the total housing stock.

In 2017, the development of large pre-fabricated housing estates once again rose high on the agenda of national politics in Hungary. In 2017, the government began to elaborate a new 20- to 25-year panel regeneration strategy aimed at improving the quality of life of people living in panel housing estates by improving the residential environment. The programme is currently in the preparatory phase, but it is certain that the government will not rule out the partial demolition of pre-fabricated buildings either.

Concerning demolition, it is important to know the opinion of local residents living in large housing estates. In 2014, a questionnaire survey was carried out in Budapest with the aim to measure the satisfaction of residents living in downgrading neighbourhoods. The survey covered four neighbourhoods including Hungary's second largest housing estate, Újpalota (15th District of Budapest), erected using pre-fabricated technology in the early 1970s. Other neighbourhoods were selected in the densely built inner-part and the low-rise outer fringe of the city. Respondents were randomly surveyed from renovated and non-renovated buildings of housing estates. Survey data show that local residents of housing estates have more negative opinion about their neighbourhood than people living in other run-down quarters (Table 9.3).

The negative internal image highly correlates with residential mobility chances. Almost one-third of the residents in Újpalota feel that they are stuck in the housing estate (unable to move due to financial or other reasons), while this share is less than one-fifth in other downgrading areas. The renewal process started in the quarter only in the late 2000s and remained limited until now. However, the very few respondents living in renovated houses already expressed their higher satisfaction with the neighbourhood compared to those living in non-renovated buildings.

Although satisfaction with housing estates as a form of living varies greatly by country, city and neighbourhoods, the physical rehabilitation of pre-fabricated buildings (e.g. better insulation, lower level of noise, lower costs of heating, aesthetic aspects) improves the satisfaction of inhabitants (Kovács and Herpai 2011). Yet, the need for regeneration shows significant differences among the various types and generations of housing estates, and often within the same generation. For instance, regarding the pre-fabricated panel buildings, there is a much higher demand for renewal in housing estates of the 1970s showing infrastructural and architectural problems than those of the 1980s, but there are also significant differences between housing estates built in the first and the second half of the 1980s (van Kempen et al. 2005). In the first half of this decade, mainly large, 'traditional' housing estates were built, while during the second half, smaller scale elite housing estates became dominant. In the latter group, there is less need for full renovation.

Table 9.3 Perception of declining neighbourhoods by residents in Budapest, 2014

Statement	Percentage of those residents who totally or partly agree with the statement		
	Újpalota, non-renovated buildings	Újpalota, renovated buildings	Other declining areas of Budapest
'The value of dwellings is continuously decreasing in this neighbourhood'	92.4	81.3	66.1
'Mainly those people move into this neighbourhood who cannot afford to buy a flat somewhere else'	83.0	45.5	37.7

In this respect, other important factors—besides age and technology—are the size and location of housing estates. Generally, we can conclude that housing estates which are embedded in low-rise environments tend to be more commonly renovated. They are not elite housing estates, but typically smaller units (less than 1,000 dwellings) with low-rise buildings, and most of them differ little from their surroundings.

Another important factor about the perception of housing estates is the quality of environment and local services. Originally, great emphasis was placed on the proper provision of infrastructure and services in housing estates of the 1950s and 1960s; in the 1970s, however, due to a lack of financing and the acceleration of construction works, little attention was paid to this aspect. Thus, infrastructure and basic services were often lacking. After the change of regime, especially in the 1990s, small retail and service units (e.g. shops, pubs, hairdresser etc.) providing predominantly daily consumer goods and services appeared in the ground floor of panel buildings. With the renovation of housing estates and the construction of shopping centres at the urban fringe, and due to growing motorisation and the transformation of consumer culture, the role of these small service units has significantly diminished since the early 2000s.

The evaluation of housing estate dwellings by the market has shown twists and turns since 1990. After the general relative decline of dwelling prices throughout the 1990s, there was growing appreciation on the market (after the turn of the millennium) accompanied by relative price increase. This was halted by the global financial crisis in 2008, followed by a frozen housing market with falling prices until 2013. Housing prices have rapidly risen in Budapest since 2014, and in recent years, housing estates became one of the most popular segments in the housing market. The reasons for growing popularity are manifold. Running costs of housing estate dwellings have not increased since 2013, and the average selling time of housing estate apartments is much shorter and prices are 20–30% lower compared to apartments in brick buildings. Consequently, buyers of housing estate flats can enter the housing market more easily.

As far as the local self-governance of housing estates is concerned, we can conclude that housing estates are not the focus of political interest. There are only four districts in Budapest (out of the 23) that locally have a sub-municipality (a part of an upper tier municipal government), two of which are located in housing estates (4th district, Káposztásmegyér; 9th district, József Attila housing estate). This highlights a lack of self-governance and management in large housing estates. On the one hand, housing estates in Hungary and Budapest do not appear as independent administrative or urban planning entities, and they are therefore not targeted objects of municipal policies. The two aforementioned housing estates with partial local governments are not giant housing estates, suggesting the successful establishment of local sub-municipality cannot be linked with overall size (i.e. number of inhabitants). Rather, it is related to the local power relations and the activities of key persons and actors in the local community. After 2000, several attempts were made in other districts to establish sub-municipalities (2008, 11th district; 2009, 10th district), but these efforts failed; after 2010, due to the

centralisation efforts of the conservative government, the issue of partial governance was removed from the agenda. Due to the lack of targeted policies for housing estates, there is no special attention given to housing estates in development tenders issued by the city or district governments. Thus, proposals are free to apply for housing estates and other residential areas (i.e. in general, there are no development tenders on local levels targeting exclusively at housing estates). For example, the *Tér-Köz* (Public-Space) programme in Budapest is aimed to draw attention to community building activities (e.g. innovative design of public areas, community programmes) and complex regeneration of public spaces. Although the call is not targeted specifically for housing estates, there is always a significant share of housing estate projects among the winners (for example, there were four housing estates subsidised in 2013 and 2016 by the programme).

Regarding the local civil society and civic life, the gradual strengthening of local communities and civic self-organisations could be witnessed in housing estates both in Budapest and the countryside. The process accelerated in two fundamental forms: first, local associations appeared in order to bring together active local residents (e.g. Association for the Centenarium Housing Estate in the 16th district founded in 2007, or Agora Local Patriot Association in the Lakatos Street housing estate in the 18th district founded in 2014) and, second, foundations have been established to finance local developments and institutions (e.g. Fund for the József Attila Housing Estate provided by the Ferencváros Community Association in the 9th district or Békásmegyér Church Foundation in the 3rd district).

9.6 Conclusion

Considering the number and size of its housing estates, Hungary has an intermediate position among European countries. The share of the population living in housing estates is approximately 20% in Hungary, and approximately 30% in Budapest. There are seven giant housing estates with more than 10,000 dwellings, but both Hungary and Budapest can be characterised by predominately small and medium-size housing estates. In 2011, the average size of housing estates (with more than 1,000 apartments) was 3,870 dwellings in Budapest, housing 8,200 people on average.

In Hungary, housing estates built after WWII can be readily categorised by the time of their construction. These housing estate generations show different features with regard to their physical layout and socio-economic characteristics. Socio-economic changes that took place after the change of regime (1989) are widely affected by the physical parameters of the housing and the dwelling stock (e.g. time and type of construction, age and size of housing estates).

Our results show that various generations of housing estates have followed distinct trajectories. In addition, their social composition remained relatively heterogeneous until now and became even more diversified due to the influx of new residents.

Considering the composition of population by age and type of households, we can conclude that the technology applied (pre-fabricated systems or brick) strongly affected population changes that have taken place in the various generations. In older generations (especially in the housing estates of the 1950s), an influx of younger, better educated strata can be detected, while in younger generations (in housing estates of the 1970s and 1980) an ageing process and a relative socio-economic decline has taken place. Although the share of residents with tertiary education is growing in all housing estate generations, its dynamics lags behind the Budapest average; consequently, our results confirm, in relative terms, a gradual downgrading process in the social status of housing estates. The composition of population by occupation groups clearly demonstrates the social downgrading process of high-rise pre-fabricated housing estates built in the 1970s.

Housing estates in Hungary and Budapest generally provide home for lower middle class strata. Processes of social exclusion and an influx of immigrants (occurring in certain Western European housing estates) are not typical in Hungary or Budapest. Thus, problems regarding ethnicity, poverty, marginalisation and discrimination appear only in a very limited form compared to other European countries and cities.

Since housing estates do not appear as independent administrative or planning units, there are no targeted policies for housing estates per se either on the national or local level. However, the future of housing estates is permanently on the agenda in public debates. As a consequence of the long-term attention to the destiny of housing estates, the first attempts to improve the physical environment of housing estates date back to the late 1990s. Large-scale regeneration of pre-fabricated housing estates began in Hungary in 2001, and by the end of the 2010s, large share of pre-fabricated buildings will be modernised (with new insulation and heating systems). Rehabilitation seems to be an efficient instrument to prevent socio-economic decline and strengthen the position of large housing estates on the housing market. Despite the negative socio-economic tendencies, current market trends give rise to optimism about the future development of large housing estates. A large wave of urban sprawl terminated in Budapest by 2010, and since then the city has a moderate surplus of migration and population growth. The regeneration of inner-city neighbourhoods commenced since the turn of the new millennium, and the central city has been discovered again by younger and more affluent strata. In these dynamically changing housing market conditions, housing estates have a specific role to provide basic housing for newcomers (i.e. students), less affluent and elderly people. Sustainable demand is justified by housing market data and steadily growing dwelling prices since 2014.

Acknowledgements Funding for the research leading to this publication was received from the Hungarian Scientific Research Fund (OTKA) Grant Agreement No. K119710.

References

- Benkő M (2015) The lifespan of large prefabricated housing estates in post-communist cities: an international comparison. *Architektúra & Urbanizmus* 49(3–4):180–197
- Csanádi G, Ladányi J (1992) Budapest térbeni-társadalmi szerkezetének vál-tozásai. Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest
- Csizmady A (2003) A lakótelep. Gondolat Kiadó, Budapest
- Csizmady A, Csanádi G (2009) From housing estates to gated communities. In: Smigiel C (ed) *Gated and guarded housing in Eastern Europe*. Forum Leibniz-Institut für Landerkunde, pp 9–20
- Egedy T (2000) The situation of high-rise housing estates in Hungary. In: Kovács Z (ed) *Hungary towards the 21st century, the human geography of transition*. Geographical Research Institute, Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Budapest, pp 169–185
- Farkas EJ, Szabó M (1995) Privatizáció és szociálislakás-gazdálkodás. *Statisztikai szemle* 73(12): 999–1014
- Fóti P (1988) Röpirat a lakáshelyzetről Magvető Kiadó, Budapest
- Gyáni G (1992) Bérkaszárnya és nyomortelep. Magvető Kiadó, Budapest
- Győri P (1996) A várospolitika és a lakásépítés szerepe egyes szegregációs minták kialakulásában. In: Győri P (ed) *A város, a város társadalma, életformacsoportok*. Wesley János Lelkészképző Főiskola (szöveggyűjtemény), Budapest, pp 77–112
- Hall S, Murie A, Knorr-Siedow T (2005) Large housing estates in their historical context. In: van Kempen R, Dekker K, Hall S, Tosics I (eds) *Restructuring large housing estates in Europe*. Policy Press, Bristol, pp 63–84
- Hegedüs J (2013) Housing privatization and restitution in post-socialist countries. In: Hegedüs J, Lux G, Teller N (eds) *Social housing in transition countries*. Routledge, pp 33–49
- Hegedüs J, Tosics I (1998) Towards new models of the housing system. In: Enyedi G (ed) *Social change and urban restructuring in Central Europe*. Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest, pp 137–168
- Iván L (1996) Mégegyszer a budapesti lakótelepekről. In: Dövényi Z (ed) *Tér-Gazdaság-Társadalom—Huszonkét tanulmány Berényi Istvánnak*. MTA Földrajztudományi Kutatóintézet, Budapest, pp 49–80
- Kovács Z, Douglas M (2004) Hungary—from socialist ideology to market reality. In: Turkington R, van Kempen R, Wassenberg F (eds) *High-rise housing in Europe: current trends and future prospects, housing and urban policy studies* 28. University Press, Delft, pp 231–248
- Kovács Z, Hegedüs G (2014) Gated communities as new forms of segregation in post-socialist Budapest. *Cities* 36:200–209. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2013.08.004>
- Kovács Z, Herfert G (2012) Development pathways of large housing estates in post-socialist cities: an international comparison. *Housing Stud* 27(3):324–342. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02673037.2012.651105>
- Kovács Z, Herpai T (2011) A panelprogram társadalmi és környezeti hatásai Szegeden. In: Szabó V, Fazekas I (eds) *Környezettudatos energiatermelés és –felhasználás*. MTA DAB Megújuló Energetikai Munka-bizottsága, Debrecen, pp 322–328
- Kovács Z, Tosics I (2014) *Urban Sprawl on the Danube. Confronting suburbanization*. Wiley Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118295861.ch2>
- Pieniżek M (2010) The peripheral housing estate as a form of urban spatial development: the status quo and perspectives. *Miscellanea Geographica* 14:273–281
- Preisich G (1998) Budapest városépítésének története 1945–1990. Műszaki Könyvkiadó, Budapest
- Rietdorf W (1997) *Weiter wohnen in der Platte: Probleme der Weiterentwicklung großer Neubaugebiete in den neuen Bundesländern*. Institut für Regionalentwicklung und Strukturplanung. Ed. Sigma, Berlin
- Rietdorf W, Liebmann H, Knorr-Siedow T (1994) *Großsiedlungen in Mittel- und Osteuropa*. Regio, Beiträge des IRS 4, Berlin

- Sailer-Fliege U (1997) Transformation of housing markets in East Central Europe. In: Kovács Z, Wiessner R (eds) *Prozesse und Perspektiven der Stadtentwicklung in Ostmitteleuropa*. Münchener Geographische Hefte 76 Geographisches Institut der Technischen Universität München, L.I.S. Verlag, Passau, pp 33–47
- Sillince J (1985) The housing market of the Budapest urban region 1949–1983. *Urban Stud* 22(2): 141–149
- Szelényi I, Konrád G (1969) *Az új lakótelepek szociológiai problémái*. Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest
- Sýkora L (2009) Post-socialist cities. In: Kitchin R, Thrift N (eds) *International encyclopedia of human geography*. Elsevier, Oxford
- van Kempen R, Dekker K, Hall S, Tosics I (2005) *Restructuring large housing estates in Europe—restructuring and resistance inside the welfare industry*. Policy Press, University of Bristol, Bristol

Open Access This chapter is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if changes were made.

The images or other third party material in this chapter are included in the chapter's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the chapter's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.

