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Introduction

1.1 RESTATE: a general overview

Cities and their regions are the dynamos of the European economy, enabling the European Union (and potential member states) to maintain a strong position in the global economy. When these cities contain large areas that are not faring well, it is important to find out how best to change them so as to remove their dysfunctional characteristics. Large-scale housing estates built in the three or four decades after the Second World War are seen as problem areas in many cities all over Europe. Here, economic decline goes hand in hand with physical and social decline.

All over Europe massive numbers of people live in these post-WWII large-scale housing estates. They were carefully planned, but now they often manifest a multitude of problems. They house large numbers of low-income households, the unemployment rates are above average, and in some countries these estates have become concentration areas for ethnic minorities. Many estates are becoming increasingly associated with crime and social exclusion. The circumstances on the estates and policy initiatives associated with them are the focus of the RESTATE project. An important part of the project is the exchange of experiences and solutions between policymakers and academic researchers.

RESTATE is the acronym for Restructuring Large-scale Housing Estates in European Cities: Good Practices and New Visions for Sustainable Neighbourhoods and Cities. All the participants in this project share the basic underlying conviction: if the problems of these large-scale housing estates are not resolved, they will increasingly hinder the good economic functioning of cities. The study draws on estates in ten European countries: France, Germany, Hungary, Italy, the Netherlands, Poland, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, and the United Kingdom.

The project has the following objectives:
• to identify and to clarify the social and economic changes which have occurred on large post-WWII estates and in particular to identify general and specific factors triggering and influencing the emergence of problems and patterns of decline in these areas;
• to develop a checklist of items that have proved to be important in successful and less successful policy responses with respect to these estates;
• to draw conclusions about the potential for the cross-national transfer of knowledge and experience and for cooperation in strategic planning for these areas and in area and estate management;
• to produce a comprehensive and practical handbook in which forward-looking scenarios and new visions for large post-WWII estates in Europe are associated with examples of evidence-based best practice to achieve the sustainable future development of these areas;
• to build for practitioners and researchers a user-friendly database containing details of the nature, successes, and failures of present policies aimed at improving the position of large post-WWII estates and their inhabitants;
• to consider whether and in what ways European-level policy could contribute to more effective responses to problems associated with these estates.

The primary objective of RESTATE is to deliver evidence-based knowledge drawing on experiences in cities in all parts of Europe. The methods used include literature research, statistical overviews, interviews, a survey, and interviews of urban representatives. The proposed handbook that will be written at the end of the research period will set out best practices for future sustainable developments of these areas and for effective policy implementation. It is hoped that the results will be useful for policymakers seeking to discover the contexts in which measures have been, or can be expected to be, successful in improving large-scale housing estates in cities.

Case studies are the heart of the project. Each study:
• establishes general information about the estate: its characteristics, its history, and its demographic, social, economic, and physical development and problems;
• identifies the philosophy and aims of the policies that are being promoted in the estates, how policies have matured over time, what their effects have been, and how all these matters can be evaluated.

It is important to know precisely what we mean by a large-scale housing estate. Following Power (1997), we could define a large-scale housing estate as a group of buildings that is recognised as a distinct and discrete geographical area. We add one element to this definition: we see large-scale housing estates as developments planned by the state or with state support. With respect to size, we confine our attention to housing estates with at least 2,000 housing units. The focus on the project is on estates built in the second half of the 20th century. Taking these elements together, this project is concerned with large-scale housing estates built in the second half of the 20th century that can be defined as groups of at least 2,000 housing units that are recognised as distinct and geographical areas, planned by the state or with state support.¹

1.2 The contents of this report

In a first report of the RESTATE project (Murie et al., 2003) we concentrated on the structural and other factors that explain the differences between the success and failure of large post-WWII estates in Europe. A later series of reports dealt specifically with large housing estates in the ten countries previously mentioned. In these reports descriptions can be found of the estates

¹ In the rest of the report we refer to these estates as large housing estates.
in which the RESTATE research has taken place (see Erdősi et al., 2003 for the report on Hungary, also see our website (www.restate.geog.uu.nl) for an overview of the rest of the reports). In a third report the focus was on the policies and practices in the estates (see Szemző et al., 2004 for the report on Hungary and the website for the other reports).

The basic question addressed in the present report reads as follows:

*Which inhabitants profit from the developments and policies in the Havanna and Jósaváros estates? Which inhabitants experience clear disadvantages?*

This research question makes it clear that the inhabitants of the estates stand to the fore in this report. It seems logical to assume that current residents would profit from improvements made to their area. But favourable developments such as better housing, more employment opportunities, and better social cohesion may benefit some people or groups but may pass others by completely. Older people will not benefit from policies targeted at those of working age; childless households will not benefit from policies aimed at families; and residents will benefit differentially or at a different time or with different degrees of disruption depending on the part of the estate or the kind of housing in which they live. These patterns may mean that households from minority ethnic groups by and large gain less than others or the other way around. Young people may profit more than old people, households with children more than singles or two-person households. Moreover, developments and policies may have perverse effects: higher quality housing may lead to higher rents and these may force people to move out. Increased social cohesion for some groups may increase exclusion for others; increased employment for some may result in fewer chances for others.

Most results in this report are based on a survey carried out in our estates. The opinions and experiences of the inhabitants of the estates stand to the fore in this survey.

In the second chapter of this report, we give a brief description of the estates that feature in this report: Havanna and Jósaváros, both post-WWII housing estates in the cities of Budapest and Nyíregyháza, in Hungary. In Chapter 3 we say something about the survey and give some first impressions of the results of the survey. Chapter 4 focuses on the positive and negative aspects of the estates as seen through the eyes of the residents. Here we describe the kinds of people who are satisfied with their homes and with their environment and what they think about the social relationships on their estates. In Chapter 5 we concentrate on the effects of the policies, again according to the respondents. Chapter 6 concerns the future: do people think that the estate will be a better place to live in the future? Or do people want to move out as soon as possible? In Chapter 7 we present our general conclusions.

This report is concerned with the cities of Budapest and Nyíregyháza in Hungary; the same kind of information for estates in other countries in the RESTATE project can be found in the parallel reports.
Large housing estates in Hungary accommodate a substantial part of the country's population. Although their status is rather low in today's housing market, they represented a relative high standard when they were built. They also eased the chronic shortage of flats after WWII. They were built between the early 1960s and the end of the 1980s, with most units constructed in the 1970s. With the passing of time not only their size changed, but also their population went through a considerable metamorphosis. Whereas in the 1960s generally smaller estates were built with a high status population residing there, estates constructed in the 1970s were usually bigger and had a less affluent and lower status population. In the 1980s people who could afford it either did not move into large housing estates, or considered it a temporary solution.

After construction, apartments could be obtained through various channels in the housing estates. Some belonged to the local councils and were allocated by them based on a set of criteria, almost without any expenses. More costly were the units in buildings constructed by the National Savings Bank (OTP) or a housing cooperative. As these were condominiums or cooperatives, after an initial down payment a long-term loan had to be repaid. Finally, there were apartments that belonged to various state organisations – like the army or the police – and were assigned by them. Thus the social composition of an estate could differ greatly depending on the ratio of council and state organisation owned apartments and condominiums. Better housing estates usually had a high share of condominiums.

The mass-scale privatisation in the early 1990s mostly strengthened the original character of the estates. The variance that had existed before was amplified; some estates have emerged as rather prestigious areas while others have slid downwards. Despite the worsening conditions and the scarce national help, housing estates still do not represent the lowest segment of the housing market: their maintenance costs are high – the units are heated by district heating, which is one of the costliest in Hungary – which keeps the poorest families away.

Housing estates in Hungary face somewhat different problems than their Western counterparts do. One of the most important divergences is the lack of ethnic minorities: due to the low level of migration into the country housing estates have not yet become the target areas for new immigrants or asylum seekers. The most important difficulties Hungarian estates are currently faced with are largely tied to unsatisfactory physical conditions within the buildings and on the estates that, in the long run, could result in the accumulation of social problems.
2.1 The Havanna estate in Budapest: a brief description

The Havanna housing estate is located in the south-eastern part of Budapest, in the 18th district. It was built between 1977 and 1983 as a big state project, using pre-fabricated construction methods. There are 6,200 dwellings in the estate, in high-rise buildings of 11 floors that provided homes for almost 20,000-22,000 inhabitants at the time of construction. Today the number of inhabitants has decreased to approximately 17,000, which means that 17 per cent of the population of this district is concentrated in this estate.

Havanna is located close to the district centre, nevertheless it takes about 30-40 minutes by public transportation to get into the centre of Budapest. The estate itself has a symmetric layout: a row of high-rise buildings, a row of parks, another row of high-rise buildings, then the main walking road with the service buildings, then again two rows of buildings with a row of parks and playgrounds in between.

Most of the social services and many social institutions of the district are located in the estate: family-help centre, childcare service, education advisory centre, temporary residence for families in need, social centre for pensioners. There are four kindergartens, four primary schools, one nursery and a secondary school, which are still functioning, while some nurseries and one primary school have been converted to serve other purposes. There is also a community centre that offers cultural programmes. The estate is also well equipped with shops for every-day needs. There are three big groceries and numerous small stores (food, clothes and other residential services). The stores generally offer products at a very low price. There are a lot of liquor stores and alcohol selling ‘groceries’ due to the profitability of this business.

Havanna was built on the premises of the former State estate, which had been a mixture of substandard houses, with varying levels of poverty among its residents. The majority of these residents, together with residents from other slum clearance areas of Budapest, received new apartment in the Havanna estate after the demolition of their homes. This contributed greatly to the bad reputation of the housing estate, which, unfortunately persists even today. The social composition of the population only changed considerably after 1990, following the mass privatisation of the apartments to the sitting tenants. During this period the purchase of flats was possible for a fraction (15-30 per cent) of their market price, after which several new owners sold their freshly acquired units for 100 per cent of its value on the market. This perspective gain was a big impetus for the lower-income households of Havanna to sell their units and to move on. (A further incentive to leave the estate was the high running cost of the apartments and the buildings.) In place of the households that left, mostly young couples came from the countryside and other parts of Budapest with or without children. It was due to this change in the composition of the population that the percentage of the Roma inhabitants decreased significantly. Nowadays their ratio among the residents of the estate is estimated to be around 8 per cent.

---

2 The reasons for this sharp decrease include both the decrease of the population of Hungary in general, and a more dramatic decrease of the population of Budapest in particular. However, adding to this we can notice a change in the family structure in the estate, whereby the share of larger families has diminished considerably.

3 Where they went is unclear, but it is often presumed that that many of them bought houses – often sub-standard ones – in the agglomeration belt around the capital.
There are three major problems the population of the Havanna estate struggles with: the growing numbers of old age pensioners, the high percentage of one-parent households and the high unemployment rate. The latter is estimated to be approximately 5 per cent over the age of 20, which is significantly higher than the Budapest average. It is due to these difficulties – together with the relatively lower income of the households – that child allowance plays a significant part in the income of numerous families.

2.2 The Jósaváros estate in Nyíregyháza: a brief description

The Jósaváros housing estate is situated to the north from the centre of Nyíregyháza. It consists of 3,600 dwellings in 57 buildings that were constructed between 1970-1979. In 2001 8,494 people lived in the estate, making up 7 per cent of the population of the city. The housing estate consists of two different zones: 11-storey-high buildings are situated in the centre, whereas 5-storey-high houses are encircling this central area.

The tenure structure influences greatly the condition of the buildings: houses belonging to cooperatives and those that were originally built as condominiums are in a better condition, most likely because the owners there have a higher income and can spend more money and pay more attention to their houses. Privatised houses, where groups of former tenants live, who can hardly or cannot afford to pay the required level of condominium fee, are usually in a worse shape.

The total area of the estate is estimated to be about 0.363 km². There are three bigger and some smaller playgrounds situated in the estate. With one or two exceptions the equipment of playgrounds is not at all modern and safe, at least according to the EU standards. There are ten football and basketball courts on five different sites, partly on public spaces, partly in the courtyards of schools.

The estate is well equipped with all kinds of services: there are four supermarkets and a market, a healthcare centre and a pharmacy in the estate. There are two nurseries, three schools with combined elementary and high school education and there is one catholic high school in the housing estate. Above all, there is also a small community centre in the estate.

The household structure of the estate has changed significantly over the years. Compared to the original population, the number of inhabitants has decreased by one-third. Parallel to this, the population became older, the number of one-person households increased significantly while the number of households with children decreased. Interestingly however, the ratio of one-parent households remained constant all over the years. Besides the ageing population and the financial problems tied to it – keeping a household from one pension is a difficult task in Hungary – unemployment causes the biggest concerns in the estate. It is estimated to be around 7 per cent over the age of 20, but reaching 11.8 per cent in the category of 20-24, and 25-29 year-olds.\(^4\) It is due to these financial difficulties that many families have accumulated great arrears towards the utility companies.

\(^4\) This is not the official unemployment rate but the number of unemployed people divided by the inhabitants in that age category.
2.3 Conclusions

The two estates where the research was conducted, Havanna in Budapest and Jósaváros in Nyíregyháza, have some common features: they were both built in the 1970s as part of the large housing construction programme of the Hungarian state and consequently they were populated according to more socially sensitive standards than in the 1960s. Their similar age and structure makes their inhabitants face similar problems within the buildings – the insufficient insulation, the one-piped heating system and the basic engineering in need of repairs – and outside of the buildings – the green areas, the parks, the playgrounds and the street furniture in need of maintenance, investment and upgrading, not to speak about the lack of parking spaces. These problems have become quite apparent in the recent years, and coupled with a general neglect of the estates, are causing serious defects in their lives.

Another similarity between the two estates is the willingness of both local municipalities to do something about these problems, and to take the initial steps. However, embarking on the road of rehabilitation seems to be more difficult in the case of Havanna. For once it is bigger than Jósaváros, but it also has to struggle with its bad reputation – although it has been clearly improving – and a relatively larger proportion of people in a socially difficult position. Jósaváros occupies a different position within the real estate market of Nyíregyháza, and houses a somewhat higher status population.

Fairly different are the layout of the two estates and the size of their buildings and apartments. The Havanna estate – situated in the outskirts of Budapest – consists only of eleven-storey high-rise buildings forming eight, almost unbroken long rows – whereas in Jósaváros the buildings of five-to-eleven-storey high-form ‘streets’ and ‘squares’ by standing apart or diagonal to each other.

The tenure structure of both estates now seems similar, but it was quite different before privatisation took place. In the Havanna more units belonged to the municipality in 1990 than in Jósaváros, but the privatisation process resulted nearly the same rate of owner occupation in the two estates. What stayed more or less the same is the ratio of the cooperatives: in the Havanna it is still 19 per cent, whereas in the Jósaváros it went down to 25 per cent.
Photo gallery
Havanna and Jósaváros housing estates in the cities of Budapest and Nyíregyháza

Picture 1 – A main street in the afternoon
(Photo: Vilhelmina Bodnár, 2004)

Picture 2 – A playground
(Photo: András Ekés, 2004)

Picture 3 – Main public point: market place at the Kondor promenade
(Photo: András Ekés, 2004)

Picture 4 – There is a lack of parking places on the estates
(Photo: Vilhelmina Bodnár, 2004)
Picture 5 – Entrance of a large building from the outside: arcades (Photo: András Ekés, 2004)

Picture 6 – There is garbage and dirt on the streets (Photo: András Ekés, 2004)

Picture 7 – House of Bachelors flats on the Jósaváros estate is owned by the local government (Photo: Vilhelmina Bodnár, 2004)

Picture 8 – Robinson Hill on the Jósaváros estate is owned by the local government (Photo: Vilhelmina Bodnár, 2004)
Figure 1 – The layout of the Havanna housing estate (the city centre of Budapest is situated North-West)

Figure 2 – The layout of the Jásaváros housing estate (the city centre of Nyíregyháza is situated in the South)
3 The survey: methodological issues and some characteristics of respondents and dwellings

3.1 The survey in the Havanna and Jósaváros estates

Altogether 400 questionnaires were filled out, 200 in each estate. As a result, a relatively good sample was achieved: in the Havanna housing estate in Budapest 3.1 per cent of the households were asked, whereas in Jósaváros in Nyíregyháza 6.2 per cent were questioned. Surveyors were employed to carry out the task in both estates, as giving/mailing the questionnaires (see the Appendix for the survey) to the respondents and asking them to fill it out on their own was thought to be not enough reliable to achieve a good result.

Zoning and the use of quotas were applied in both estates to ensure a relative representativity of the sample. Both estates were divided into ten zones with approximately the same number of dwellings in each zone. The philosophy behind zoning was that the estates have better and worse parts, which must influence profoundly how their inhabitants view their flats, the estate and the future of the estate. We wanted to avoid the overrepresentation of certain areas, should there be better or worse ones. In each zone 20 questionnaires were filled out.

We also wanted to avoid that certain household structures would be over-represented – assuming that the household composition directly influences a number of determining decisions households make – so a system of quotas was introduced. This quota system – consisting of four different categories – was based on the census of 2001, and was applied to each zone. In the Havanna housing estate we prescribed that in each zone nine to eleven questionnaires should be asked in households where couples live with or without children, four or five should be asked in one-person households, similarly four or five in one parent households and one or two in all other types of households. In Jósaváros the ratio of couples with or without children was similar – nine to eleven questionnaires – but one-person households received a higher share – five to seven questionnaires – whereas the number of single-parent households became lower – two or three questionnaires. Again one or two households fell in the category of the others. As the quotas show, we allowed for certain flexibility, keeping in mind that it is difficult to gain access to households, especially in the poorer areas.

All surveyors made questionnaires in one or two zones, asking either 20 or 40 households. As a rule it was laid down that only household heads could be asked, making sure that data on household structure and income level remains comparable. Refusals were between 10-15 per cent, which we found to be rather positive.
3.2 Characteristics of the respondents

As it was pointed out in the introduction, all respondents of the questionnaire were household heads, a fact that modified the age structure of the respondents rather decisively compared to the census (see Tables 3.1/a and 3.1/b).\(^5\) Distribution among the different age categories was surprisingly even in the survey (Table 3.1/a), especially in Jósaváros, where approximately one-fifth of the respondents belonged to one age category. Slightly different was the case of Havanna, where residents between the age of 45 and 54 responded in the greatest numbers (31.5 per cent) whereas the relatively younger population – between 18-30 years – was less represented (14.5 per cent). This differs from the real constituency of the Havanna estate, reflected by the census of 2001.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Jósaváros</th>
<th>Havanna</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-30</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-44</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and over</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (=100%)</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RESTATE fieldwork, 2004

Table 3.1b – Age composition of the estates (%)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Jósaváros</th>
<th>Havanna</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-19</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-44</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and over</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (=100%)</td>
<td>8,313</td>
<td>16,990</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Census, 2001

The household composition of the residents reflected in the survey lies very close to the one found by the census of 2001. This is due to the fact that the survey quotas were created on the basis of this household composition found by the census (Section 3.1).

The survey showed a moderate fluctuation of the population of both estates. The Jósaváros estate was built between 1970 and 1979, whereas the Havanna was constructed somewhat later, between 1976 and 1983; approximately one-quarter of the original population remained in place in both cases from the time of construction (Table 3.3) and roughly one-quarter came after 2001.

Not surprisingly, the majority of the original inhabitants are 55 years old or older in both cases (in the Jósaváros 75.5 per cent of them, whereas in the Havanna 58.9 per cent of them are older

---

\(^5\) In the census all inhabitants are registered, not only household heads.
than 55). Among the recently arrived younger generation – under 44 – is more prominent. In the Havanna estate their share reaches 60 per cent, and in Jósaváros it is even higher, 73 per cent. There seems to be a difference in the composition of this younger generation between the two estates, as more household heads of the newcomer families are under 30 in Jósaváros than in Havanna. The source for their relative importance might be the closeness of the city college, and the fact that many students choose the Jósaváros housing estate as their place of accommodation. Proving this latter point was only possible through finding a set of indirect indicators, as the questionnaire did not ask for the occupation of the interviewed. Thus, we created the profile of the college students living alone or with university mates based on the following assumptions, all verifiable from the questionnaire data: they have all moved recently to the estate, they come outside of Nyíregyháza from a parental household and have more than 13 years of education. Based on this, altogether ten respondents can be described as probable college students. A further proof for the validity of this argument could be the relatively high share of private rentals in the estate (see Table 3.8 on ownership structure).

Looking at the data on ethnicity (Table 3.4), the survey reveals a staggering homogeneity of both estates. This has two important reasons: First of all, the international migration movement only slightly touches Hungary, partly because of the country’s geographical position, and partly because of its strict migration laws. (This latter could be changing with the EU accession.) Consequently, the only relevant ethnic minority population, which is present in Hungary, is the Roma population. However, the real number of the Roma is always elusive: their share in the population is estimated to be around 6 per cent in the whole country, but the census – based on self-declaration – only found them to make up 1.75 per cent of the population. This elusiveness of the Roma is the second important reason behind the homogeneity of the sample. They are surely

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.2 – Household composition (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Havanna</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estate</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single alone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single with children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple with or without children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (=100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RESTATE fieldwork, 2004; Census, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.3 – Duration of living in the current dwelling (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Havanna</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981-1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991-1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996-2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001 &gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (=100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RESTATE fieldwork, 2004
present in both housing estates – in the Havanna estate their share is estimated to reach the 8 per cent of the population. Nevertheless, most likely – if asked – they would declare themselves Hungarian, not Roma.

Table 3.4 – Ethnicity of the respondents (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Heads</th>
<th>Partners</th>
<th>Heads</th>
<th>Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hungarian</td>
<td>99.0</td>
<td>98.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (=100%)</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RESTATE fieldwork, 2004

With regard to the earning capacity of the population, we can say that approximately half of the 200 respondents in each estate have a paid job. The ratio was somewhat better in Havanna, where 111 people said that they had a paid job as opposed to exactly 100 in Jósaváros. These numbers however, are somewhat distorted, as the 200 cases include all who are pensioners. So excluding all households where the pension forms the main source of income, we get a 22 per cent (Havanna) and a 25 per cent (Jósaváros) share where respondents do not have a paid job. Among those households where couples live – still excluding pensioners – we find approximately 5 per cent, where neither the respondent nor his/her partner has a paid job, and 40 (Havanna) 45 (Jósaváros) per cent of the households, where only one of them has a job. So, the overall picture regarding employment is somewhat better in Havanna, which might be in connection with the better working opportunities of Budapest.

How much people work a week is hard to say, as the answers show a surprising variation. Approximately half of the respondents in each estate said that they had to work 40 hours a week. The other half however, indicated with a relatively even dispersion all kinds of variations for a weekly employment between 10 and 90 hours.

What seems to be sure is that the main source of income for both estates is the salary from paid jobs: in the Havanna 67 per cent of the respondents said so, whereas in Jósaváros somewhat fewer, 57 per cent of the respondents indicated this. Pensions, on the other hand also make up the most important source of income for a relatively large group of people in both places, for approximately one-third of the population in each estate (Table 3.5).

Table 3.5 – Main source of income of the households (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Havanna</th>
<th>Jósaváros</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salary (work)</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>57.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social or unemployment benefit</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pension</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (=100%)</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RESTATE fieldwork, 2004

The somewhat better earning capacity of Havanna over the Jósaváros estate is also shown by the distribution of household incomes. The majority of people belong in both housing estates
to the category of medium low – an indication of the relative low social status of the estates. However, only 11.9 per cent of the population belongs to the lowest income category in the Havanna, whereas 28.8 per cent belongs to the lowest category in Jósaváros (Table 3.6). At the same time, in the categories of medium high and average income, households from the Havanna estate are represented in a higher share than the Jósaváros one. (Answers on income level however, should be regarded with caution, as people tend to confess lower income levels than they actually have.)

Table 3.6 – Income level of the respondents (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Havanna</th>
<th>Jósaváros</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High (top 10%)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium high (10-30%)</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average (top 30%-bottom 30%)</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium low (bottom 30-10%)</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>47.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low (bottom 10%)</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (=100%)</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RESTATE fieldwork, 2004

It is surprising to note at first that the income level in Havanna is significantly higher than in Jósaváros. Especially after looking at the education level of both estates, which clearly demonstrates that in Jósaváros the better-educated residents are present in significantly higher percentages than in the Havanna housing estate (Table 3.7).

Table 3.7 – Education level (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Havanna</th>
<th>Jósaváros</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No education after the age of 6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-12 years</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-14 years</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 or more years</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (=100%)</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RESTATE fieldwork, 2004

First, it indicates that the correlation between the level of education and the income level is not very strong. Secondly, it highlights some regional differences within Hungary with regard to the income level. Generally, it can be stated that wages and salaries are significantly higher in the capital than in the countryside, including the bigger cities. Finally, an important reason strongly influencing the lower income level of the Jósaváros residents is the higher number of households where pensions form the most important source of income (Table 3.5).
3.3 The respondents’ dwellings

Housing estates in Hungary consist of high-rise buildings – 5 to 12 storeys – and family houses are very rarely located on their territory. Most housing estates form a homogenous visual unit, which sharply distinguishes them from their surroundings. Consequently, neither in the Havanna nor in the Jósaváros housing estate can any other form of housing apart from flats be found.

All the dwellings in question were built in a short period of time, between 1976 and 1983 in the case of Havanna and 1970 and 1979 in the case of Jósaváros. Most units were state owned originally in Havanna – 64.5 per cent – whereas in Jósaváros the share of privately owned units was 66 per cent. But, as a result of the large-scale privatisation in the early 1990s, the share of municipal rental units decreased to 10-15 per cent in both estates by 2001.

Apart from municipal ownership, practically no other form of the public rental sector exists in Hungary. There are no housing companies or housing associations in the country. Although there are cooperatives, but even in a cooperative the dwellings are privately owned, and only the common parts – such as staircases, walls, roofs – belong to the cooperative. This means that there is very little difference between a cooperative and a condominium except for the fact that a condominium is always one building while a cooperative may consist of several buildings.

As Table 3.8 on the tenure types shows, the sample in the survey was quite close to the tenure structure shown by the census. However, it had one serious advantage over that: it revealed the extent of the private rental sector, which remained totally hidden in the census of 2001. If we add the share of private rentals to the owner occupied one – as it is privately owned in reality – then the data of the sample becomes even closer to the official numbers.

Table 3.8 – Tenure type of the current apartment (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Havanna</th>
<th>Jósaváros</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estate</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private rental</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner occupied</td>
<td>84.7</td>
<td>89.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>74.5</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (=100%)</td>
<td>6,231</td>
<td>3,233</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RESTATE fieldwork, 2004; Census, 2001

The owner occupied units may be owned outright or financed by a mortgage loan. As long-term housing loans were nearly impossible to get in the 1990s – because of the high inflation rate – the owners that still have a mortgage loan moved to the estate in the 1980s or after 2001 (both before 1989 and after 2000 serious state subsidies existed for housing loans). In the sample 34 per cent of the dwelling owners in Havanna and 16 per cent of the dwelling owners in

6 State organisations and ministries used to be owners as well, but most of their apartments were privatised. What remained in their maintenance is a negligible amount.
7 In the survey we considered a flat being financed by a housing loan if it still had a lien on it.

[26]
Jósaváros have housing loans at the moment, a rate, which is considerably lower than in Western Europe.

The size of the dwellings and the number of rooms in the survey reflect the typical housing estate layout: middle-sized flats with as many rooms as possible (Table 3.9). This description is actually more fitting to the case of Havanna, which is a bit more modern estate than Jósaváros. In Havanna 63.5 per cent of the dwellings in the sample have two bedrooms – meaning three rooms – while it is 57 per cent in Jósaváros. Bigger flats, with at least three bedrooms are quite rare in both estates; their share is under 4 per cent.

Table 3.9 – Size of the current flat (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Havanna</th>
<th></th>
<th>Jósaváros</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Estate</td>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>Estate</td>
<td>Sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 30 m²</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40 m²</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50 m²</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60 m²</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>71.5</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-80 m²</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-100 m²</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 m² &lt;</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (=100%)</td>
<td>6,231</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>3,233</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RESTATE fieldwork, 2004; Census, 2001

The data concerning the housing expenses does not seem to be adequate in the survey. People tend to underestimate their income and overestimate their expenses, when they are asked in general terms. Table 3.10, if taken seriously, would show a great deal of households to be in serious financial difficulties. Despite the exorbitant housing costs in panel estates as a result of district heating, 50 per cent housing costs/income ratio seems to be an exaggeration, especially if we consider that basically no private tenants and owners with mortgages fall into this category, but municipal tenants8 and outright owners. (In an official survey made in 2003 the housing costs/income ratio was 36 per cent for the poorest one-fifth of the society, while it was 12 per cent in the wealthiest one-fifth. These ratios were a bit higher in Budapest.)

Table 3.10 – Housing costs/income ratio (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Havanna</th>
<th></th>
<th>Jósaváros</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Estate</td>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>Estate</td>
<td>Sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 10%</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-30%</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-50%</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>49.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 50%</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (=100%)</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RESTATE fieldwork, 2004

8 Municipal rents are very low in Hungary, mostly they are less or equal to the common fees that owners have to pay.
The data on migration show that people moved to their apartments mainly from other parts of their city, but not from the same estate (76 per cent in Havanna/54.5 per cent in Jósaváros), which is not surprising, especially in Budapest. Both in Havanna and Jósaváros 12-13 per cent of the residents lived previously in another apartment of the same estate. In the case of Jósaváros, 20.5 per cent of the inhabitants moved from other parts of the country, while this rate was only 9.5 per cent in the case of the Havanna. There were only 1-2 households in both estates that came from abroad.

A little bit more than one-quarter of the household heads in the sample used to live with their parents and siblings before moving to the estates. The fact that they became household heads in their current dwelling indicates that approximately one-fourth of the households were formed in these estates.

Concerning the motivations for moving to these estates we can emphasise that many people had no choice but to move here: 51 per cent in the Havanna estate and 39 per cent in the Jósaváros estate reported so in the survey. For them either no other dwelling was available, or it was the municipality that allocated their dwelling here. Only 5 per cent of the answers in Havanna and 17 per cent of the answers in Jósaváros indicated the positive characteristics of the estates, like good connections, good schools, good services, as a reason for moving here. (The other factors, like physical proximity of relatives, physical proximity to work, a bigger flat, or being born in the neighbourhood seem to be less important.)

### 3.4 Conclusions

The two estates in the sample, although built largely in the same period, differ quite substantially from each other. The Havanna housing estate represents a lower segment of the housing market in Budapest than the Jósaváros estate does in Nyíregyháza. When Havanna was built, it was built on the site of the previously demolished ‘State estate’ that had been populated by very low status residents. The fact that parts of Havanna’s population came from the former residents of the ‘State estate’ contributed to its bad reputation. Into Jósaváros however, after it was finished in 1979, a middle-status population moved in, which was also reflected by the fact that the share of privately owned units was as high as 66 per cent.

After the mass privatisation movement of the early 1990s the population of the Havanna estate has changed somewhat, as the poorest households have moved out. Still, the staggering share – 21 per cent – of the single-parent households in the estate reflects the vulnerability of the population. In comparison, in Jósaváros 16.1 per cent of the households are single-parent households. Another sign for the relative lower status of Havanna is the lower education level of its residents. In the survey – which concentrated only on household heads – residents from Jósaváros significantly outnumbered residents from Havanna among the better educated (with at least 15 years of education). In the lowest segment however, among those, who only had an elementary education (6 to 10 years in the school system) the share of the Havanna and Jósaváros residents were equal.

Surprisingly, it is the Havanna housing estate, where the survey showed residents to earn somewhat better. This might be due to the lower income levels outside of Budapest, and the higher share of pensioners in Jósaváros. Despite this difference, people in both housing estates are generally very poor. In the sample among the households 52.6 per cent in Havanna and
76.1 per cent in Jósaváros belonged to the lowest 30 per cent of the Hungarian society with regard to their income levels – if we consider their claim true.

Regarding the age structure of the population, we can say that both estates are relatively young, comparing to their city average, and both have experienced an influx of young people recently. This is even more apparent in Jósaváros, where the closeness of the college makes the estate an ideal location for students to live. There was only one aspect of the population that the survey could not catch: ethnicity. It showed a surprising homogeneity of the population and the presence of no ethnic minorities in spite of the fact that the Roma are present in both estates.

About one-fourth of the households of both estates have lived in the neighbourhood from the time of its construction, while about another one-fourth came in the last four years. This latter data shows that the mobility rate in the estates is significantly higher than in other housing types. (The average mobility rate in Hungary is about 3-5 per cent of the families annually.)
4 Positive and negative aspects of the estates

In this chapter we will analyse the attitude of the residents towards their neighbourhood and residential conditions. However, we have to emphasise that only very few estate specific policies were implemented, thus the attitude of the residents is not really influenced by the effects of these policies. As we will see later, these few policies did not influence the satisfaction level of the inhabitants but rather effected their vision about the future of the estate. This lack of policies also partly explains why no civil organisation functions in the estates.

Although about one-fourth of the inhabitants live in the two estates from the time it was constructed, there is no real feeling of identity, which would encourage civil movements — however, the development of civil society is generally a new phenomenon, dating from the fall of socialism. Articles on housing estates in the 1980s emphasised more the feeling of alienation rather than the feeling of cohesion or solidarity, and the situation is the same today.

4.1 People in the neighbourhood

In the housing estates in Hungary, parallel with the residential buildings all the necessary service buildings were constructed. That is why, even today, we cannot say that the lack or shortage of services would cause the depreciation of the quality of life in the housing estates. The survey also supports this hypothesis, as both in Havanna and in Jósaváros all basic services, like grocery stores, primary schools or the general practitioner may be reached within 10 minutes. More sophisticated services, like banks or dentists are more difficult to reach for 22-53 per cent of the households in Havanna, while in Jósaváros, practically all services may be reached in some minutes.

As the estates are well equipped with services the time spent out of the estate is mainly determined by the labour market position of the residents. In the estates observed 38 per cent (Havanna) and 32.5 per cent (Jósaváros) of the household heads spends more than 10 hours out of the estates regularly, however another 22 per cent (Havanna) and 23 per cent (Jósaváros) of the household heads spends less than 1 hour out of the estate on a usual working day. Not surprisingly around 70 per cent of the households spending less than 1 hour out of the estate have pension as their main source of income, so they seem to be pensioners.

Housing estates are not really the target of any civil movement or civil initiatives. In the survey 6.5 per cent (Havanna) and 5.5 per cent (Jósaváros) of the households reported to participate in some kind of sport or cultural activities in the estate, while only two or three people reported
to be part of an association that aims to improve the neighbourhood. However, people answering that they participate in an association that improves the quality of the neighbourhood just do some gardening around the buildings. Gardening is the most liveable activity in both estates, which is supported by the local municipalities that give plants for free if someone takes care of them. As there is no structured rehabilitation programme going on in either of the estates, there are no civil organisations that could be connected to the rehabilitation process. Nevertheless, some years ago there was one civil organisation both in Havanna and Jósaváros that theoretically tried to gather people that wanted to do something for their estates. But during the current research, we could not find any trace of them.

Table 4.1 – Level of attachment to the neighbourhood (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Havanna</th>
<th>Jósaváros</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>50.3</td>
<td>52.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>36.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (=100%)</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RESTATE fieldwork, 2004

Regarding the question of attachment, Table 4.1 shows that in both estates more households like the neighbourhood than they dislike it. (‘Attached to the estate’ in the Hungarian questionnaire was translated into ‘how much do you like it’, as it is the question we thought people could make an evaluation about.) Still, people in Jósaváros have a stronger attachment towards their estate than people in Havanna do. (This question will be further evaluated in Section 4.4 in connection with the satisfaction with the neighbourhood. It may be premised though that there are no relevant household characteristics that would determine attachment to or detachment from the estate. The only relevant correlation, which could be observed, was in connection with the amount of time spent in the estate. But even in this case only in Jósaváros, where the ‘old’ inhabitants have a stronger attachment to the estate than the newcomers).

4.2 Satisfaction with the home

As we described in Section 3.3 the dwellings in Havanna and Jósaváros estates are not really large. Most of them are middle sized – between 51-64 m² – while bigger dwellings – more than 64 m² – are quite rare. This composition of dwellings was a real improvement compared to the estates of the 1960s, but it still does not fully meet the requirements of a middle-sized family.

The satisfaction levels concerning the dwellings are 6.5 in Havanna and 7.1 in Jósaváros (in a scale where 1 means ‘not at all satisfied’, and 10 means ‘fully satisfied’). The variation is nearly the same in the two estates, so the results could be compared.

9 We accepted ‘yes’ answers, in case someone carries out sport or cultural activities outside the estate with people that have connections to the estate, or participates in activities that are carried out in the estate even if the other participants come from outside.
Regarding the connections, correlations between the satisfaction level and other variables, the survey produced the following results.

- There is no correlation between the size of the dwelling and the level of satisfaction either in Havanna or in Jósaváros. Naturally it does not mean that people are satisfied with the size of their unit, it rather suggests than in some cases the flat is too small while in others too big.
- Surprisingly there is only a slight correlation between any kind of refurbishment carried out and the level of satisfaction of the residents. In Havanna 68 per cent of the households implemented a smaller or bigger refurbishment in the past five years, while this rate is 63 per cent in Jósaváros. (Refurbishment means any kind of renovation, renewal or painting/wallpapering in this case.)
- There is a strong correlation between the form of ownership of the flat and the satisfaction level. Basically the residents living in municipal flats are a lot less satisfied than the ones in the owner-occupied sector in both estates. It is an interesting result, especially if we consider that the dwelling conditions in the municipal flats are also mainly dependent on the tenants. The municipality does not take the responsibility to maintain and renovate the flat inside. Even in this case there may be at least two reasons why municipal tenants are less satisfied: firstly, tenants constitute the poorest layer of the estate society. When they were allowed to buy their homes in the ‘give away privatisation’ of the early 1990s for 15-30 per cent of its value, they were not able to do so. They are pessimistic, and tend to ‘look on the dark side of life’. We could of course also think that municipal flats are of worse quality and that is why the tenants did not want to buy them at the time of privatisation, but experience shows, that this is not the case. Secondly, tenants always have the possibility to blame someone else, and due to their dependent status they may think they would deserve something better.
- One can also discover a strong correlation between the housing costs and the satisfaction level. Interestingly this significant relationship could be observed just in the case of Havanna, where housing costs/income level ratio is reported to be higher than in Jósaváros, where the income levels themselves are lower. It may be the case that residents in Havanna feel themselves poorer compared to the residents of the capital, and that is why they feel housing costs to be more significant as a factor of satisfaction concerning the dwellings.
- Far the strongest correlation can be observed connecting the satisfaction levels of the flat with that of the estate. This fact may lead to two different conclusions: either the questionnaire did not bring out some other existing correlations with regard to the attitude of the residents, or being satisfied or not are mainly explained by subjective characteristics that are rooted in the personality: some people tend to be less satisfied in general than the others. (Naturally it does not mean, that the two variables go ‘hand in hand’, but as a trend they move together.)

Concerning the change in the satisfaction level (Table 4.2) we can observe a slight decrease in the last 5 years. A bit more people reported to have a lower satisfaction level than a higher one in both estates, but nearly half of them did not experience any changes.

Interestingly, this opinion does not have any connection with the fact whether the flat was renovated or not. This also strengthens the conclusion that the satisfaction level concerning the flat is mainly based on not qualitative characteristics, but reflects more the attitude of the interviewees.
4.3 Satisfaction with the estate

The satisfaction level in connection with the estate is 5.7 in Havanna while 7.1 in Jósaváros (in a scale where 1 means ‘not at all satisfied’, and 10 means ‘fully satisfied’). The variation is also nearly the same in the two estates so the means could be compared again. There was not as much difference between the two estates concerning the satisfaction level with the dwelling. The satisfaction level in Jósaváros is the same concerning both the flat and the estate. This is especially interesting, as in general people tend to be more satisfied with their homes, as they have much more influence on it than on their neighbourhood. This fact emphasises more that in Jósaváros people have a quite positive opinion about the estate, whereas in Havanna people are not as much satisfied.

What does it depend on how many people are satisfied with their estates; what are the variables that explain the satisfaction level? There is a strong correlation between the satisfaction level and the level of attachment, but interestingly there are no other significant connections. In the case of the satisfaction level with the dwelling one can find a few explanatory variables like housing costs, or ownership structure, but in the case of the estate there are no such variables. No connection could be discovered with the ownership structure either – tenant or owner – the household structure – singles or families – the education level, the income level, source of income – pension or salary – or age. Although concerning the age, it can be discovered in Jósaváros that the older interviewees are more satisfied with the estate, which supports the finding that in Jósaváros ‘old’ inhabitants feel more attached to the estate than the newcomers.

The satisfaction level basically has remained the same for the last five years.

Table 4.2 – Change in the satisfaction level concerning the flat (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Havanna</th>
<th>Jósaváros</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>42.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable (less than 5 years of residence in the flat)</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (=100%)</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RESTATE fieldwork, 2004

Table 4.3 – Change in the satisfaction level concerning the estate (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Havanna</th>
<th>Jósaváros</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>48.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable (less than 5 years of residence in the estate)*</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (=100%)</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RESTATE fieldwork, 2004

* It is important to note that not exactly the same amount of households have reported to live less then five years in the current flat and in the Havanna or Jósaváros estate – compare Tables 4.2 and 4.3. Theoretically it may be a mistake of the survey, but practically it is proved, that some households lived in the estate 5 years ago, but not in the same flat.
It is interesting to note that while the level of satisfaction with the dwelling has decreased in the last five years – see Table 4.2 – the level of satisfaction with regard to the estates has remained stable (see Table 4.3).

A more heterogeneous picture can be observed in the case of Havanna, as most people did not have a neutral opinion. In objective terms the quality of life in Havanna should have increased partly as a result of some municipal investments – improvement of public spaces, instalment of CCTVs – partly due to a slight change in the composition of residents towards a better direction. However, a relevant number of households do not recognise these results.

With regard to the characteristics of the estates (Table 4.4), the interviewees had the opportunity to choose only one favourite characteristic, so they really had to emphasise the most typical one. The result – and the fact that the result is nearly the same in the two estates – underlines one of the most important features of the Hungarian estates: they were planned for very little traffic inside, with a lot of greenery, and the availability of services.

Table 4.4 – Characteristics of the estates liked the most (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Havanna</th>
<th>Jósváros</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Green spaces</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>42.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility to public services</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playgrounds for children</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity to work</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity to schools</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of local schools</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People who live there</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quiet neighbourhood</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (=100%)</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RESTATE fieldwork, 2004

With regard to the characteristics of the estates (Table 4.4), the interviewees had the opportunity to choose only one favourite characteristic, so they really had to emphasise the most typical one. The result – and the fact that the result is nearly the same in the two estates – underlines one of the most important features of the Hungarian estates: they were planned for very little traffic inside, with a lot of greenery, and the availability of services.

We may take a closer look at the peculiarities of the estates if we analyse the least liked characteristics, although the similarities are obvious in this case as well (Table 4.5).

Table 4.5 – Characteristics of the estates liked least (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Havanna</th>
<th>Jósváros</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Green spaces</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility to public services</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playgrounds for children</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth facilities</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity to work</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of local schools</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People, who live there</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack and care of cleanliness</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dirt of dogs and/or birds</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifts often do not work</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shortage of parking places</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RESTATE fieldwork, 2004
First of all we have to emphasise, that the rate of unknown answers was the highest in this question. It means that the negative characteristics are not so obvious as the positive ones, and the estates are not in such a critical state as we may have expected. The most negative feature in the eyes of many respondents in both estates was the population itself. Interestingly, the share of these answers was nearly twice as much in Havanna as in Jósaváros. This supports the hypothesis that the society of Havanna is more mixed. Unfortunately we could not identify that layer of the estate society in the survey that has the most averse feelings towards the current composition of residents. (As an example, neither the income level, nor the education level explains this attitude.)

Analysing the least liked aspects, it becomes obvious that the parking problems seem to be quite serious in Jósaváros – although the local municipality of Havanna also considers its case critical. In both estates many households mentioned that they were unsatisfied with the playgrounds despite the fact that in the Havanna estate nearly all playgrounds have been renovated, and a few of them were improved in Jósaváros as well.

More differences between the estates come to light, if we evaluate the next question connected to the problems experienced personally by the residents.

### Table 4.5 – Characteristics of the estates liked least (%) (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Havanna</th>
<th>Jósaváros</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Density</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of safety</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too many pubs</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No such thing</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (=100%)</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RESTATE fieldwork, 2004

### Table 4.6 – Share of people that experienced certain problems personally at the estates (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Havanna</th>
<th>Jósaváros</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dirt on the streets</td>
<td>86.5</td>
<td>63.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug abuse</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary in dwellings</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary in cars</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graffiti</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling of unsafety</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upkeep of public spaces</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition of the roads</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playground for children</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of buildings</td>
<td>71.5</td>
<td>47.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of employment</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of schools</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of commercial services</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of public services</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different values</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racism</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RESTATE fieldwork, 2004
Table 4.6 emphasises that the residents of the Havanna housing estate are more sensitive to the problems than residents in Jósaváros (people in Havanna are usually faced with more difficulties in their daily life), which actually might explain their lower satisfaction level with the estate. The problem hierarchy differs in the two estates. While dirt and the condition of the buildings are in the focus in both estates, there is more emphasis on the criminal factors in Havanna, and more on the public spaces and roads in Jósaváros. The employment problems seem to be serious in both estates, however, the share of people experiencing problems with the lack of employment is higher in Havanna than in Jósaváros, where the unemployment rate is considerably higher, mainly among the youth. This result strengthens the assumption that people in Havanna in general are more pessimistic about their estate, and perceive to have more problems and conflicts. (It is also reflected in the high rate of criminal actions experienced, despite of the fact that with the implementation of the CCTV the criminality rate decreased significantly.)

4.4 Social aspects in the area

As we mentioned in Chapter 4.1 people in Jósaváros are more attached to their neighbourhood than people in Havanna. We could only identify the ‘old’ inhabitants in Jósaváros as a special group, who have a considerably stronger attachment to their estate than the newcomers. The attachment level does not have any correlation with social relations – at least it was not proved by the survey. There are relative strong interpersonal relations in both estates, as only 3 per cent (Havanna) and 2 per cent (Jósaváros) of the households stated to have bad relations with the neighbours, while 65 per cent (Havanna) and 72 per cent (Jósaváros) reported to have really good connections with them.

The connections with relatives and friends are also quite strong as nearly half of the households in both estates have some relatives or friends in the estates. (They may have acquired friends in the estates after moving there.) However, having friends or relatives in the estate does not seem to strengthen the attachment to it, which in turn further supports the idea that satisfaction levels and attachment levels are very subjective, having hardly any verifiable relation with the other indicators of the survey.

The heterogeneity of the population in the estates is probably bigger than it was in the 1970s, when they were built. That time mostly families with small children or young couples received the flats, or people who were not well positioned enough to get state owned flats in the 1950s or 1960s. Originally, with the emerging cooperative and private construction, a thin layer of better off families also moved to the estates but these families were also mostly young. The privatisation process, the ageing population, and the transition itself – which increased social heterogeneity considerably all over the society – increased the heterogeneity level of the estates as well. This controversial process is reflected in the data of Table 4.7.

Social mixture seems to be something that has connection with deviance and the gipsies in some people’s minds. That is why more people consider it to be rather bad than good (35.5 per cent in Havanna and 20 per cent in Jósaváros).

Concerning the types of people living in the estates, most residents think that they simply go their own way (49.5 per cent Havanna and 54 per cent Jósaváros) rather than help each other (18 per cent Havanna and 17 per cent Jósaváros). This result may be caused by the rapid social
and economic changes in transitional countries. People living in the estates are basically not
winners of the political and economic changes, and they rather think people became selfish.

Table 4.8 analyses what the residents think about how outsiders regard the estate. In this table
we aggregated two questions:
• What do the residents think how the others look at the estate?
• Do the residents think these considerations are true or false?

By means of this comparison we can see in absolute percentages what the opinion is of the
people about their estates.

Table 4.8 – Reputation of the estates as conceived by the inhabitants* (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Havanna</th>
<th>Jósváros</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good Agree</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not agree</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Agree</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not agree</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad Agree</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not agree</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (=100%)</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RESTATE fieldwork, 2004

It is obvious according to Table 4.8, that Jósváros has a lot better reputation in Nyíregyháza,
than Havanna has in Budapest. Almost all people in Budapest know that the Havanna housing
estate is something bad, while Jósváros is a normal place to live in, according to the people of
Nyíregyháza. Although Havanna has a bad reputation, people living there basically do not agree
with this opinion. But even in this case, when residents do not agree with this bad reputation,
people in the estate are not really attached to it, nor are they satisfied with it. They refuse the
complete negative attitude, however they have their own reservations.

This bad reputation of Havanna is a two-edged sword thing:
• On the one hand the local municipality won several tenders because of the bad reputation,
because the supporters knew that Havanna has several disadvantages.
• On the other hand this bad reputation decreases the housing prices, which motivates the
lower level of the society to move in. On the long run this phenomenon may worsen the social
composition of the estate.
4.5 Conclusions

We had the preconception before the research that the residents of Havanna would be more critical and less satisfied with their estate than those of Jósaváros – that preconception was verified. We thought so in spite of the fact that from a physical point of view the two estates do not differ much from each other. What is really different is their status in the housing market: Jósaváros is an average place to live in while Havanna bears a stigma in Budapest.

The social composition of Havanna is weaker than that of Jósaváros, and it makes the residents more critical towards their living conditions. People in Havanna have a negative attitude concerning their estate, while in Jósaváros people are in general more positive and there is a group of people – elderly and ‘old’ inhabitants – who are really attached to the estate. This attitude resulted in that the satisfaction level with the estate is 5.7 in Havanna, while 7.1 in Jósaváros.

Surprisingly this attitude can hardly be influenced by objective (physical) factors:

• People are not more satisfied in refurbished flats.
• People have crucial problems with safety in Havanna, while the new CCTV system decreased criminality significantly.
• People consider playgrounds equally problematic in both estates, while nearly all the playgrounds were renovated in Havanna and only a few in Jósaváros.
• People in Havanna consider their housing costs/income significantly higher, while the income level in Jósaváros is lower, and the housing costs in a panel building do not differ too much in Budapest and Nyíregyháza.

These examples prove that satisfaction and attachment levels are very subjective, often influenced by the self-perception of a person.

Analysing the positive and negative characteristics of the estates we may discover that estates all over the country are quite similar to each other. The most positive features are the greenery and the proximity of all kinds of services, while the most negative features turned to be the inhabitants themselves both in Havanna and Jósaváros. The problem hierarchy is not the same in the two estates. While dirt and the condition of the buildings are in the focus in both estates, there is more emphasis on the criminal factors in Havanna, and more on the public spaces and roads in Jósaváros.
Not much has been done with regard to housing estates in Hungary in the last 10-15 years. This is so partly, because of sheer neglect, but partly because housing estates do not represent the most problematic part of the Hungarian housing stock, where urgent intervention would be necessary. However, as we have tried to point out on several occasions in earlier studies written for the RESTATE project, waiting for the last moment of intervention is not a wise strategy, especially, because of the sheer quantity of existing estates, which cannot be renovated and regenerated simultaneously. The two estates in question in the study – Havanna and Jósaváros – form part of the few exceptions to the general neglect. Their respective local governments have realised the necessity to start some kind of a rehabilitation programme, even at a small scale, before the deterioration of the estates begin.

Some problems are shared by the two estates, like the bad physical conditions of the buildings and the public spaces or the lack of parking lots. However, others are very different, as the two estates represent a different segment of their respective local societies. Whereas Havanna struggles with higher criminality rates and a higher rate of deviant families, Jósaváros has to face delinquency and deviance seriously only in one of its buildings – the so-called Bachelors’ House. Consequently, the development strategies and policies of the local governments are different. Furthermore, the different financial capacities – Jósaváros belongs to a city level local government whereas Havanna to a district level one – also determine the rehabilitation strategies. For example, the modernisation of the heating system remains out of reach for the local government of the Havanna estate.

5.1 Brief overview of policies and actions in the estates

5.1.1 Havanna estate

The Havanna housing estate, which lies in the south-eastern part of Budapest, is often regarded as a problem spot in the capital. Its reputation is far worse than it would deserve, nonetheless, there are some serious problems that make life for its inhabitants difficult. The estate is situated in the 18th district, so it is the local government of this district that is the best-equipped organisation to carry out the rehabilitation of the estate. (Local governments enjoy a high level of independence and at the same time have a lot of responsibilities in the municipal structure of Budapest and the whole country.) Realising the problematic nature of the housing estate, the local government has begun to take some steps in order to improve the situation in Havanna.
The bad prestige of Havanna housing estate was established during the 1980s. Although things have improved a lot ever since as a result of the change of residents, even today many people tend to think of it as one of the worst places regarding criminality in the capital. Similarly, residents of the Havanna have complained about the high rate of criminality in general, and car thefts in particular. Even the appearance of drug-users was mentioned as a problem – although their real presence and number is questionable. The local government’s decision to install a system of cameras (CCTV) in early 2002 to survey public space was motivated by the firm decision to tackle criminality before mass flight from the estate would begin. They installed a closed circuit system, which covers approximately 95 per cent of the territory of the Havanna estate but reaches out to the neighbouring estate, in order to lessen the possible spill-over effects and to hinder the move of criminal activities directly to the adjacent small estate.

Another serious problem, which some policies are aiming to overcome, is the deplorable condition of the public spaces in the estate. Pavements are broken, green areas are also in need of care, and several playgrounds are in a very bad condition. Only with regard to the playgrounds have important steps been taken by the local government. Their change or renewal has been carried in a number of cases in the last couple of years, mainly starting from the end of the 1990s. Their renewal means the encirclement of the area they occupy, the change of the equipment, and the employment of a guard in some cases. The process is far from over now, but two playgrounds have been renovated, three have been completely restructured in accordance with the EU standards, and a standardisation test has been carried out on every one of them. According to municipal plans in another four years time – or even less – all the playgrounds will have been refurbished.

With regard to the maintenance and upgrading of the green areas, and the improvement of the roads, local spending has increased quite substantially recently. Lately 2,600 m² of pavement was refurbished and the Square of Nationalities was built in the centre of the estate. However, the majority of the roads are still in an appalling condition, and renewing them would require considerably more financial resources. So the local government is planning to apply for funding from the European Union.

Another programme going on in the Havanna estate – even if at a very limited scale – is the renovation of the buildings in order to make energy consumption more efficient. The change or the insulation of the windows, the insulation of the roof, the basement and the façade is supported with non-repayable loans by the national government up to one-third of the costs. (And, in case, all these things should already be done, the renovation of the heating system, the system of ventilation, the repair and the change of the elevators can also be subsidised, provided that they function in a more energy-efficient way.) The remaining two-thirds of the costs is shared equally by the local government and the condominium/cooperative. The fact that both local governments and condominiums are running short on money usually puts a strain on the success of the programme. In the Havanna estate only a couple of cooperative buildings have managed to carry out partial renovations with the help of this state subsidy.

Finally, in the case of the Havanna estate, one can observe a conscious move from the side of the local government to enhance the attachment of the residents to the estate. The annually organised Havanna days, which usually last a week, are designed to boost the local consciousness of the people, and at the same time, to overcome the negative stereotypes that have become attached to the Havanna estate.
Unlike in the Havanna estate, the modernisation of the buildings is a high priority in Jósaváros. The city of Nyíregyháza has an annual budget of 100 million forints (EUR 390,000) set aside to cover the municipal part for the renewal of pre-fabricated buildings in the city — connecting to the state subsidy programme described above. However, in 2003 they made an exception. They supported all applications for energy efficient renewal — a total of 53 — setting aside more than 473 million forints (EUR 1,840,000) for this purpose. From the 53 buildings six were to be found in Jósaváros, four condominiums and two cooperatives. These six buildings add up to 12 staircases, of which three are in ten-storey high buildings.

Besides the energy-efficient renovation of the buildings, it is the ‘Nyitás’ (‘Opening’) programme that affects the life of the residents in Jósaváros the most. Carried out and financed by the local district heating company, the aim of the policy is to modernise the absolutely outdated pipeline system within the buildings, thus making possible the measurement on an apartment basis. Previously this was hardly imaginable — as the one-pipeline structure of the pre-fabricated buildings did not permit it — and consequently bills were paid on a flat rate. Flat rates always imply an incredible loss of energy and a relatively more expensive service. The latter aspect is important, as due to the Hungarian energy price system and the lack of efficient state subsidies, district heating is by far the most expensive way of heating in modern, multi-dwelling buildings. People, especially one-person households, can spend a large share of their income — even 20-25 per cent — during the winter months paying their heating bills. Making the heating consumption measurable and the heat emission adjustable offers the possibility to each consumer to decide according to his family budget and personal needs. It also offers the only opportunity to the district heating companies to hinder large-scale abandonment of the system on the long run.

Besides the partial modernisation of these buildings, the local government of Nyíregyháza will hopefully engage in a complex project in Jósaváros. From approximately 108 million forints (EUR 420,000) — which covers half of the expenses — the local government plans the complete reconstruction of a building owned by it, and popularly called ‘the Chicago’ or the ‘Bachelors House’ by the residents of Jósaváros. (This project is also connected to a national subsidy system, which pays half of the cost of a total rehabilitation of some municipally owned buildings. Unfortunately this subsidy system is terminated currently.) Even its name alludes to the status it occupies in the life of the estate: situated in the middle of it, it is full with problematic families. Its 195 units house almost 600 people in one-room apartments. The complex project — that has a 50 per cent state support — plans the total physical renewal of the house: insulation, change of windows, radiators, pipelines, renovation of the elevator, the ventilation system. Also the rearrangement of its direct vicinity is planned. The size of the apartments will remain as today, and the local government wants to keep them to serve as temporary apartments. It also intends to make some public space improvement around the building in the framework of the project.

---

10 The difficulty of the condominiums and the local governments in coming up with their own respective share is eased from September 2005 on, with the introduction of the Panel Plus programme. This is a state-subsidised loan programme, giving loans for 15 years with a 5-6 per cent interest rate for local governments and households in the condominiums, so that they are able to pay their part in the building refurbishments. The government pays the interest rates for those households who are in a socially disadvantaged position.
The condition of public spaces, the bumpy and broken roads, the lack of greenery and the deterioration of playgrounds is as much a problem in Jósaváros as it is in Havanna. Just like in the case of Havanna, in Jósaváros, the local municipality of Nyíregyháza plans to apply for European Union funds to carry out a major reconstruction of public spaces. In 2005, it bid successfully under the Regional Operative Programme, which will allow the municipality to implement the first phase of the project that aims at reconstructing the Ungvár Avenue of the estate.

Another problem in connection with the condition of public space is the chronic shortage of parking lots. Some new garages were built a few years ago on the green areas within the estate, which very much satisfy their owners, but because of the noise and smoke, annoy the people who live on the lower floors of the surrounding buildings. In order to ease the shortage and somewhat regulate the question a system of mobile garages was introduced. This does not solve the problem of space, but at least gives protection to the cars from the harsh weather. Residents can rent the 'sites' from the local government for a symbolic EUR 47 per year, and set up tarpaulins that cover the cars.

5.2 What has been improved?

The survey has revealed in both estates an interesting split between how home improvements and estate renovations are perceived. Whereas the majority of the respondents declared to have had some kind of renewal carried out in the apartment within the time span of the last five years, only a minority of them took notice of the renewals – however modest – carried out in the estates. Concentrating mostly on works in the kitchen, bathroom or wallpapering/painting, 136 households in Havanna and 120 households in Jósaváros declared to have made at least one kind of home refurbishment. Even two or three renewals were not rare, 111 and 84 cases in Havanna and 94 and 62 in Jósaváros.

This high level of investment into the apartments could – theoretically – suggest an attachment to the estate, and consequently that people pay attention to what is going on outside of their homes. But, the findings of the survey contradict this assumption. From the 200 respondents in each estate only the minority could name programmes or projects aiming to improve conditions in Havanna or Jósaváros. Results were quite shocking in Jósaváros, where only 18 per cent thought that some plans existed for the improvement of conditions in the housing estate. Those few who thought so, believed that these were about building renewals, the renewal of public spaces or the refurbishment of playgrounds. Visibility of the local activity was a lot higher among the residents of the Havanna estate. Here 47.5 per cent replied that they were aware of some plan or project for the estate. They mostly knew about the instalment of closed circuit cameras, the improvements of public spaces and the refurbishment of the playgrounds and green areas.

The difference between the two estates can partly be attributed to the nature of the investments the local governments have been carrying out. Clearly, the instalment of cameras was a project that not only resonated with the wishes of the population but was also highly visible. The later is an important point, as local governments often fail to communicate their programmes and plans to the residents, so even finished projects often remain unnoticed by many people.
The programmes themselves of course, are sometimes so small that residents do not consider them important at all, especially if they are not affected directly by them. A case in point could be that elderly people are more likely not to notice a playground renovation, or if they do, probably do not consider it a major improvement. Besides, the research showed that residents generally neglect public life on the estates. Whereas everyone is concerned with his/her home, very few people are interested in what happens on the estate level. With the exception of some people looking after the gardens in front of the buildings, we could not find anyone who stated to participate in any association for the improvement of the neighbourhood.

Not surprisingly, respondents were willing to name the principal actors of their rehabilitation programmes only in relatively small percentages (Havanna 47 per cent, Jósaváros 18 per cent). But when they named an actor, they named with overwhelming majority the local government, with only some people mentioning the national government, and even less the local population. This might be the indication of a relative success for both local governments, as people seem to appreciate their work. Nevertheless, this can also indicate further burdens, as it might be interpreted in a way that residents do think of the local governments as the actors responsible to carry out the renewals.

This later might be a somewhat frightening perspective, as there were several problem areas revealed by the survey (see Chapter 4 about the analysis) and only very little improvement had been registered by the residents (Table 5.1). Most striking were issues, such as dirt on the street, maintenance of the buildings, the condition of the roads and the lack of employment. With the exception of dirt on the streets, where residents of both estates have felt improvement in greater numbers, in all other areas the situation seems to be tragic. Regarding the employment opportunities only 3.5 per cent (Havanna) and 2.6 per cent (Jósaváros) of the respondents that had indicated it previously as a problem, could report some kind of a progress. The picture seems faintly more positive with regard to the condition of the roads – 6.6 per cent (Havanna), 4.3 per cent (Jósaváros) – and the maintenance of the buildings – 7.7 per cent (Havanna) and 7.4 per cent (Jósaváros).

In none of the above-mentioned problem areas have any of the local governments engaged in extensive rehabilitation programmes. And it is only the condition of the roads – together with the green areas, the playgrounds and other public spaces – that, if things go according to the plans of the local governments, will be improved in the near future. The problem of unemployment is generally handled by the state, whereas the maintenance of the buildings is the responsibility of the residents, as most units are privatised.

Another area, where the hands of the local authorities are relatively tied, but was regarded as a problem, is that of drug abuse. Apparent only in Havanna from the two estates, the gravity of the situation is reflected by the sheer percentages: only 6.2 per cent of those respondents, who felt it to be a problem, think that there has been some progress, whereas 81.4 per cent feels the contrary.\textsuperscript{11}

\textsuperscript{11} One reason why one should be careful with this data despite the very pessimistic attitude of the people is the lack of hard evidence on the extension of the drug networks in the estate. It seems evident that they are present, but whether they deal with lighter or heavier drugs, or how they influence everyday life, remains a question. This ambiguity favours the spread of gossips, which was reflected in the survey by the numerous answers deeming drug use a serious problem.
In none of the cases, where a substantial number of people have indicated an area problematic, can we note great improvements. Rather, where one-third of the respondents indicated some progress, was already positive. In the case of the Havanna estate two areas can be considered to fall into this category: the questions of safety and the upkeep of public spaces. As they are both connected to on-going programmes – the installation of the cameras, and a slow reconstruction of the public spaces – we can assume that the relative feeling of improvement is linked to the success of the programmes.

In Jósváros however, the situation is somewhat different. Here the respondents felt that streets have become substantially cleaner. Also, many had the impression that the number of burglaries has dropped. But none of these improvements can be connected to the on-going rehabilitation programmes, which largely concentrate on modernising the buildings. What makes the Jósváros cases further distinct from the Havanna ones is the relatively low number of respondents who found several things to be problematic on the estate. From this, we might assume that only those problems were indicated that were considered really bad by the respondents, which might be the reason behind the lower rate of improvements there compared to the case of Havanna.

All these statements are supported by the data of Table 5.1.

Table 5.1 – Residents’ perception of how the problems have changed (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Conceived as a problem in Havanna</th>
<th>Improved in Havanna</th>
<th>Worsened in Havanna</th>
<th>Conceived as a problem in Jósváros</th>
<th>Improved in Jósváros</th>
<th>Worsened in Jósváros</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dirt on the streets</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>69.4</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug abuse</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>81.4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary in the dwellings</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>66.1</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>58.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary of cars</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>71.8</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>67.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graffiti</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>78.6</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>78.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling of unsafety</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upkeep of public spaces</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>74.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition of the roads</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>86.8</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>93.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playgrounds for children</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>85.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of the buildings</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>85.3</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>90.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of employment</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>87.1</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>94.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of schools</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>77.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of commercial services</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different values</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of public services</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>87.1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>96.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racism</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>89.2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RESTATE fieldwork, 2004

* Not the percentage, but the number of people that perceived the problem is indicated in the cells.

** In the percentage of people that perceived the problem.
5.3 Spill-over effects

Spill-over effects, given the limited number and size of the programmes, together with the short time span of their implementation, have yet to occur. The only case, where some instances might be traced regards the installation of the closed-circuit cameras in the Havanna estate. Without data to underline it, it has been claimed by some representatives of the local government of district 18, that the crime rate – which has significantly decreased in Havanna – has increased in district 10, which neighbours district 18.

5.4 Conclusions

It is hard to talk about successes and failures with regard to the different policies, as they have not been implemented at such great scale that a value judgement like that would be justifiable and would make sense. We cannot even talk about the existence of a coherent rehabilitation policy in either of the cases. Rather, the research has revealed that both local governments have taken notice of the problems, and a process of assessment has begun on their part. They have already started to implement some policies, which all aim at improving life in the estates. Some of these policies – like the building renovation – are tied to national policies, whereas others – like the installation of the cameras – were local initiatives. Financial difficulties and a tight local budget however make it rather difficult for any of the local governments to engage in large-scale rehabilitation. No wonder that both are hoping to receive funding from the European Union for their more costly projects, like the rehabilitation of the green areas, the roads and all kind of public spaces in the estate.

Given the scarcity of the policies and the limits of the questionnaire, who has profited from the policies is a daunting question to answer. Most obviously parents can enjoy the positive consequences of the refurbished playgrounds, which now provide a safer environment for their children. From the other policies – like the instalment of the CCTV in Havanna and the slight investment into the public space in both estates – generally all residents have profited. The building renovations have only benefited some houses, but the sample was not wide enough to establish whether or not in these houses the better-off strata of the estates lived.

What can be concluded from the empirical research is that among residents there is a tangible wish that the local government would engage in a more active rehabilitation policy. They see their estate generally as really problematic – especially in Havanna – singling out several aspects of the estate life, where improvements would be necessary. Generally, they do not seem to be much aware of either on-going policies or policies which are intended to begin later, aiming at improving life in the estates. The most successful policy in their view, which not only was effective but residents was also visible for the residents, was the installation of cameras in Havanna. Although some other policies have also been implemented to change for the better the general quality of public space, this remains an area where the deepest deficiency can be felt. Based on this, we might assume that serious physical investments could significantly foster the residents’ attachment towards their estate.
The future of the estates

The future of housing estates is an open question in Central Europe. They struggle with a number of problems, but are still not in crisis. Whether they will become the lowest segment of the housing stock – as it can be observed in many Western European countries – or rather will be improved, is still undecided. The survey made in Havanna and Jósaváros housing estates implies that renewal is feasible, at least residents generally believe in a better future.

6.1 The future of the neighbourhood

Residents of the two estates show rather divergent opinions with regard to their perspectives.

Table 6.1 – How the future will change (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Havanna</th>
<th>Jósaváros</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Better</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worse</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (=100%)</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RESTATE fieldwork, 2004

Based on the analysis of the preceding chapters we might have the impression that residents in the Havanna estate face more serious problems than the ones in Jósaváros, despite the similar physical characteristics of the two estates. Nonetheless, residents of Havanna were found to be significantly more optimistic than those of Jósaváros, where not really the share of pessimists, rather the share of uncertain people stood out. This optimism of the Havanna residents could be interpreted as a result of the previous efforts of the municipality. As it was mentioned before, the local municipality of District 18 – where Havanna is located – invested already a relevant sum of money in the renewal of playgrounds, public spaces and implemented a CCTV system, which reduced significantly the crime in public areas. Of course, the local municipality of Nyíregyháza also made efforts to modernise the heating systems of district heated buildings, but these measures were not specifically directed to the estate, but to the whole city. In turn, there has been no policy implemented which would concentrate on Jósaváros. This might be a reason
why the residents were less optimistic, and could not discover the obvious signs of the municipal efforts.

The hypothesis, that mainly the municipal investments made people more optimistic in the Havana, is strengthened by the fact, that we found no social factor determining pessimism or optimism among the respondents. Rather, we could see an equal dispersion in the whole population of the estates of the optimistic/pessimistic attitudes. The attitude showed no correlation either with income level or with education level, age, time span of living in the estate, housing costs, ownership form, etc. Eventually one slight correlation could be established with the satisfaction level: people that were more satisfied with the estate tended to be a bit more optimistic about its future. However, even correlation remained quite weak. The municipal investments carried out – mainly in Havanna – were not targeted to benefit a specific residential layer, but had a positive effect on the estate as a whole. This might also contribute to the fact that no specific beneficiary and optimistic group could be discovered.

Now, let us evaluate what the pessimists or neutrals would expect to happen in order to improve the living conditions in the estates. (Table 6.2 includes only the first suggestions of the respondents.)

Table 6.2 – What the pessimists or neutralists think should be done in order to improve the estates (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Havanna</th>
<th>Jósaváros</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improvement of public spaces</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More safety</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More police on the streets</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More attention of the local government</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems with dirt on the street</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better employment opportunities</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do something with the problems of alcoholism</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the composition of residents</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More support for the renovation of the buildings</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>37.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>37.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (=100%)</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RESTATE fieldwork, 2004
would be better than the present. Table 6.3, which summarises their opinions, shows similar things to 6.2: it emphasises the improvement of dwellings/buildings, public spaces and the changing composition of the residents. Consequently, optimists and pessimists have similar expectations, but pessimists do not believe that they would come true.

Table 6.3 – What the optimist think will cause the better living conditions in the estates (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Havanna</th>
<th>Jósaváros</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New and/or improved dwellings</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New and/or improved green areas</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New residents</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement of public spaces</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More police on the streets</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renovation tenders*</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People take more care</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The local government takes care</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because of EU norms</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No concrete answer</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (&lt;=100%)</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RESTATE fieldwork, 2004

* Renovation tenders in this case means the subsidy system of the state that provide one-third of the renovation costs in the case of energy saving renovations. The details are written in Section 5.2.

It is obvious, that people do not believe in a spontaneous process of improvement, rather they emphasise the importance of interventions. But, there are some exceptions. In Havanna, where the positive change in the composition of the residents is an on-going process – which occurs spontaneously – people tend to think that it will continue.

6.2 Staying or leaving?

From all respondents, 23.6 per cent reported in Havanna and 25.5 per cent in Jósaváros that they intended to move within two years. In our opinion this seems to be an extremely high share, as only 4-5 per cent of the households move annually in the bigger cities of Hungary, and approximately 3-4 per cent in Budapest. It is also true that housing estates have a higher mobility rate than other forms of housing. But even in this case, if we consider, that about one-fourth of the households have moved to Havanna or Jósaváros during the last four years, than we should not expect the same mobility rate in two years.

Analysing the specific group of people, that are willing to move, we cannot discover many relevant correlations. Naturally, private rentals are the most mobile segment of local society – that is why the number of households that would like to move is higher in Jósaváros.

The question on mobility was: whether they plan to move or not in two years. According to this question we could assume that mainly better-off families intend to move, which have the necessary resources for that. In spite of this logical assumption, we cannot find any correlation between the income level and the intention to move. This may prove two different things: on
the one hand that there is no connection between the intentions and the resources, or on the other hand that the income data is simply bad — people do not answer correctly to questions in connection with incomes — or it does not reflect the real financial status of the respondents, as it does not include the number of the members of the household.

Interestingly enough, there is no correlation either between the intentions to move and the satisfaction level, or with the high housing costs. This may mean, that the motivations for moving are not really based on a necessity, rather special needs, or better housing conditions elsewhere may motivate people. However, the detailed question on motivations shows a somewhat divergent picture (Table 6.4):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for moving (%)</th>
<th>Havanna</th>
<th>Jósváros</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home is too small</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home is too expensive</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wants to buy a dwelling — if he/she is a tenant</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closer to relatives and friends</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More quiet environment</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More safe environment</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wants to buy a family house</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not like housing estates</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>37.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (=100%)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RESTATE fieldwork, 2004

‘Home is too expensive’ is a motivation of several households in Havanna, where the housing costs/income ratio was proportionally higher than in Jósváros. This is a typical ‘push’ factor, which, however was impossible to prove by correlation. (This may also mean, that housing cost/income ratio answers are not correct, as we suspect.) In Jósváros, most of the motives are personal, like: finishing university education, the expiration of a contract, a better job, illness, etc.

The fact, that in both estates the rate of households that want to move is nearly the same also assures that the motivation for leaving is basically not the rejection to live in the specific estate. Despite the fact that people feel more aversion towards their estate in Havanna, they do not want to leave it in greater numbers than residents in Jósváros do. This means, that housing estates as a form of housing have high mobility rates in general, which has nothing to do with the specificities of the estates.

6.3 Conclusions

In Chapter 4.3 we stated that residents in Havanna are a lot more pessimistic, less satisfied with the estate than people in Jósváros. This statement became more nuanced in this chapter, as it turned out, that people in Havanna were aware of the local municipality’s efforts to improve their living conditions, thus they predicted a better future for the estate. While residents of
Jősaváros, where no obvious interventions were carried out, are somewhat less optimistic, and much more uncertain about their future.

This result may be very important for the policymakers, as survey respondents tend to answer according to their first impressions without really thinking in depth about the questions. So it seems that policies – or the lack of them – actually have an effect on people’s every day thinking.

Let us sum up, what residents think policymakers should/will do to improve the living conditions on the estates, by analysing the connections between the problem-hierarchy (Table 4.6) and the suggestions of the residents (Tables 6.2 and 6.3), whether people concentrate on solving the main problems they have mentioned before.

- As people could answer freely to questions in connection with what kind of policies should be implemented, without choosing certain solutions, the answers are more dispersed, reflect more the subjective characteristics of the respondents. Thus, results are often very divergent, with sometimes unclassifiable variations, and often without concrete policy suggestions.
- Some main problems that people would like to solve in order to improve the living conditions in the estate came up both in the problem hierarchy and the suggestion table. These should be the focus points of the rehabilitation efforts: renovation of the buildings, improvement of the composition of the residents.
- Some problems that regard more the appearance of the estates in Table 4.6 – like the quality of public spaces or the dirt on the streets – seem not to be the determinant factors concerning the better or worse future of them. These rather seem to be additional factors that influence people’s attitude, but do not define that.

Most likely, despite the growing relevance of interventions and the basic optimism of the residents, the mobility rate will not decrease in the near future. Mobility in the estates is higher, than in other forms of housing, and it seems, that at least as many new residents will move into them in the course of the following years, as during the last ones (or even more, as twice as many people reported to have the intention to move).
The main goal of the current research phase was to define the effect of the rehabilitation policies on the inhabitants of the housing estates in question. The study should have identified those groups that have experienced the advantages or the disadvantages of these policies. This research goal was not easy to meet in the case of Hungary, as there have been no relevant, large-scale policies implemented so far aiming to improve the status of the housing estates and the living condition of their residents. The interventions were limited to some projects that had an overall impact on the estates, and mostly no specific groups could be identified as beneficiaries. However, the research highlighted several interesting facts concerning the attitude of the inhabitants and their expectations, which will form a good basis for the policymakers to implement policies in the future.

In order to understand the specificities of the Hungarian estates it is essential to point out that they make up 20 per cent of the Hungarian housing stock, and more than 30 per cent of the housing stock in Budapest. Thus they are not marginalised in the housing market. The housing estates that were analysed in the framework of the RESTATE project are the Havanna housing estate in Budapest and the Jósváros housing estate in Nyíregyháza – a city of around 120,000 inhabitants. Both estates were mainly constructed during the 1970s – some buildings of Havanna in the 1980s – and look accordingly: high-rise buildings in a bad physical shape, middle-sized units mainly between 50-62 m², units mostly privatised in the mid 1990s, a lot of green public space and all services available in close proximity.

Given the lack of policies, the main question was somewhat modified in course of the research: What are the strengths and weaknesses of the estates according to the residents and what kind of policies should be developed in order to build on the local potential?

The survey was carried out in May 2004 with 200 questionnaires filled out in both estates. The representativity of the survey was ensured not only by the relatively high percentage of the interviewees, but also by the sampling method. So the main indicators – like household structure, type of dwellings – fitted the census of 2001.

The survey added very vital pieces of information to the already well-known characteristics of the estates. It turned out that slowly Jósváros is becoming the place for families that start their

12 The method of the questioning process was the following: both estates were divided into ten parts with approximately the same number of dwellings. In each part 20 questionnaires were made with surveyors that asked the household heads, with the condition that the households must belong to certain household composition categories that were calculated from the census 2001.
lives,\textsuperscript{13} while Havanna is becoming a place for households that do not have a choice but to move there. Accordingly, households in Havanna estate turned out to be more cost sensitive, than those of Jósaváros. We also found that residents of Jósaváros are more attached to their estate than their counterparts in Havanna. When asked about the problems they have experienced in the estate, inhabitants from Havanna have indicated several ones in a higher share then residents in Jósaváros did. Interestingly the first and second most critical problems were the same in both places: dirt on the streets and the condition of building. But the third and fourth were different: while public spaces and parking were of high importance in Jósaváros, the problems regarding criminality were the focus in Havanna. We also found out that in the case of both estates one-fourth of the population moved in during the last four years, which proves that the mobility rate in housing estates is significantly higher than the Hungarian average.

The survey made the assumption stronger that there are very few ethnic minorities living in the housing estates. The only ethnic minority, which is visible in both cases, is the Roma population, but they mostly consider themselves Hungarian so they simply did not appear in the questionnaire. We had prior information on some Ukrainian and Chinese households in the estates, but probably their share is so low, that we could not discover them with the help of the survey.

The main topic of the survey would have been to analyse the affect of policies that were implied in order to improve the living conditions in the estates. As we mentioned in the beginning, there were only few actions implemented:

In Havanna the local municipality installed a system of cameras in 2002, which covers approximately 95 per cent of the territory of the estate. The CCTV produced a significant decrease in the criminal actions in public spaces. The local municipality also made investments in the public spaces: created a new square, renovated most of the playgrounds. For some years the local municipality has organised Havanna days in order to increase the attachment level of the residents to the estate.

In Jósaváros for years now the local municipality and the district heating company manages a programme that aims at modernising the current heating system of the buildings by making the heat consumption metered. A lot of buildings from Jósaváros have already undergone such a small reconstruction.

In both estates some buildings were partially renovated by means of a state programme that finances one-third of the costs in the case of energy saving renovations, if the other two-thirds is financed by the municipality and the owners of the dwellings. This is the only state programme that runs in connection with prefabricated buildings. There is no other state programme that would target either the housing estates, or inner cities, or cities at all.

One interesting finding was that the effect of the few implemented policies were often hardly known by the residents. We were surprised to note that even in the case of the most visible projects – such as the instalment of CCTV – half of the people had no idea about its existence. Which implies that for any successful regeneration project better communication skills are necessary from the local governments.

\textsuperscript{13} Jósaváros is located nearby the city college, that is why about 5 per cent of the residents may be students that privately rent a unit in the estate.
Finally, it was interesting to compare the problems that were mentioned with the suggestions people made for the improvement of the estates. This comparison gave hints where future policies should put the emphasis on. In Havanna the renovation of buildings is high on the agenda, which occupies an important place both in the problem and in the suggestion hierarchy of the inhabitants. However, equally important is the wish to improve the resident composition of the estate. This is all the more surprising, as with 85 per cent of the apartments sold, the municipality has little manoeuvring space to influence who moves into and out of the estate. In Jósaváros, where the social composition is better, the renovation of public spaces is the first priority besides the renewal of the buildings. As a problem the scarce employment possibilities were also mentioned, but as a policy suggestion it turned to be less relevant, as people feel that municipalities have limited influence on employment questions.

In general the survey pointed out that in spite of the fact, that experts foresaw a decline in the status of the housing estates, residents do not experience such a tragic trend. Although they also see the deplorable status of public spaces, still, would like to rely on municipal and state interventions mainly in connection with renewing physically their buildings.
Appendix

RESTATE survey

First some basic information to be provided by the interviewer/local coordinator

City of interview: ............................................ (to be coded later)
Neighbourhood: ............................................ (to be coded later)
Date of interview: ...........................................
Name of interviewer: ....................................
Number of survey: ........................................

Introduction

Interviewer: register the kind of dwelling in which the respondent lives

1 apartment/flat
2 single-family house
3 other: ...........
9 unknown

Interviewer: register the number of floors of the building

…… floors
99 unknown

Interviewer: register the floor of the dwelling under consideration (including ground floor)

1 ground floor (i.e. accessible without stairs)
2 first floor
3 second floor
4 third-fifth floor
5 sixth-tenth floor
6 eleventh floor or higher
9 unknown

Good morning/afternoon/night. My name is …… I am working at the University of … We are carrying out a large international comparative research project in cities in 10 European countries. The European Commission subsidises this project. The focus is on housing and neighbourhoods and this area has been included in the study. Therefore we would like to ask you a series of questions and hope you will be prepared to answer these. All information will remain anonymous and confidential. I would like to start with some questions about your current housing situation.
1. When did you first move to this address?
   - before 1960
   - 1961-1970
   - 1971-1980
   - 1981-1990
   - 1991-1995
   - 1996-2000
   - 2001-2004
   - unknown

2. What was the tenure of the place you lived at before this address?
   - rented from local council
   - rented from housing association/registered social landlord
   - rented from a private landlord
   - owned with mortgage
   - owned outright
   - unknown

3. With whom did you live at your previous address?
   - alone
   - partner and/or children
   - family (parents and siblings)
   - friends
   - no answer/unknown

4. Do you rent or own your present dwelling?
   - social rent (from municipality, housing corporation, housing company, etc.)
   - rent from private person
   - rent from private company
   - own with mortgage
   - outright owner
   - other:……………………
   - unknown

5. What is the approximate size of your dwelling in square metres?
   - below 30 m²
   - between 31 and 40 m²
   - between 41 and 50 m²
   - between 51 and 60 m²
   - between 61 and 80 m²
   - between 81 and 100 m²
   - over 100 m²
   - unknown/no answer
6 How many bedrooms does your dwelling have?
1 one bedroom
2 two bedrooms
3 three bedrooms
4 four bedrooms
5 five or more bedrooms
9 unknown/no answer

7 What share of your income is needed to cover your total housing costs (rent or mortgage, electricity, water, etc.)?
1 less than 10 per cent
2 11-30 per cent
3 31-50 per cent
4 more than 50 per cent
9 unknown

8 When was your present dwelling built?
1 between 1945 and 1960
2 between 1961 and 1970
3 between 1971 and 1980
4 between 1981 and 1990
5 between 1991 and 2000
6 between 2001 and 2004
9 unknown

9 What was the most important reason for moving to this neighbourhood? (one answer only: only the most important reason)
1 low rent/housing costs
2 nearness to relatives and friends
3 nearness to work
4 good connections (e.g. public transport)
5 good schools
6 presence of other services
7 there were no other dwellings available
8 other ...........................
99 unknown

10 Where was your previous dwelling located?
1 in the same neighbourhood
2 somewhere else in the city
3 elsewhere in the country
4 elsewhere, abroad
9 unknown
Now I would like to ask you some questions about the satisfaction with your present dwelling and the neighbourhood.

11 How satisfied are you with your home? Please indicate on a scale between 1 (very low) and 10 (very high).

\[ 99 \text{ unknown} \]

12 Has your satisfaction with your home increased or decreased in the last 5 years?

- 1 lower
- 2 same
- 3 higher
- 8 not applicable (settled less than five years ago)
- 9 unknown

13 Has your dwelling been renovated/refurbished in the last five years?

- 1 no (go to question 15)
- 2 yes
- 9 unknown

14 What has been improved? (circle all answers that apply)

- 1 renovation of the kitchen
- 2 renovation of the bathroom
- 3 change of layout
- 4 renovation of the roof
- 5 renovation of the floor
- 6 renovation of the entrances
- 7 renovation of the outside walls
- 8 complete renewal (after demolition)
- 9 other: ..................................
- 99 no answer/unknown

15 How satisfied are you with your neighbourhood? Please indicate on a scale between 1 (very low) and 10 (very high).

\[ ... \text{ unknown} \]

16 Has your satisfaction with the neighbourhood increased or decreased in the last five years?

- 1 lower
- 2 same
- 3 higher
- 8 not applicable (settled less than five years ago)
- 9 unknown
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17 Which aspect of the neighbourhood do you like most?
1 green spaces
2 accessibility to public services
3 playgrounds for children
4 youth facilities
5 proximity to work
6 proximity to schools
7 quality of local schools
8 people who live there
9 other: ..................................................
99 unknown

18 Which aspect of the neighbourhood do you like least?
1 green spaces
2 accessibility to public services
3 playgrounds for children
4 youth facilities
5 proximity to work
6 proximity to schools
7 quality of local schools
8 people who live there
9 other: ..................................................
99 unknown

19 How do you rate the contacts you have between yourself and other residents in your
neighbourhood?
1 good
2 moderate
3 bad
9 unknown

20 Do many of your close friends or relatives live in the neighbourhood?
1 yes, both relatives and friends
2 yes, but only friends
3 yes, but only relatives
4 no
9 unknown

21 Do you feel weakly or strongly attached to the neighbourhood?
1 weak
2 neutral
3 strong
9 unknown
22 Do you regard the estate you are living in to be socially mixed (households with very different incomes) or socially homogenous (mostly households with approximately similar incomes)?
1 socially mixed
2 moderately mixed
3 socially homogenous
9 unknown

23 In some areas people mix together and try to help each other, while in other areas people mostly go their own way. Is this an area where people mostly help each other or where people mostly go their own way?
1 help each other
2 go their own way
3 mixture
9 unknown

24 In your opinion, is a high level of social mix in the estate good or bad for the interaction between residents?
1 good
2 neutral
3 bad
9 unknown

25 What is the reputation of the estate in the rest of the city?
1 good
2 moderate
3 bad
9 unknown

26 Do you agree with this reputation?
1 yes
2 no
9 unknown

27 Do you personally experience serious problems in the neighbourhood with respect to:
1 = yes
2 = no
8 = not applicable (has lived here not longer than a year)
9 = unknown

- dirt on the streets 1 yes 2 no 8 9
- drug abuse 1 yes 2 no 8 9
- burglary in dwellings 1 yes 2 no 8 9
- burglary in cars 1 yes 2 no 8 9
- graffiti/vandalism 1 yes 2 no 8 9
- feelings of unsafety 1 yes 2 no 8 9
28 Which of the mentioned aspects have been improved by any policy or action?
- upkeep of public places 1 yes 2 no 8 9
- condition of roads 1 yes 2 no 8 9
- playgrounds for children 1 yes 2 no 8 9
- maintenance of buildings 1 yes 2 no 8 9
- lack of employment 1 yes 2 no 8 9
- quality of schools 1 yes 2 no 8 9
- quality of commercial services 1 yes 2 no 8 9
- quality of public services 1 yes 2 no 8 9
- different values/norms/lifestyles 1 yes 2 no 8 9
- racism/racist harassment 1 yes 2 no 8 9

In the next block I would like to ask a few questions regarding the policies of the local
government or other institutions with regard to the neighbourhood you are living in.

29 Do you know about any policies or actions aiming at improvement of living in your
neighbourhood?
1 yes
2 no (go to question 32)
9 unknown

30 If yes, what are, in your opinion, the most important positive effects of these policies in
recent years?
…………………………
…………………………
…………………………
99 unknown
31 Who were the principal actors in these policies or actions?
   1 national government
   2 local government
   3 housing companies/housing corporations
   4 local population
   5 other: ..................
   9 no answer, unknown

I would like to ask you a few questions about your activities in and use of the neighbourhood.

32 Do you or one of the members of the household actively participate in an association that aims to improve the neighbourhood?
   1 yes
   2 no (go to question 34)
   10 unknown

33 What kind of participation is that?
   ..........................
   unknown

34 Do you participate in a sports club, cultural association or another organised social activity in the neighbourhood?
   1 yes
   2 no
   9 unknown

35 Can you reach the following facilities within 10 minutes from your home?
   - a grocery shop  1 yes  2 no  9 unknown
   - your bank  1 yes  2 no  9 unknown
   - a post office  1 yes  2 no  9 unknown
   - a general practioner (doctor)  1 yes  2 no  9 unknown
   - public park  1 yes  2 no  9 unknown
   - bus stop  1 yes  2 no  9 unknown
   - primary school  1 yes  2 no  9 unknown
   - a dentist  1 yes  2 no  9 unknown
   - your place of work  1 yes  2 no  9 unknown

36 How many hours per day – on average – do you spend outside your neighbourhood on normal weekdays?
   1 10 hours or more
   2 5-9 hours
   3 3-4 hours
   4 1-3 hours
   5 less than 1 hour
   9 unknown
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I have a few questions regarding the future.

37 Does your household have plans to move house within 2 years?
   1 yes
   2 no (go to question 40)
   9 unknown (go to question 40)

38 What is the main reason for considering moving?
   1 present home is too small
   2 present home is too expensive
   3 want to buy a dwelling
   4 want to be closer to relatives/friends
   5 want to live in a more quiet environment
   6 want to live in a more safe environment
   7 want to live closer to work
   8 other: ………………………
   99 unknown

39 Where would you like to move to?
   1 in the same neighbourhood
   2 close to the present neighbourhood (less than 5 km from present home)
   3 somewhere else in the city
   4 elsewhere
   9 unknown

40 Do you think the future of your present neighbourhood will be better or worse than today?
   1 better (go to question 42)
   2 neutral (go to question 41)
   3 worse (go to question 41)
   9 unknown (go to question 43)

41 If you envisage no change or change for the worse for the neighbourhood, how can that be turned into a brighter future? What should have highest priority?
   ………………………
   ………………………
   ………………………
   99 unknown (go to question 43)

42 What is the main reason why you think the neighbourhood's future will be brighter?
   ………………………
Finally I would like to ask you some short questions about the household.

43 Interviewer: register gender of respondent
   1 male
   2 female

44 May I ask you in which year you were born?
   …

45 How is the composition of your household?
   1 living alone (go to question 48)
   2 living with a partner, no children (go to question 48)
   3 living with a partner and …. children (how many children?)
   4 single-parent household, with …. children (how many children?)
   5 living alone with … others (no partner, no children) (to question 48)
   6 living with partner and … others (to question 48)
   7 living with partner and … others and …. children
   8 other: ………………………
   9 no answer

46 What is the age of the oldest child still living at home?
   88 … age
   not applicable

47 What is the age of the youngest child living at home?
   88 … age
   not applicable

48 How many years did you follow school education since you were 6 years of age?
   1 none
   2 1-6 years
   3 6-10 years
   4 11-12 years
   5 13-14 years
   6 15 years or more
   9 unknown

49 Do you have a paid job?
   1 yes, for …. hours per week
   2 no
   9 no answer
50 Does your partner have a paid job?
1 yes, for …. hours per week
2 no
8 not applicable
9 no answer

51 How many people in your household are income earners?

52 Would you classify the monthly household income as high, medium high, average, medium low, or low, compared to national levels?
1 high (top 10%)
2 medium high (between top 10%-30%)
3 average (between top 30% and bottom 30%)
4 medium low (between bottom 30% and lowest 10%)
5 low (poorest 10%)
9 unknown

53 What is the main source of your household income?
1 work
2 unemployment or social benefit
3 pension
4 other:……………………….
9 no answer

54 In terms of ethnicity, how would you call yourself (for example: native UK, Moroccan, Dutch Moroccan, American, Hungarian, French, Algerian, etc.)?

55 And your partner?

56 Is there anything you would like to add related to this interview?
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