



Munich Personal RePEc Archive

Effects Of Urban Regeneration - Social/Structural-Spatial And Property Market

Feigelfeld, Heidrun and Huber, Florian and Wieser, Robert

November 2015

Online at <https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/67629/>
MPRA Paper No. 67629, posted 13 Nov 2015 10:42 UTC

EFFECTS OF URBAN REGENERATION - SOCIAL/STRUCTURAL-SPATIAL AND PROPERTY MARKET

Heidrun Feigelfeld

Centre for Urban and Regional Research, Vienna, Austria, heidrun@feigelfeld.at

Florian Huber

University of Vienna, Department of Sociology, Vienna, Austria florian.huber@univie.ac.at

Robert Wieser

Research on Housing Markets and Economy, Vienna, Austria robert.wieser@housing-economist.eu

June 2015

Abstract

It is a challenge for researchers - and for local policy-makers - to find a structured approach to identifying the effects of long-term processes of urban regeneration. Behind it is also the interest in identifying the various “drivers” of effects according to their fields and levels of action. Their interaction sets the framework for the consequences whether they be a “lack of upgrading or even downgrading” or “upgrading with or without displacement effects” (keyword “gentrification”). In a current project commissioned by the Municipality of Vienna - a promoter of the principle of “Soft Urban Regeneration” for forty years - the multidisciplinary team is examining these questions using various investigative strands (social and structural changes and the property market) to compare three inner-city areas over 25 years. The paper discusses experiences with methods in a first phase, whether initial conclusions can be drawn and the concept for a phase 2 of the research project.

Keywords:

Urban regeneration, Upgrading effects, Gentrification, Property market development, Types of social space.

Introduction to the Project Framework

The overall objective of the project “Effects of Urban Renewal - Social/Structural-Spatial and Real Estate” is the comparison of political-administrative urban renewal strategies and subsidy policy with analyses related to the building stock, the real estate market and social developments. It was commissioned by Magistratsabteilung 50 (Municipal Department 50, (Housing Promotion and Arbitration Board for Legal Housing Matters)Vienna) as part of the new research focus “effects of urban renewal” and is supervised by the department “Housing Research and International Relations”.

In this framework it is also coordinated with two other projects (FGW Research Institute for Housing, Construction and Planning, Oberhuber A. et al. – Compilation of a comprehensive database for the evaluation of effects of renovation and new construction activity in selected areas for renovation in Vienna (Focus Phase 1: subsidised and privately financed renovation), and University of Vienna / Austrian Academy of Sciences, Y. Franz et al. - “The role of Urban Renewal Offices (GB*) in Vienna (a comparison of the work of three affected GB*)).

At the request of the commissioning authority all three projects are divided into Phase 1 of establishing a framework and Phase 2 of refinement, consolidation and finalisation.

A focus on the same registration districts (1006 Erlachplatz, 1204 Wilhelmsdorf, 1601 Neulerchenfeld / Brunnenviertel) and an investigation period from around 1989 until now were agreed for all three projects in the framework of the main research topic. Registration districts are administrative and planning districts in the Vienna urban area. They divide city districts into smaller units. The selected registration districts have areas of between 0.4 and 0.5 km² and populations (2011) between around 8,200 and 13,400.

Urban Renewal Offices have been established in all three areas for many years. Because the densely built-up urban area of Vienna is almost completely covered by these offices, it has not been possible to use an 'unsupervised' area as a control.

It should be mentioned in advance that this is a final report on the first phase of research. We have so far worked on the project for six months. This first phase of "establishing a framework" does not aim to provide conclusive verdicts with regard to the central research questions. It is therefore still too early for a public discussion on the basis of the findings so far.

However, our research team is very interested in presenting the methodical approach and mix of methods we have used so far and discussing it with the international research community.

This paper concentrates on describing a methodological approach to the research question of the effects of urban renewal in Vienna. It contains no conclusions on content because the project is a work in progress and results are not sufficiently validated. The principal of the method is transversal - it is the linking of analyses from different fields in order to produce synergies and wider holistic conclusions.

After a brief description of the project framework the theoretical approaches will be touched upon, both from sociological as well as real estate business perspectives and the data sets and methods of the investigative strands - social, structural-spatial, real estate market, and coordinating and integrating - will be described. Suggestions for further work strands in a Phase 2 (intended by the commissioning authority), as well as assessments of the suitability of the approach and first possible results are also included.

The Context of the Policy of 'Soft Urban Renewal' in Vienna

An explanation from the city administration is quoted here to explain this policy:

"The model of sustainable or soft urban renewal has made a significant contribution to improving living conditions in the City of Vienna. A decisive factor in this process is that urban renewal is understood as an interdisciplinary challenge, where social, economic, cultural, aesthetic and ecological demands must be taken into consideration.

Urban renewal requires future-orientated, strategic continuing development, which reflects the possibilities for the city as an evolving system. "Soft urban renewal" pursues the goal of linking affordable housing with economic use of resources, mixed use, and adaptation to the existing infrastructure. Re-conversion and upgrading of the existing urban structure is counter-posed to demolition and new building.

The Viennese model of "soft" urban renewal .. (that started in 1984) .. places residents in the foreground so as to minimise the repression frequently induced by improvement activities. Owners and residents are involved in the progress. Main emphasis is placed on so-called base improvement, that is on maintaining, improving and modernising existing housing structures in coordination with residents."

"At the time, more than 300,000 dwellings without toilets or water and sanitation making up some 40 percent of Vienna's housing stock were targeted for renovation. Under the multi-million dollar programme over the years the sub-standard housing stock has been reduced to below nine percent."

"The legal foundations of "soft urban renewal", such as amendments to the tenancy laws, were laid long before actual improvement activities were launched. "Soft urban renewal" is an excellent example of how a cost-intensive project is easily prepared with reasonably priced planning measures."

“Currently, ... more than 320.000 apartments have been renewed within the framework of soft urban renewal, more than one third of the total housing stock, among them ... more than 150.000 with public subsidies - one of the world's leading tenant-oriented urban renewal programmes.”

(Quoted from: City of Vienna, Municipal Department 50 2008, and UN-HABITAT 2010, plus amendments)

Vienna sustainable urban renewal is a UN-HABITAT Best Practice from 1996, 2000, 2002, and 2006, and UN-HABITAT 2010 Scroll of Honour Award Winner.

Urban (Neighbourhood) Renewal – a Sociological Perspective

The sociologist in the team sets out the theoretical framework with a discussion of upgrading in conflict with displacement.

Cities are characterised by their dynamics and are subject to permanent transformation. This change includes several dimensions and does not only apply to the structural-physical level but also to the infrastructure as well as the political and economic structure of the city. In reciprocal dependence these transformations also influence the social structure.

The Phenomenon of Gentrification

The term ‘gentrification’ has also gained an increasing popularity in public discourse in recent years. Gentrification is a form of urban development that is closely linked to questions of social inequality. It is a combination of several processes: economic upgrading that is for example expressed in an increase in rents and property prices goes hand in hand with a symbolic transformation, namely a changed image and a change (or also a sanctioning) of cultural practices. The influx of a higher income (higher status) stratum leads to the displacement of a lower income (lower status) stratum. Several forms of displacement are distinguished, particularly direct, indirect (including pressure to move) and excluding (Lees et al. 2008).

Although the term was first coined back in 1964 by the English sociologist Ruth Glass in her work “London: Aspects of Change” (Glass 1964), it first took on significance at the end of the 1970s through the works of critical geographers in the academic world. Parallel to the development of Anglo-American gentrification research (especially in the USA, UK and Canada) groups and actors who were critical of society took up the concept and reinterpreted it as a battle cry. Gentrification became a symbol for the unequal distribution of economic resources and political power.

A central field of tensions lies in the fact that many cities, or their relevant actors, often argue for “positive gentrification” which is supposed to create a social mix. However, as international research has shown, this approach of “upgrading without displacement” falls short because it operates with a one-dimensional view of the consequences (see among others: Shaw/Hagemans 2015).

The Discourse in the German-Speaking Countries - Intended and Unintended Effects

In the German-speaking countries the concept of gentrification was adopted at the beginning of the 1990s particularly by (political) groups and actors who were critical of society. They quoted Anglo-American gentrification research because research in the German-speaking countries was still in its infancy. The differences in the legal, social, political and economic frameworks became clear at the latest in the mid-1990s when a group of German researchers led by Jürgen Friedrichs published the first comprehensive results on gentrification processes in German cities (among others: Friedrichs/Keckes 1996; previously: Dangschat 1988).

On the basis of the subsequent development of gentrification research the broader public reception in Austria and Germany has also been reflected in media reporting since the 2000s at the latest. Gentrification has “hit the mainstream”.

However its broad use simultaneously harbours the risk of inflationary application and imprecision. With its presence in the media and in political discourse the impression has been and is being created that similar processes of change can be observed in Viennese urban quarters to those in London, New York or Berlin. However, there is certainly no consensus among researchers. For some years the debate has rather been about whether certain developments in Vienna can be described as ‘gentrification’ or not, and what intended and unintended social effects the “Vienna model of soft urban renewal” has. The context of the discourse should be briefly sketched here.

Several aspects are discussed in the literature in relation to the intended effects of urban renewal (among others: Häussermann/Siebel 2004). A central aim of upgrading processes is creating a “social mix”. A discussion of “social mix” is beyond the scope of this project report on account of the very different positions. It should therefore merely be pointed out that a central aspect of this discourse asks the question as to who defines the mix and for whom it should be created.

Among the intended effects is also the possibility of stabilising disadvantaged urban quarters. On the one hand this is achieved by renovation and adaptation of the building fabric along with public spaces, and on the other, expansion of the social infrastructure also makes a contribution. Because both private and public space gain in quality of stay, the housing satisfaction of residents increases.

This upgrading can also accompany a symbolic transformation - in combination with a change in the consumption infrastructure. Public and media perception thereby changes and a previously marginalised urban quarter can become a trendy neighbourhood and/or a destination for higher status strata. Insofar as urban renewal takes place without displacement social networks remain intact or expand with new residents. Due to this there is ultimately an increase in integrative capacity connected with the residential location. Taken as a whole urban renewal and upgrading can create new opportunities for social advancement which would not otherwise have existed.

But where does the concept of ‘gentrification’ start? A central unintended effect of upgrading processes is discussed under this term. The concept of ‘gentrification’ is characterised by various processes in interaction with one another which have an effect on urban quarter level (Lees et al. 2008; Huber 2013). According to the actor model or the phase model of Clay (1979), so-called ‘pioneers’ (artists, students and generally people with a high cultural level but limited financial capital) are the first to move into a certain urban quarter that was previously mainly a residential area of low-income households. The presence of this group, which is also described as “creative”, often goes along with the opening of new restaurants and bars, target-group oriented local shops and a new creative and business infrastructure. This can then create dynamics that also make the area attractive for other actors. With investments from the real estate business hoping for profits and the influx of higher income households, the so-called “gentrifiers”, an urban area is ultimately economically upgraded.

Further specific features of such upgrading processes, which are certainly not a linear model, cannot be dealt with in more detail here. Various forms of ‘displacement’ should also be differentiated. Firstly the influx of higher status households can lead to the *direct displacement* of lower status households and residents. Certain criteria, so-called ‘gentrification markers’, can indicate such developments (and are therefore used in this project for analysis, see ‘Methods’). In addition, put very briefly, certain social spaces can be suppressed or substituted, or lower income groups are displaced from the social spaces they previously used - *‘indirect displacement’*. Furthermore, this typology distinguishes the form of excluding displacement when a dwelling that was previously occupied by a household with a certain socio-economic background is no longer affordable for a household with the same background when the first family moves out (see Marcuse 1985; Huber 2012).

Further potential ‘gentrification markers’ are changes in building fabric data and analyses of the housing market - another part of the project described here. An improvement in the transparency of processes taking place in areas can therefore be expected by bringing together all these components. This can also serve to examine the current discourse on “upgrading” and “gentrification”, to question the “narrative” and lay the foundations for a new policy and administrative orientation. This is the context in which to see this project.

Urban (Neighbourhood) Renewal - an Economic/Real Estate Perspective

The real estate researcher and economist in the team is approaching the superordinate question of the (aims and) effects of urban renewal from another perspective. .

He brings into play the expectations of urban policy and the real estate business, those who promote and subsidise but also react (urban policy) and owners with potential interest in investing (house owners, real estate companies).

Assuming that the upgrading of older quarters to a large extent goes along, or should go along, with an improvement in the housing situation and thus with investment in the housing stock - this is the policy approach of the city administration - he discusses parameters of strategic, interdependent investment decisions. The focus is on property value and maintaining or increasing it. Relevant factors are the location, building fabric but also public spaces and infrastructure.

The status and change of real estate actors in a quarter has been identified as a significant parameter. Only knowing about these in order to be able to react to stimuli and obstacles to investment and their consequences can lead to adequate diversification of public instruments. In return there is the need to support and attend to investors due to the complexity of the local situation. The status of urban quarters is after all determined by social, economic/business, ecological and planning and policy influences (see Meisel, 2012).

As a logical consequence, these findings lead to a requirement to gather historical and current data on the situation as a basis for decisions. In the process the dominant place is taken by the analysis and characterisation of property owners. Previous studies (Wieser/Feigelfeld 2007, Wieser 2010, Kaufmann, Hartmann 1984) show that here - apart from the highly simplified distinctions of private persons and companies in the public registers - a wide range of actors must be taken into consideration. They differ mainly with regard to their interests, know-how and potential for action.

Because - in relation to Europe at least in numerous cities and countries - the coordinated aim of urban renewal policy is to set in motion, promote and steer a harmonious process of urban quarter development in accordance with the interests of the largest possible number of those both directly and indirectly affected, Wieser has developed an ideal process model of quarter development from a real estate business perspective based on the factors mentioned.

This quarter-related process is reflected in the process of project development of individual properties (location, finance, ideas) with two significant differences: the large number of stakeholders and the factor of the announcement and action by the public authorities with respect to infrastructural measures in public space. The market environment is the basis behind all this for all actors, which for its part is very strongly influenced by the legal framework (building, housing and commercial legislation etc.).

Stakeholder analysis and the process of participation are cornerstones of urban quarter development. And it therefore seems essential and promising also to integrate real estate development into quarter renewal via the relevant stakeholders and link it to a precise but flexible timetable.

The intended aim of quarter development (which should include positive real estate development) is focused on sustainability. This is not seen as a 'final aim' because quarter improvement must and should be a process of continual renewal. Each small step, each phase and each field of activity should ideally produce sustainability.

Only this 'auto-stabilisation and mobilisation' makes it possible for the public authorities to retreat step by step after initial activities (planning, communication, start-up financing, moderation, monitoring). (Sustainability should be the aim here on many levels: sustainability with regard to investments, housing satisfaction, quality and ecology, public finances and efficient use of funds, public space and infrastructure,

social fabric, local shops and cultural life.) From the standpoint of real-estate economists it goes without saying that this also includes ‘sustainable real estate development’.

However, the Achilles heel of urban quarter upgrading emerges here because the process can also lead to changes in the social structure which are not in the interests of harmonious urban development (there are enough examples) - the well-known and much discussed phenomenon of gentrification.

From a real estate business point of view Wieser also does not deny the negative aspects of such a development. He goes on to discuss the range of individual or community perspectives, the elements of stimulation. Displacement in the course of upgrading processes is a distribution problem but has also become an ‘efficiency problem’. The necessary and reasonable role of the quarter community as ‘producer’ of public assets is paralysed by displacement phenomena and legal uncertainty and is thus no longer available or only to an inadequate extent. Further aspects of this discussion must be omitted from this paper (for more see Feigelfeld, Huber, Wieser 2015).

Here reference must be made to the previous chapter which describes the theory-directed approach to quarter upgrading from a sociological perspective, not without going into more detail on the questions of negative displacement and gentrification phenomena which are closely but not necessarily imperatively connected.

Urban (Neighbourhood) Renewal - Attempt to integrate the various expert views

The discourse thus logically comes up against the basic question of the current project: is the aim of ‘upgrading without displacement’ achievable? - This aim was set by policy and administration of the Municipality of Vienna decades ago and since been pursued with the use of many instruments and measures - has it (largely) been achieved? Does the policy of ‘soft urban renewal’ produce the desired effects? And in an important further question: to what extent do developments on city level prove to be controllable and where are influences from other levels (national, European, global) or fields (financial market, migration etc.) the actual motors which cannot be locally influenced?

Whereas the sociological approach goes the way of measuring demographic developments and changes in life situations on the basis of gentrification markers (see the chapters ‘Data and Methods’), also in order to be able to point out risks and negative developments, the real estate business approach assumes that urban development models can only be successful when they sustainably improve the building fabric and thus inevitably contribute to the maintenance of, or even an increase in, property prices. The data used for analysis of the real estate market thus fulfills less the function of ‘markers’ but is intended to clarify the implications of this field of actors.

Only with the third step, which via the material, construction process (renovation, new construction), the economic process (change in rent level, change towards owner-occupiers) and the urban social process connects what is happening to the population, can the two approaches be linked and thus lead the innovative concept to an integrated view of the findings.

It will also be fascinating to see how the sometimes very different positions from the theoretical-critical basis will be reconciled. Both obviously have the common goal of striving for and enabling upgrading which is ‘socially tolerable’ and ‘includes the development of property prices’. What these two aspects include and what they exclude is still to be defined. The role of the urbanist who as the ‘generalist’ brings numerous strands of urban development, housing, policy analysis and comparative European development to the team is responsible for the integrative moderation of the project process and the discussion as well as rounding off the analysis.

Analysis of the Areas from a Real Estate Business Perspective - Data and Methods

The most important data for the real estate market investigations in Phase 1 were the purchase price records of the Municipality of Vienna for transactions with rental apartment buildings, the housing censuses of 1991 and 2001 of Statistik Austria and the 2011 register-based census of Statistik Austria.

The development of transactions (purchases, sales...) with rental apartment buildings in the areas during the period 1989 to 2013 will be examined with the help of the purchase price records. The “Vienna Purchase Price Record” is an official statistic on real estate transactions that is compiled by Municipal Department 69 ‘Real Estate Management’ of the City of Vienna. The source is reports from the Land Register Courts to the municipality. (Comparable records of purchase prices are also, for example, kept in Germany.)

At the centre of our investigations is a description of the market cycle based on price developments in Vienna as a whole and price developments and developments in the study areas among the main types of actors, ‘private persons’ and ‘companies’. Developments in these areas will not only be compared with one another but also with those in larger spatial reference areas such as the central districts of Vienna and the city as a whole.

The analyses of the building and housing censuses serve to characterise the areas in terms of buildings and ownership. Among other things the changes in building and dwelling stocks, quality of dwellings and legal relationships in the buildings and apartments will be examined. The findings about building and dwelling characteristics also serve for the interpretation of the results of the analysis of apartment building transactions. (Nationwide macro-censuses were carried out every ten years in Austria until 2001. Since then appropriate macro data sets have been compiled from aggregations of various digital data stocks under the name ‘register-based census’ (*Registerzählung*). Direct comparison is only possible with limitations. See also below.)

Additional important sources of data have been market reports on apartment buildings and press releases from larger companies on the property market such as EHL, Otto-Immobilien and Remax about transactions and turnover on the Vienna real estate market.

Analysis of the Purchase Price Records

The purchase price records of Municipal Department 69 (Real Estate Management of the Municipality of Vienna) are a valuable data set for the examination of real estate transactions in Vienna. The data set contains some important information from the land register about transferred properties.

The most important features (variables) for this analysis of the Vienna purchase price records are: address (street and house number), property size, purchase price, date of purchase, type of buyer and seller, allocation and use (incl. construction classification) (in Vienna ‘use’ is defined as the obligatory specification of the permitted use of the property in categories, and the construction classification is the highest permissible building density, in groups).

MA 69 concentrates mainly on transactions with undeveloped parcels of land and properties for demolition for residential housing but also collects data on agricultural land, industrial sites and land with other uses. Furthermore, current transactions with single-family houses and rental apartment buildings are examined and/or recorded in the land register.

The data on rental apartment buildings in the purchase price records only contain transactions concerning the whole building. Transactions involving parts of rental apartment buildings are not recorded. Thus, depending on the year, around half of all transactions with rental apartment buildings are not taken into account.

Transactions with parts of apartment buildings mainly involve private persons as purchasers. Their role in market developments is therefore larger than the results of the following investigations suggest.

On the other hand, records of transactions involving whole buildings are almost complete, as shown by a comparison with comprehensive data collections for the creation of market reports of important real estate companies (EHL and Otto-Immobilien) from recent years. Therefore valid conclusions can be drawn for some significant features as well as for the universal set of whole properties that actually changed ownership. The total number of transactions with whole properties is only a little underestimated since when a building has changed ownership several times details of individual sales are occasionally lacking.

Hedonic regression models have shown that - with the help of the features of buildings recorded in the data set, supplemented with a variable on the situation in a certain cadastral community - only around 60% of the variation in rental apartment building prices in Vienna can be explained, whereas over 80% of the purchase prices of undeveloped residential land can be explained with such statistical comparative value models (Wieser, 2008). The reason for the lower degree of explanation with rental apartment buildings is that important features of the buildings are missing from the data set. These include missing data about floor space, tenancy relationships and investments made between sales.

Price developments with rental apartment buildings which can be investigated from the purchase price records should therefore be interpreted with care. This applies even more to localised studies, as is the case here with the analysis of the three study areas. The influence of unknown, price-defining features on price differences can be very large. The danger therefore exists that observable price differences or different price developments can be attributed to factors which actually play no role, or only a smaller role than suggested at first glance. This (statistical) problem of “neglected variables” is especially virulent with real estate prices.

The investigation of price developments in the areas using only the data from the purchase price records can therefore only be a first step for more detailed examinations. The suggestion put forward at the current end of Phase 1 for an integrated real estate research approach for Phase 2 of the project therefore proposes that the data from the purchase price records be brought together with data on building renovation, developments in rental prices, changes in apartment ownership and further data from land register analyses to throw more light on price developments and actors. In particular, the effects of various types of renovation could be estimated with an econometric model approach from which recommendations for the future selection of more effective and efficient promotion instruments could be derived.

Analysis of the Building and Housing Censuses

In addition to some evaluations from the purchase price records, the characterisation of the areas from a real estate perspective carried out in Phase 1 of the project is based on the data from the building and housing censuses of 1991 and 2001 of Statistik Austria and the 2011 register-based census of Statistik Austria (for more details of available information on features see below).

A comparison of the data from the 1991 and 2001 censuses with the data from the register-based census of 2011 is not directly possible because the features of the available data from the censuses are mainly targeted at dwellings used as main residences whereas the register-based census reflects dwellings as a whole. Data on the censuses from Statistik Austria was only available in incomplete form, especially for 1991. In Phase 2 access to data should be improved via the city administration, especially with regard to interlaced data. Nevertheless, some interesting facts emerge.

The presentation of the last observable building and housing structures in the selected registration districts and the larger comparison areas is based on data from the 2011 register-based census. Important building features include the construction period, the main type of use, the number of apartments, the net floor areas, the number of storeys and the ownership structure. The housing features examined are designation of residence (main residence or other), construction period of the building, legal position of the apartment,

number of rooms, floor space, standard of facilities, type of ownership and the number of apartments in the building.

Comparisons is carried out in the project with the inner districts of Vienna (2nd - 9th Districts and the 20th District) and with Vienna as a whole. The comparisons with these large areas are based on several considerations. Firstly, activities on the Vienna market for rental apartment buildings will be examined more closely in the real estate analysis and comparisons made of developments in the study areas with the market for old rental buildings but also with developments on the apartment building market in Vienna as a whole. Because a large proportion of old rental buildings in Vienna is located in the inner districts and because certain spill-over effects of rental housing activity in the centre (including some actors) are very probable in the nearby Gürtel areas, a comparison with building and housing features in the inner districts seems appropriate.

The data analyses have been set out in the as-yet unpublished project report on Phase 1 in numerous graphs (a total of 40, 8 per area and a further 16 superordinate or comparative graphs) and individual tables. Transactions with rental apartment buildings are also depicted on map sections of the examined areas according to market phases and prices.

Experience so far with the Data and the Methods, Intended Continuation

It was clear from the beginning that the real estate evaluations in Phase 1 of the sub-project would not yet provide any definitive results. The data situation was still too inadequate with regard to rental apartment buildings. Only by bringing together the data collected in the parallel projects and further supplementary research will a more complete picture emerge and provide some valid findings, but at least trailblazing hypotheses which can serve as a basis for subsequent analyses.

Central issues for further work should be the themes of price developments, effect of/on renovation measures and analyses of actors. A combination of working with case examples and more detailed statistical examination suggests itself as the best approach. This combination on the one hand offers the advantage of relativising anecdotal evidence (case examples) while on the other it adds a human face to the statistical analyses.

One component is in any case the combination of data on transactions with rental apartment buildings with data collected by another team in the parallel project on subsidised and privately financed renovation and new construction.

All of this is intended to lead us closer to answering some of the key questions: what are the interactions between purchase/sale and consequent (building and renovation) activity? And will the aim of an 'impulse effect' of public action be positively achieved? How could a desired process be steered better?

Trends that Can Already be Recognised

Despite the above-mentioned limitations the real estate investigations in Phase 1 have already revealed remarkable differences as well as similarities in the areas. In addition, a very interesting chronological structure of market activity with four main phases on the market for rental apartment houses in Vienna from 1989 to 2013 could be identified and used as a basis for the evaluation of changes in the areas. This could also serve as a starting point for further research going beyond the project described here. Above all however, questions are raised in Phase 1 which will go into Phase 2 as an important basis for the research design.

Besides comparable basic trends, significant differences showed themselves in sale/purchase activities in the housing stock, the participating actors and in price development, despite the very similar social and building structures.

Analysis of the Areas from a Sociological Perspective - Data and Methods

'Gentrification Markers'

Urban development is complex and developments cannot be reduced to single parameters. The proportions of various housing market segments must of course be taken into account. The historical development of a neighbourhood ("path dependency") can also provide important information (see for instance Zukin, 2010). However, in order to analyse social-structural changes and draw conclusions about gentrification and displacement, the focus must be on demographic development.

For this reason the data analysis was carried out with so-called "gentrification markers". These are a selection of social structure variables that are used, among other things, in international literature for examining upgrading and displacement. Briefly, these include: age, citizenship and migration background, residential mobility, education level and field, employment status, family and household forms and housing cost burden.

One central aspect of the analysis is thus the relational embedding of the results - namely the comparison of developments in one urban neighbourhood with trends in the city as a whole.

On the one hand, data used was from the Statistik Austria register-based census of 2011 on register districts supplied by the municipality. On the other hand, in order to describe the changes, census data from 1991 and 2001 at Vienna registration district level was analysed.

In order to compensate for the limited comparability of the three data sets (differences in scope, type of survey, type and number of variables etc.) variables were - when considered expedient - adjusted by code conversion.

Although the three data sets cannot be compared without reservations, the team working on the following analysis nevertheless assumed that the data reflects general trends and changes which can be analysed and interpreted in relation to the subject of this research.

In addition, further evaluations and sets of data commissioned by the Municipality of Vienna were included (see Synthesis Forschung 2011). The results were also compared with findings from several sociological studies of Vienna and checked for plausibility (Rode, Schier, Giffinger, Reinprecht (2010), Stadtentwicklung Wien (2009) Fassmann, Kohlbacher (2009), TU Wien (2009). Detailed information on one of the areas, the Brunnenviertel, from bachelor theses from the TU Vienna (2014) could also be included.

Data on citizenship and 'migrational background' is of special interest for the analysis of the study areas in densely built-up parts of the city because for decades these neighbourhoods have been the main residential zones for these population groups (they predominantly live in rented flats in old 19th century apartment buildings owned by private landlords). For some years Austria has also been collecting information on 'migrational background' in addition to citizenship. The 'Statistik Austria' classifies those citizens as persons with migrational background whose parents were both born abroad. This group can then be subdivided into first-generation migrants (people who themselves were born abroad) and second-generation migrants (the children of immigrant parents who were themselves born in Austria). This definition of migrational background follows the "Recommendations for the 2010 censuses of population and housing" (United Nations Economic Commission for Europe UNECE 2006). As part of the EU-wide module of the micro-census labour force survey on the subject "Labour market situation of migrants and their children" the question of parents' country of birth was asked for the first time in 2008. Conclusions about the migrational background of the Austrian population can be made on the basis of this information. Some basic data about Vienna: average 38,5% (2013), investigation areas between 49 and 57% (2010).

For the interpretation and validation of the results the project also includes talks and interviews with a range of experts - from the fields of sociology university academics, Municipality of Vienna urban planning and

urban development, university and non-university housing research (see References). The lessons learned from these talks will be anonymously worked into the analysis.

Types of Social Space

On the basis of the socio-demographic characteristics evaluated for the study, various social-spatial ideal types emerge for the study areas. The sociological method of creating “ideal types” serves to reduce complexity. Ideal types represent abstract constructs integrating numerous similar features and condensing them under one common term (Flick et al. 2000).

In this project the ideal types are worked out in a three-stage process. The first step is to characterise the individual areas. In stage two the areas are compared with one another and with district and city levels and stage three works in the results of the talks with experts, relevant literature and information from discussions with Area Renewal Offices (Gebietsbetreuungen).

Besides characterising the types of social space, the following section also describes positive effects or “achievements” as well as risks for the study areas on the basis of the social-spatial ideal types developed.

Experience so far with the Data and Methods, Planned Continuation

The sociological evaluations in Phase 1 of the sub-project also assumed that a first insight into local developments and the local situation, also in comparison with other parts of high-density areas, could only be obtained with the surveys and analyses to be carried out here. This was confirmed - also because, in addition, access to data was burdened with problems of time, scope and evaluation methods. Thus several strands were defined as indispensable before sound conclusions could be drawn.

Firstly it is quantitative - a partly refined and more detailed data analysis from the census and register-based census data and a combination of different variables as far as possible. A further adjustment with available small-scale data should be made, keyword: ‘Social Space Atlas’.

Secondly: quantitative data is a useful basis but a qualitative focus is essential for deeper analysis. A qualitative approach enables connections to be recognised that are not evident in the data. Furthermore, it emerged that data analysed in Phase 1 contained gaps. Therefore, for the reasons mentioned, a qualitative part is planned for Phase 2. The focus will be on checking and refining the social-spatial ideal types developed in Phase 1.

This first rough typification from Phase 1 serves as a hypothesis for Phase 2 which should go into detail and identify a pattern of social-spatial sub-types. This detailed social-space type pattern should ultimately be located (e.g. on a map), whereby we aim to cooperate with the other research teams who have already carried out preliminary work in the field of visualisation.

The “relational space model”, which states that space is produced through arrangements and synthesis (see Anthony Giddens 1997, Martina Löw 2001), serves as a theoretical reference point. Therefore the survey and analysis of the action and social spaces of residents is in the foreground of the approach in Phase 2. The new focus is thus on the residential structure. In the process the spatial overlaps, intermediate spaces or niches and the non-spaces should also be taken up. As part of working out this refined pattern, processes of “moving in vs. displacement”, “inclusion vs. exclusion”, “cohesion vs. fragmentation or polarisation” and “uses vs. conflicts of use” should be especially highlighted.

Because both private as well as public spaces are also part of social space, the analysis should also provide indications of how appropriations and uses of space function against the background of densification of the urban structure.

Qualitative Methods in Phase 2

Qualitative interviews in which residents are asked about their uses of space lend themselves as an empirical methodical approach. The interviews will subsequently be evaluated in a qualitative analysis of content. A further method would be comprehensive, participatory observation supplemented with ad-hoc interviews and informal conversations. Furthermore, mental maps and city walks are conceivable, which would be documented with the help of a map.

This range of quantitative and qualitative data and the interlacing of Phases 1 and 2 thus represents a comprehensive gain in knowledge so that this strand of the project also clearly sets itself apart from previous studies of this subject in Vienna.

First Conclusions Possible

Despite the above-mentioned limitations, the sociological investigations in Phase 1 have already shown remarkable differences as well as similarities in the areas. Despite the fact that they share a similar structure and have been subject to the same urban renewal policies and Area Renewal Offices (*Gebietsbetreuung*) for the last 25 years, they show three very special profiles which are now to be verified and worked out in more detail. In view of this, the chosen methodology is proving itself to be by all means practicable. In a first synthesis the classification of types could be well supplemented by building and structural qualifications and a look at the real estate market. This synthesis has been internally submitted to the commissioning city department with all reservations and is currently serving as a basis for discussion of further action.

Consolidation and Background – the Role of Coordination and Integration

The initial idea of establishing the role of a coordinator, moderator and integrator of the various perspectives and approaches in the project team in order to do justice to the variety of the subject matter has evidently proved to be productive. The intention of enriching the project but also of monitoring and questioning and developing a common, coordinated and ‘harmonised’ final report on Phase 1 has been satisfactorily realised.

The transversal, integrative and coordinating contribution will thus illustrate as wide a background to the subjects as possible and bring together the thematic approaches of the project from the early stages onwards. This should do justice to the complexity of the questions and embed the work in the current discourse.

In detail, during the course of the supervision of data collection, lateral coordination between the thematic strands and, where necessary, harmonisation with the parallel projects, the other two strands will be supplemented and supported to achieve a harmonised approach. In the process (urban) structural, spatial and planning aspects will be included. More detailed or modified evaluations will be encouraged in the critical monitoring of the data analyses and interpretations.

In talks with the Area Renewal Offices (*Gebietsbetreuung*) in the selected areas their experience and opinions on local developments, actors and those affected as well as influential factors from the city as a whole were gathered, material was obtained and subsequently supplemented with internet and media research. Area Renewal Offices are publicly financed and coordinated on-the-spot offices which perform the functions both of individual consultation as well as ‘urban quarter management’. The field of activity of these offices, which are geared to permanence, has been continually expanded since the 1970s and they now cover most parts of the densely built areas of Vienna.

Urban development specifications such as urban development plans and the like and their situational analysis and political/administrative approach to the so-called ‘Gründerzeitviertel’ (inner-city areas with the majority of their building stock dating from the 19th century) were inspected and passed on to the team as background material for their research, adapted to the research period ‘end of the 1980th until today’.

The current range of the discussion of the perspectives of the problem and the planning and legal framework was ascertained through participation at various specialist events, talks by experts, personal conversations, research into the specialist literature and continual observation of the media. All of this was also disseminated among team members and discussed. Above all, permanently interim results from the social, structural-spatial and property market strands of investigation were compared, stringent context or possible contradiction was distilled and further approach developed.

The specialist profile of this team member, an urbanist with a focus on housing research and many years of expertise in sociological, urban-planning and structural research as well as policy consultancy has proved helpful for this role and this should be continued in Phase 2.

Conclusion

It is still too early to draw binding conclusions on whether the initially formulated project hypotheses can be verified. However, the chosen methods seem appropriate to be able to identify signs of the extent and phases of upgrading of urban neighbourhoods. As things stand it seems that verification of whether this upgrading is connected with gentrification phenomena and whether these are compatible with and relatable to a 'stage model' or 'market model' should be provided - insofar as further supplementary and detailed investigations can be carried out in the following Phase 2.

In the sociological approach evaluations according to 'gentrification markers' have brought usable indications and the approach via allocation of the areas into 'social space types' has proved useful. Consolidation through more complex data analysis and qualitative methods has not yet been carried out. In the real estate business section a big step has been made with information about market activities with rental apartment buildings, quantities, prices, actors and market phases - all of which has so far been absent from most investigations of upgrading and gentrification themes that we know. However, for conclusions about the reciprocal interactions of dealings with the building fabric, market activities as well as efforts of policy steering it is now indispensable to link the evaluations of the real estate market with those of (subsidised or privately financed) renovation and new construction. Analyses of developments in rents and the move towards owner-occupation suggest themselves as further promising steps. In addition, more detailed information about the types and motives of actors is required to test our hypotheses about investment development.

In our view the examination of sociological analyses, evaluations of data on buildings and deeper knowledge of the real estate market has the potential to bring an innovative dimension to current research on the subject.

This paper has been presented by Heidrun Feigelfeld at the International Conference of the ENHR European Network for Housing Research 28 June to 2. July 2015 in Lisbon, Portugal (ENHR2015 Lisboa), Housing and Cities in a time of change: are we focusing on People? In the workshop 'Holistic Approaches to Sustainable Urban Renewal'.

The paper has also been published in a German version as MPRA-Paper 66484 (Munich Personal RePEc Archive).

References

- Bell, D. (1973) *The Coming of Post-Industrial Society*. New York.
- City of Vienna (ed) (2014) *Stadtentwicklungsplan 2025 (Urban Development Plan 2025)*, Wien.
- Clay, P. L. (1979) *Neighborhood Renewal: Middle-class Resettlement and Incumbent Upgrading in American Neighborhoods*. Lexington.
- Dangschat, J. S. (1988) Gentrification: Der Wandel innenstadtnaher Wohnviertel (Gentrification: Changes in inner-city housing quarters), in: Friedrichs, J. (ed) *Soziologische Stadtforschung. Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie*. Sonderheft 29. Opladen, 272-292.
- EHL Immobilien GmbH (2014) *Aktueller Wiener Zinshaus-Marktbericht (Current Vienna old rental apartment building market report)*. Wien.
- Fassmann, H. and Kohlbacher, J. (2009) *Housing and Segregation of Migrants. Case Study: Vienna, Austria*. Dublin.
- Feigelfeld, H. and Hartig, R. (2001) „Sag mir, wo du wohnst ...“. *Großstädtische Lebensbedingungen marginalisierter Bevölkerungsgruppen in Wien (Tell me where you live... urban living conditions of marginalised groups in Vienna)*, Vienna.
- Feigelfeld, H. et al (SRZ) (2000) *25 Jahre Gebietsbetreuung in Wien – Bilanz, Perspektive, Strategie (25 years of Area Renewal Offices in Vienna – Review, Future Prospects, Strategy)*, Vienna.
- Feigelfeld, H. Huber F. and Wieser R. (SRZ) (2015) *Effekte der Stadterneuerung – sozial/baulich-räumlich und immobilienseitig – Phase 1 (Effects of Urban Regeneration – social/structural-spatial and property market – Phase 1)*, Final Report, Vienna, unpublished.
- Flick, U., Kardorff, E. and Steinke, I. (2000) (eds) *Qualitative Sozialforschung*. Reinbek bei Hamburg.
- Franz, Y. Et al (2015) *Die Rolle und Wirkungen der Gebietsbetreuungen in Wiener Stadterneuerungsprozessen (Role and effects of Urban Renewal Offices in Vienna's processes of urban renewal)*, University Vienna, Department for Geography and Regional Research, Vienna, unpublished.
- Friedrichs, J. (1996) Gentrification. Forschungsstand und methodologische Probleme (Gentrification. State of research and methodological problems), in: Friedrichs, J. and Kecskes, R. (eds) *Gentrification. Theorie und Forschungsergebnisse (Gentrification. Theory and Research Results)*. Opladen, 13-40.
- Friedrichs, J. and Blasius J. (2014) *Economic Consequences of Gentrification*. Paper presented at the ENHR Conference Edinburgh.
- Giddens, A. (1997) *The Constitution of Society*. London.
- Glass, R. (1964) *London: Aspects of Change*. Centre for Urban Studies report No.3, MacGibbon & Kee.
- Häussermann, H. and Siebel, W. (2004) *Stadtsoziologie (Urban Sociology)*. Frankfurt/M..
- Huber, F. J. (2011) Sensitive Urban Renewal or Gentrification? The Case of the Karmeliterviertel in Vienna, in: Manella, G., Perrone, Camilla and Tripodi, Lorenzo (Hrsg.): *Everyday Life in the Segmented City*. Research in Urban Sociology, Vol. 11, Bingley, 223-239.
- Huber, F. J. (2012) Gentrifizierung – Reflexionen über einen kritischen Begriff in der Krise (Gentrification – reflections on a critical concept in crisis), in: *Derive*, 46, 38-41.
- Huber, F. J. (2013) *Stadtviertel im Gentrifizierungsprozess. Aufwertung und Verdrängung in Wien, Chicago und Mexiko Stadt (Urban quarters in a process of gentrification. Upgrading and exclusion in Vienna, Chicago and Mexico City)*, Vienna.
- Kaufmann, A. and Hartmann, B. (1984) *Wiener Altmietehäuser und ihre Besitzer (Vienna's old rental apartment buildings and their owners)*, Vienna: Institut für Stadtforschung, Band 70.
- Lees, L., Slater, T. and Wyly, E. (2008) *Gentrification*. London.
- Löw, M. (2001) *Raumsoziologie (Sociology of Space)*. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp.
- Marcuse, P. (1985) Gentrification, Abandonment and Displacement: Connections, Causes and Policy Responses in New York City, in: *Journal of Urban and Contemporary Law*, 28, 195-240.
- Meisel, U. (2012) Routenplaner Bestandsquartiere – Bewertungssysteme nachhaltiger Quartiersentwicklung und sechs Dimensionen für praktisches Handeln (Route planner stock quarters – systems for the evaluation of sustainable quarter development and six dimensions for applied action), In: Drilling, M. et al.: *Nachhaltige Quartiersentwicklung, Positionen, Praxisbeispiel und Perspektiven*. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, Springer Fachmedien, S. 229-249.

- Oberhuber, A., Denk D. et al (2015) *Aufbau einer umfassenden Datenbasis zur Evaluierung von Effekten von Sanierungs- und Neubauaktivitäten in ausgewählten Sanierungszielgebieten in Wien (Creating a comprehensive data basis for the evaluation of effects of renovation and new construction activities in selected Urban Renewal Target Areas in Vienna)*, FGW Forschungsgesellschaft für Wohnen, Bauen und Planen Vienna, unpublished.
- Otto Immobilien (2013) *Erster Wiener Zinshaus-Marktbericht (First Vienna old rental apartment building market report)*, Wien.
- Rode, P., Schier, H., Giffinger, R. and Reinprecht, C. (2010) *Soziale Veränderungsprozesse im Stadtraum. Wiener Sozialraumanalyse mit Vertiefung in acht ausgewählten Stadtvierteln (Processes of social change in urban areas. Vienna social space analysis with in-depth research in eight selected quarters)*, Stadtentwicklung Wien (ed) Werkstattberichte Nr .104, Wien.
- Rosifka, W. (2014) *Altbau in Wien – Zahlen, Daten, Rechtliche Rahmenbedingungen, Probleme durch Spekulation (Old housing stock in Vienna – figures, data, legal framework, problems caused by speculation)*, contribution at the conference „Wien wächst – Wien wohnt! – Gutes Wohnen in einer wachsenden Stadt“, Vienna, November 2014.
- Shaw, K. and Hagemans, I. W. (2015) Gentrification without Displacement and the consequent Loss of Place. Effects of Class Transition on low-income residents of Secure Housing in Gentrifying Areas, in: *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, DOI: 10.1111/1468-2427.12164.
- Stadtentwicklung Wien, MA18 (2009) *Wiener Lebensqualitätsstudien (Vienna studies on quality of life)*. Sozialwissenschaftliche Grundlagenforschung für Wien 2008. Werkstattbericht 102. Wien: Stadt Wien.
- Steiner, W. and Troper, R. (1991) *Entwicklung der Wiener Altmiethäuser – Probleme und Szenarien (Development of the old Vienna private rental housing stock – problems and scenarios)*. Vienna: Institut für Stadtforschung, Band 93.
- Synthesis Forschung (2011) *Die 250 Zählbezirke Wiens: Ein quantitatives Wohnversorgungsprofil (The 250 Registration Districts of Vienna: a quantitative profile of housing provision)*, Wien.
- Technical University Vienna, Department for Finance and Infrastructure Policy (IFIP) (2009) *Wohnverhältnisse in Wien. Zu den Anforderungen einer integrationsorientierten Wohnungspolitik (Housing situation in Vienna. On the requirements for an integration-oriented housing policy)*, Vienna.
- Technical University Vienna, Department of Spatial development and Infrastructure & Environmental Planning ISRA (2014) diverse bachelor theses, based on the bachelor seminar: Social Space and Social Inequality. Among them e.g.: Mueller, A. (2014) *Gentrifizierung im Brunnenviertel? Ein lösungsorientierter Beitrag zur Diskussion (Gentrification in the Brunnenviertel? A solution-oriented contribution to the discussion)*, Vienna.
- Verlic, M. (2013) *Housing neo-liberalisation and displacement? Emerging rent gaps in Vienna's highly regulated housing market. Conference Paper*, RC 21 Conference Berlin, August 2013.
- Wieser R. (2009) *Parameterstabilität in hedonischen Bodenpreismodellen (Parameter stability in hedonic models for property prices)*, Technical University Vienna, Department for Finance and Infrastructure Policy (IFIP), Vienna, unpublished.
- Wieser, R. (2010) *Wohnbauland in Wien – Entwicklung von Mobilität und Preisen 1987 bis 2009 (Residential building land in Vienna – developments in mobility and prices 1987 to 2009)*, Technical University Vienna, Department of Finance and Infrastructure Policy (IFIP), Vienna.
- Wieser, R. and Feigelfeld, H. (IFIP-SRZ) (2007) *Eigentümerstrukturen im Wiener privaten Althausbestand – Analyse der Veränderungen und deren Auswirkungen auf den Wohnungsmarkt in Wien (Ownership Structure in the Old Vienna Private Housing Stock – Analysis of the Changes and their Impact on the Housing Market in Vienna)*, Vienna.
- Zukin, Sharon (2010) *Naked City. The Death and Life of Authentic Urban Places*. New York.