



Village Block' Energy Efficiency Refurbishment Project - Óbuda – Békásmegyer (Hungary)

I. IDENTIFICATION

Investor (key institution): Budapest
Contact person: Town mayor – Balázs Bús
Year of implementation: 2006

Implementation venue

Region: Budapest
Town: Budapest
Size of area: 43500 m²

Impact: municipal

Total costs: 5 EUR

Source per every institution

- EU funds: 2,3 mil. EUR
- national: 1,9 mil. EUR
- other: 1,6 mil. EUR

II. TYPOLOGY

1. Improved provision of local cultural and social events.
2. Improved attractiveness of the architecture of the socialist buildings.
3. Improved involvement of the local community in events organized in its quarter.

III. DESCRIPTION

1. What forms of cooperation were used as new approaches in the field of rehabilitation and conversion of urban functional areas?

The project involved the following forms of cooperation, reflecting the relation between local communities, planners and decision makers: - consistent cooperation between decision makers, scientist and planners, - cooperation between decision makers and local communities.

2. Was the building or the space between buildings) identified as a valuable socialist heritage?

None of the buildings or space between buildings have been identified as a valuable socialistic heritage as there are only limited theoretical concepts, methodologies and case studies for the socialistic heritage conservation in the

Hungary. The buildings and space is usually modified or transformed regardless of its potential value.

3. What criteria were applied to make this judgment?

Not relevant as the answer for the previous question was negative.

4. Was the building or space between buildings) important to local communities and how were they involved in decision-making process about its rehabilitation or conversion?

The prefab house zone represent the high concentration residential area with partial importance and self-identification potential for the locals. They are especially involved in: - extension of parking space- reconstruction of roads and sidewalks, - general appearance of buildings. Among the participatory planning approaches, we identified the following: - the locals were invited to the discussion about the plan. - the local stakeholders had a chance to participate with their projects within the framework of the general programme.

5. Were attempts made to improve territorial cohesion within the city/town/district? And, if so, how was success on this front gauged?

The regeneration project has primarily local significance. Only limited interrelation is apparent between local and town level (reconstruction of traffic network, etc.).

6. Were there attempts to reduced disparities between districts within cities/towns achieved reduced? And, if so, how was success on this front gauged?

No attempts has been made to reduce disparities. The major attention has been devoted to overall regeneration of the zone, which should improve the quality of living and pursuing the leisure time activities of the local communities. The indirect influence on reducing the disparities can be considered by increasing the above mentioned aspects of quality of living and thus approaching them to the rest of the city, and in improvement of the social learning and social interaction potential within the regenerated area between the buildings.

7. Other important facts and comments, e.g. critical review.

The other aspects that were not included in the previous comments and are worth of mention include:- existence of evaluation report for the project, made by town mayor- significance of the project in respect of high concentration of inhabitants in the zone in relation to overall population of the town.

IV. SUPPLEMENT

There are more than 6 000 people living in Dědina block of flats. The whole revitalization 3 -phases -process took 4 years and the total cost of the project was 11 200 000 EUR. It is one of the first completely reconstructed block of flats as far as the public spaces in Prague are concerned.

Web site: www.faluhaz.eu/

