


· NAGY BUDAPEST ·



THE 1908 EXTENSION PLAN OF BUDAPEST SHOWING THE OLD SETTLEMENTS AROUND "SMALL" BUDAPEST WITH BLACK COLOR AND THE SUGGESTED EXTENSION AREA WITH THICK LINE. THE TERRITORIAL BOUNDARIES OF GREATER BUDAPEST CHANGED SEVERAL TIMES BEFORE THE 1950 EXECUTION.

ROZVOJOVÝ PLÁN BUDAPEŠTI Z ROKU 1908, ZOBRAZUJÚCI STARÉ USADLOSTI OKOLO "MALEJ" BUDAPEŠTI. HRANICE TERITÓRIA VEĽKEJ BUDAPEŠTI SA PRED JEJ SCHVÁLENÍM V ROKU 1950 NIEKOĽKO KRÁT MENILI.

Source Zdroj: HARRER, József and BÁRCZY, István. 1908. Tanulmány a szomszédos községeknek Budapesthez való kapcsolatáról. Budapest.

Re-Shaping Budapest: Large Housing Estates and their (Un)Planned Centers

Pretvoriť Budapešť: veľké sídliská a ich (ne)plánované centrá

Anna Kornélia Losonczy, Regina Balla,
Hlib Antypenko, Melinda Benkő

Budapešť, hlavné mesto Maďarska, má trinásť veľkých sídlisk plánovaných pre viac ako 20 000 obyvateľov. Všetky boli realizované v priebehu dvoch pätnásť rokov trvajúcich programov hromadného bývania medzi rokmi 1960 a 1990 a významne transformovali územie mesta vytvárajúc nové husto obývané štvrte. Svojou unifikovanou urbanistickou formou sa veľké sídliská stali dôležitými novými časťami metropolitného zlepenca a novým využitím mestského územia predstavujú významnú vrstvu mesta-palimpsestu. Tieto priestorové a časové kontexty odhaľujeme prostredníctvom komparatívnej štúdie zameriavajúcej sa na otázku centrality: na to, ako boli v dobe výstavby sídlisk ich centrá plánované či neplánované a ako sú plánované či neplánované dnes. Aký vzťah panuje medzi starými, modernými a súčasnými plánovanými centrami? Ako sa mení rola a pozícia týchto centier v celkovom systéme budapešťianskych centier? Ako mesto ovplyvňovali či v súčasnosti ovplyvňujú veľké sídliská a ich centrá? Veľké sídliská sú „mestami“ vnútri Budapešti, pričom normálne mesto by malo mať jedno alebo viacero centier. Rovnako je dôležitým aspektom to, ako definujeme centrum a čo predstavuje v rámci každodennej funkčnosti, ako aj fyzického vzhľadu.

Výskum vychádza z prehľadu medzinárodnej a maďarskej literatúry venovanej teórii veľkých sídlisk a mestského centra, ktorú dopĺňa súbor historických a súčasných údajov (zámery a plánovacie dokumenty, publikácie, terénne prieskumy) súvisiacich s predchádzajúcimi plánmi z 50., 60. a 70. rokov a s aktuálnym plánom z roku 2013, ako aj s realitou budapešťianskych sídlisk. Príspevok sumarizuje naše zistenia a vizualizuje meniaci sa systém centier, a to v dvoch rovinách: z perspektívy celkovej mierky Budapešti a následne mierky samotných trinástich sídlisk.

Centrálnosť sa v priebehu času zvykne meniť pomaly. Veľké sídliská realizované v priebehu niekoľkých rokov ako nové „mestá“ rovnako potrebovali nové centrá. Tridsať rokov po konci obdobia socialistického hromadného bývania sa tieto moderné centrá, plánované aj neplánované, realizované či nerealizované,

stali integrálnou súčasťou histórie mesta a veľkou výzvou pre súčasný mestský rozvoj. Podľa aktuálnych mestotvorných hodnôt zdedených sídlisk a tohto výskumu zameraného na ich typy centier môžeme určiť dva hlavné faktory zohrávajúce významnú úlohu pri utváraní ich statusu a potenciálu rozvoja. Prvý faktor súvisí s časom a napriek 40 rokov trvajúcemu politickému a ekonomickému zlomu v histórii počas demolačných a obmenných procesov, ktoré zmenili mestskú štruktúru, veľké sídliská s polycentrickým modelom zostali a aj naďalej zostanú v Budapešti v centrálnej pozícii. Sú administratívnymi centrami budapešťianskych mestských obvodov, kde stoja tradičné historické budovy povedľa moderných historických a súčasných budov a verejných priestorov. Druhý faktor súvisí s lokalitou a s výhodným situovaním v rámci mestského zlepenca. Veľké sídliská s dobrou pozíciou neďaleko budapešťianskeho mestského centra a s dobrým dopravným prepojením, dobrými „susedmi“ sa tak môžu stať lokalitami súčasného rozvoja. Ich takzvané dynamické nové centrá v skutočnosti neprihliadajú na pôvodné centrá konkrétnych sídlisk či históriu lokality, fungujú však ako styčné body umožňujúce komunikáciu medzi jednotlivými časťami mesta. V tomto prípade sú moderné sídliská len jedným, no vďaka svojej hustote kľúčovým komponentom pre potenciál rozvoja centra. Ďalšie príklady extrovertných sídlisk s existujúcimi či plánovanými centrami v ich okrajových častiach alebo s centrami nachádzajúcimi sa na významných dopravných tepnách Budapešti, majú skutočne dobrú pozíciu. No izolované, introvertné sídliská s malými dennými centrami uprostred sú pre verejný i súkromný rozvoj nezaujímavé.

Záver výskumu na jednej strane zdôrazňuje dôležitosť individuálneho prístupu k jednotlivým sídliskám v rámci mestského rozvoja, procesov obnovy či tvorby politík vzhľadom na to, že každá životnosť je rozdielna. A na druhej strane zdôrazňuje potrebu dobre koordinovaného mestského rozvoja v aglomerácii Budapešti založeného na danom fyzickom a sociálnom kontexte reflektujú, že mesto funguje ako živý organizmus.

Introduction

Budapest, the Hungarian capital, contains thirteen large housing estates planned for more than 20 000 inhabitants each. All of them were realized during the two 15-year mass housing programs between 1960 and 1990, and obviously transformed the territory of the city, creating new high-density neighborhoods. Through their unified urban form, large housing estates became significant new parts of the patchwork metropolis,¹ and in their re-use of the urban land, they exist as a powerful layer of the palimpsest city.² To discover these contexts of space and time, the present

BUDAPEST'S LARGE HOUSING ESTATES BUDAPEŠTIANSKE VEĽKÉ SÍDLISKÁ			BEFORE 1960 PRED 1960		1960 – 1969		1970 – 1979		1980 – 1990		1990 ONWARDS 1990 ĎALEJ	
name názov	spatial position umiest- nenie v priestore	construc- tion výstavba	housing: inherited bývanie: zdedené	center transport centrum doprava	housing: no. new flats bývanie: počet nových bytov	center transport centrum doprava	housing: no. new flats bývanie: počet nových bytov	center transport centrum doprava	housing: no. new flats bývanie: počet nových bytov	center transport centrum doprava	housing: total no. in estate bývanie: celkový počet bytov	center transport centrum doprava

C1 Budapest's subcenters in 2013

Budapeštianske subcentrá v roku 2013

Füredi út	small Budapest malá Budapešť	1964 – 82	old starý	village C H8-PM2	527	D/P H8-PM2	10940	R H8-RM2	666	R H8-M2	12276	C1 H8-M2
Kelenföld	small Budapest malá Budapešť	1966 – 83	-	- T	6517	P T-PM4	2437	P T-PM4	343	R T-PM4	9494	C1 T-M4
Óbuda Center	small Budapest malá Budapešť	1968 – 75	old & socialist starý a so- cialistický	town C H5	1175	D/P H5	11684	R H5	670	R H5	15999	C1 H5

C2 Budapest's local centers in higher level in 2013

Budapeštianske lokálne centrá vyššieho významu v roku 2013

Csepel Center	outskirt pred- mestie	1968 – 88	old & socialist starý a so- cialistický	town C H7	1166	D/P H7	3092	P H7	6310	R H7	10960	C2 H7
Pesterzsé- bet Center	outskirt pred- mestie	1976 – 83	old & socialist starý a so- cialistický	town C T-H6	1249	D/P T-H6	3663	P T-H6	2908	R T-H6	7971	C2 T-H6
Rákoske- resztúr	outskirt pred- mestie	1971 – 89	old & socialist starý a so- cialistický	village C T	-	D/P T	924	R T	6710	R T	7657	C2 T
Újpest Center	outskirt pred- mestie	1969 – 88	old & socialist starý a so- cialistický	town C T	1091	D/P T-PM3	8355	R T-PM3	7471	R T-RM3	17528	C2 T-M3

C3 Budapest's local centers in lower level in 2013

Budapeštianske lokálne centrá nižšieho významu v roku 2013

Békás- megyer	outskirt Danube pred- mestie Dunaj	1971 – 83	-	- H5	-	- H5	7694	P H5	10279	R H5	17973	C3 H5
Havanna	outskirt pred- mestie	1976 – 85	slum	slum	-	- -	2868	P -	3354	- -	6231	C3 -
Kispest Center	outskirt pred- mestie	1977 – 86	old starý	town C -	-	P PM3	3228	D/P PM3	8239	R RM3	11467	C3 M3
Újpalota	outskirt pred- mestie	1968 – 85	-	- -	173	P PM4	15563	P PM4	150	P PM4	15886	C3 -

without any central role in Budapest in 2013

bez centrálneho významu v roku 2013

József Attila	small Budapest malá Budapešť	1955 – 81	slum	- -	6826	P PM3	1087	R RM3	242	R M3	8440	- M3
Kőbánya- Újhegy	small Budapest malá Budapešť	1974 – 78	-	- -	-	- -	6352	P -	616	R -	6968	- -

BUDAPEST'S LARGE HOUSING ESTATES: PERIODIZATION, NUMBER OF HOUSING UNITS BUILT, PLANNED AND REALIZED CENTRAL FUNCTIONS. THE ORDER OF THE HOUSING ESTATES FOLLOWS THE ACTUAL RANKING RELATED TO THE ROLE IN BUDAPEST'S CENTER SYSTEM DEFINED BY THE LATEST BUDAPEST DEVELOPMENT CONCEPT IN 2013.

BUDAPEŠTIANSKE VEĽKÉ ŠÍDLISKÁ: PERIODIZÁCIA, POČET BYTOVÝCH JEDNOTIEK, PLÁNOVANÉ A REALIZOVANÉ FUNKCIE CENTRA. PORADIE ŠÍDLISK ZODPOVEDÁ AKTUÁLNEMU HODNOTENIU PODĽA ICH ÚLOHY V RÁMCI SYSTÉMU BUDAPEŠTIANSKEHO CENTRA DEFINOVANÉHO POSLEDNÝM ZÁMEROM ROZVOJA BUDAPEŠTI Z ROKU 2013.

comparative study focuses on the question of their centrality: how their centers were planned or unplanned at the time of the period of mass housing construction, and how their centers are planned or unplanned today. What is the relationship among the old (if was a historic in the neighborhood), the modern (realized for the housing estate) and the contemporary planned centers? How have these centers changed their role and position in the system of Budapest's centers? How have large housing estates and their centers shaped and continue to shape the city? The research tries to propose a classification for center types that could be used for a better understanding of current spatial, functional and development challenges related to modern large housing estates.

Case Study Section and Comparison Method


In international comparison, Hungary is a country of "small" housing estates.³ However, we lack an exact definition of the large housing estate, so as fundamentals we used two different approaches. On one hand, during the state-socialist era,⁴ Soviet mass housing concept calculated 3.5 persons per apartment as the normative density⁵ and officially more than 20 000 residents formed an institutional neighborhood.⁶ On the other hand, by the United Nations Statistic Divisions⁷ a population of 20 000 today corresponds to a small or medium-sized city. Considering these facts and using existing housing data about the number of constructed dwelling units,⁸ we worked with a definition of the large housing estate as an urban development and planning unit – realized in one or more phases – with more than 6 000 flats. As consequence, in Budapest we have thirteen large housing estates that function as institutional neighborhoods, all of which were realized during the socialist mass housing programs between 1960 and 1990.

In consequence, we can recognize that these modern high-density large housing estates form "cities" within the city of Budapest, and that a normal city should have one or more centers. At the same time, it is an important question how we determine the center, what it means in terms of everyday functionality as well as physical appearance. The research is based on a review of international and Hungarian literature on the theory of the large housing estate and city center, previous historic and contemporary data collection (policy and planning documents, publications, fieldwork) related to the previous findings in 1950, 1960, 1970⁹ and actual planning in 2013¹⁰, and the reality of these estates in Budapest.

A summary of the relevant collected data is presented in a table and on a map of Budapest helping in the understanding of the changing dimension and role of these areas. The spatial position reflects the location of the large housing estates. In this category, we can differentiate two cases: five estates realized on land lying outside the former 'small Budapest' (in fact known as the transitional zone of Greater Budapest), the other eight in the outskirts of Greater Budapest that formed a part of the agglomeration before 1950. The construction period indicates the initial year of the planning phase of the housing estate and the year of the realization of its last residential building. In this research, the periodization addresses the site before (till 1960) and after (1990 onwards), and the division of the two 15-year periods of mass housing programs between 1960 and 1990 follows the existing housing data stated in decades.

In addition to population changes and the intensification of the built density through the construction of mostly prefabricated residential buildings and basic facilities (nurseries, primary schools, health centers, small shops), the other important aspect of this research is the change of the more complex central functions: public multimodal transport hub, administrative, cultural, educational (secondary school, higher education), social, large scale shopping facilities, etc. For this reason, the table shows center/transport columns with the following signs: "D" = demolition, means that the previous built environment was partly or totally demolished, "P" = planned or "R" = realized, reflecting the decade when center functions or new high-speed transport connection, stations (T = train, H = HÉV¹¹ and M = metro, and the number of the line, for example H5 or M2) were opened.

The paper summarizes our findings and provides a visualization of the changing system of centers on two levels: first on the scale of Budapest as a whole, then on the scale of the individual thirteen housing estates. The objectives are to analyze how the realization of large housing estates, these new cities within the city, modified the former position of their land and how the existence of a large housing estate could affect the actual urban development concepts. Last, based on the research we attempted to create a classification for housing estates vs a center system.



RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE LOCATION OF LARGE HOUSING ESTATES AND BUDAPEST CENTERS DEFINED BY THE URBAN DEVELOPMENT PLAN IN 2013

VZŤAH MEDZI LOKALITOU VEĽKÉHO SÍDLISKA A CENTROM BUDAPEŠTI DEFINOVANÝ MESTSKÝM PLÁNOM ROZVOJA Z ROKU 2013

Authors Autori: A. K. Losonczy, R. Balla, H. Antypenko and M. Benkő

The Greater Budapest Plan and its Realization in 1950

The idea of the Greater Budapest Plan (GBP)¹² emerged at the beginning of the 20th century, hoping to shape the future Hungarian capital city for 6 million people of a prospering Central European country. But after WWI and the loss of much territory after the Trianon Treaty, Budapest remained "small", confined to the form realized in 1873, and workers and immigrants moved to the settlements surrounding the capital. In this way, the population of the agglomeration grew rapidly during the interwar period. Most of the land of the suburbia developed without control, in which areas of housing, industry, infrastructure, agriculture changed the urban landscape dramatically. In 1946, the *Fővárosi Közmunkák Tanácsa*,¹³ the Communal Planning Office of Budapest (1870 – 1948) created a new unified concept to develop the agglomeration for a population of 3.2 million, in which the high-density Budapest city center would be surrounded by a green belt, and the sparsely built-up outskirts function in terms of separate local centers of low-density residential areas.¹⁴

The plans of the territorial boundaries of Greater Budapest were modified several times following changing political forces, and finally "Greater Budapest", the actual city, was established in 1950. Twenty-three former settlements, mainly on the Pest side, were annexed to "Small Budapest". At the time, seven of them were important towns with developed centers (Budafok, Csepel, Kispest, Pesterzsébet, Pestszentlőrinc, Rákospalota, and Újpest) while the other sixteen were simple villages. Traditionally these settlements had a strong blue-collar worker identity that was enhanced still further under state socialism, alongside their development through creating modern and ideologically appreciated urban values.¹⁵

Development of Budapest's Large Housing Estates

The solution to the post-war housing shortage was the standardization, industrialization, and prefabrication of apartment buildings, as well as the construction of large housing estates as

**HISTORIC CITY CENTER,
SZENTLÉLEK TÉR IN ÓBUDA
SURROUNDED BY THE ÓBUDA
CENTER LARGE HOUSING ESTATE,
1970**

HISTORICKÉ CENTRUM, SZENTLÉLEK
TÉR V ÓBUDE UPROSTRED CENTRA
SÍDLISKA ÓBUDA, 1970

Source Zdroj: zoldkalauz.hu



**THE FIRST RESIDENTS ARRIVED
IN KELENFÖLD IN 1967 AND THE
CENTER OF HOUSING ESTATE WAS
OPENED IN 1980, CONTAINING
A LIBRARY, CINEMA, SHOPS, AND
OFFICES**

PRVÝ OBYVATELIA PRIŠLI DO
KELENFÖLDU V 1967 A CENTRUM
SÍDLISKA S KNIŽNICOU, KINOM,
OBCHODMI A KANCELÁRIAMI BOLO
OTVORENÉ V ROKU 1980

Photo Foto: Melinda Benkő, 2018

**THE MAIN SQUARE OF THE
ÚJPALOTA HOUSING ESTATE
WHERE THE REAL CENTER WAS
NEVER REALIZED, 1974**

HLAVNÉ NÁMESTIE SÍDLISKA
ÚJPALOTA, KDE SKUTOČNÉ
CENTRUM NEBOLO NIKDY
REALIZOVANÉ, 1974

Source Zdroj: fortetpan.hu, János Gergely



nationwide policy. Nevertheless, Communist politicians also promised apartments for every family as part of creating a socially just society, and most of the urban planners and construction designers were similarly enthusiastic about utilizing international housing policy, architecture, and planning theory. Generally, under the influence of modernist dogmas, no attention was paid in the renewal process to the earlier physical and social characteristics of the site of new housing developments.¹⁶

Consequently, during the development of Greater Budapest, the first housing estates were planned for areas of the territory of the former Small Budapest that were well-connected but unused or not urbanized; later, the sites were cleared through demolition of well-located central areas or were situated on greenfield areas of the outskirts. In 1950, the year of the creation of Greater Budapest, the first national housing scheme planned to build 75,000 dwelling units by 1960, but the focus was on the development of entirely new Communist industrially-focused cities and not on the capital.¹⁷ In Budapest, the planning and realization of large housing estates started in 1960, through the new General Development Plan (GDP 1960)¹⁸ and the first fifteen-year housing policy (1960 – 1975) reflecting the Soviet-type centrally planned economy. In this first mass housing development period, new housing developments formed a belt around the historic city center of Budapest, in its transitional zone: Kelenföld, József Attila, Óbuda Center, and some smaller estates. This led to the demolition of large areas of former outlying towns and their transformation into additional housing estates: Újpest Center, Pesterzsébet Center and Csepel Center. The use of the word “center” [*központ*] in the names of these planned housing estates reflects their traditional center position.

The professional directives determined a hierarchic structure of the city in which every estate with more than 15 – 20,000 inhabitants had to include urban center elements such as: secondary educational institutions, major shopping malls, sports and cultural facilities.¹⁹ In some cases (for example in Óbuda Center, Csepel Center and Újpest Center), the center of the original town settlement along with a few public buildings was preserved, but in general, the focus was on constructing housing and basic residential facilities. As for the planned complex centers, these were realized later – if at all.

During the preparation period of the second fifteen-year housing policy (1976 – 1990), new professional initiatives appeared: planners and architects strove to find urban and architectural design solutions to realize more flexible plans on the consecutive levels of the neighborhood, building and apartment. The General Development Plan accepted in 1970 (GDP 1970) further increased the number of large-scale residential developments. Time and budget restrictions became more important factors. At the same time, the well-located central areas were developed during the first fifteen-year housing policy, thanks to which most of the new housing estates arose in the outskirts of the capital city. According to the mass housing concept at that time, the calculated normative density was 3.5 persons per apartment. Finally, during the 30-year long mass housing period of state socialism between 1960 and 1990, thirteen large housing estates were constructed with at least 6 000 dwellings in Budapest. As should be evident, these urban interventions dramatically changed not only the structure but also the everyday life-patterns of the city.²⁰

These large housing estates could be classified by their relationship to their former land use. Five large housing estates were realized within the border of small Budapest, inside its former exterior (so-called transitional) zone: the sites of the Óbuda Center and Fűredi úti (Rákosszalva) estates were originally historic neighborhoods, József Attila was one of the biggest residential slums of the growing capital, but Kelenföld and Kőbánya-Újhegy were largely unurbanized areas at the beginning of the 1960s. After the realization of Greater Budapest in 1950, five former centers of towns or villages, namely Csepel Center, Kispest Center, Pesterzsébet Center (Pestszenterzsébet), Rákoskeresztúr, and Újpest Center – after drastic demolition of their physical and social environments – became the site of new large housing estates. Only three new estates out of the thirteen were created by slum clearance (e.a. Havanna) or on the greenfield land of the outskirt of Budapest (Békásmegyér, Újpalota).

The System of Budapest's Centers

After the realization of Greater Budapest, the development concept changed its direction. The new aim was to dissolve the distinction between the city historic core and the annexed outskirts

by applying modern development to the traditional “workers’ districts” and linking them to the center by densification and transport infrastructure – not only using the metro and suburban railway (HÉV) but also cars and buses – along the extant radial roads. The first Urban Development Program of the new Communist Budapest was submitted in 1952 (UDP 1952) and designated five sub-centers in the outskirts: Óbuda, Újpest, Zugló, Kőbánya, and Csepel.²¹ But due to financial constraints, the GDP of 1960 limited the new large housing estate development areas to empty plots around the historic city center. So, despite the 1952 Program, the housing development plan did not make any concept for decentralization: as in the pre-war era, the idea was based on the steady decrease of density. Planners then began to assume a Greater Budapest population of 2.3 million people²² and this number remained until the change of the political and economic regime in 1989.²³




However, the development of the former workers’ settlements became an increasingly pressing issue because their poor human infrastructure (= health, education, nutrition and other services) and rural outlook caused political tension. The idea of forming sub-centers and local centers appeared again in the General Development Plan of 1970²⁴ envisioning a radial development for the city by integrating the arbitrarily imposed greenfield prefabricated mass-housing estate developments.²⁵ The GDP 1970 elaborated a two-tier hierarchy: besides the historic core, it designated six sub-centers²⁶ and sixteen local centers^{27, 28}. We can see that the GDP of 1970 applied a different method than the UDP 1952: sub-centers and local centers were positioned along existing or planned railway, HÉV and metro lines and were defined as transport hubs rather than community centers. Large greenfield housing estates -like Újpalota and Káposztásmegyer - that are located far from existing centers appear on this map as local centers, being connected to the city core by planned new metro lines. This shows the aim of forming substantive local centers with new upper-level community facilities.

In the last years of state socialism, professionals often criticized the lack of complexity in the two General Development Plans. They noticed the priority of arbitrary housing project constructions that resulted in developments consigned to peripheral status.²⁹ Due to financial restrictions and the lack of subsidiarity, the community and cultural facilities of the housing estates were built with long years of delay, and the architectural quality was often far from expectations. It is interesting to note that among several hundred winners of the Ybl Prize (the most important Hungarian award in architecture since 1954) architectural projects for public buildings realized in a new housing estate in Budapest are severely underrepresented.³⁰ Evidently, the missing central functions of these new neighborhoods indicated a sizeable political discrepancy between the municipality of Budapest and the state.³¹

Budapest Development Concepts after 1990





In the centralized socialist era, Budapest did not have its own urban development concept. The State Planning Office³² made central decisions and shared financial sources. After the change of regime, the first General Development Plan was submitted in 1994, which aimed to define the new strategic goals for the capital city. The GDP of 1994³³ defined the new zoning system of Budapest, identifying five major areas with different urban characteristics and development goals. The inner zone, the historic city center of Budapest, was not targeted with large housing estates, while the transitional zone, i.e. the historic exterior belt of small Budapest, contains six of the thirteen large mass housing estates inherited from the state socialist era: Óbuda Center, Füredi úti, Kőbánya-Újhegy, József Attila, Pesterzsébet Center and Kelenföld. The so-called suburban zone, or more precisely the outskirts of Greater Budapest, is almost equivalent to the 1950 extension area where seven large mass housing estates are located: Békásmegyer, Újpest Center, Újpalota, Rákoskeresztúr, Havanna, Kispest Center (a smaller part of which belongs to the transitional zone) and Csepel Center. A few housing estates are also marginally connected to the Danube zone: Békásmegyer, Óbuda Center and Pesterzsébet Center. The hilly zone, which comprises residential areas and significant nature conservation reserves, contains no large housing estates whatsoever.

The GDP of 1994 was replaced by the new Urban Development Concept (UDC) in 2003 which was modified in 2013. The five zones established in 1994 remain, but the planned centrality system of Budapest has changed significantly. In the UDC of 2003, the city center was surrounded by six sub-centers. The ones termed “centers with intermodal significance” lay in the transitional zone between the historic core and the outskirts or the hilly zone. In addition, local centers were mostly






POLYCENTRIC MODEL: ÓBUDA CENTER (C1), ÚJPEST CENTER (C2), CSEPEL CENTER (C2), PESTERZSÉBET CENTER (C2), KISPEST CENTER (C3)

POLYCENTRICKÝ MODEL: CENTRUM ÓBUDY (C1), CENTRUM ÚJPESTE (C2), CENTRUM CSEPELU (C2), CENTRUM PESTERZSÉBET (C2), CENTRUM KISPESTE (C3)




DYNAMIC MODEL: KELENFÖLD (C1) AND JÓZSEF ATTILA (C3)

DYNAMICKÝ MODEL: KELENFÖLD (C1) A JÓZSEF ATTILA (C3)



MONOCENTRIC MODEL: FÜREDI ÚTI (C1), BÉKÁSMEGYER (C3) AND ÚJPALOTA (C3)

MONOCENTRICKÝ MODEL: FÜREDI ÚTI (C1), BÉKÁSMEGYER (C3) A ÚJPALOTA (C3)



ABANDONED MODEL: RÁKOSKERESZTÚR (C2), KÖBÁNYA-ÚJHEGY AND HAVANNA (C3)

OPUSTENÝ MODEL: RÁKOSKERESZTÚR (C2), KÖBÁNYA-ÚJHEGY A HAVANNA (C3)

Authors Autori: A. K. Losonczy, R. Balla, H. Antypenko and M. Benkő

positioned in the outskirts and were considered as traditional neighborhood centers in the legislative documents.³⁴ The development goal of the local centers was to reduce the burden placed on the city core by creating higher-level facilities.

Since the UDC of 2013 was submitted, the city center has been surrounded by six hubs along the Grand Boulevard (Nagykörút), though shifted in their positions when compared to the GDP of 1994. According to the UDC 2013, existing and potential centers require strengthening through development of a network of sub-centers as easily accessible transport nodes which include both workplaces and dwellings. An important characteristic of these centers is mixed-use development that provides varied functionality. The Budapest transitional zone has nine potential sub-centers³⁵ that can play a major role in creating a polycentric city. In turn, sub-centers require a significant capacity of traffic connections; thus, they can have sectorial influence towards agglomeration, and most of them also function as intermodal hubs. From these nine subcenters, only three are within or on the border of a high-density large housing estate : Óbuda Center (Flórián tér), Kelenföld and Fűredi úti (Örs vezér tere).

The Plan applies a three-tier methodology: apart from sub-centers, the document distinguishes local centers by catchment area. “Local centers on a higher level” are defined as district centers or traditional community centers that have a major capacity of connectivity to the city. The functional criteria are those of local administration, secondary schools or higher education facilities, and the presence of higher-level services. They are positioned both next to the transitional zone and the outskirts, but in case of the large mass housing estates, the hubs in the outskirts³⁶ are important. The ones termed “local centers on lower level” are defined as neighborhood centers with only basic services that have no effect on the whole city. Four of the thirteen estates with more than 20 000 residents are in this category, and two others have no official center position.

Classification of the Center Types in Budapest’s Large Housing Estates

To compare the actual central position of Budapest’s thirteen large housing estates, and to classify them by actual spatial and functional characteristics, the research focuses on the representation on the housing estate level after consideration of the scale of the city as a whole. Using similar visualization methods, maps show the following components of the urban fabric: the area of the mass housing, the inherited buildings with central functions (city hall, culture center, secondary school, church, shopping mall, market, etc.) in black and new buildings realized after 1990 in white. Train, HÉV or Metro stations are marked (T, H, M), along with the main roads providing connectivity and the contemporary plan related to central position in Budapest: C1 – sub-center, C2 – local center in higher level, C3 local center in lower level.

We can differentiate four types:

The polycentric model

The five large housing estates representing this type were historic town centers before 1950 with strong local identity. Nevertheless, their administrative center functions were preserved to form one of the 23 district centers of Greater Budapest. They are well connected by HÉV or metro lines to Budapest’s urban core. Some of the historic public institutions were not demolished by housing estate developments in the 60s and 70s, so there is a planned symbiosis between old, modern, and contemporary centrality.

The dynamic model

The two housing estates that belong to this model are particularly well positioned, being situated close to Budapest’s city center with good metro connection. In their case, besides the good location, development of contemporary urban infrastructure has facilitated the reevaluation of the area to attract private investments as well. Their planned and partly realized new centers are situated on the edge of the large housing estate, previously not intensively used, but these neighborhoods are able to adapt to the changing situation and are future oriented.

The monocentric model

In the monocentric model, the inherited modern center, realized or partly realized, remains intact, and there is no strong exterior effect – as in the case of the dynamic model – to modify the position of the large housing estate. At Fűredi utca, this center of the housing estate is situated on the

edge, because that point is one of the most important intermodal centers of Budapest, with metro and HÉV stations. In the two other neighborhoods, the center is in the middle of the housing estate area, on the main road, though one, Újpalota,³⁷ has only a planned metro connection since the 60s.

The abandoned model

In the abandoned model, the main problem of the three large housing estates in Budapest is their poor connectivity, because the planned infrastructure developments were never realized, and higher-level facilities were never built. In addition, these estates lack strong local historic grounding. Thus, these parts of the city function today as isolated islands that struggle with identity crisis searching character.

Conclusion

Normally, urban centrality changes slowly over time, providing one of the fixed points of a multilayered palimpsest city. As a result, large housing estates realized in a short few years as new “cities” at least for 20,000 inhabitants needed new centers as well. Thirty years after the end of the socialist mass housing period, these planned or unplanned, realized or unrealized modern centers became integrative parts of the urban history, yet also an important challenge for contemporary urban development. Matching the current urban values of inherited mass housing neighborhoods with theoretical research related to their center types, we can highlight two main components that provide an important role in their status and development potential.

The first one is related to time: in spite of the 40-year long political and economic rupture in the history during demolition and replacement process changing the urban fabric, large housing estates with a polycentric model have remained and will remain in a central position in Budapest. They are the administrative centers of a Budapest district, where traditional historic buildings coexist alongside modern historic and contemporary buildings and public space. The second one is related to space, in other words their good location within the patchwork metropolis. Consequently, large housing estates in a good position, not at a distance from Budapest’s city center and with good connectivity to it³⁸ along with good “neighbors”, could become sites for contemporary developments. The so-called dynamic new centers are not particularly connected to the former centrality of mass housing or the history of the site, but they function as shared points to facilitate the communication among parts of the city. In this case, the modern mass housing estate is just one component, if through its density a key one, of the center’s development potential. In other cases, outward-looking housing estates with their inherited or planned centers on the edge, or with their center on a Budapest’s scale transit road are in a quite good position. But isolated, inward-turned housing estates with their small everyday center in the middle have been abandoned by contemporary public and private developments.

The research findings on one hand highlight the importance of the individual approach to every large housing estate³⁹ in urban development, renewal process, policy making, etc., revealing that every lifespan is different. On the other hand, they highlight the necessity of the well-coordinated urban development on the scale of the Budapest agglomeration, based on the inherited physical and social context that allows the city to function as a living organism.

ANNA KORNÉLIA LOSONCZY
REGINA BALLA
HLIB ANTYPENKO
DR. MELINDA BENKŐ PHD.

DEPARTMENT OF URBAN DESIGN
AND PLANNING, FACULTY OF
ARCHITECTURE, BUDAPEST
UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY AND
ECONOMICS

Műgyetem rakpart. 3
1111 Budapest
Hungary

losonczynelli@gmail.com
benko@urb.bme.hu

- 1 FLORIDA, Richard and ADLER, Patrick. 2018. The patchwork metropolis: The morphology of the divided postindustrial city. *Journal of Urban Affairs*. **40**(5), p. 609 – 624, Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/07352166.2017.1360743>
- 2 KROESSLER, Jeffrey A. 2015. *The City as Palimpsest*. CUNY Academic Works. [Accessed 30 March 2020]. Available at: http://academicworks.cuny.edu/jj_pubs/42
- 3 KOVÁCS, Zoltán, EGEDY, Tamás and SZABÓ, Balázs. 2018. Persistence or change: divergent trajectories of large housing estates in Budapest, Hungary. In: Hess, D. B., Tammara, T. and Ham, M. van (eds.). *Housing estates in Europe: Poverty, ethnic segregation and policy challenges*. Cham: Springer, pp. 191 – 214.
- 4 BENKŐ, Melinda and KISSFAZE-KAS, Kornélia. 2019. *Understanding Post-Socialist European Cities*. Budapest: L'Harmattan.
- 5 Városépítési Tudományos és Tervező Intézet, Településtudományi Iroda. 1974. *Irányelvek Lakóterületek Tervezéséhez, Tervezet*. (ed.) Hörcher Ferencné, Alfréd Mechtl and István Kislegi Nagy. Budapest.
- 6 YUNMI, Park, and ROGERS, George O. 2015. Neighborhood Planning Theory, Guidelines, and Research: Can Area, Population, and Boundary Guide Conceptual Framing? *Journal of Planning Literature*. **30**(1), pp. 18 – 36. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0885412214549422>.
- 7 Unstats.un.org. *Population density and urbanization*. [online] 2017 [accessed 27 Apr. 2020]. Available at: <https://unstats.un.org/unsd/demographic/sconcerns/densurb/densurbmethods.htm>
- 8 PREISICH, Gábor. 1998. *Budapest Városerépítésének Története 1945 – 1990*. Budapest: Műszaki Könyvkiadó, pp. 107 – 111.
- 9 General Development Plans of Budapest (GDP) in 1950, 1960 and 1970.
- 10 Municipality of Budapest. 2013. *Budapest 2030 Long-Term Urban Development Concept adopted by the General Assembly under Decision Number 767/2013 of 24 April 2013*.
- 11 HÉV = “Budapest Railway of Local Interest” is the suburban train system that connects the agglomeration to Budapest since 1887.
- 12 HARRER, József and BÁRCZY, István. 1908. *Tanulmány a szomszédos községeknek Budapesthez való kapcsolatáról*. Budapest.
- 13 SIPOS, András. 2009. Nagy-Budapest Létrehozásától Nagy-Budapest Revíziójáig (1949 – 1956). *Múltunk*, **2009**(3), pp. 4 – 31.
- 14 SIKLÓSSY, László. 1931. *Hogyan épült Budapest? 1870 – 1930*. Budapest: Fővárosi Közmunkák Tanácsa.
- 15 KOCSIS, János Balázs. 2008. *Városfejlesztés és Városfejlesztés Budapestén 1930 – 1985*. Budapest: Gondolat Kiadó, p. 100.
- 16 ANDRÁŠIOVÁ, Katarína, DULLA, Matúš, HABERLANDOVÁ, Katarína, MORAVČÍKOVÁ, Henrieta, PASTOREKOVÁ Laura, and SZALAY, Peter. 2015. Unplanned city: modern urban conceptions in a traditional urban structure. *Architektúra & urbanizmus*. **49**(3 – 4), pp. 217 – 239.
- 17 PREISICH, Gábor. 1998. *Budapest Városerépítésének Története 1945 – 1990*. Budapest: Műszaki Könyvkiadó, p. 72.
- 18 BUVÁTI. 1960. *Budapest és Környéke Általános Rendezési Terve*. Budapest.
- 19 KÖRNER, Zsuzsa and NAGY, Márta. 2006. *Az Európai És a Magyar Telepszerű Lakásépítés Története 1945-től Napjainkig*. Budapest: Terc Kiadó, p. 60.
- 20 BENKŐ, Melinda. 2016. Budapest's Large Prefab Housing Estates: Urban Values of Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow. *Journal of Hungarian Studies*. **29**(1 – 2), pp. 21 – 36.
- 21 SIPOS, András. 2009. Nagy-Budapest létrehozásától Nagy-Budapest revíziójáig (1949 – 1956). *Múltunk*. **2009**(3), pp. 4 – 31, p. 19.
- 22 PERÉNYI, Imre. 1961. Budapest és Környéke Általános Városrendezési Terve a nagyvárosok fejlesztési problémáinak tükrében. *Településtudományi Közlemények*. **13**(5), pp. 3 – 16.
- 23 Greater Budapest has a land area of 525 km² and its population in 2020 is app. 1.77M. Available at: <https://worldpopulationreview.com/world-cities/budapest-population/>
- 24 BUVÁTI. 1970. Budapest és Környéke Általános Rendezési Terve. Budapest.
- 25 KONDOR, Attila Csaba and SZABÓ, Balázs. 2007. A lakáspolitikai hatása Budapest városrészkeletére az 1960 – as és az 1970-es években. *Földrajzi Értesítő*. **56**(3 – 4), pp. 237 – 69.
- 26 Moszkva tér (today: Széll Kálmán tér), Óbuda, Rákospalota-Újpest train station, Örs vezér tere, Kispest and Móróc Zsigmond körtér.
- 27 Hűvösvölgy, Aquincum station, Árpád híd, Rákospalota Kertváros station, Káposztásmegyer, Újpalota, Bosnyák tér, Sasshalom, Cinkota, Rákospalota, Kőbánya, Budapest Airport, Pestimre, Pesterzsébet, Csepel and Budafok.
- 28 A budapesti agglomeráció központrendszer (1971) In: PREISICH, Gábor. 1998. *Budapest Városerépítésének Története 1945 – 1990*. Budapest: Műszaki Könyvkiadó.
- 29 FÜLE, Lajos. 1979. A II. 15 Éves Lakásépítési Terv Városerépítészeti Előkészítése. *Településrendezés*. **1979**(2), pp. 14 – 18.
- 30 The Ybl Prize is the most important Hungarian award in architecture since 1953. In: Kovács, I. (ed.) 1995. *Évek, művel, alkotók. Ybl Miklós-díjak és műveik 1953 – 1994*. Budapest: ÉTK.
- 31 KOCSIS, János Balázs. 2008. *Városfejlesztés és Városfejlesztés Budapestén 1930 – 1985*. Budapest: Gondolat Kiadó, p. 112.
- 32 In Hungarian: Országos Tervhivatal (OT).
- 33 BUVÁTI. 1994. Budapest Főváros Általános Rendezési Tervének programja. Budapest.
- 34 This claim is not entirely true, because new shopping centres like Pólus Center and Europark slightly distorted centrality. (Seen on the 1st annex [Functional Structure Plan] of Budapest Főváros, Településszerkezeti Terve, 2005.)
- 35 Flórián tér, Árpád híd metro station, Bosnyák tér, Örs vezér tere, Kőbánya-Kispest, Gubacs, Albertfalva, Kelenföld and MOM Park.
- 36 These are the following: Újpest-Városkapu, Újpest Center, Rákospalota, Erzsébetliget, Rákospalota, Pest-szentlőrinc-Pestszentimre, Soroksár, Pesterzsébet, Csepel and Budafok.
- 37 BENKŐ, Melinda, BALLA, Regina and HORY, Gergely. 2018. Participatory Place-making in the Renewal of Post-Communist Large Prefabricated Housing Estates: Újpalota Case Study, Budapest. *Journal of Place Management and Development*. **11**(3), pp. 223 – 241.
- 38 BENKŐ, Melinda, BALLA, Regina and DUROSAIYE, I. Oluremi. 2017. Mass Housing Estate Location In Relation To its Livability: Budapest Case Study. In: *Cities, Communities and Homes: Is the Urban Future Livable? AMPS Architecture MPS Conference 10*. Derby: University of Derby, pp. 192 – 200.
- 39 BENKŐ, Melinda. 2015. The Lifespan of Large Prefabricated Housing Estates in Post-Communist Cities: An International Comparison. *Architektúra & urbanizmus*. **49**(3 – 4), pp. 180 – 197.



ARCHITEKTÚRA & URBANIZMUS

ČASOPIS PRE TEÓRIU
ARCHITEKTÚRY A URBANIZMU

JOURNAL OF ARCHITECTURAL
AND TOWN-PLANNING THEORY

Ročník Volume LIV
Číslo Number 1 – 2 / 2020

REDAKČNÁ RADA EDITORIAL BOARD
prof. Dr. Ing. arch. HENRIETA MORAVČÍKOVÁ
predsedníčka chairwoman
Fakulta architektúry STU, Bratislava
Historický ústav SAV, Bratislava

prof. Mag. phil. Dr. phil. MATTHIAS BOECKL
Universität für angewandte Kunst Wien

doc. PhDr. DANA BOŘUTOVÁ, PhD.
Filozofická fakulta UK, Bratislava

prof. Ing. arch. MATÚŠ DULLA, DrSc.
Fakulta architektury ČVUT, Praha

doc. Ing. arch. PAVEL HALÍK, CSc.
Fakulta umění a architektury TUL, Liberec

doc. Dr. Ing. arch. SONJA IFKO
Fakulteta za arhitekturo Univerza v Ljubljani

doc. PhDr. PETR KRATOCHVÍL, CSc.
podpredseda deputy chairman
Ústav dějin umění AV ČR, Praha

prof. Ing. arch. KAREL MAIER, CSc.
Fakulta architektury ČVUT, Praha

prof. Ing. arch. ÁKOS MORAVÁNSZKY, PhD.
Institut für Geschichte und
Theorie der Architektur ETH, Zürich

Dr. PÁL RITOÓK
Magyar Építészeti Múzeum és Műemlékvédelmi
Dokumentációs Központ, Budapest

Mgr. PETER SZALAY, PhD.
hlavný redaktor managing editor
Historický ústav SAV, Bratislava

prof. Ing. arch. KARIN ŠERMAN, PhD.
Arhitektonski fakultet Sveučilište u Zagrebu

prof. Ing. arch. VLADIMÍR ŠLAPETA, DrSc.
Fakulta architektury, VUT, Brno

prof. Ing. arch. ROBERT ŠPAČEK, CSc.
Fakulta architektúry STU, Bratislava

prof. PhDr. ROSTISLAV ŠVÁCHA, PhD.
Ústav dějin umění AV ČR, Praha

M. arch. Ing. arch. MARIA TOPOLČANSKÁ, PhD.
Akademie výtvarných umění v Praze

prof. Ing. arch. PETR URLICH, CSc.
Stavební fakulta ČVUT, Praha

doc. Ing. arch. PETR VORLÍK, PhD.
Fakulta architektury ČVUT, Praha

ADRESA REDAKCIE EDITORIAL ADDRESS
ARCHITEKTÚRA & URBANIZMUS
Historický ústav SAV,
P. O. Box 198, Klemensova 19, 814 99 Bratislava, SK
IČO 166944
www.architektura-urbanizmus.sk
e-mail: architektura-urbanizmus@savba.sk

REGISTROVANÉ V INDEXED AND ABSTRACTED IN
Thomson Reuters Arts and Humanities Citation Index,
Current Contents – Arts & Humanities, SCOPUS,
RIBA journal index, CEOL, EBSCO

VYDÁVA PUBLISHED BY
© Historický ústav SAV, Bratislava, jún 2019
TLAČ PRINTED BY
VEDA, vydavateľstvo SAV
Centrum spoločných činností SAV, Bratislava

ROZŠIRUJE DISTRIBUTED BY
o.z. reflektor
Šancová 17, 811 05 Bratislava
Mediaprint-Kapa Pressegrasso, a.s.
Stará Vajnorská 9, 831 04 Bratislava

VYCHÁDZA POLROČNE PUBLISHED SEMIANNUALLY
EV 3179/09, ISSN 0044 8680

REDAKCIA EDITOR
Dagmar Slámová

JAZYKOVÁ REDAKCIA EDITING
Katarína Jostičová

PREKLADY TRANSLATIONS
Martin Tharp (ENG), Eliška Mazalanová (SK),
Pavlna Zelničková, Martina Mojzesová (CZ),

GRAFICKÁ ÚPRAVA LAYOUT
Juraj Blaško

OBÁLKA COVER
Juraj Blaško

ROČNÉ PREDPLATNÉ
SUBSCRIPTION RATE
18 € + **poštovné** postage 13,80 € / EU,
25 € / **mimo EU** outside EU
Objednávky SR a ČR
subscription SR and ČR
www.ipredplatne.sk,
ostatné krajiny other countries
www.architektura-urbanizmus.sk

CENA JEDNÉHO VÝTLAČKU
SINGLE ISSUE PRICE
9 €
Objednávky SR a ČR
subscription SR and ČR
www.ipredplatne.sk
ostatné krajiny other countries
www.architektura-urbanizmus.sk

ARCHITEKTÚRA & URBANIZMUS

Časopis Architektúra & urbanizmus uverejňuje štúdie z oblasti teórie architektúry a urbanizmu. Zameriava sa na súčasný stav, históriu, filozofiu a kultúru architektúry a urbanizmu, na otázky ich umeleckého charakteru a na teóriu ich technickej stránky. Zaoberá sa vzťahom architektúry a urbanizmu k umeniu, technike a k životnému prostrediu. Publikuje výsledky sociológie a psychológie architektúry a urbanizmu, sociálnej ekológie, výsledky výskumov z oblasti techniky prostredia a z iných disciplín, ktoré prispievajú k rozvoju teoretického poznania v architektúre a urbanizme. Zaoberá sa ďalej metódami hodnotenia a kritiky architektonickej a urbanistickej tvorby a hodnotením význačných architektov, architektonických diel a období. Publikuje príspevky o výučbe architektúry a urbanizmu, recenzie odborných kníh, ako aj informácie a správy o dôležitých vedeckých podujatiach. Časopis Architektúra a urbanizmus vydáva Historický ústav Slovenskej akadémie vied v spolupráci s Ústavom dejín umenia Akadémie vied Českej republiky.

ARCHITEKTÚRA & URBANIZMUS

The journal Architektúra & urbanizmus provides a forum for the publication of papers on theory of architecture and town-planning. The attention is mostly concentrated on the recent state, history, philosophy and culture of architecture and town-planning, as well as on the problems of their art nature and on the theory of their technical aspects. The published papers deal with the relation of architecture and town-planning to art, technology and environment. They also present research results of architecture and town-planning sociology and psychology, social ecology, environment technology and of other theoretical disciplines which contribute to the development of the theoretical knowledge in architecture and town-planning. The papers further deal with methods of appreciation and criticism of architectural and town-planning activities, as with appreciation of outstanding architects, architectonic works and periods. Papers on architecture and town-planning education, book reviews and information on scientific meetings are involved. The quarterly is published by the Institute of History of the Slovak Academy of Sciences in cooperation with the Art History Institute of the Academy of Sciences of Czech Republic.

Obsah Content

EDITORIAL EDITORIÁL

2 Henrieta Moravčíková, Peter Szalay
(UN)PLANNED CITY
(NE)PLÁNOVANÉ MESTO

VEDECKÉ ŠTÚDIE SCIENTIFIC STUDIES

6 Lýdia Grešáková, Zuzana Tabačková, Zuzana Révészová
MAPPING WITH CARE AS AN OUTLINE FOR POST-NEOLIBERAL ARCHITECTURE METHODOLOGIES – TOOLS OF THE “NEVER-NEVER SCHOOL”
MAPOVANIE SO STAROSTLIVOSŤOU AKO PODKLAD PRE POST NEOLIBERÁLNE ARCHITEKTONICKÉ METODOLÓGIE – NÁSTROJE „NEVER-NEVER SCHOOL”

20 Peter J. Larkham
BRITISH URBAN RECONSTRUCTION AFTER THE SECOND WORLD WAR: THE RISE OF PLANNING AND THE ISSUE OF “NON-PLANNING”
BRITSKÁ OBNOVA MIEST PO DRUHEJ SVETOVEJ VOJNE: VZOSTUP PLÁNOVANIA A OTÁZKA “NEPLÁNOVANIA”

32 Matěj Spurný
URBAN EXPERTS IN THE BUILDING OF POST-STALINIST BRATISLAVA
URBÁNNÍ EXPERTI A BUDOVÁNÍ BRATISLAVY V ÉŘE POSTSTALINISMU

44 Anna Kornélia Losonczy, Regina Balla, Hlib Antypenko, Melinda Benkő
RE-SHAPING BUDAPEST: LARGE HOUSING ESTATES AND THEIR (UN)PLANNED CENTERS
PRETVORIŤ BUDAPEŠŤ: VEĽKÉ SÍDLISKÁ A ICH (NE)PLÁNOVANÉ CENTRÁ

56 Karel Maier
PLANNING OF BOHEMIAN REGIONAL CENTRES IN THE PERIOD OF THEIR INDUSTRIALISATION AND MODERNISATION: PLZEŇ AND HRADEC KRÁLOVÉ 1860 – 1938
PLÁNOVÁNÍ ČESKÝCH REGIONÁLNÍCH CENTER V OBDOBÍ INDUSTRIALIZACE A MODERNIZACE: PLZEŇ A HRADEC KRÁLOVÉ 1860 – 1938

70 Adriana Priatková, Ján Sekan, Máté Tamáska
THE URBAN PLANNING OF KOŠICE AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF A 20TH CENTURY AVENUE
MESTSKÉ PLÁNOVANIE V KOŠICIACH A VÝVOJ MESTSKEJ TRIEDY 20. STOROČIA

89 Klára Brühová
THE PARLIAMENT FOR PRAGUE – PROPOSALS, COMPETITIONS AND DEBATES ON ITS LOCATION AND ARCHITECTURE
PARLAMENT PRO PRAHU – NÁVRHY, SOUTĚŽE A DEBATY NAD UMÍSTĚNÍM A ARCHITEKTONICKOU FORMOU KOMPLEXU

106 Lina Degtyaryova, Oleg Olashyn
URBAN PLANNING AND CONSTRUCTION OF THE INTERWAR CITY OF UZHGOROD: MISSION INTERRUPTED
PLÁNOVANIE A VÝSTAVBA MESTA UŽHOROD V MEDZIVOJNOVOM OBDOBÍ: PRERUŠENÁ MISIA

116 Peter Stec
CREATIVE TRANSFORMATIONS: THE CAMPUS PARADIGM
KREATÍVNE TRANSFORMÁCIE: PARADIGMA KAMPUSU

134 Gonçalo M. Furtado C. L.
THE LEGACY OF THE IGNASI SOLÀ-MORALES AND THE CONTEMPORARY URBAN DEBATE
ODKAZ IGNASIHO SOLÀ-MORALES A SÚČASNÁ DEBATA O MESTE

RECENZIE REWIEVS
145 Zoltán Bereczki
PATTERN RECOGNITION
ROZPOZNÁVANIE VZOROV

148 Peter Szalay
MOC EXPERTOV: KONTINUITY ČI RUPTÚRY PRED A PO ROKU 1989
THE POWER OF EXPERTS: CONTINUITIES OR RUPTURES BEFORE AND AFTER 1989

150 Katarína Haberlandová
SANDALOVA MIMORIADNA HĽBKA OSTROSTI
SANDALO'S EXCEPTIONAL DEPTH OF SHARPNESS

