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Introduction
The Relevancy of the Problem
Why is it relevant to analyse the territorial aspect of consumption issues?

According to the Stiglitz Report:

- Progress of society depends not only on economic circumstances but it also depends on the well-being of current and future generations.
- There is a correlation between the well-being of citizens and urban sprawl problems.

Important to examine the consumption issues in a special way.

The empirical background

„The social mechanisms and interests determining territorial consumption models”, carried out by the Institute of Sociology of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, within the project titled „Sustainable Consumption, Production and Communication” supported by the Norwegian Financial Mechanism, organised by the Corvinus University.

- Sample: 1000 persons in the Budapest region,
- in the city and in
  - 2 developed,
  - 2 underdeveloped villages in the peripheries,
- 50 elite deep interviews.

Reanalysation of international literature.
Ecological (and Social) Consequences of Urban Sprawl
presented by world photos
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Summary of the ecological consequences of urban sprawl (worldwide, European, Hungarian context)

- The new types of residential landscapes, and the new models of production of built space are significant,
- The decrease of green areas, forest degradation, environmental damages, pollution are present,
- The development of dispersed cities and the danger of the liquidation of the compact city are characteristic,
- The essential consequences are the rising consumption of energy, water, and the special infrastructural requirements related to the construction of new housing forms.

Ecological (and Social) Consequences of Urban Sprawl
presented by the artists’ view
Edward Albee’s *Who’s Afraid of Virginia Woolf?*
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Urbanisation Trends
The Dichotomies of Urban and Suburban Areas

C r i t i c s – S u p p o r t e r s – P r o c e s s e s

- Many critics,
- More supporters,
- The most important supporters are the real urbanisation processes.
- And the affected social groups, the winners of suburbanisation.

- What can we see from the statistical data?
### USA – Change in the rate of city and suburb population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metropolitan region</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>Change between 1990 and 2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rate of city</td>
<td>Rate of suburb</td>
<td>Rate of city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York-Northern New Jersey-Long Island</td>
<td>37,5%</td>
<td>62,5%</td>
<td>37,8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles-Riverside-Orange County</td>
<td>24,0%</td>
<td>76,0%</td>
<td>22,6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago-Gary-Kenosha</td>
<td>33,8%</td>
<td>66,2%</td>
<td>31,6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston-Galveston-Brazoria</td>
<td>43,7%</td>
<td>56,3%</td>
<td>41,8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia-Wilmington-Atlantic City</td>
<td>26,9%</td>
<td>73,1%</td>
<td>24,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>44,5%</td>
<td>55,5%</td>
<td>43,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit-Aux-Ann Arbor-Flint</td>
<td>19,8%</td>
<td>80,2%</td>
<td>17,4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas-Fort Worth</td>
<td>36,0%</td>
<td>64,0%</td>
<td>33,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix-Mesa</td>
<td>43,9%</td>
<td>56,1%</td>
<td>40,6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: http://www.demographia.com/db-2000metrocoreshare.htm*

### Europe – Change in the rate of city and suburb population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metropolitan region</th>
<th>1996</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>Change between 1996 and 2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rate of city</td>
<td>Rate of suburb</td>
<td>Rate of city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oslo</td>
<td>48%*</td>
<td>52%*</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>19%*</td>
<td>81%*</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brussels</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copenhagen</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berlin</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>75%*</td>
<td>25%*</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vienna</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warsaw</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prague</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ljubljana</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budapest</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: www.urbanaudit.org*

*2001-es adat*
Suburbanisation trends in the Budapest metropolitan region

Hypothesis: The suburbanisation will be more dynamic in the region.

Based on the facts:

Two important tendencies:

I. The proportion of residential intention to move is not too characteristic and has reduced (2005-2010) (13-10%)

- Who wants to move? The higher status groups (e.g., high-school graduates, professional groups, entrepreneurs, executives, people with high income)
- Where do they want to move from? From the city centres, from the transitional zone of Budapest.
- They don't want to move from the high position suburbs.

II. A new urbanisation trend appears:

- After 2000 the decrease of the Budapest city population stopped.
- A slow migration trend started from the suburbs to the city (not only in Budapest).

American model summary

- Decline of social and physical position of urban centres,
- Outmigration of the high strata from city centers
- Concentration of the poor strata in city centres.
- New trend: renewal and gentrification of city centres (globalisation).
- Consequences:
  - Low status of the urban centres
  - High status of the peri-urban areas. BUT
  - Changing positions of suburban areas (slow deterioration) (for example Canada).

European (and Hungarian) model summary

- A concentration of wealth and upper classes in the city areas.
- The localisation of the lower classes mainly in the outskirts and in the city centers as well.
- Diversification of the suburbs: middle class and working class suburbs.
- New trend: dynamic gentrification of city center areas (Paris, Oslo)
- But not yet in Budapest.
- Consequences:
  - High status of city centres,
  - Low, and also high status of suburbs.
Formation of significant social spatial disparities: Dichotomies of cities and suburbs

Where can we detect them?
- in the social–structural differences between the urban and the suburban population,
- in the commuting differences (based on our data: suburban working class members with some qualification and medium income commute more),
- differences in the access to and the usage of educational and health care institutions,
- differences in everyday life opportunities.

The future of urban sprawl in the Hungarian context

What can we predict?
The continuity of urban sprawl?
The dynamism of city development?
The development of suburbs?

There is no definite answer yet!
The effects of the contemporary economic crisis slowed down suburbanisation
The migration demands reduced
The majority of urban population is quite satisfied with the conditions of urban life.
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