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Housing poverty in Romania

The data of the 2002 census proves the extreme housing poverty (characterized by sq m/person situated between 3.1 and 3.5 sq m/person covers 930,000 people.

In this category you can find households made of:
- One family nucleus (about 82.5%) 767,250 people
- Two family nuclei (about 15.9%) 147,870 people
- Three family nuclei (about 10.3%) 95,790 people

There is a group of approximately 24,800 people for which the poverty indicator is placed around 1.5 sqm/person.

Approximately 13,000 people live in improvised or “emergency” buildings, as the census calls them – it is similar to the homeless situation.
One million people live in inappropriate shelters and at least two millions are facing severe housing problems. Even if the situation is underevaluated and seen as a minor phenomenon of transition, it is already a “historically” constituted way of inhabiting space. We witness the creation of neighbourhoods that develops into symbolic, ethnic and poverty enclaves.
Romania has the largest number of Roma inhabitants in Europe. The economy of transition produced a decline in their housing condition, leading to an acute social exclusion. The racist attitude that forms the background of urban decisions can be seen today in the alarming development of the shantytowns surrounding the Romanian towns. The post revolution era reversed the integration process that defined the communist period – after the forced settlement of the nomads, the gypsies were the first to loose their jobs and to be evicted.
The **extreme housing poverty**, especially in the Romany communities, show to further aspects: precariousness of the house itself, and precariousness of the community milieu. Another dimension to poverty definition is vulnerability, which governs the investment strategies in the living space; it decisively determines the perception on one’s own condition.

**Vulnerability** represents a risk to slip into housing poverty by diminishing the living standard (cutting off the utility mains, increased number of family members) or extreme housing poverty by losing one’s house due to its serious dilapidation or total destruction.
Historical Center Dorohoi

Dorohoi – north of Romania, historically poor Botosani County, last train station
34,000 inhabitants
collapsing economy – 20% unemployment rate
460 Roma

Former Jewish shops facades
Historical Center - backyard
Houses
Neglect and decay

- Who bears responsibility for safety and hygienic issues?
- What are the legal provisions?
- How should the authorities enforce law?
- What are the basic housing rights?
People

- Traditional / Non homogeneous / Non hierarchical / Traders, beggars
• Ethnical & social MIX
Drochia area – former industrial dump site
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Initiative &amp; Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Social and demographic</td>
<td>• Actors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Political</td>
<td>• Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Local</td>
<td>• Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Economic</td>
<td>• Technical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Geographical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Climatic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Urban planning

1. SCOALA PRIMARA
2. SPOLETO
3. CASEN
4. CASEN
5. CASEN
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36 unitati locative
8 unitati tip 1 x 4 apartamente - 3 camere
4 unitati tip 2 x 1 apartament - 4 camere
Minimal standards must meet basic needs

total sărăcie de consum = 6,265,184
rural 4.2 mil. / urban 2.1 mil.
Minimal house
13,500 Euro
Individual house
14,800 Euro
- Confronting the existing standards with the need
- Simplifying – de-estheticize
- How to save money? How to maximize the effect of the investment?
Ideal?
Prefabricate
light / fast to assemble / cheap / work can be done in the winter
One occurrence of ideal
Infrastructure & equipment
Follow up
• Test for the flexibility of the system
• “the largest programme of the year”
• New houses with new materials
• Basic infrastructure, equipments and services acquired: water supply, sewage, electricity, roads, heating system
• Follow-up
• Real step forward for the community - leap
• Overcoming fears of authorities and stereotypes and catastrophic scenarios

• Residential segregation
• Exposure to environmental risks – environmental racism
• Not enough for everybody
• Not enough levels
• Non-participatory
• Unaffordable for half of the population
• Maintenance costs too high
Next ideal?

- Integrated development partnership
- Community participation

- Good practice

Bad practice

Ambiguous practice
Dorohoi Social Housing as Emergency Intervention

Thank you!