More together, More apart: migration, densification, segregation
Welcome to Uppsala!

And welcome to ENHR 2018! We have much to discuss; the conference theme addresses concerns that many of us share. Uppsala is a fitting host city for a conference on the ways in which migration, densification, and segregation come to affect housing and residential contexts more generally. It is a near neighbor to the metropolitan region around Stockholm, one of the fastest growing capital cities in Europe. It is of itself the fourth largest urban area in Sweden, and the population is expected to see steady growth for decades to come. Whether they are among the many refugees from countries in conflict or young people seeking opportunities not available in the smaller Swedish communities where they grew up, the people contributing to this growth in population need housing and services. And new housing and services are being built - within former industrial areas and other available spaces within the central urban area, on top of existing buildings, and on an expanding periphery. Much of the new housing is of relatively high density, even that being built in more peripheral areas, a reflection of concern for the environment, the need to efficiently provide communal services, and the potential for profit for developers, among other reasons. Much of the new housing and much of the newly renovated older housing is also relatively expensive, and many people of limited resources, including young adults and recent immigrants, are unable to find rental housing, to enter the housing market, or to avoid displacement into less satisfactory housing circumstances. We at the Institute for Housing and Urban Research (IBF) at Uppsala University, host for the conference, recognize that understandings from the social sciences will be needed to avoid, ameliorate and resolve problems and perhaps to create opportunities as migration, densification and segregation proceed apace. This motivated us to host this conference. We are pleased you could join us here in Uppsala, and we hope you find your time here pleasant, rewarding and inspiring.

Terry Hartig
Chair, Local Organizing Committee, ENHR 2018,
Professor of Environmental Psychology
Conference Venues

1. UNIVERSITY MAIN BUILDING
The first two plenary sessions will be held in the beautiful Aula of the historic University Main Building, near the Cathedral. The second plenary session will be followed by the welcome reception in other rooms in the University Main Building.

2. CAMPUS EKONOMIKUM
The remaining plenary sessions, workshop sessions, lunches and coffee breaks will be held at Campus Ekonomikum.

3. UPPSALA CASTLE
The dinner will be held on the second evening of the conference in Rikssalen (the former Hall of State) at Uppsala Castle (Slottet).

Please note that for additional information about the conference you can always visit the conference web site http://www.enhr2018.com/
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17.00-  GENERAL ASSEMBLY AND CLOSING
18.00  EKONOMIKUM, LECTURE HALL 3
Plenary 1

Wednesday, June 27, 09.00-10.30: Aula, University Main Building

Setting the context: Migration, densification, and segregation in Sweden

Welcome by the Chair of the Local Organizing Committee
Terry Hartig, Professor of Environmental Psychology
Institute for Housing and Urban Research, Uppsala University

Welcome by the Chair of the ENHR
Peter Boelhouwer, Professor of Housing Systems
Delft University of Technology, the Netherlands

A municipal politician reflects on ’More together, more apart’ in Uppsala
Erik Pelling, Member of the Uppsala City Council (Social Democratic Party)

The Delegation against Segregation
Inger Ashing, General Director
Delegation against Segregation, Swedish Government

Segregation, large housing estates and counter-segregation policies in Sweden
Roger Andersson, Professor of Human Geography
Institute for Housing and Urban Research, Uppsala University

The Swedish housing regime in crisis
Bo Bengtsson, Senior Professor of Political Science
Institute for Housing and Urban Research, Uppsala University
Keynote speakers

ERIK PELLING

ABSTRACT
Erik Pelling will share his perspectives on the conference theme based on his long involvement with local housing policy in this rapidly growing and densifying city, part of the metropolitan region centered on the capital city Stockholm.

INGER ASHING

ABSTRACT
Inger Ashing will talk about the new Swedish governmental agency she leads, the Delegation against Segregation, which was recently created to address the constellation of increasingly pressing issues related to segregation.

ROGER ANDERSSON

ABSTRACT
From January 1st 2018 Sweden has a new State counter-segregation authority, called Delegationen mot Segregation (Delmos). Its long-term goal is "to improve conditions in socioeconomically disadvantaged neighbourhoods and counteract structural causes producing segregation". This presentation provides a background for understanding why the present Swedish government sees the segregation issue as pivotal for the country. Focusing empirically on the Stockholm region, the long-term segregation development will be summarized with a particular focus on income and ethnic segregation. The presentation will zoom in on the large housing estates built from the 1950s to the 1980s and address the question why only some of circa 50 estates studied, far from all, have come to symbolize the public image of segregation in Stockholm and led to repeated policy interventions. Why is it so that some estates continue to do well in socioeconomic terms while others see concentrations of relative poverty and refugee migrants, attended by territorial stigmatization and increasing concern over crime and safety issues? Rather than stressing the role of building scale, density, layout and architecture in understanding the diverging developments, explanations will emphasize structural causes related
to macroeconomic developments, policy changes, and the changing role of tenure. Within that context, selective migration flows (who moves into, out from, and who stays in different types of neighbourhoods) have tended to reproduce and deepen residential segregation by class and ethnicity. The question then is: Can political reforms “counteract the structural causes producing segregation”?

BO BENGTSSON

ABSTRACT
At least formally, Sweden’s housing regime has been the most comprehensive or ‘universal’ in Europe. It is based on a programmatic right to housing rather than a legal individual right; since the 1940s there has been no institutionalized system of means-tested housing. Instead, the housing regime has stood on five institutional pillars: (1) a universally oriented policy without individual means-testing; (2) a public rental sector based on municipal housing companies and open to all types of households; (3) a political idea about tenure neutrality; (4) an integrated rental market with both public and private landlords providing for all types of households; (5) a centralized collective system of rent negotiations where tenants are represented by a uniquely strong national tenant union.

Recently all five pillars of the regime have come under pressure due to adaptation to EU competition policy and a combination of general housing shortage and inadequate access to affordable housing. This keynote address analyses how the ongoing crisis in the housing market has affected the five pillars of the Swedish housing regime and discusses the future of Swedish housing more generally.
Gentrification, segregation, and the construction of borders: Social implications of urban growth dynamics in troubled times

The mixed blessings of gentrification
Ingrid Gould Ellen, Paulette Goddard Professor of Urban Policy and Planning Robert F. Wagner Graduate School of Public Service and Furman Center, New York University, USA

The design of the civic
Michael Neuman, Professor of Sustainable Urbanism University of Westminster, United Kingdom

Keynote speakers

INGRID GOULD ELLEN

ABSTRACT
In cities throughout the United States and much of Europe, the pace of development and gentrification has accelerated in the past two decades. Many critics charge that this new development and gentrification lead to displacement and resegregation. But at least in the short-run, gentrification increases economic integration, and often furthers racial and ethnic integration as well. I will describe the longer run dynamics of gentrifying neighborhoods and show the degree to which gentrification in U.S. cities has led to stable economic and racial integration over time. I will also review new evidence about how gentrification and densification affect lower income children of different races and ethnicities. What does it mean to grow up in a gentrifying, urban neighborhood? Recent research from the Moving to Opportunity Demonstration shows that poor children enjoyed significant
long-run economic gains if their families were given the opportunity to move to low-poverty, and typically low-density, neighborhoods. Do low-income children growing up in dense, central neighborhoods that experience in-movement of higher-income households enjoy the same benefits? Or are they forced to move to more disadvantaged neighborhoods? Do effects depend on whether they have access to subsidized housing? The answers to these questions have critical implications for policy.

MICHAEL NEUMAN

ABSTRACT

As globalization accelerates, cities and nation-states are struggling to cope with “others” who are not historically members of their new communities and societies. This is exaggerated by the twinning of neoliberalism and populism, which in the former has led to the weakening of the public and the civic – that is, common norms for conduct – and in the latter has led to reactionary activism – that is, the erosion of civil discourse and heightened mistrust of the other, even if they are from the same society and ethnicity. The ironies include that history itself is the story of human migration, and that many of these societies have been founded by immigrants and in the past welcomed them. As one result, walls, borders, and closings of the mind and spirit reign, and rain havoc on societies and lives. What can and should be done? How can scholars contribute?

In the scholarship on borders, planning and governing organisations and institutions are key societal elements in drawing and enforcing borders. This is especially apparent in sociology, political science, geography, and planning. Yet discussions of institutions and their roles vis-à-vis borders tend to be – inexplicably – muted, with significant exceptions, some to be noted here. This paper analyses key aspects of the border-institution nexus in relation to cities and how we plan, govern and live in them.
Plenary 3
Session A
Thursday, June 28, 09.00-10.30: Campus Ekonomikum, Lecture Hall 3

Too dense for democracy? Urban growth, loss of public space, and possibilities for civil exchange

More together, more apart? On the opportunities for building communities of democratic practice
John Parkinson, Professor of Politics, Centre for Deliberative Democracy and Global Governance, University of Canberra, Australia

More together, definitely more apart: Policing public space in two British cities
Don Mitchell, Professor of Cultural Geography, Department of Social and Economic Geography, Uppsala University; Distinguished Professor of Geography Emeritus at Syracuse University, USA

Session B
Thursday, June 28, 09.00-10.30: Campus Ekonomikum, Lecture Hall 4

Implications of national immigration policies for international migration flows

The effect of policy on interconnected asylum flows
Marianne Røed, Senior Researcher, Department of Work and Welfare, Institute for Social Research, Norway

Do asylum seekers respond to policy changes? Evidence from a Swedish-Syrian case
Henrik Andersson, PhD, Institute for Housing and Urban Research, Uppsala University

Spillover effects of stricter immigration policies
Cristina Bratu, PhD student, Department of Economics, Uppsala University
JOHN PARKINSON

ABSTRACT
One of the most striking features of many national policy debates about urban planning and design is a tendency to channel the 1989 film Field of Dreams: “If you build it, they will come.” That is, if we build spaces that are thought to encourage inclusion and connection, then an inclusive range of citizens will come, and connect. This tendency is being reinforced by current fashions in public policy, driven by behavioural economics and psychology, which see behaviour in rather crude terms, often as responses to cues laid out in the built environment.
And yet, such a view ignores much of what urban scholars already know about place making; what cultural theorists know about how meanings are created; and what critical policy scholars know about the failures of similar modernist projects in the past.
In this presentation I will suggest a way of thinking about the problem of living together yet apart that uses a novel, cultural theory of democracy. I argue that our goal ought not to be to build inclusive spaces so much as ‘communities of democratic practice’; and that building the spaces might be a ‘necessary but not sufficient’ condition – in other words, that it does not automatically lead to the practices. I suggest a range of short and long-term interventions to bring space and practice closer together.

DON MITCHELL

ABSTRACT
For the past two decades, the British economy has been founded – at least in large part – in a political economy of urban (especially housing) regeneration, including (in many instances) efforts at densification. At the same time significant (pre-Brexit) immigration, especially from poorer EU states has transformed the social geography of cities, threatening, in the view of many, the social cohesion of their neighborhoods. Tensions endemic in these trends – of class, ethnicity, race, language, custom, and more – frequently get worked out in public space, sometimes in the form of low-level hostility between groups, sometimes violently. As a result, during the first decade and a half of the 2000s, the British government, first New Labor then the...
Conservative-led Coalition, doubled down on ideologies and practices of community policing in an effort to reinforce what colleagues and I have identified as police-led community cohesion. This is a new phenomenon, but one also echoed in numerous places around the world facing inter-communal struggle. Drawing on research done with Lynn Staeheli and Kafui Attoh, I will examine what police-led community cohesion is, how this transforms both access to and the nature of public space (and therefore the forms of life and culture it may support) and what this means especially for housing regeneration in rapidly changing cities. Our argument is that police-led community cohesion is a means of reinforcing segregation, at both micro and meso scales, in the name of multicultural togetherness.

MARIANNE RØED

ABSTRACT
A tougher asylum policy in one receiving country may reduce the asylum flow out of the origin countries. However a more restrictive policy may also clearly deflect asylum seekers to other destinations. The awareness of this last possibility has been a main cause of tension between the European countries when it comes to the design of asylum policy, both at a national level and at the common European level. I will present results from empirical investigations of how asylum policy reforms affect asylum flows. Specifically, I will consider the consequences of policy amendments completed from 1985 to 2015 (2010) in the following nine European receiving countries: Austria, Belgium, The Netherlands, Switzerland, Germany, Denmark, Sweden, Norway and the United Kingdom. Asylum policy is represented both by measures of change in the aggregated level of restrictiveness and changes in quite specific rules related to family reunion and the conclusions of readmission agreements between the governments in origin- and destination countries. The policy changes are examined with regard to the direct effect on the number of asylum applications submitted in the countries that conducted the reforms, and with regard to their deflection effect, that is, their impacts on the inflows to the other receiving countries. Finally, the policy changes are examined with regard to the impact on the total outflows of asylum seekers from the origin countries to all receiving countries in OECD. With regard to all these three categories of effects, I will present significant results which are in accordance with our prior expectations.
HENRIK ANDERSSON

ABSTRACT
Given the last year’s heated European debate on asylum policy regimes, it is crucial to understand how effective certain asylum policies actually are. The current state of the academic literature is roughly divided into two strands; one qualitative, which asks refugees about their pre-application knowledge on the recipient countries’ rules and institutions; and one quantitative, combining cross-country longitudinal data to study effects of yearly asylum policy changes on inter-country flows of asylum seekers. There is, however, a lack of quasi-experimental evidence, which can provide a causal interpretation. Motivated by this, I and Kristoffer Jutvik looked specifically at a sudden, regulatory change in the Swedish reception of Syrian asylum seekers. The change took place in September 2013, and implied that all Syrian asylum seekers would be granted permanent, instead of temporary, residence permits. Using high frequency data and an interrupted time series set-up, we studied the extent to which this change caused more Syrian citizens to apply for asylum in Sweden, and how the change affected the distribution of asylum seekers in Europe. Results show that the change in policy almost doubled the number of asylum seekers from Syria within 2013, with a significant jump in numbers already within the first week after the implementation of the policy. While this also decreased the share of asylum seekers to other large recipient countries (Germany), the effects were highly temporary. The paper hence both points to the importance of national policy, as well as the interdependence of European states in policy making.
CRISTINA BRATU

ABSTRACT
We study the effects of stricter immigration policies on migration flows to neighboring countries. In particular, we analyze how stricter rules on family reunification, the outcome of a policy reform in 2002 in Denmark, affect reunification-related migration to Sweden, a neighboring country with less strict rules. We reach two main conclusions. First, using Danish register data, we find that the reform led to a clear and significant increase in emigration rates of affected individuals from Denmark, and in particular to Sweden. Swedish register data corroborate our findings allowing us to identify reunified couples that have moved to Sweden. Second, in terms of onward migration, our results show that a significant fraction of those affected by the Danish reform seem to have considered the move to Sweden as temporary; within two (eight) years approximately 20% (50%) had left Sweden, with the absolute majority returning to Denmark. Further evidence that the move to Sweden was seen as temporary is given by the fact that a large share of those affected kept receiving labor income from Denmark during their stay in Sweden.

Plenary 4

Session A
Friday, June 29, 09.00-10.30: Campus Ekonomikum, Lecture Hall 3

Can’t stay or can’t go: Displacement, segregation and limited housing choice in growing cities

Trapped in one’s own housing: The limitations of housing choices in segregated neighbourhoods
Nóra Teller, Senior Research Fellow, Metropolitan Research Institute, Budapest, Hungary

Housing inequality: Narratives from a precarious housing market
Carina Listerborn, Professor in Urban Planning, Department of Urban Studies, Malmö, Sweden
NÓRA TELLER

ABSTRACT
Spatial exclusion processes across post-transition countries have resulted from an interplay of political, economic and institutional changes. Migration to and from urban and suburban areas and densification of selected neighbourhoods have created room for segregation and displacement of marginalized groups. At the same time, urban renewal, regional development and housing policies, coupled with restrictive social protection reforms have contributed to an increase in the gap between middle-class home-owners and trapped groups on the margins, who have not only been pushed to the margins of the housing market but also have concentrated in areas with decreasing housing values. Individual household housing choices have thus become more and more spatially restricted, especially in those cases where national housing subsidy programs have been made available for better-off households and labour markets have concentrated in regions out of reach for poor commuters. The spatial concentration of poverty coupled with the concentration of excluded ethnic groups has brought about specific responses in urban and regional develop-
ment policies. However, these policies necessarily remain limited in scope and effectiveness because they can seldom transform poor households’ individual housing choices and other players’ housing strategies. Also, they can seldom change economic and institutional settings for more sustained and balanced spatial arrangements. Spatial isolation of marginalized groups has been exacerbated through the exclusion from quality services of both children and parents, which further increases the social divide between neighbourhoods with a high presence and quick reproduction of poverty versus neighbourhoods with higher status. This has again reinforced serious limitations to spatial mobility and migration because of the high value gap and transaction costs, which represent a stronger constraint in super-homeownership countries like Hungary, Slovakia, Romania and Bulgaria, where the share of private home owners is above 95%.

The presentation will explore the patterns of housing choices of those who have lived in segregated neighbourhoods and how the households’ choices interplay with broader social issues like economic inequalities, ineffectiveness of housing policies and broader discrimination on the housing market. Based both on case studies and quantitative data I will demonstrate the above-mentioned processes focusing on Roma poverty neighbourhoods’ developments and policies addressing segregation mechanisms.

**CARINA LISTERBORN**

**ABSTRACT**

The provision of ‘good housing’ has been at the core of the Swedish Social democratic post-war welfare model, characterized by subsidized construction, strong tenant protections and a tenant organization, and high-quality housing standards. However, the Swedish housing market has undergone dramatic changes since the early 1990s. The last decades of reforms in housing policy have increased segregation and spatial and social polarization; contributed to the shortages in housing; increased homelessness; worsened overcrowding; fueled displacement from renovictions (i.e. renovations that lead to eviction); and provoked constant fear among many people that they may lose their homes. In 2016, the National Board of Housing declared that Sweden needs 710 000 new housing units in the coming ten years in order to mitigate the crisis, which would mean building 88 000 new housing units per year in a country with a population of 10 million. The housing shortage is particularly acute within the rental sector, as
rental housing has been regarded as too expensive to build and not profitable enough for the housing construction companies. The ‘housing crisis’ is on the one hand an opportunity for investments for construction companies and property owners, and on the other hand a lived experience of insecurity and precariousness for people who have been marginalized on the housing market. This presentation will focus on narratives from people who belong to groups that find it difficult to access affordable housing: young adults, single parents, unemployed people, migrants, and pensioners. Their stories illustrate the point that the housing ‘shortage’ should rather be interpreted as housing ‘inequality’.

THOMAS MALOUTAS

ABSTRACT
Segregation is usually understood as the unequal spatial distribution of class or ethnic groups, which leads to the formation of neighbourhoods with different socioeconomic or ethnic profiles. This ‘horizontal’ model of sociospatial separation was manifest in the expansion to increasingly distant and socially homogeneous low-rise suburbs of American cities, and it has dominated the field of urban studies. In most parts of the world, however, cities have evolved rather compactly, producing more intricate segregation patterns. One of those is vertical segregation in high-rise areas.
Vertical segregation is one of several possible modes by which space may become socially differentiated and ranked. These forms of segregation in spatial proximity are interesting for the ways in which they have been promoted; for the particular social strata involved in these segregation forms and their mutual relations; for their competing or complementary relations with other forms of segregation; and for the ways the particular forms of spatial proximity for the groups involved become an advantage or a disadvantage for social mobility.
The discussion of vertical segregation in Athens will serve as a showcase of important social divisions and inequalities that are not expressed by spatial separation. The social cohabitation that vertical segregation is producing may have ambivalent effects on the relations among the social groups involved, often with respect to the use/appropriation of important local services. It may also affect processes of substantial neighbourhood change, like gentrification, depending on the ways constraints and opportunities in the housing market are shaped by changing trends or regulated by urban policies.
ABSTRACT

Densification is our time’s expected panacea for creating sustainable cities. It has been suggested by policy makers that densification of human habitats is the remedy for a number of issues. It will save energy, land and water. Compact neighbourhoods are assumed to promote better social interactions, practical co-operation, high-quality green structure, cheaper housing, and a shift in transport modes to public and active transport. Packed housing is believed to promote cultural activities and offer synaesthetically attractive living for tomorrow’s healthy citizens. Yet, there is little evidence that these anticipated benefits get realized.

Rather, the current practice of densification has revealed quite the opposite: Overly dense urban blocks generate more consumption of physical resources, are more expensive, have lost most of their green-blue values, offer a tortuous everyday living, are repelling neighbours, restrict cultural expressions and produce low-grade intersensory urban landscapes. Horizontal and vertical densification can also threaten healthy habits, challenge mental health and generate segregation and gentrification.

As an alternative target for densification practices today, functional density seeks to confer on urban and rural communities a sound balance between efficient land use and an attractive city life between buildings. In this presentation, I will define a new concept for sustainable human settlements and demonstrate a new method (FOMA-analysis) for measuring and assessing density and spaciousness qualities when exploring plans, newly built areas and mature built-up reference areas.

Functional densification is a process that can mitigate segregation and gentrification – and promote a healthy city life everywhere.
Workshops

For the room location and detailed programme for each workshop, visit www.enhr2018.com/programme/workshops/

1. COLLABORATIVE HOUSING

2. DISADVANTAGED URBAN NEIGHBOURHOODS AND COMMUNITIES

3. EAST EUROPEAN HOUSING AND URBAN POLICY

4. ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY OF HOUSING

5. HOUSING AND FAMILY DYNAMICS

6. HOUSING AND LIVING CONDITIONS OF AGEING POPULATIONS

7. HOUSING AND REFUGEES

8. HOUSING AND SOCIAL THEORY (SPONSORED BY THE JOURNAL HOUSING, THEORY AND SOCIETY)

9. HOUSING ECONOMICS

10. HOUSING FINANCE

11. HOUSING IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

12. HOUSING LAW
Field Trips

1. Gottsunda/Valsätra—densification and segregation in a Swedish Million Program neighborhood

**Time:** 13.15-17.00  
**Guide:** Irene Molina  
**Meeting point:** Ekonomikum car park  
**Means of travel:** Chartered bus (driving time amounting to 1h in total) and walking (ca. 5 km)

2. Urban densification and democracy in Eriksberg

**Time:** 13.15-17.00  
**Guide:** Åse Richard  
**Meeting point:** Ekonomikum car park  
**Means of travel:** Chartered bus (driving time amounting to 30 min total) and walking (ca. 2x3 km)
3 Early history of Swedish urban planning and the welfare state in Leufsta Bruk

Time: 13.00-17.00
Guide: Göran Rydén
Meeting point: Ekonomikum car park
Means of travel: Chartered bus (driving time amounting to 2h in total) and walking (ca. 3 km)

4 Residential architecture in Luthagen

Time: Timeslot A: 13.00-15.00 and Timeslot B: 15.00-17.00
Guide: Mats Franzén
Meeting point: Registration desk, Ground Floor, Level 2
Means of travel: Walking (ca. 3 km)
Densification and segregation on the outskirts of Uppsala municipality

**Time:** 13.15-17.00  
**Guides:** Jan Amcoff and Roger Andersson  
**Meeting point:** Ekonomikum car park  
**Means of travel:** Chartered bus (driving time amounting to 1.5h in total) and walking (ca. 4 km)

Urban planning in central Uppsala

**Time:** Timeslot A: 13.00-15.00 and Timeslot B: 15.00-17.00  
**Guide:** Fredrik Nilsson  
**Meeting point:** Registration desk, Ground Floor, level 2  
**Means of travel:** Walking (ca. 4 km)
Self-guided tour

**Time:** 13.15-17.00

**Guide:** No guide

**Material:** Collect material at the Registration desk, Ground Floor, Level 2

**Means of travel:** Walking (as much as you like)

Note: Gustavianum closes at 16.00
Welcome reception, University Main Building
Wednesday, June 27, 17.45-19.00
The welcome reception on the first evening of the main conference is at the invitation of the University Vice Chancellor. It will be held in rooms at the University Main Building. Light refreshments will be offered.

Conference dinner, Uppsala Castle (Slottet)
Thursday, June 28, 19.00
The conference dinner will be held the second evening of the conference in Rikssalen (the former Hall of State) at Uppsala Castle.

Social Events

Slide Competition
Thursday, June 28, 17.00-18.30: Vasasalen, Uppsala Castle (Slottet)
In keeping with tradition at ENHR conferences (since 1990!), we will hold a slide competition focused on actual urban problems and achievements in European cities. The competition is organized for teams of at most four people. The task of each team is to answer questions by filling out a questionnaire, aided by photographic slides. Conference participants are free to form a team as they wish. As the slides and the related questions can cover the whole of Europe, it is advantageous to form a diverse team, with colleagues from very different cities. At the end of the competition, after the questionnaires are collected, the correct answers will be shown and discussed. The announcement of the winners will take place at the closing of the conference. The three top-scoring teams will receive a present and have their names published in the ENHR Newsletter. It is worth coming and participating: you cannot lose anything, but you can learn a lot while also having fun! The slide competition will be held in a room at the Castle, just after the field trip and just before the conference dinner.

Iván Tosics, Moderator
Managing Director, Metropolitan Research Institute, Budapest
The walking distance between the University Main Building (Universitetshuset) and Campus Ekonomikum is 800 m and takes approx. 12 minutes. The distance from Ekonomikum to Uppsala Castle (Slottet) is 1.4 km and takes approx. 19 minutes on foot. You will pass the University Main Building on the way to Uppsala Castle. The building labeled "Domkyrkan", just to the right of Universitetshuset, is the Cathedral. You can see its tall spires from many places in Uppsala.
Campus Ekonomikum
Floor plans

LOWER FLOOR, LEVEL 1

GROUND FLOOR, LEVEL 2

PRACTICAL INFORMATION

WIFI-INFORMATION: Please ask at the Registration desk.

EMERGENCY: 112 for police, ambulance and fire department.

TAXI: Uppsala Taxi +46 18 100 000/ +46 18 123 456 Taxi Kurir.
CONFERENCE SUPPORT: + 46 (0) 18 67 1527.

MEDICAL SERVICES: Call 1177 to get medical advice.

Smoking is not allowed in any public establishment in Sweden.
ENHR 2018 is hosted by the Institute for Housing and Urban Research at Uppsala University

With thanks to our sponsors:

RIKBANKENS JUBILEUMSFOND

Uppsala KOMMUN

Routledge