4 Affordable housing for all? Challenging the legacy of Red Vienna

*Katharina Litschauer and
Michael Friesenecker*

Introduction

Housing plays a particularly important role in social inclusion and urban justice, as it influences urban segregation and profoundly shapes people's living conditions. Similar to other European cities, such as Amsterdam, it has been argued that Vienna's particularly large, de-commodified housing stock contributes to affordable housing for a wide section of the population. This model of *housing for all* builds upon the achievements of *Red Vienna* and is characterised by both a large social rental segment as well as strict rent control in the private rental segment. Since social housing competes directly with private rental housing, affordable housing is also achieved by dampening rent levels in the private segment. Hence, both social and private rental provide affordable housing.

However, like other European cities, Vienna is increasingly facing affordability problems that challenge its *housing for all* approach. Demographic change, immigration, rising income inequality, property price increases and housing policy deregulations put pressure on housing affordability and urban justice. Such pressures are similarly experienced by many cities, though these pressures can be mediated in quite distinct ways depending on the historical trajectory and concrete policy choices of the respective city. Over the past decade, population growth and migration increased demand for housing in Vienna and changed the urban context of housing policy. In addition, two policy shifts affected the provision of affordable housing: the delegation of social housing construction to limited-profit housing associations, and the deregulation of rent controls in the private rental segment (Kadi, 2015). Against this background, this chapter explores how policy shifts and changing urban conditions are affecting housing affordability in Vienna and elaborates on underlying mechanisms that threaten the city's *housing for all* approach.

Regarding European cities, research in urban studies has analysed how housing policy reforms – such as homeownership promotion, privatisation of social housing and de-regulation of rent control – have contributed to tenure restructurings and transformed housing systems (van Duijne and Ronald, 2018; Stephens, 2020). Applying the concept of *regulated marketisation*, Hochstenbach and Ronald (2020) reveal how and why a revival of private rental took place in Amsterdam. In a similar vein, van Duijne and Ronald's (2018) study of Amsterdam shows how the unitary rental market has been unravelling by exploring processes of *dualisation* between social and private housing. Research on Vienna's housing system has highlighted the integrated nature of its rental market (Mundt and Amann, 2010), analysed the state of social housing and current challenges in Vienna (Mundt, 2018), and investigated changes in social housing policy (Lévy-Vroelant and Reinprecht, 2014). Another strand of research assesses how policy reforms impact on housing conditions rather than the housing system (Kadi and Musterd, 2014; Kadi, 2015). Kadi and Musterd (2014) study the effects of reforms on accessibility and affordability in Amsterdam, whilst Kadi (2015) explores housing conditions for low-income households in Vienna and asked how policy reforms produced insiders and outsiders regarding access to affordable housing.

Building on these findings, we analyse shifts in Vienna's housing system in terms of the city's status as a *just city* by going beyond low-income households and asking who (still) has access to affordable and secure housing. Drawing on Fainstein's (2010) analytical framework of *equity* and *recognition*, we analyse how access to affordable housing has shifted over time. *Recognition* focuses on the design of policies, drawing attention to the acknowledgement of tenant rights in (private) rental housing as well as changing eligibility criteria and existing access barriers in social rental housing. *Equity* refers to '[the] distribution of both material and nonmaterial benefits derived from public policy' (Fainstein, 2010, p. 36). In the context of housing, this calls for an analysis of housing costs and security in different sub-segments of the Viennese housing system.

To analyse the distributional outcomes, we draw on the concept of *dualisation*, understood as an increasing differentiation of 'rights, entitlements, and services' (Emmenegger, 2012, p. 10) to grasp the split between access to, and exclusion from, affordable and secure housing. Contrary to existing research that either focuses on a 'split forged between social and private housing under dualization' (van Duijne and Ronald, 2018, p. 637) or 'a dualization trend among low-income households' (Kadi, 2015, p. 247), we apply it to housing conditions (more

specifically housing costs and tenure security). This allows us to give a more nuanced picture of the implications of tenure, identify increasingly less affordable and secure sub-segments within both private and social rental, and specify in which regard an unbalancing of segments is taking place. The result of this dualisation is both a gap between affordable and unaffordable housing (structural outcome) and a gap between insiders and outsiders (social outcome). Analysing tenant profiles in sub-segments shows who has access to affordable sub-segments and which groups are locked out.

Accordingly, the next section outlines how recognition has changed by presenting the historical trajectory of Vienna's housing policy as well as recent policy reforms. Subsequently, we attend to the outcomes of housing policy and analyse processes of dualisation by investigating tenure restructuring, housing cost developments and changes in tenure security. In addition, we draw attention to insider-outsider divides by analysing shifts in tenant profiles and highlighting who has access to affordable sub-segments. This allows us to assess the city's redistributive capacities and evaluate how just the housing system of Vienna still is.

Shifts in housing policy: the legacy of *Red Vienna* and its transformation

Today's housing policy in Austria came into existence after the Second World War and was developed within a framework of social policy and not only as a response to housing (market) problems (Matznetter, 2002). Housing policy contributes to high-quality and affordable housing by relying on three key pillars: first, acknowledging housing as a basic right. Housing regulations traditionally exert rent controls, especially in the private rental market. Second, social housing continues to be highly important, is targeted at a broad section of the population, and provided by both municipalities and *limited-profit housing associations* (LPHAs). LPHAs are well-established actors in the Austrian housing system and are required to charge cost-covering rents in exchange for tax exemptions (for details see Chapter 5 by Friesenecker and Litschauer in this volume). Third, housing subsidies – especially for new constructions – are an important element in steering housing construction and securing affordable housing, whilst housing allowances play a less important role.

Housing policy in Austria is highly complex and embedded in a historically grown, multilevel setting. The general responsibility for housing lies at the federal level and includes the Tenancy Law and

legislation regarding LPHAs. Vienna, being both a *Bundesland* and a municipality, not only provides social housing (i.e. municipal housing) but also has full autonomy regarding housing subsidies. Hence, whilst rent controls (first pillar) are a federal competence, both the federal and the local level influence social housing (second pillar), and housing subsidies are the sole responsibility of the City.

However, over the past decades, two housing policy reforms have profoundly influenced Vienna's capacity to provide affordable housing. First, at the local level, Vienna shifted social housing construction from municipal to limited-profit housing associations; and second, at the national level, private rental housing was deregulated.

Social housing: from municipal to limited-profit housing

Vienna has a long history of promoting socially inclusive forms of urban development (see Chapter 3 by Ahn and Mocca in this volume). During the *Red Vienna* era of the 1920s, the local state established itself as a forerunner in social housing, and although the policy focus has shifted over the decades, the social democratic principles of housing policy still remain (for more discussion on Social Democracy, see Chapter 2 by Mocca and Friesenecker in this volume). The 'Viennese Model' of taking 'responsibility for the provision of efficient infrastructure, municipal services and, in particular, for affordable housing' continues to this day (see STEP 2025, 2014). Contrary to most European cities, Vienna still administers a large municipal housing sector. In addition, social housing is also provided by LPHAs. Together, the two sub-segments of social housing deliver affordable and secure housing for a broad section of the population (almost half of all residencies in Vienna, see below).

Although Vienna never sold its municipal housing stock, new constructions were phased out in the mid-1990s and ceased in 2004. Whilst municipal housing construction was reintroduced in 2016, only 4,000 units are currently under construction, therefore handing the task of social housing construction to LPHAs. The retreat was justified in reference to limits on public debt due to European regulations (Maastricht criteria and Competition Law), and it was argued that LPHAs offer comparable low rents. Although it seems like a viable alternative, it differs from municipal housing in some important respects.

First, rent setting differs. In municipal housing, legally set rent applies, whereas rent in limited-profit housing is cost-covering and depends on the respective land, building and financing costs. As shown below, in practice, rents are comparable and both sub-segments

guarantee affordable housing. A crucial difference, however, are the down payments required by tenants in limited-profit housing. Depending on land and financing costs, the average down payment is 500 €/m² (approx. 40,000 EUR for an 80 m² flat), which is returned to tenants when they move out (discounted yearly by 1%). This poses an important access barrier to limited-profit housing, especially for low-income households, and implies a shift in recognition, with distributional consequences for households with little financial resources.

Second, eligibility criteria differ. High income thresholds give broad sections of the population (nearly 80%) formal access to limited-profit housing, guaranteeing a social mix and preventing segregation (net annual income for a single household is 47,000 EUR, and for a family with two children it is 90,000 EUR). Municipal housing is more targeted, as additional criteria apply. Whilst only Austrian citizens were eligible for municipal housing up until 2006, non-EU residents gained access after five years of legal residency (i.e. *equivalent citizens*) following the EU directive on the equal treatment of third-country nationals. The change in the policy design has therefore led to the recognition of the housing needs of non-Austrian citizens and strengthened Vienna's *housing for all* approach. In 2015, the allocation policy for municipal housing was reformed once again. Henceforth, Austrian or equivalent citizens over the age of 17 who are within the income limits and have lived at their current Viennese address for at least two years are eligible for subsidised (limited-profit) housing, allocated by the City. For municipal housing and SMART apartments (see below), a justified housing need must also be demonstrated. Hence, the target group of municipal housing are young adults (up to the age of 30), single parents, and people in social hardship (overcrowding, illness etc.). In light of increasing demand for social housing, the City's approach to new lettings became more targeted, making access for (long-term) migrants with non-Austrian Citizenship easier.

Third, since LPHAs are regulated at the national level, this weakens Vienna's steering capacity. By retreating from municipal housing construction, the City has progressively lost its capacity to influence new construction and allocate social housing in accordance with its own target groups. However, the granting of housing subsidies gives the City the right to allocate one-third of newly constructed units for the duration of the subsidy loan (40 years). Additionally, housing subsidies allow the City to realise objectives by adjusting subsidy schemes. The so-called *SMART apartment* model was introduced in 2012 to better serve low-income households. Down payments for these are limited (approx. 5,000 EUR for an 80 m² flat) and compact floor plans reduce

housing costs (for further details, see Chapter 5 by Friesenecker and Litschauer in this volume). The City of Vienna stipulates that half of all subsidised dwellings must be SMART apartments. Thus, Vienna did not completely lose its redistributive capacities, but rather shifted them from active provision to steering via housing subsidies. This model has allowed the City to reduce differences in rent setting and eligibility/access between the two sub-segments of social housing. Whilst policy instruments have changed, the overall approach of *housing for all* remains and continues to target broad sections of the population, whilst also providing for those in need. Vienna continues its commitment to providing affordable municipal housing and steers new construction in limited-profit housing via housing subsidies. However, redistributive capacities differ between the two sub-segments of social housing, especially regarding eligibility, access and housing costs. This creates the potential for housing conditions to drift apart.

Private rental: deregulation of rent controls

Affordable housing is not only provided by social rental housing, but also rests on strict rent controls in the private rental segment. Implemented as part of the post-war Keynesian welfare strategy, rent controls apply to housing units built before 1945, accounting for around two-thirds of private rental and 42% of total rental (Kadi, 2015). However, the last three decades saw profound deregulation and a dismantling of tenant rights in private rental housing. The harmonisation and simplification of housing regulation was a consensual goal in the political discourse of the early 1990s and was followed by further liberalisations by the conservative/right-wing national government (ÖVP-FPÖ) at the beginning of the 21st century.

Within the rent-controlled segment, the amendment of the Tenancy Law of 1993 (legally effective in 1994) was the most substantial reform. Whilst the rent in rent-controlled dwellings was set according to predefined categories regarding the standard of amenities (so-called *category rent*), the amendment introduced the so-called *reference value rent* for rental contracts signed after 1994. In addition to the standard of amenities, the amendment allowed private landlords to charge location premiums. Location premiums are not legally set, but recommendations provided by the City and legally binding only in case of controversy. Location premiums are adjusted according to building plot prices in the respective area and have increased sharply over the last decade. Whilst location premiums remained stable until 2010 (approx. 1 €/m² in good locations), they now range between 1.50 and 4.60 €/m², depending on the location. However, following a Supreme Court

decision in 2018, Vienna introduced a new calculation logic that classifies only one-third of all rent-controlled dwellings as above average, effectively reducing rent levels by evading location premiums. Hence, whilst the policy design at the national level strengthened the profit interests of owners, the City continues to recognise tenant rights and tries to secure housing affordability also in the private rental segment.

Furthermore, the amendment of 1993 introduced time-limited rental agreements. Initially this aimed at short-term increases in housing supply, as the maximum duration could not exceed ten years and a 20% discount on the rent applied. However, with the amendment of the Tenancy Law in 2000, the maximum duration was abolished, and henceforth a 25% discount applied. In addition, the conservative/right-wing national government (ÖVP-FPÖ) excluded detached and semi-detached dwellings, as well as attic conversions from the Tenancy Law regulation at the turn of the millennium. This implies that rent controls and regulation of contracts no longer apply, thereby reducing the rent-controlled segment. Hence, within private rental, housing is progressively framed as a commodity rather than a basic need, tenant rights are abolished and rent controls evaded.

The reforms of the Tenancy Law saw the layering of new policies onto existing ones, as new regulations only apply for new contracts. Reforms shifted recognition in private rental and created the potential for housing conditions to drift apart. Housing costs in rent-controlled private housing now depend on the date of the rental agreement and land price developments, whilst the introduction of time-limited contracts potentially leads to tenure insecurity. Therefore, although the overall approach remains, shifts in recognition indicate diminishing redistributive capacities. Whether policy reforms led to changing distributional outcomes will be analysed in the next section.

Trends of dualisation in affordable and secure housing

Following the assessment of housing policy shifts in both social and private rental, we can now evaluate whether this led to processes of dualisation of housing conditions in the Viennese housing system. More specifically, we analyse processes of tenure restructuring and tenure security, and evaluate housing cost developments.

Tenure restructuring and tenure security

Whilst clear shifts in tenure were reported in relation to other European cities (Andersson and Turner, 2014; van Duijne and Ronald, 2018), Vienna's tenure structure remained rather stable between 1991

and 2018. Overall, the number of dwellings increased, but the rental sector consistently accounts for over 70% of main residencies, compared to homeownership standing at less than 20% (see Table 4.1). In contrast, in Amsterdam, owner-occupied housing increased from 12% in 1998 to 32% in 2017 and declined to 31% in 2019 (Hochstenbach and Ronald, 2020). In Vienna, the rental segment splits nearly equally into private and social housing, whilst social housing even increased slightly between 1991 and 2018 to 43% of all dwellings, and 57% of rental housing. This suggests that social housing is still highly important and competes with private rental housing. However, within social housing, a shift from municipal to limited-profit housing is observable. Whilst the City still owns over 20% of the total housing stock, LPHAs increased their share of rental housing from 16% to almost 28%. Considering access barriers in limited-profit housing, this indicates a differentiation of rights between sub-segments of social housing and thus a process of dualisation.

Table 4.1 Tenure structure Vienna, 1991–2018

	1991 ^o		2018		% change 1991 ^o – 2018
	(%) of main residence	(%) of rental	(%) of main residence	(%) of rental	
Main segments					
Ownership	17.4		19.4		2.0
Rental	73.6		76.3		2.8
Other*	9.0		4.2		–4.8
Rental subsegments					
Social rental	39.4	53.6	43.4	56.8	3.9
Municipal housing	27.5	37.4	22.2	29.0	–5.4
Limited-profit housing	11.9	16.2	21.2	27.8	9.3
Private rental	34.2	46.4	33.0	43.2	–1.2
Rent-controlled ⁺	31.2	42.4	22.2	29.1	–9.0
Free market rent	3.0	4.1	10.8	14.1	7.8
Time-limited ^o	4.0	5.4	13.2	17.3	9.2
Unlimited ^o	33.9	45.0	19.8	26.0	–14.2

Sources: 1991 – STATISTIK AUSTRIA, Dwelling and Building Register; 2005 and 2018 – Austrian Microcensus; weighted analysis, own calculation; *N*=11,850 (2005), *N*=11,050 (2018).

Note: *service accommodation, free of charge, etc.; ⁺approximated as dwellings in buildings built before 1944; ^ofor time-limited and unlimited contracts 2005–2018.

Besides social housing, rent-controlled private rental also offers affordable housing. Whereas the share of private rental remained rather stable, the share of rent-controlled housing decreased significantly. In 1991, almost all private rental dwellings were rent controlled (93%). By 2018, the share of the free market rent sub-segment had increased to 33% of private rental (14% of total rental). This change can be explained in reference to newly added private rental housing, the demolition of old stock and the exclusion of attic conversions from regulation.

Furthermore, the introduction of time-limited contracts in 1994 established sub-segments in private rental housing that are characterised by diverging housing conditions with regard to tenure security. Contrary to both sub-segments of social housing, which provide unlimited rental agreements, the 1994 amendment jeopardises tenure security in private rental. Only 5% of rental contracts were time-limited in 2005 (11% of private rental), however, this increased to 17% in 2018 (40% of private rental). In the free market sub-segment, the share even increased from 12% to 55% between 2005 and 2018. This suggests a dualisation of housing conditions in rental housing with regard to tenure security that is even more pronounced in the free market segment. Taking account of the fact that 67% of new contracts in private rental are time limited (Tockner, 2017), it becomes apparent that obtaining unlimited private rental is becoming increasingly difficult. The social outcome of this dualisation regarding tenure security within private rental is an evolving insider-outsider divide, with sitting tenants enjoying long-term, secure housing, whilst newcomers face increasingly insecure, time-limited contracts.

As social housing still offers unlimited contracts, the introduction of time-limited contracts in private rental also results in an increasing dualisation between private and social rental. Tockner (2017) reports that 60% of all new rental agreements are in the private market (only 22% in municipal, and 18% in limited-profit housing), which indicates that obtaining social rental housing is becoming increasingly difficult. The social outcome of this dualisation is that social housing tenants are insiders to tenure security, whilst others are progressively locked out.

Although no overall tenure restructuring took place in Vienna between 1991 and 2018, shifts *within* private rental indicate processes of dualisation regarding tenure security that forge a divide between newcomers and sitting tenants. This also brings the danger of a divide between social and private rental, although currently the majority of all rental contracts are still unlimited and social housing contributes to high levels of tenure security. The next section analyses trends of dualisation regarding housing costs in rental sub-segments.

Housing costs

In light of housing cost developments in the respective sub-segments, Figure 4.1 shows that levels and trends differ substantially. First, a divide in rental prices emerged between social and private rental. In 2005, prices were rather similar (5.1 and 5.4 €/m², respectively) but diverged by 2018 (7 and 9.8 €/m², respectively). By contrast, Kadi and Musterd (2014) report a median rent increase of only 28% for Amsterdam between 1995 and 2009.

Second, regarding the two sub-segments of social housing, it is apparent that rental prices in limited-profit housing were slightly higher than in municipal housing in 2005 and this continued until 2018. Considering down payments in limited-profit housing are not included in rental prices, municipal housing is, in practice, the most affordable segment. Nevertheless, since the trend is similar in both sub-segments, this suggests that no dualisation of rents within social housing took place.

Third, within private rental, a growing divide between the rent-controlled and the free market sub-segments is observable. Whilst free market rents soared from 5.9 €/m² in 2005 to 11.8 €/m² in 2018,

Rental prices by segment (€/m²)* Vienna, 2005–2018

Figure 4.1 Development of rental prices in sub-segments.

Source: Statistik Austria; Microcensus 2005–2018, own calculations.

Note: *square meter rental prices, including utility costs. Rent controlled housing stock estimated as the private rental stock built before 1944

the increase in the rent-controlled sub-segment during the same period was less pronounced, from 5 to 8.8 €/m². Rent control effectively cushioned price developments, whilst liberalisations nevertheless increased costs. The introduction of location premiums in the rent-controlled segment transferred land price dynamics to the rent-controlled sub-segment, thereby increasing housing costs, especially since 2010. In addition, the introduction of time-limited rental agreements is another price driver. Although legally a 25% discount applies for time-limited contracts, paradoxically the rent level was already outstandingly high in 2005, at 7.9 €/m², and further increased to 11.5 €/m² in 2018. Since rental prices are renegotiated every three to five years, price dynamics on the overall housing market exert more pressure. Moreover, this indicates that rent controls are not enforced.

Policy reforms in private rental led to a dualisation of housing conditions, with tenure security and rent levels diverging in sub-segments. Whilst rent control still partly guarantees affordable housing, the free market sub-segment is becoming increasingly unaffordable. Boundaries between insiders and outsiders are redefined, forging a split between sitting tenants with old, unlimited contracts and newcomers to private rental housing that face insecure and more expensive housing conditions. In addition, access to social housing is becoming increasingly difficult, as down payments in limited-profit housing pose an access barrier and the percentage of new contracts in social housing is small. Meanwhile, sitting tenants in social housing enjoy secure and affordable housing conditions. The next section takes a closer look at tenant profiles in the respective housing sub-segments to elaborate on precisely who is affected by emerging divides in Viennese housing.

Who is affected by the affordable and secure housing divide?

Migration and rising income inequality are two main urban transformations that put pressure on housing affordability in Vienna. Figure 4.2 shows how income quintiles are distributed across sub-segments in 2011 and 2018 and additionally highlights changes in the distribution of citizenship (2005 and 2018).

Homeownership is dominated by high-income groups, and although private and social rental show a similar distribution of income groups, more low-income households are in private rental. Hence, private rental continues to be important for low-income groups, as they are overrepresented in this segment. Furthermore, they are slightly overrepresented in the free market sub-segment, and especially depend

Figure 4.2 Tenant profiles – income quintiles (2011, 2018) and citizenship (2005, 2018) across tenures in Vienna.

Source: Statistik Austria; Microcensus 2005, 2011, 2018, own calculations. Net income per month and citizenship of household reference person.

on time-limited contracts. Considering recent housing cost developments, this indicates potential affordability problems for low-income groups. Data suggests that high-income households are leaving these more expensive sub-segments of private rental in favour of homeownership. Regarding social housing, no income group is profoundly over or underrepresented, confirming that social housing shows no signs of residualisation and continues to cater for a wide range of the population. However, a clear difference between municipal and limited-profit housing is observable, which suggests that down payments play out as access barriers. Whilst municipal housing is dominated by the second and third quintiles, limited-profit housing caters predominantly for mid- and high-income groups. Nevertheless, as the lowest two quintiles grew in limited-profit housing between 2011 and 2018, it seems that Vienna’s housing subsidy policy (e.g. SMART apartments) leads to inclusion and redistribution.

As Vienna has faced major immigration since 1990, Figure 4.2 additionally highlights changes in the distribution of citizenship and shows that the share of non-Austrians increased from 14% to 24% between

2005 and 2018. Compared to their overall share, non-Austrians are underrepresented in homeownership (11% in 2018) and social rental (16% in 2018), whilst they are clearly and increasingly overrepresented in the private rental segment (42% in 2018). On closer inspection, they are increasingly dependent on the less affordable, free market sub-segment and time-limited contracts (46% and 52% in 2018), whereas the share of Austrians clearly dropped in free market rental. However, this does not necessarily imply affordability problems for all since, according to Kohlbacher and Reeger (2020), immigration is twofold. On the one hand, there are the well-educated immigrants and, on the other hand, the low- to mid-skilled immigrants who enter Vienna's labour and housing market (see Chapter 7 by Riederer, Verwiebe and Ahn in this volume). Nevertheless, as the share of non-Austrians in municipal housing increased, this indicates that the recognition of foreigners in 2006 led to inclusion and redistribution. Still, a higher share of non-Austrians are outsiders to affordable housing and face higher housing costs in the (free market) private rental segment. However, dualisation of housing conditions forges a split between insiders and outsiders that arises predominantly along residency (sitting tenants) rather than citizenship lines.

Conclusions

This chapter set out to evaluate Vienna's status as a *just city* by exploring access to affordable and secure housing. We analysed the development of housing conditions (housing costs and tenure security), presented how the split between affordable and unaffordable housing unfolds in Vienna, and showed who is affected by being locked out of affordable housing.

Though the City's *housing for all* model remains, shifts in recognition indicate changes in distributional outcomes. In private rental, the past decades saw profound liberalisations in Austria that have dismantled tenant rights and challenged the provision of affordable housing in Vienna. The introduction of location premiums and time-limited contracts in regulated private rental have diminished the redistributive capacity of rent controls. Housing conditions in private rental dualise both tenure security and housing costs, forging a split between affordable and unaffordable housing within the segment. In social rental, more vulnerable groups are targeted, and the opening to migrants has translated into better access for this group. Although down payments in limited-profit housing pose an access barrier, Vienna reduces them by drawing on its powerful policy tool

of housing subsidies (i.e. SMART apartments). Municipal and limited-profit housing together still guarantee tenure security, thanks to unlimited contracts, and provide affordable housing by offering the lowest rent. The structural outcome is a split within private rental as well as a split between private and social rental concerning housing conditions. The overrepresentation of low-income groups and non-Austrians in less affordable and less secure sub-segments indicates that the dualisation of housing conditions excludes some of the least well-off. As divides emerge along the lines of residency rather than citizenship, redistribution via social housing and rent control continues to work for sitting tenants; however, this is increasingly not the case for newcomers.

Although conditions have changed and trade-offs are clearly detectable, we argue that Vienna continues its legacy as a *just city* because it continues to take responsibility for affordable and secure housing. As our findings reveal, Vienna's model of *housing for all*, which builds on social housing and rent control in private rental, continues to provide affordable and secure housing for a broad section of the population. Unlike many other European cities, Vienna is characterised by a stable tenure structure, where social housing remains the largest housing segment. However, faced with growing demand, eligibility does not necessarily translate into access and redistribution for everyone in need. The unbalancing of part of the private rental segment threatens the City's redistributive capacity and jeopardises the just housing system of Vienna. In the absence of stricter national rent regulations, only an expanding social housing segment can guarantee the continuation of a just housing system in Vienna.

References

- Andersson, R. and Turner, L.M., 2014. Segregation, gentrification, and residualisation: From public housing to market-driven housing allocation in inner city Stockholm. *International Journal of Housing Policy*, 14(1), pp. 3–29.
- Emmenegger, P., ed., 2012. *The age of dualization: The changing face of inequality in deindustrializing societies*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Fainstein, S., 2010. *The just city*. Ithaca, NY and London: Cornell University Press.
- Hochstenbach, C. and Ronald, R., 2020. The unlikely revival of private renting in Amsterdam: Re-regulating a regulated housing market. *Environment and Planning A*, 52(8), pp. 1622–1642.
- Kadi, J., 2015. Recommodifying housing in formerly “Red” Vienna? *Housing, Theory and Society*, 32(3), pp. 247–265.

- Kadi, J. and Musterd, S., 2014. Housing for the poor in a neo-liberalising just city: Still affordable, but increasingly inaccessible. *Tijdschrift voor economische en sociale geografie*, 106(3), pp. 246–262.
- Kohlbacher, J. and Reeger, U., 2020. Globalization, immigration and ethnic diversity: The exceptional case of Vienna. In: Musterd, S., ed., 2020. *Handbook of urban segregation*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing, pp. 101–117.
- Lévy-Vroelant, C. and Reinprecht, C., 2014. Housing the poor in Paris and Vienna: The changing understanding of the ‘social’. In: Scanlon, K., Whitehead, C. and Fernández Arrigoitia, M., eds., 2014. *Social housing in Europe*. Oxford: John Wiley & Sons, pp. 297–313.
- Matznetter, W., 2002. Social housing policy in a conservative welfare state: Austria as an Example. *Urban Studies*, 39(2), pp. 265–282.
- Mundt, A., 2018. Privileged but challenged: The state of social housing in Austria in 2018. *Critical Housing Analysis*, 5(1), pp. 12–25.
- Mundt, A. and Amann, W., 2010. Indicators of an integrated rental market in Austria. *Housing Finance International*, 25(2), pp. 35–44.
- STEP 2025, 2014. *Urban development plan Vienna STEP 2025*. Vienna: Municipal Department 18 (MA 18).
- Stephens, M., 2020. How housing systems are changing and why: A critique of Kemeny’s theory of housing regimes. *Housing, Theory and Society*, 37(5), pp. 521–547.
- Tockner, L., 2017. *Mieten in Österreich und Wien 2008–2016*. Wien: AK Wien.
- Van Duijne, R. and Ronald, R., 2018. The unravelling of Amsterdam’s unitary rental system. *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment*, 33(4), pp. 633–651.