Henk van Dijk (ed.)

THE EUROPEAN METROPOLIS 1920-2000

Proceedings of a Conference at
The Centre of Comparative European History

Berlin 2002

Dynamics of Sub-urbanisation - The Growing Periphery of the Metropolis.

Berlin 1890 – 2000

Heinz Reif

Sponsored by the European Science Foundation

Dynamics of Sub-urbanisation - The Growing Periphery of the Metropolis. Berlin 1890 – 2000

Heinz Reif

Abstract

What controls the secular process of sub-urbanisation of Berlin to garden and satellite cities and what were the effects? Through the massive retreat of its wealthy and academic bourgeoisie from the centre, Berlin became a bipolar city. On this side of the "railway ring", stood the "stony Berlin" of tenement blocks, the "largest mietskasernen city in the world"(Julius Posener). On the other side the "largest villa city in the world" was growing. The concept of the "green" city had some positive influence and brought a long-term "moral mission" of the upper middle classes into the inner-city.

The pre-war villa settlements were an effective laboratory for the middle class dream of owning a house and a garden on the green and healthy outskirts of the city. In the competition between the political systems after the War, the GDR ran with an inner-city housing development, which unlike the prevailing "spacious green city" idea in West Berlin, had to remain true to the old city structure. Recently some urban planners and sociologists, looking at suburbia in a positive sense, using concepts like 'net city' or 'edge city', have accentuated the autonomy of suburbia. Whether this suburban mix contains the future of city development, remains to be seen.

Why do people live where they do? Why does living in a family home on the greener edge of the city continue to be the favourite style of living in Germany and many other European countries? What controls the secular process of sub-urbanisation, the move to the periphery of the city, in one's own home, to the suburbs, to garden and satellite cities?

Why is this style of modern living so resistant to the continual criticism of suburbia and the references to the enormous problems this style of living incurs, such as the over-development of the surrounding countryside, division of living areas, formation of islands of poverty in the inner-city, retreat into the non-committal private sphere and the collapse of the responsibilities in the civil society, erosion of the varied functions of the inner-city and desolation of city centres, monotonous architecture and structures of settlement, irresolvable traffic problems and irresponsible waste of resources; for along with the urban sprawl, the expensive city infrastructures are profusely growing. Suburbia has been offering strong resistance for a rather long time.

Many city experts are set against this move to the "urbanized" countryside, which has taken on sometimes the characteristics of a "back-to-nature" crusade, a decisive statement "It stops here!" Sub-urbanisation is replaced with a return to a compact, complex and communicative city, for the purpose of social and political engagement, the establishment of new social integration and new needs for social creativity as well as productivity.

The discussion of sub-urbanisation in Germany has until recently been largely led by city planners and sociologists.[1] Out of this reason the research has become too narrowly focused on the post-war decades and on the subject of mass automation as well as its consequences.

In this view private sub-urbanisation experienced a breakthrough in the 1950s and the early 1960s, which was followed by a commercial sub-urbanisation in the 60s. This rather questionable orientation on the sub-urbanisation processes in the United States is in need of correction from a historical point of view, as far as its course of development and the unacceptably short period of time that has been considered are concerned. This orientation of planners and sociologists ignores the fact that sub-urbanisation in Germany and in other European countries, was in spite of all mutual observations and impulses and all the empirical similarities with the occurrences in the USA, an independent, highly complex, genuinely European process on the periphery of the city. And an analysis of this process demands a *longue durée* perspective of its economical, social, political and above all the cultural-historical dimensions.[2]

This article tries to describe the phases and driving forces of this private sub-urbanisation in Berlin. In doing this we will leave out the long period that was necessary to free the periphery, the area of *extra muros* from its stigma of obscurity, so that it could be used by respectable citizens and house owners.

Not until the middle of the nineteenth century did this suburban building development gain a long-lasting dynamism. This was driven by the desire for representative villas of the up and coming wealthy bourgeoisie. The nineteenth century, the century of industrialisation and urbanisation, gave the large cities and metropolises a euphoric and celebrated ascent, especially the rise of the inner cities to centres of the governments and of culture, of service and consumption, of modern civil engineering and mobility of the masses, of entertainment and "nervous stimulation."

At the same time this century made the metropolises, through a concentration of factories and workers, into focal points of the so called "social question", which could be seen in the growing number of densely populated workers districts with their multi-storey apartment houses, with dark, stifling courtyards and which found its expression in the impressive metaphor of the "stony Berlin".[3]

On the other side of these two secular processes, the formation of a pulsating centre on the one hand and worker's districts on the other, there were two other movements: In the 1860s and above all in the 1890s there was an exodus of the wealthy, educated bourgeoisie to the green edges of the city, buying or renting family homes situated in landscaped settlements, in a socially homogeneous living environment, in "villa suburbs" or "country house colonies."

In Berlin, following London's example, a suburban mosaic of new settlements was formed during the Kaiser's rule. This was an incredible field of villas and country homes, which in their representation of wealth as well as in number was unrivalled in Europe. Through the massive retreat of its wealthy and academic bourgeoisie from the centre, Berlin became a bipolar city. On this side of the former city wall, which had been replaced by the "railway ring", stood the "stony Berlin" of tenement blocks (*Mietskasernen*) of 4 or 5 floors, the "largest *mietskasernen* city in the world"(Julius Posener). On the other side of the railway ring, the "largest villa city in the world" was growing. This was so to speak an answer to the inner *mietskasernen – city*.[4]

The start of this was the *Tiergarten* district, formerly a settlement of summer houses outside the city wall south of the large park, which early served as hunting grounds for the Prussian Electors and Kings and now served the Berliners as a relaxing getaway. Then quickly, this district was enveloped in the fast growing city and transformed into a part of the big city.

As this likewise happened to other settlements, which had been offered to the, so to speak, exploding bourgeois wealthy, as a place of residence by resourceful entrepreneurs, the city developers working in Berlin were left with little choice, but to look to the outskirts of Berlin. The "Westerly drift" in Berlin began and slowly formed a tongue, which eventually reached out to Potsdam.[5]

Of course, other real estate entrepreneurs, following Paris' example, also offered the bourgeoisie an inner-city alternative to the suburban villa. This was the "elegant floor"(*hochherrschaftliche Etage*) with its stunning suite of rooms in relatively uniformly-shaped, monumental multi-storey apartment houses on the boulevard. But these Berlin boulevard projects remained for the most part far behind the Paris model.[6]

So, what were the driving forces that made the villa settlements in Berlin so successful?

An attempted analysis has to distinguish between three levels:

1. The extremely favourable conditions for such a development at that time.
2. The "producers" of these "good addresses" on the periphery of the city and
3. The owners and renters, who accepted the offers, and their cultural character, expectations, experiences and motives.

Here are simply a few of the main points on the favourable conditions:

Only the population of a very large city is able to provide a sufficient number of wealthy citizens as potential buyers or renters of villas or country houses. Only a sufficiently large number of wealthy families in the city made the wish to live in a socially homogeneous district a plausible reality. Since the 1860s the wealth in Berlin had grown substantially, as the statistics on millionaires show, in the amount as well as in the amount of wealthy and also in different social and economic groups of society.[7] These new wealthy upper and middle classes, who in large had immigrated to the city and were extremely heterogeneous and, strangely apolitical, was searching for their own "visibility" in the city. This reservoir of potential clients eventually brought these groups of entrepreneurs into the picture, which specialised in the construction of villa colonies, as the risk had become calculable. In the *Kaiserreich* suburbia was a domain for the rich and a large city phenomena.

Demand cannot alone explain the Westerly drift in Berlin. Other favourable conditions had to come about such as: Cheap and easily attainable land reserves, available on the edge of the city, which were located in beautiful surroundings; investors with growing wealth looking for capital investments with high yields; modern transit systems, cutting the travel time from the inner-city to the edge of the city in half; and a city infrastructure in the settlements that were up for offer. City, community and district policies, which due to costs left the regulation of city expansion to wealthy private individuals and offered no resistance to these settlements being made into independent communities. Tax laws, which gave these communities free reign on communal taxes, practically encouraging tax evasion. Not least, the federal, city and community building laws, which made it possible for the real estate entrepreneurs to design their villa and country house settlements with a unique architecture and urban landscape.

Let's look at the main protagonists of suburbia in Berlin under Kaiser Wilhelm II: real estate entrepreneurs, bankers, architects and the individuals having houses built. In the middle of these protagonists, who created "the largest villa city in the world"[8], stood a new figure in society, who had grown out of the early bourgeoisie sub-urbanisation, especially in London: the real estate entrepreneur and his joint-stock company. This figure blossomed for a few decades

in the Kaiser's Berlin. Disappearing from the scene step by step in the 1920s, the real estate entrepreneur has quite obviously enjoyed a come back since the fall of the Berlin Wall. These city developers were stigmatised as speculators by their contemporaries even though they in most cases had a much better understanding of the urban processes in Berlin than did the city's civil servants did.

The real estate entrepreneurs, at their own expense and risk, bought and developed huge areas; equipped them with modern infrastructure and saw to it that streets and train stations were built; they created natural-looking suburban scenery in the form of parks, squares, woods and manmade lakes, monuments and views of Arcadian countryside.

They parcelled out large tracts of land, set clear building and design ordinances in the purchase contracts and land register; and sold the this way developed land only to hand-picked "respectable" bourgeoisie clients, who ensured the homogeneity of the settlement being planned and guaranteed its exclusivity. Therefore, this allowed the properties built up with extremely individual villas and country houses.

An additional driving force proved to be the specific constellation in Berlin. For example, when compared to London, there was an extremely close co-operation between the real estate entrepreneurs and the big banks in Berlin. This partnership led a large number of bankers and bank managers to the villa settlements in suburbia, increased the influence of the real estate entrepreneurs on the local governments and the communities; and above all improved the chances of underground-, commuter train- and tram connections being built to these planned settlements, as the transport companies' finances were also in the hands of the large banks.

In London the transport companies, which were left to their own devices, always constructed their lines according to existing demand and secure sources of profit. However, in Berlin, one finds many lines, which owed their very existence to the future prospect of blossoming villa settlements.

It was the banks that made the villa settlements in Berlin a success. In that they reduced the financial risks from villa settlement projects, the banks were decisive in creating an over saturation of the market. Therefore, they also played a dominant part in the serious profit crisis that occurred in the years leading up to 1914, which led many real estate entrepreneurs to the brink of ruin.[9]

Along with the real estate entrepreneurs and the bankers, one other group was decisive in creating the dynamism of the suburban settlements in Berlin: the landscapers and gardeners, artists and above all architects, who flocked to Berlin from all over and effectively organised themselves, and formed a professional group. They enthusiastically took on these lucrative architectural challenges: building villas and country houses. The new wealthy desired individually designed houses, that in their outer appearance as well as their inner furnishings proudly displayed not only the newly acquired high social status, but also culture, style and the personality of the homeowner. This new wealth was in need of refinement.

Ingenious and ambitious architects; garden and landscape designers; interior decorators and sculptors attempted to realise the dreams of the "Parvenupolis"[10] Berlin in stone, furniture, gardens and parks. It was high times for fashionable architects. "Tous Berlin" was talking excessively about villas and gardens, which confirmed the affiliation with a class of cultivated society, prestigious family life and good taste. Until the turn of the century, the historically styled architecture served this need of representation. Then came the success of the "simple" and "modest"

English country house, which had been imported by the expert on English architecture and reform architect, Hermann Muthesius. People now wanted to live in homes that were oriented to family and natural experiences. Representation quickly lost ground to this new style. The country house was now turned away from the road and oriented towards the sun and the garden. The garden, or domesticated nature, was now the central place for finding one's self and self representation.

This leads us to yet another driving force of the building projects being described here. "Values, not villas characterized….the suburb", is how David Reeder and Richard Rodger stated it.[11] Which values and normative patterns of living were at work here? The "pastoral vision" of reconciliation between the civilised city and the country as "uncontrolled nature", is as old as European history. As Berlin was becoming a metropolis, this vision gained a new fascination and a complete new set of defining components. The city was growing dramatically and there was an ever-greater shortage of living space. City density and social mixing were rising. The number of migrants, also among them an ever growing number of tourists, was becoming a burden. The air and water was getting worse and sound pollution, dust, traffic and hustle and bustle were getting to be intolerable. Health hazards were lurking around every corner. Much worse than this reality was the "moral filth" in the city. Self-assured workers and the "uncultivated" masses everywhere; climbing crime rates and prostitution; and above all the brightly lit world of shop windows in the city with their tempting offers for consumption and entertainment as well as freakish exhibitions. This included the explosion of entertainment establishments, indecent services, trashy literature, and aggressive advertising with bright lights and pictures.[12]

What was more important than escaping this mixture of dust, health hazards an moral decay and moving to the western edge of the city? The green belt around the city had fresh air and plenty of nature as well as a homogeneous neighbourhood, which offered protection from the threat of moral decay of the inner-city.

What started out as a practical contrast between the inner-city and the villa settlements, centre and periphery, was in the course of the 1890s quickly turned into an aesthetic code of class representation by a broad and diffuse reform movement and an aggressive criticism of the big city, which tended to have a slight biological-*völkisch* element to it.[13] According to their antithesis, the inner-city represented nervousness, materialism, danger and class struggle, or in other words a loss of values and social integration. On the other hand, suburbia was defined as a balanced, highly cultivated lifestyle: leisure, domesticity, finding one's self, trustful interpersonal relations, family and friends, civilising self-refinement, moral stability and social harmony. Therefore, this amounts to the union of individuality; an intact family; and a physically, socially and spiritually "healthy" society.

This familial-naturalistic utopian vision of an urban pastoral and beyond that, as the core of the moral mission of this bourgeoisie, the imagination of a future harmonious society, reconciling the large city and a domesticated countryside, had a massive impact on German urban development well into the twentieth century. On the one hand there was the negative influence of the "stony Berlin", a densely populated, dangerous "*mietskasernen* city" lacking light, air and sun. On the other hand there was the positive influence of the villa- and country house settlements on the outskirts of the city, which were objects of prestige and dreams for middle class and working class people. The momentous concept of the "green" city, which called for an opened up and less densely populated city with a large number of parks and communal gardens, was also

a positive influence, which brought a long-term "moral mission" of the upper middle classes into the inner-city.

The further development of suburban Berlin can only be summed up here with a few main points: The antithesis of urban development in Germany before 1914, or the view of the "*mietkasernen* city" as a horrid city and suburbia as a reconciliation between the civilised city and the " domesticated nature", fully blossomed in the Weimar Republic. In fact, this occurred in such a way that it marked Berlin's housing and city development as decisively socially balanced. The pre-war villa settlements were without question an effective laboratory for the middle class dream of owning a house and a garden on the green and healthy outskirts of the city. In contrast to the U.S.A., where the realisation of this dream was slow process starting with the broad middle classes and then being partially accessible to the working classes, the development in the Weimar Republic moved in a different direction. The basic goal of the politics of intervention in the area of housing and city development was to reduce social inequality "from the bottom up", or more precisely to offer the working classes and less fortunate quality apartments, as the Weimar constitution guaranteed. After the revolution 1918 the villa settlements came to an end and many of the architects and even the real estate entrepreneurs switched sides and started working in planning and development offices in the city government or for the up and coming building contractors: the co-operative and public utility housing companies. The most impressive engagement of these two groups, which formed the nucleus of reform housing development, was drawn out of a hate for the "*mietkasernen* city Berlin" and an obsession on "decentralisation". In the long term this led to the near destruction of the fabric of Berlin's areas of old buildings. In the short term, it gave the reform housing development an exceptional quality, which brought about the breakthrough of the classic modernity. This reform housing development did not orient itself so much towards detached family homes for the working and "less fortunate" classes, although there are some impressive examples of this. Much more important and symbolic for the reformers were large multi-storey housing projects on the periphery, which took up less space.[14]

This suburban reform housing development worked not only for a different clientele, but it had changed its basic model dramatically. It was no longer about privacy, individualisation and civil refinement of a homogeneous "ruling" class in both, small simulated urban and rural surroundings, but rather a mixture of social classes, variety of architectural styles, a variety of different uses and formation of communities on the green periphery of the city. Furthermore, it was about urban development that would produce a new socially able human for the future republic.

The traditions, which drove this reform housing development, have not yet been fully researched. Besides the socially applied bourgeoisie suburbia-ideals, what other movements in pre-1914 Germany influenced this housing reform? For example, the concepts of the labour movement, the radical experimental utopian communes, or even the, *ex negativo*, the paternalistic housing projects, undertaken by industrialists? In any event, these reformers in the Weimar Republic saw to it that suburban Berlin expanded in a limited way, even though they enabled residence for masses of the "less fortunate" on the green outskirts of the city.

Essentially, this remained the case in Berlin until even after 1945, whereas at the same time in West Germany, the construction of detached suburban homes increased at an amazing rate as a consequence of: post-war reconstruction, apartment shortages, mass automation and

enormous federal subsidies, reaching until then unimagined dimensions. A number of factors played a role in ensuring that suburban expansion in Berlin continued along at a slow pace.[15][15] On the one hand, the island-like situation in West Berlin held the city's tendency towards an urban sprawl in check. On the other hand, there was still a deep seeded dislike for the miet-kasernen city, which kept the architects and city planners distracted with the inner-city. 1945 the inner-city offered undreamt of possibilities due to the war damage and finally the "structured and spacious city, embedded in park-like green areas" could be made into reality.[16] The *Hansa – quarter*, result of a 1957 international building exhibition, is a representative example of this concept. Afterwards, in the 1960s and 1970s they concentrated on multi-storey housing settlements on the green outskirts of the city, which now were built with much larger dimensions (for example: *Gropiusstadt, Märkisches Viertel*). Settlements of detached houses remained rather seldom in comparison with the above two focuses of the Berlin housing development and had also lost a lot in respect to the style and architectural quality of their predecessors in the Weimar Republic.

In the competition between the systems, the GDR ran with an inner-city housing development, which unlike the prevailing "spacious green city" idea in West Berlin, had to remain true to the old city structure. But with the transition to a forced, tasteless industrial mass production of apartments construction, building activities shifted during the 70s and 80s more and more to the north west periphery of Berlin. Huge *plattenbau* settlements (for example *Marzahn, Hohenschönhausen, Hellersdorf*) soon emerged with a various social groups and diverse communal furnishings.

All in all Berlin – its West and its Ost - remained a city with very limited suburban development until the fall of the wall and a city of social housing developments par excellence. Both of which in the end long-term factors from the polarisation between *mietkaserne-city* and city of villas in pre-World War I Germany.

After the fall of the wall the picture changed dramatically. Sprawling planned and "wild" urban activity, which had previously been concentrated on certain "tongues" and areas in the north west, now dominated the surrounding countryside around Berlin and pushed even further and further into the East, even into the former GDR garden and dacha settlements.[17] Let me name the most important driving forces in this development: The transitional phase 1989 to 1992 was a completely incalculable situation; not legally regulated; with an unplanned, rampantly growing real estate market, which was used to make things quickly and decisively happen. Additionally, there was an absurd optimistic vision of city planning and development for future population growth, especially the expectation, that "high salaried" professionals will settle in Berlin in great numbers. This resulted in an extreme over usage of the well over proportioned subsidies for housing development, e.g. tax breaks and "*Bauherrenmodelle*." Finally, the appearance of new internationally active investment groups, building for example shopping malls, entertainment parks and prefabricated houses. Last but not least the unscrupulous competition among the communities for jobs and tax money.

One possible explanation of this explosion in urban activity might be a "catch-up suburbanisation." This means that the middle class Berliners, most of whom were renters, could finally fulfil their desire that had been blocked both in the East and West to build their own homes with gardens. More recent attempts of interpretation have accepted a much more complex chain of events. A suburban mosaic has appeared on the outskirts of Berlin, which essen-

tially represents all of the concepts in the suburban tradition of city development up to now: Everything from wild constructions to settlements with monotonous rows of houses to the architecturally high valued garden suburb and satellite city (of 5000 and more family units) with varied uses, a variety of house types and various social groups.

The cultural milieus, which have established themselves in suburban Berlin, seem to be equally as diverse as the architectural forms. There is a clear functional connection between these milieus and the centre of Berlin, but in many of these milieus a cultural consensus between centre and periphery did not come into existence up to now. In the long run this diversity will massively endanger the political predictability of these suburban communities, for example on the question of the creation of Berlin-Brandenburg as a unified state. Recently some urban planners and sociologists, looking at suburbia in a positive sense ("suburbia is no longer sub"), using for example concepts like between city, net city or edge city, have accentuated the autonomy of suburbia.[18] Whether this suburban mix contains the future of city development, remains to be seen. Certainly, at the moment, we are experiencing the repetition of the occurrences in pre-World War I.[19][19] The citizens leave their city, turn their backs on it, and use the heart of the city only to their own end, without actually having the responsibilities in civil society. Both the multi-storey apartment buildings in the heart of the city and on its outskirts are becoming more and more deserted. The market, for so long successfully controlled by city planning and policies for city development, is once again winning the upper-hand and is producing, apart from all other costs, a new segregation. After the long and successful fight to tame the market and to democratise the pastoral vision, it seems that after 1989 the trauma of the bipolar city has returned to Berlin.

NOTES

[1] See for example: Klaus Brake, Jens Dangschat, Günter Herfert (eds.), *Suburbanisierung in Deutschland. Aktuelle Tendenzen*, Opladen 2001.

[2] As regards German suburbanisation: Tilman Harlander et. al. (eds.), Villa und Eigenheim. Suburbaner Städtebau in Deutschland, München 2001. Classical studies on sub-urbanisation in the USA: Robert Fishman, *Bourgeois Utopias. The rise and fall of Suburbia*, New York 1987; Kenneth T. Jackson, *Crabgrass Frontier. The Suburbanization of the United States*, New York 1985. The latest review in German: Werner Sewing, "Suburbia takes command. Aspekte der Suburbanisierungsforschung in den USA", in: *Informationen zur modernen Stadtgeschichte* 2, 2002, 29-38.

[3] This highly influential metaphor was invented by: Werner Hegemann, *Das steinerne Berlin. Geschichte der größten Mietskasernenstadt der Welt*, Berlin 1930.

[4] See Heinz Reif, „Villa suburbana – Berlin im europäischen Metropolenvergleich, 1870-1914", in: L. Bauer u. G. Sievernich (eds.), *Reden über die Stadt*, Berlin 2002, 85-100; Gerhard Fehl, „Berlin wird Weltstadt: Wohnungsnot und Villenkolonien", in: G. Fehl/J. Rodriguez-Lores (eds.), *Städtebaureform 1865-1900*, 101-152.

[5] See the map in: Burkhard Hofmeister, „Alt-Berlin – Groß-Berlin – West-Berlin. Versuch einer Flächennutzungsbilanz 1786-1985", in: id. et al. (eds.), *Berlin. Beiträge zur Geographie eines Großstadtraumes*, Berlin 1985, 254.

[6] Michel Pincon/Monique Pincon-Charlot, *Dans les beaux quartiers*, Paris 1989.

[7] See for example: Dolores Augustine, *Patricians and Parvenus. Wealth and high society in Wilhelmine Germany*, Oxford 1994.

[8] This phrase was introduced by Julius Posener, "Berlin. Gründung der Gartenvororte", in: Arch+, No. 63/64, 1982, 51.

[9] Christoph Bernhardt, *Bauplatz Groß-Berlin. Wohnungsmärkte, Terraingewerbe und Kommunalpolitik im Städtewachstum der Hochindustrialisierung (1871-1918)*, Berlin 1998.

[10] This metaphor was created by Walter Rathenau, entrepreneur, philosopher and politician on the eve of the First World War; see Reinhard Rürup, "Parvenü-Polis and Human Workshop: Reflections on the History of the City of

Berlin", in: *German History* 6, 1988, 233-249; Heinz Reif, "Hauptstadtentwicklung und Elitenbildung: "Tout Berlin" 1871 bis 1918", in: Michael Grüttner et al. (eds.), *Geschichte und Emanzipation*, Frankfurt a.M. 1999, 679-699.

[11] See Richard Rodger/David Reeder, *Housing in Urban Britain 1780-1914: Class, Capitalism and Construction*, London 1989, 41.

[12] See Kaspar Maase/Wolfgang Kaschuba (eds.), *Schund und Schönheit. Populäre Kultur um 1900*, Köln 2001.

[13] Clemens Zimmermann/Jürgen Reulecke (eds.), *Die Stadt als Moloch? Das Land als Kraftquell? Wahrnehmungen und Wirkungen der Großstädte um 1900*, Basel 1999; Dirk Schubert, „Großstadtfeindschaft und Stadtplanung. Neue Anmerkungen zu einer alten Diskussion", in: *Die Alte Stadt*, 1986, 22-41; Classical studies on this topic: Klaus Bergmann, *Agrarromantik und Großstadtfeindschaft*, Meisenheim am Glan 1970; Andrew J. Lees, *Cities perceived*, New York 1985.

[14] See Harald Bodenschatz, „Schöner Wohnen im neuen Berlin? Der Wohnungsbau Berlins in der letzten Dekade", in: Berliner Festspiele und Architektenkammer Berlin (eds.), *Berlin: offene Stadt. Die Erneuerung seit 1989*, Berlin 1999, 106 – 125; Klaus-Peter Kloß, *Siedlungen der 20er Jahre*, Berlin 1982. The most important reform housing settlements in Berlin: Hufeisensiedlung Britz 1925-1927 (1027 family units), Waldsiedlung Zehlendorf/Onkel Toms Hütte 1926-1932 (1918 family units); Weiße Stadt/Reinickendorf 1929-1931 (1255 family units).

[15] See Bodenschatz, Schöner Wohnen; Wolf Beyer/Marlies Schulz, „Berlin-Suburbanisierung auf Sparflamme", in: Klaus Brake et al. (eds.), *Suburbanisierung*, 123-150.

[16] Bodenschatz, *Schöner Wohnen*, 107ff.

[17] Bodenschatz, *Schöner Wohnen*, 108ff. and 117ff; Wolf Beyer/Marlies Schulz, „Berlin-Suburbanisierung", 126ff.; Ulf Mathiesen (ed.), *An den Rändern der deutschen Hauptstadt*, Opladen 2002.

[18] See Thomas Sieverts, *Zwischenstadt, zwischen Ort und Welt, Raum und Zeit, Stadt und Land*, Basel 1999 See Thomas Sieverts, *Zwischenstadt, zwischen Ort und Welt, Raum und Zeit, Stadt und Land*, Basel 1999^3.

[19] Here I follow Bodenschatz, *Schöner Wohnen*, 117ff.