DIVERSITY IN NEUKÖLLN

MAINTAINING OR CREATING ACCESSIBILITY (FOR A DIVERSITY OF SOCIAL GROUPS) IN A GENTRIFYING CENTRAL NEIGHBOURHOOD IN THE CASE OF BERLIN

MSc Thesis
Lisanne Caspers

Urban Fabrics Research Group
MSc Urbanism
Faculty of Architecture
Delft University of Technology

June 2015
DIVERSITY IN NEUKÖLLN
- MAINTAINING OR CREATING ACCESSIBILITY (FOR A
DIVERSITY OF SOCIAL GROUPS) IN A GENTRIFYING
CENTRAL NEIGHBOURHOOD IN THE CASE OF BERLIN

P5 REPORT
MSc THESIS

LISANNE CASPERS
STUDENTNR. 4030443
LISANNE_CASPERS@HOTMAIL.COM

1ST MENTOR:
DR. IR. MAURICE HARTEVELD

2ND MENTOR:
DR. STEPHEN READ

URBAN FABRICS RESEARCH GROUP
MSc URBANISM
FACULTY OF ARCHITECTURE
DELFT UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY

JUNE 2015

KEYWORDS:
DIVERSITY, ACCESSIBILITY, GENTRIFICATION, PUBLIC
SPACE, BERLIN, NEUKÖLLN, URBAN DESIGN, URBAN
RENEWAL
Diversification in Neukölln is the title of this P5 report. It is the report of my graduation project of Urbanism at the TU Delft, within the studio of Urban Fabrics. As introduction, it includes the thesis plan for the graduation project and the supporting theory paper. This is the result of the first semester and the basis for the further elaboration of the project, that is documented in the report.

How to stimulate/maintain accessibility for a diversity of social groups in a central gentrifying area [in the case of Neukölln, Berlin]? This is the main research questions that will be answered in the report.

In the research chapter an analysis of the location is made, on multiple scales. This is the basis for a strategy, explained in the following chapter. To illustrate the strategy, a few examples of spatial interventions, possible within this strategy, will be showed.
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This chapter will introduce the current processes that are happening in Western city centres, and zoom in to the case of Berlin. This is the framework (including literature and analysis) for the problem statement.

First the focus is on the general trends in urban planning in a change to the neoliberal city. It will focus further on an explanation of these trends in the case of Berlin, linking the trends to the key projects in the city (that caused media attention) after the reunification.

One of the main current processes involves the gentrification of city centres. An introduction to the theoretical concept of gentrification will be given. The causes and symptoms of gentrification processes are researched in the case of Berlin, to make the current process and the problems associated with the process in Berlin visible.

This will lead to the problem statement, as a conclusion of the threads of some of these processes.

To underpin the problem statement, an introduction into the concept of the right to the city movement is included as theoretical framework.

Finally, the framework for the graduation project will be formulated.
CONTEXT
CURRENT TRENDS

The Neoliberal City

The sub urbanization of cities has influenced the public domain in inner cities. In the beginning of the twentieth century, sub urbanization started with the Garden Movement. It was strengthened by modernism. After the Second World War it became THE style of the consumer society, facilitated by the car (Wagenaar 2013) Because of sub urbanization, the residential function of the city centre is disappearing and the major functions of the inner city are the central shopping facilities. The functional shopping and the spatial accessibility play a major role. The historic city centre needs to compete with the new shopping centres.

Underhill describes that the consequence of sub urbanization are the shopping malls (especially in America). The private developers own this space. But these places do take over the function of the public zone. The problem is that these spaces are perceived as public, but they can keep out unwanted visitors. (Underhill, 2004)

In the seventies the modern city planning is started to get criticized. Jane Jacobs plays an important role in the return to the compact city. In contrast to the segregation of functions that was promoted by modernism, Jane Jacobs advocates for urban diversity, as a condition for a lively city. Four conditions for diversity are given. The district has to have more than one primary function; the urban blocks need to be small; the district should be a fine grained mixture of buildings; enough concentration is needed. Important is the liveliness of the street, a place to discover new things. The city is popular because of its unknown, curious character, which otherwise can only be seen when traveling. (Jacobs, 2009)

In the seventies the criticism on Fordism reaches its highest level. “The relatively stable aesthetic of Fordism modernism has given way to all the ferment, unstable, and fleeting qualities of a postmodern aesthetic that celebrates difference, ephemerality, spectacular, fashion, and the commodification of cultural forms.” (Harvey, 2001) In the post-industrial city the attention of the consumption of goods is changing to the consumption of events.

Burgers states that the [post-industrial] city is in fashion again. The inner cities are increasingly presented as consumption environments. The city changed in the eighties from a production to a consumption environment. There is a growth in retail and horeca in for example the Netherlands, because the interest and consumption pattern of the public is changing. (1992)

City as a Brand

In the post-industrial city art, culture, entertainment and amusement are very important. (Burgers, 1992) Cities try to compete with branding and are marketing themselves. Often events such as festivals are used to promote the city. Hajer, Reijndorp and Brinkman state that in the past years there has been an enormous increase in the interest to consume places and events. (2001) Cities are responding to this trend by organizing and promoting spectacular festivals, markets and other events. But in contradiction to the fact that people want ‘experiences’ they do not want confrontations with other social groups, but only positive experiences. This is possible because meetings can be more planned. “This is increasingly tuning the public space and collective space of the urban field into a space in which various small ‘tribes’ wander about and claim their territory.” (Hajer et al., 2001)

Changes of Public Space

Hajer and Reijndorp state that because of the decreasing job opportunities city centres do not see alternatives for tourist consumption. The spaces are made more attractive and safe. Private parties are taking increasingly possession of the urban space. This trend is also visible, because buildings that are collective become bigger and incorporate more functions (such as the new stations and for example the market halls). They state that these spaces have a more diverse user group than a lot of traditional public spaces.
PLACED MARKETING & DEVELOPMENT IN THE NINETIES

After the fall of the wall in 1989 there was in the first years a debate on which direction the city should take. Two main alternatives were discussed: ‘careful urban renewal’ was promoted by the Greens/Alternative List. This aimed for limiting gentrification. The other alternative aimed for transformation into a service metropolis. Because of a new political coalition in 1990 of SPD and CDU they choose the last alternative as their guiding model for urban development. (Colomb, 2012)

In 1991 Berlin applied to host the Olympic Games in 2000. The arguments for this bid were both pragmatic and symbolic, as the symbol of the end of the Cold War. The Olympic Games should function as an accelerator and deadline for the already necessary redevelopment of the city. And it could contribute to the promotion of the city as a global metropolis and attract investors. But apart from the politicians, there was not much support from the Berlin population for the plans. An Anti-Olympia-Komitee was formed and they started a large anti-Olympic Games campaign. Eventually Berlin did not win the competition for the organization of the Games, but there was a lot of competition and it is not clear how large the role of the AOK was in losing the competition. (Colomb, 2012)

During the nineties the promotion of the city of Berlin was focused on a few key sites that were marketed as the new images and icons of Berlin. These key spots were the Potsdamer Platz, the new government quarter and Friedrichstadt or Neue Mitte.

So in the 1990s the attention from the Berlin government was shifted as part of the neoliberal trends “the core attention of intervention in the cities started to be paid no longer to the provision of public goods and services or the improvement of local conditions, but to the means of bringing financial benefits to the city’s vault, which was done by new forms of outward-oriented policies aiming to attract financially influential, however, contemporarily mobile investments, international tourists and new residents” (Nowobilskis and Zaman, 2014) This caused also a big interest in place marketing and the development of cooperation between public, private and nonprofit sectors. A project in which place marketing reached its peak is in the development of Potsdamer Platz according to Clair Colomb.

After the fall of the wall, Potsdamer Platz was a large ‘tabula rasa’ in the middle of the re-united Berlin. The government chose the area to become a new centre. It was divided in four large plots of land and sold to private investors. The Berlin government made it possible for large companies such as Daimler-Benz to buy the land with large subsidies (Krätke, 2004). The ambition of the city planners was to make Potsdamer Plats a symbol of and for Berlin as a global city. Well-known architects were contracted by the companies to make plans for their plots. But because they feared that Berlin would be too ‘provincial’ they started promotional campaigns. They developed a temporary exhibition, information, multi-used building, named the INFOBOX. This building attracted eight million visitors during its existence (of six years) The ‘Partner für Berlin’ promotional organization organized events on the construction site and exhibitions. The project was also discussed in the media.

At the same time the city made plans for the development of a new centre with the parliament and government buildings. In 1991 it was decided that Berlin would become the capital of reunited Germany. In 1993 they decided on a development program in the middle of the centre, partly in the former east and partly in the former west. The area is shown on the map with black dots. “The goal was to incorporate parliament and the government into the existing urban structure, with its diversity and historical elements, as well as to restore and re-connect the streets, open spaces and parks, including the riverbank promenades, of the city centre.”(2013) They aimed to create a new centre with a mixed use: a combination of the capital related functions and key cultural, academic and commercial facilities. And they aimed to expand and stabilize housing.

In the mid-nineties a promotional campaign called the New Berlin started. The focus groups of the campaign were tourists and investors, as well as the Berliners themselves. Part of the campaign was the promotion of tours and exhibitions on the construction sites. In 1996 at four key squares in Berlin (see map) life size canvases with the future look of the squares were placed during the summer months. This project was called ‘Berlin 2005 - City vision’. The focus of the marketing was at the beginning more focused on the promotion of the capital city. When this succeeded it shifted to a broader orientation. At the end of the nineties a ‘New Berlin’ campaign advertised the ‘five strengths’ of Berlin: ‘Capital City’, ‘East-West Metropolis’, ‘Cultural Metropolis’, ‘Livable City’ and ‘Creative City’. This last strength was gradually becoming more integrated and getting a bigger role in the promotion of the city. (Colomb, 2012)
While in the nineties the focus was on promotion of cultural consumption in a traditional way by investing in cultural infrastructure and emphasize on symbols of mainstream culture (opera, theatres and museums), gradually the alternative and youth culture is integrated in the tourism and place marketing. Love parade is an example of such an alternative festival that got bigger and was/is used for promotion of the city.

Both because of the financial crisis and because the ‘New Berlin’ is not so new and exciting anymore, the city marketing is changing its focus in the course of the 2000s. There are three developments since 2000.

First the urban voids are used on temporary basis for cultural use or for entertainment. These (spontaneous developments) are used as unique selling point in the tourism marketing.

Second remnants of the GDR and National-Socialist past, that in earlier campaigns was not mentioned at all, is becoming visible again in the form of for example exhibitions and memorial days/events. On Potsdamer Platz are in 2005 a few parts of the Berlin re-erected to make the history visible again.

Lastly the ‘ordinary’ socially and ethnically mixed neighbourhoods with ‘authentic’ and alternative cultural life are marketed. They are addressed in marketing campaigns as tourist attraction or as potential location for ‘young creative entrepreneurs’. (Colomb, 2012)

In 2004 Berlin started a campaign called ‘Twelve Times Berlin’ that promoted new tourism: not the big sights were promoted but ordinary areas or districts. In 2009 another campaign marketed for the vibrant cultural scene, the creative economy and ethnic diversity.

After the reunion of Berlin there is a declining in the amount of jobs, except for “small islands of growth” in the cultural industries. (Nowobilska and Zaman, 2014) In the course of the 1990s the traditional industrial jobs were declining rapidly. This was due to the closure and relocation of production sites. In West-Berlin the industries were reliant on special subsidies that were provided during the division of Germany. In these traditional sectors the number of jobs decreased with 18 percent between 1995 and 2005, which is a total amount of 229,000 jobs. In the same period the cultural economy increased with 5,200 employees to a workforce of 160,000 people. In 2006 the cultural economy is respon-
of the total workforce. Krätke critically remarks that this new economy does not cover for the amount of jobs that are lost in the traditional sectors. But the urban policies are influenced after 2002 by Florida’s theory and in their promotion campaign a shift in attention is visible towards attracting the creative class. This is not their only focus point though. (Krätke, 2004)

An example of a project aimed at attracting the creative class is the media spree project. The media spree project is aimed at promoting cultural industries. The local music and club culture is in this project used as a brand and the subculture is seen as an important economic activity by the government. Universal Music Group Germany and MTV Central Europe relocated to old redeveloped warehouses in the project area along the Spree. Both organizations admitted that Berlin’s alternative music and club culture was an important factor to locate in Berlin. (Porter and Shaw, 2008)

There is protest against the Media spree project. The criticism was mostly because in the developments a partly private spree riverside is proposed, and the people want to have access to the waterfront. Also, because a private owner decided to build an apartment block on his property. A part of the Berlin wall is demolished to create this building. Temporary clubs, that are located in this area, have become popular and there are protests against the new developments that were planned after the temporary period of these clubs. It is feared that clubs will have to move, as housing is also proposed in this plan.

It is contradicting that these activities are acknowledged to be economically important by the government, but they are not promoted for long term periods. Shaw and Porter acknowledge that there are only short-term contracts for these creative activities and that ‘they also need long term prospects’.

In this period, the focus shifts towards a larger area. In the nineties, the focus was on the central districts, now additional areas are promoted and developed. Both physical and in ‘brands’ or key spots, the promotion of Berlin is widened. Because of the relative growth in the cultural industries and influenced by the book of Florida, the cultural class is addressed in promotional campaigns and in new projects, particularly visible in the Media Spree Project. This led also to a promotion of the ‘ordinary’ and an expansion of areas that were promoted. Furthermore, it led to the promotion of underground or alternative culture, that is often expressed in temporary spaces: urban voids.
Kate Shaw (2008) explains the definition of gentrification. According to her, Neil Smith defined the traditional and first definition of gentrification as “process by which working class residential neighbourhoods are rehabilitated by middle class home buyers, landlords and professional development.” Transition of rental houses to buying property is an early characteristic of gentrification and displacement was a remarkable aspect from the start. According to Shaw “there are no serious studies demonstrating that displacement does not occur at all, or that low-cost housing does not become harder to find as gentrification advances.” Although, some argue that ‘poor’ people benefit from new working opportunities and others argue that the problem of displacement is not significant, but the research supporting these opinions is not extensive.

At an international conference on gentrification in Glasgow in 2002 the term is gentrification is extended and used in much wider terms, than its earliest definition. It does not only refer to the transformation of residential neighbourhoods but to a wide range of inner-city development. (Levine, 2004)

The stage model is used to describe the ‘classical’ stages that happen in a gentrification process. It is already criticized because in gentrification processes, not always all stages are happening. Also, there are new developments in gentrification processes that are not described in the classic stage model. But it will give an overview of typical phases that often happen in gentrification processes.

The marginal stage is the start of gentrification. In this phase displacement does not take place jet, or marginally, because in this phase the land values are not increasing. But pioneers move into a neighbourhood. These pioneers are well-educated people, but have a low income (such as artists).

In the following stage the ‘early gentrifiers’ are discovering the neighbourhood. These people are cultural professionals that have a higher income than the pioneers. They often renovate and own their houses. Because of their investments in the neighbourhood, the housing prices will increase. Still, in this phase the increase in prices is relatively low.

Next, the area is discovered by people with more money. They buy property in the neighbourhood as investment. The still cheap houses and other property are bought to be rehabilitated by developers and investors. Afterwards, they sell the property again to the most affluent buyers. This is the final stage. The pioneers move on to a new neighbourhood. The social diversity has decreased and the old population of the neighbourhood is replaced by middle-to-upper-middle class inhabitants. (Shaw, 2008)

Currently, in some places even another stage takes place of super-gentrification. This is described by Lees as a recent wave of urban transformation where the new economically successful are bought out by even more affluent people. (Levine, 2004)
The causes of gentrification

Shaw summarizes the argument of Ley that "gentrification is a result of global economic restructuring". Just like the phenomenon of suburbanization in the fifties, the inner-city lifestyle is heavily marketed, and it is available because of the degeneration of the city centres.

In the book "the new urban frontier" Neil Smith makes a division in local, global and social arguments to explain the process of gentrification. The global argument is "uneven development". "Gentrification is...part of the social agenda of a larger restructuring of the economy." Uneven development is a process that is related to a capitalist society. It is a process in which a certain area is being developed until a certain level (when it reaches its potential value) and this is leading to underdevelopment in another area. This underdevelopment creates opportunities for a new phase of development in this other new area. The rent gap is an important factor in this valorization and devalorization of areas. The local argument is the existence of a 'rent gap'.

The rent gap is the difference between the existing rent of a location and the potential rent under a higher and better land use. This rent gap exists because of devalorization of the property. Spatial development is prone to devalorization and over-accumulation, because of the long turnover period (Shaw, 2008). The potential rent can be realized also by redeveloping property. The process of gentrification could be seen as most importantly a move back to the city of capital.

The social arguments focus on an explanation why the early gentrifiers want to come to the city centre. Why are they interested in these areas again? The rent gap explains the economic possibility and interest, but does not explain the social rediscovery of the inner city. This can be seen as the consumption-side explanation for gentrification.

According to Ley, the main "tenet of its application of gentrification is that the current inner-city transition is the product of cultural choice, under given conditions." These conditions included the crisis; the economically independent women; the perceived 'blandness' of suburban living; the restructured labour market; the availability of low-cost housing in the inner-city and the proximity of offices and to places of cultural consumption. The choice was made by a group of relatively young, affluent couples without children: 'the new middle class'.

Shaw describes several factors that have influence on the occurrence of gentrification phases. The area's position in the international, national and local hierarchies is important. It also depends on global conditions. Furthermore, it depends on local particularities, such as the characteristics of the (housing in) a neighbourhood; the level of opposition and the government interventions (Shaw, 2008).

The history/waves

Smith describes the gentrification processes defined by periods in time when certain stages were recognized, related to the economic and societal circumstances. He defines three typical waves of gentrification. He also describes an ongoing process that is now happening as a fourth wave.

The first wave of gentrification was in the sixties and seventies. Gentrification happened sporadically in Western-Europe, North-America and northeast Australia. The government made this possible by providing restoration grants to promote improvements on properties and by easing the access to home ownership.

The second wave started because of the depression in the late seventies. The scale of this gentrification wave was bigger. It was often encouraged by the local economy and had as incentive to encourage the market. "New neighbourhoods converted into real estate frontiers" (Shaw, 2008).

In the nineties the third wave started with the global recession. The scale was again growing and more large scale developers were involved. Also, the government was more involved. There was a change to a neoliberal government. The local government is more reliant on the attraction and retention of the middle class to increase tax revenues, because it got less funding from national government. "The construction of new gentrification complexes in central cities across the world has become an increasingly unassailable capital accumulation strategy for competing urban economies." In this third wave the possible location that gentrify are also expanding to economically risky neighbourhoods, for example industrial quarters (Shaw, 2008).

So the waves are growing in the size of their impact. While in the first wave it was mostly used as a means to redevelopment of a dilapidated neighbourhood by giving incentives for new home owners, it increases to become a tool to increase and speculate with property values, and to make profit for large scale developers and other investors. This process of is still going on. Smith describes it as a fourth wave that is happening.

In this latest phase the global capital reaches down to the neighbourhood scale. Smith describes the generalization of gentrification in different dimensions. The role of the state transformed. Also, there is geographical dispersal. The levels of political opposition are changing in a revanchist city, making the city safer for gentrification and increasingly intolerant to opposition. Furthermore, global finance penetrates the process. This is resulting in mega-scale developments that have symbolic value and that aim at the highest financial benefits. The gentrification has become a strategy for competing urban economies. Thus it includes everything that attracts the middle class. Real estate development is central in city's productive economy and it is justified by economic benefits: appeals to jobs, taxes and tourism. (Smith, 2002)
The definition of gentrification has broadened, just as the impact and size of it has. While in the first waves, the gentrification was limited to smaller areas as a result of the smaller scale developments of people investing in their property. The current problem of gentrification is because it has become a tool to increase and speculate with property values and to make profit, for large scale developers and other investors (in the fourth wave). This is justified also by public sector because of the economic benefits for the city.

A defining characteristic for “gentrification” in its traditional meaning is the occurrence of displacement. The rents are increasing and lower incomes can not afford the housing in a gentrifying area anymore. The current inhabitants with low income are pushed out of the city. This is encouraging segregation in terms of property value and agglomeration effects.
GENTRIFICATION
AND HOUSING IN BERLIN

**Possible Existence ‘Rent Gap’ and Pressure on Housing Market**

After the Second World War there was a degenerated housing stock in Berlin. Especially in East Berlin the buildings were not renovated. There were no private incentives for rebuilding in East Berlin, since private ownership was discouraged. Also the rents where frozen after 1945. This lead to high vacancy rates and to a poor condition of the building stock. This explains the possible existence of a ‘rent gap’.

After the fall of the wall the “First Berlin Renewal Program” was started. Twenty-two renewal areas were designated, of which the most were in the former East of Berlin. This program had two phases. In the first phase private investment in the building stock was supported. This was encouraged with tax reductions and loans. This could be explaining why most gentrifying neighbourhoods are on the former East. Here the houses were more dilapidated and because of the promotion of private investment in the areas the first stage of gentrification was supported.

In the Wohnmarktreport Berlin is stated that there is an increasing population (in every neighbourhood). Although Berlin has a higher amount of unused property (2% against 1% in most other large cities in Germany), there is a pressure on the housing market, because of this growth and because the current housing stock needs to be partly adapted or renewed.

In all of the districts of Berlin is a growing population. In combination with the decrease in persons per household, there is a growing need for apartments. Also, larger and more comfortable houses on attractive locations are more demanded, according to the Wohnmarktreport. The amount of households is growing four times faster as the amount of apartments.

Also, the housing market is unbalanced because of the decay of houses. These trends can lead to increasing housing prices and rents, as visible in Berlin.

An example of gentrification in Berlin is the Oranienstraße. In this example the city of Berlin, in the first phases, did try to slow down the process of gentrification. But in 2004, they abolished all these efforts.

Tessa Dikke describes the process of gentrification in the case of the Oranienstraße. This street is close to the former East Berlin. After the fall of the wall, this street was in the middle of the city. People could easily explore the area, because it was close to East Berlin. In the street is an old shopping mall from 1907 that was planned to be demolished in the 1990s. But this building was squatted by artists and became famous under the name Tacheles. After the fall of the wall, the old housing association of the DDR wanted to give the property back to the former owners. But it had problems finding the owners and made it possible to legally ‘squat’ these buildings for low prices. These factors made the street appealing and made the public change. After the experimental phase, it became more popular and thus the prices went up. Instead of experimental and spontaneous activities, it became more conventional, professional and bureaucratic. Luxurious and expensive shops or establishments popped up. Until 2003, the gentrification of the Oranienstraße was slowed down, because of regulations such as maximum rents and a supporting institution that assisted in problems with landlords (called the Büro für Stadtteilne- he Sozialplanung). But they abolished both the rent control and the Büro. (Deben and Bontje, 2006) Also, in 2002 a law that banned the conversion of owned apartments for use other than residential use was lifted. In the Oranienstraßen the proportion of tourist and entertainment related uses increased from 10% to 80% of the total floorspace in a few years. (Colomb, 2012)

**Outward Movement of Inhabitants & New Inhabitants in Centre**

New inhabitants from outside Berlin are moving into the central parts of the city recently. The inhabitants of Berlin are moving to outer parts of the city. This can indicate the possibility of displacement within the central area of Berlin. The incoming new inhabitants can indicate that pioneers or later gentrifiers are moving into the central area.

Inhabitants of Berlin are moving to outer parts recently. The migration into the central parts of the city is positive. With the Land Brandenburg is the moving balance always negative, between the last and most Berliners, as well as with the old and new Berlin, the new came faster from Brandenburg, than from them came. In the year 2000, there were still 17,146 Berliners who moved out. Since then, the number has increased to 20,412 people. After the fall of the wall, this street was in the mid-
Incentives for Gentrification

Furthermore, the change from rental to owner occupied housing is happening in a gentrification process (in the first and second stage). The map shows this process in Berlin. Originally, Berlin is a city that has a tradition of rental houses. The government is promoting the change towards home ownership. This is visible in the map below.

Change from rental to owned 2005 - 2010

When these indicators changed more than +1 or -1 from the SD, then it is given a positive or negative indication. The map below shows these statistics for 2013. This index shows the probably positive attitude of the planning department, towards changing populations of certain neighbourhoods. An area is positive, if there is a change in the amount of unemployment, but there is no attention to the influence under which this change in unemployment is happening. As visible in the inhabitation lengths, in the central districts there are a lot of new inhabitants. Maybe the change in unemployment is the result of a gentrifying area, instead of a positive development in the existing population.
Statistics of the rent prices in Berlin in the last years show an increase in average rent (see the graph on the left). Also a rent map for the different district show increasing rents in the central districts of Berlin. Especially north of the centre the rents are increasing.

An other map from the municipality (on the right) shows the height of the rents in 2013. The four highlighted areas are the most remarkable for the height of the rent and/or for the increase in rent.

In the Wohnmarktreport 2014 a map describes these different zones or areas. Four areas with the highest rents are specified and explained.

1. This high price zone is the historical Mitte and the southern part of Prenzlauer Berg. The highest rents are around Friedrichstraße, Unter den Linden, Hackischer Markt and Alexanderplatz. This is a mixed area in both buildings and inhabitants, according to the report. Also it has high rents per square meter and the amount of money spent on housing is high.

2. This second price zone is the around Kurfürstendamm. Around this boulevard are large apartments, both historical and new.

3. The third high price zone is mostly remarkable for recent gentrification. It is stated in the report as the youngest high price zone, consisting of Kreuzberg, Neukölln and Friedrichshain. The apartments are mainly small. Most of the housing exists of small, old, working-class houses or of post-war prefab buildings. This limits the maximum possible rent and makes it still affordable for relatively small incomes.

4. The last fourth zone is Grunewald and Dahlem. This is an area with a lot of villas and single family houses. The area is close to the centre and has a high ‘living value’, according to the report. (2014)
An other indication of the existence of gentrification are the protests against new projects and against gentrification specifically. The protests (according to Colomb, 2012 and to several protest sites named in the map) are highlighted in the map. The location of these protests show the trend of the gentrification process.

First in Prenzlauer Berg local residents protested against gentrification in the early nineties. But since the 2000s ‘Creative City’ policies there is an apparent acceleration and extension of gentrification. This causes the reappearance of urban social mobilization by various groups. They express their resistance in two ways: attacks of material property and opposition to large-scale redevelopment plans. An example of the first form is the wave of car burning in Friedrichshain, Kreuzberg and Neukölln by radical left scenes. The resistance against large-scale redevelopment projects is by broad-based coalitions. (Colomb, 2012)

Another bread-based protest is opposing against the development of the former Tempelhof airport. It closed in 2008 and in 2012 a opposition called 100% Tempelhöfer Feld started. They collected more then 180.000 signatures against development.

Also, on the internet a lot of organizations against gentrification or large-scale developments can be found. They also organized protests. In the map these groups are shown as well. For example in Friedrichshain the Turkish community is protesting against gentrification of the Kottbusser Tor. They started a protest named “I love Kotti”.

During my stay in Berlin in march 2015, a demonstration against gentrification took place at the Hermanplatz in Neukölln. (Shown in the pictures above)
The maps on the left show the trends visible in the centre of Berlin. Looking at the order of protests that happened in different location, a trend becomes visible in which the location of protest is moving outward the centre of the city. Because of the higher prices in the centre the 'pioneers' have been moving toward outer areas. Andrej Holm has published a map with his conclusion of pioneering phases of gentrification in Berlin. It is an arrow directing outwards the centre of the city. This trend is similar to the trend found in the mapping of protests.

The focus of the project will be aiming at this area at the end of the arrow: Neukölln. Here the process of gentrification is currently happening. According to Shaw (2008) the gentrification can be best directed in an area were it is in one of the earlier phases, which makes this area suitable for the location of the graduation project.

The map below shows the rents in 2013 for the centre of Berlin. The striped areas show the areas with the biggest increase in rents in the period of 2011-2013. This is combined with the marketed areas. It is visible that the areas that have been promoted are mostly along the arrow and have relatively high rents. It also shows that Neukölln, were the newest protest are, is still a lower rent-zone. Which indicates the earlier phase of the gentrification, and the possibility to direct and influence the process.

The commercial way of promoting the inner city by the public sector is a thread to the open city ideals: a city that is accessible and open for everyone. The goal is attracting a certain public: an economically attractive public. This goal should not block the aim of trying to create accessibility for everyone.

In the first decade after the reunification, Berlin aimed to become a more global orientated city. With the Potsdamer Platz as one of the main images they wanted to create for the city, they tried to attract international investors. Gradually their orientation in the promotion and development of the city was expanding. While the centre is still being developed, new attention is given to attracting the creative class, under influence of Florida’s book. In their campaigns for city promotion they focus on the temporary uses and the ‘ordinary’ neighbourhoods. While at the same time these ‘ordinary’ neighbourhoods start to gentrify. So, the current emphasis in promoting existing neighbourhoods is encouraging the gentrification of these areas. Also, new developments are directed at attracting this creative class. There is visible protest that happen in these neighbourhoods and the large protest against the big projects, as main example the Media Spree Project.

Within Berlin different stages of gentrification are visible. The areas that were promoted in the 1990s do have the highest rents. The 'symptoms' of gentrification: displacement, rented to owner occupied and increasing rents are visible in Berlin. All the central districts have a high outward migration trend and have a lot of inhabitants for less than five years. This means segregation in terms of property value and agglomeration effects are increasing and the gentrification finally leads to less diversity.
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK
AN OPEN INNER CITY

INTRODUCTION

To whom does the city belong? The right to the city is a concept that was first introduced by the Situationists. Their critique included a different view about society as a whole, including the city. Who were they? And what was their critique? This will be explained to understand the emergence of this demand for the right to the city. Their methods and answers to accomplish this right for the city will be reviewed as well.

The goal is to formulate aims for an urbanism project based on the ideals of the open city. This open city is advocated in the claim for the right to the city.

After the existence of the Situationists there has been constantly some form of protest for rights to the city. The central question of to whom the city belongs, is still an ongoing and relevant discussion.

In the neoliberal city the role of the local governments/public has changed from providing welfare to the focus on economic prosperity. By competing with other regions or cities the focus is on attracting mostly economically attractive people and functions, and is thus addressing only a certain public.

In the case of Berlin this resulted, in the last twenty years, in policies that stimulated gentrification and focussed on promoting the city as a brand. There are several protests in the city against these private-public large scale redevelopments and gentrification.

In the current debate different directions and ideals are proposed to the current trends in city development. Building on the current discussion, their arguments are used to form the aims for the project.

ORIGIN OF ‘RIGHT TO THE CITY’: THE SITUATIONISTS

In the sixties and seventies demonstrations in Europe took place. Youths, students and migrants demonstrated against "the cultural norms of the institutions, their quality and the limited options to participate in their design." (Mayer, 2009) And leftist groups discovered the ‘reproductive sphere’ is crucial in bringing about revolutionary change.

In this period the Situationist International, with a basis in Paris, played a role in introducing the concept of the right to the city. They tried to understand and construct the right on space with their vision and in their critique. (Barnard, 2011)

The Situationists originate from two different groups. COBRA was the more expressionist group and in Paris a conceptual group was the Lettrist Group. Eventually, these organized into the Situationist International that existed from 1957 to 1972. (Sadler, 1998)

COBRA’s member Colle criticized the concept of Corbusier of the functional ‘machine for living in’. He compared the house of the working man as another factory for ‘eating and sleeping’. The Situationists were positive about the explorative and progressive character of the functionalism when it came to being, but they especially had critique on the blending of functionalism with the “…productivist values of capitalism and state communism, workers remaining appendages to the machine rather than its masters.” (Sadler, 1998)

According to them, the technology should do the work for the people so we have to spend less of our time on production or reproduction.

Lefebvre, who influenced the Situationists and whose articles were published in their magazine, stated that modern urbanism was creating abstract ‘homogeneous’ space, while he proposed to develop society, urban form and processes together.
“His concern was the reintegration of the perceptual, conceptual, and practical dimensions of social life and space.” (Read et al., 2013) He proposed to realize the city as a collection of contributions of all citizens, instead of a closed book. The right to the city was according to Lefebvre the right to this oeuvre: “the collective totalities of social relations and activity that makes up a city.” It is a right to participation and appropriation. (Barnard, 2011)

The Situationists recognized popular culture as a valid culture and were interested in mass culture, expressed in their interest of everyday objects. They were interested in unplanned places and buildings and objects without a known producer. They aimed for revolution. “...general revolution would originate in the appropriation and alteration of the material environment and its space.” (Sadler, 1998) Revolution would lead towards an urbanism without the reign of the spectacle. This concept of the spectacle is one of the key terms of the Situationists. Barnd describes the spectacle as a key element in the need for production and consumption of commodities both material and cultural. It is the principle that our reality is formed by all images, products and activities related to mass media and “...driven towards controlling people’s activities and consciousness.” (Barnard, 2011) According to them, the spectacle is seductive but hiding real processes of exploitation. (Sadler, 1998)

Debord, member of the Situationists, states that techniques in everyday life, for example television, is part of the framework of capitalism and reduces independency and creativity. In the modern organization of life, stimulated and provided by modern planning, life is reduced to a repetitive spectacle. (Sadler, 1998)

So they pleaded for a new form of urbanism without the spectacle. In this new urbanism the participation and contributions of all people constitute the city.

**Situationists’ Ideal Urbanism**

The Situationists where aiming for an aesthetic of the people. The book La Vie Quotidienne by Lefebvre was published in the Situationist International and had a lot of influence. The interest in sociology caused awareness of class divisions within the neighbourhoods of a city. Furthermore, he demonstrated that complex old neighbourhoods have a gradual and long development. While new-built rational plans, for which these old neighbourhoods were destroyed, are compared with butchery (while the designers aspired to plan them to the detail). (Sadler, 1998)

Other key terms used by the Situationists are dérive and détournement. A state of transcendence should be aimed at. This can be accomplished by drifting aimlessly through the city and by the rearrangement of pre-existing elements. (Barnard, 2011) These activities should take place in their ideal cities instead of activities related to the spectacle.

The Situationists defended the urban mix. They stated that in a capitalist system the ethnic and working-class ghettos and cultural mix would eventually disappear. (p. 55)

“The Situationists city was a constant play of contrasts, between confined and open spaces, darkness and illumination, circulation and isolation.” (Sadler, 1998) They thought excess of space, for example for parking etcetera and other things related to the capitalist city and spectacle, would not be necessary in an urban context where the spectacle is absent.

So the Situationists reject the current system in its totality. They aim for a different solution that is accomplished by a revolution. Their ideologies are radically different from the existing functioning of the city. Some trends in the current development of a city are in line with the concepts the Situationists introduced in the sixties and seventies. The popularity of the development of mixed-use plans is providing a more organic organization of space. The emphasis on public transport instead of cars is in line with their ideologies and is providing for physical access to the city.

**Right to the City after the Situationists**

Since the sixties the demonstrations and social movements changed. In the eighties there is a shift of movements in two directions: radicalization and professionalization. This makes the forms of protest more fragmented. In the nineties the fragmentation of movements increased further. Some movements are protecting themselves and their privileges. Other movements are addressing the problem of “Whose city?” They advocate anti-globalization and anti- gentrification. (Mayer, 2009) After 2001 the movements are all turning against some form of the neoliberalisation of urban governance. These movements address three problems of which one is related closely to the right to the city. They protest against the growth politics. These include protests against the commercialization of public space, city marketing and the intensification of surveillance and policing in urban space. (Mayer, 2009)

Because the urbanization became more global through the integration of financial markets, the protests also became more global. The former three separate movements (against growth politics; against dismantling of the welfare state and anti-globalization) were brought together. Recently the UN Habitat, UNESCO, ISSC and international NGOs World Charter started a working group on Urban Policies and the Right to the City. They advocate for an institutional set of rights. This “…institutional set of rights boils down to claims for inclusion in the current system as it exists, it does not aim at transforming the current system – and in that process ourselves.” (Mayer, 2009)

**Current Interpretations of the Right to the City**

The British Harvey, who was influenced by Lefebvre, is one of the advocates of the right to the city in the current debate. He states that cities are created as a result of the concentration of surplus product. Because of competition, more surplus value is created by expansion and by innovation. There is, in the politics of capitalism, “The perpetual need to profitable terrains for capital-surplus production and absorption.” If this is not possible, capital de-values. This expansion led to increasing globalization. Harvey states that after the eighties (when cities became more popular again) the city and the quality of urban life have become a commodity “in a world where consumerism, tourism, cultural and knowledge-based industries have become major aspects of the urban political economy.” According to him the absorption of surplus value is in the transformation of the city. The growth of a city leads to artificially increasing land values. And the reconstruction within the city led to the dispossession of marginalized groups and the poor. A classic example of this phenomenon was in Paris. Haussmann made the famous boulevards through the slums. He calls this phenomenon “accumulation by dispossession”.

Currently dispersed social movements demand, according to Harvey, “…greater democratic control over the production and utilization of the surplus. Since the urban process is a major channel of surplus use, establishing democratic management over its urban deployment constitutes the right to the city.” (2003) According to Harvey the right to the city is more than access to urban areas, but it is a right to change and to collaborate in the urbanization process and to change ourselves through this change in the urban. The solution of claiming back the city lies, according to Harvey, in an urban revolution in the broadest sense of the word, which was formulated by Lefebvre.
Peter Marcuse (German/American lawyer and professor in urban planning in New York) describes the right to the city also as an overarching whole of multiple rights. It is a moral and ethical cry and demand. He gives a definition of the concept of “city”. Rather than a certain physical city, it is through having access to a city that access to the society is given. He sums up the principles of such a city: justice, equity, democracy, full development of human potentials or capabilities, to all according their needs, from all according to their abilities. He calls diversity and sustainability a necessity to the pursuit of these goals. (Marcuse, 2009)

In his book “Whose public space?” Madanipour states that the struggle over claims of space by different groups or organizations creates spaces that have overlapping meanings. These claims may take softer and more temporary forms when they are made by less powerful groups. Similarly, spaces that are not claimed and that are deteriorating reflect according to him a deterioration of the quality of the city as a whole.

He argues that a place can be called public space if it is equally accessible to everyone. The claims over space should be based on principles of equality. This can be realized with an inclusive and democratic process.

The Situationists proposed the city, in their broad definition, as an oeuvre to which everyone can contribute. This main aim is also central in the current discussion. The right to the city is about inclusivity and thus accessibility for everyone.

**Cities for profit?**

In the recent history the state/governance provided a partial redistribution of the accumulation. But neoliberalism causes new forms of governance, in which private or nonprofit organizations and the upper-classes have more power. For example in New York this trend, of the right to the city directed in favour of the private or quasi-private interests, is visible. For example a refurbishment of the inner city spaces makes the city more attractive for private investment (and tourism). (Harvey, 2003)

Madanipour also recognizes a change in the recent nature of public space, which relates to the neoliberal governance. “They are undergoing a transition from an expressive to an instrumental character.” For example a street that is pedestrianized in the interest of the businesses to gain more profit, is such an instrumental space. The shift of power towards the market, that has taken place in the neoliberal city, has led to the production of places that are economically justified. (Madanipour, 2010)

According to Marcuse the current right to the city is in the hands of “… the financial powers, the real estate owners and speculators, the key political hierarchy of state power, the owners of the media.”

He explains that the financial crisis leads to all sorts of symptoms, because the system is flawed. The current system is based on greed: the motive is profit. As a solution, he suggests to eliminate this profit-led main motive. (Marcuse, 2009)

In the development of the city the aim should be to generate an inclusive design. A strategy or design that does not strive for profit as its main goal, but that gives the opportunity for non-profitable groups of people to make claims to the space as well.

**Towards an open city**

Marcuse gives an extended explanation on what exactly constitutes the right to the city and introduces a new concept: cities for people, not for profit. He explains by whom the right is demanded and cried for. He makes a differentiation in hierarchy related to production and a hierarchy related to culture. The working class and the excluded, the lowest in his production-related hierarchy, can together be seen as the deprived. They demand for material necessities. Within the cultural division, the group of the directly oppressed demand the right to the city. These directly oppressed exists of the people that are excluded in (often only) cultural terms, for example by race, gender etc. The cry comes from the alienated, the people resisting the dominant system. They have aspirations beyond the material terms of the right to the city. (Marcuse, 2009)

The aspirations of the alienated are leading to activities that exist within the for-profit capitalist system but which are not for-profit. They “… seek a decent and supportive living environment.” These activities in everyday life already (marginally) exist within (some) different sectors. Marcuse states that the people who claim the right to the city, the oppressed and alienated, are increasingly recognizing their ‘common enemy’. He suggests eliminating this enemy per sector. In some situations and in certain places this is already done, for example in the environmental movement. With the slogan or term ‘cities for people, not for profit’ he suggests to “squeeze the profit” out of the housing system. (Marcuse, 2009)

For example, this trend of non-profitable activities is visible in Berlin in a lot of different initiatives. But they are also threatened by gentrification, because their claims over space are often temporary.

According to Madanipour, creating a public space can be done only through an inclusive process.

“Desire for exclusivity goes hand in hand with social inequality, so it is only through inclusive processes that the possibility of creating accessible and shared places increases.” He suggests including private investment in the process. Because in some cases it is the only way that public spaces can be maintained and developed. He argues it is only essential to make the process participatory, inclusive and transparent. (Madanipour, 2010)

**Conclusion**

The original right to the city was aiming for a total change in society, achieved by revolution. The spectacle is detested and an absence of the spectacle should provide for a city as an oeuvre that is composed by all people. This idea of the spectacle is in the current debate not present. The emphasis is on the redistribution of surplus value that is concentrated in the growing city. The right to the city still is defined as an encompassing right to the city. Through inclusive and participatory processes everyone should have access to the city. So the current aims are still close to the original concept of the right to city. But the difference is that there are proposals to make small steps towards the realization of an open city within the current system. To realize the right to the city, equal access to the benefits of the city should be given to everyone. The aim for the project should include a plan that is inclusive. It should give access for a diversity of social groups to provide this inclusivity.
In line with the concepts of the right to the city, who aim for a democratic redistribution of surplus value and aim for cities for people, not for profit, the aims for this project are formed.

Access to the whole of benefits of the city should be given to everyone. This can only be achieved through inclusivity and participation.

The aim for the project is thus inclusivity, by means of: Accessibility of the city centre for a diversity of social groups.

With the research of the relation between accessibility and diversity in use (in the case of Neukölln in Berlin)

But an important aspect is also to preserve the position of the city centre as an important node and central place.

Create a strategy for the city of Berlin to maintain and/or stimulate diversity in user groups and accessibility to different social groups to the inner city, with policies, building regulations and spatial interventions

The final deliverable for the project is this integral report with the following included:
- Literature study
- With research by design developed framework of policies, guidelines and spatial interventions
- (A feasible) strategy to increase the accessibility of the inner city for different social groups
- (A feasible) design of key elements in the strategy, that will show the spatial implementations of the aims.

These aims and objective are the result of the following main research question:

How to stimulate/maintain accessibility for a diversity of social groups in a central gentrifying area [in the case of Neukölln, Berlin] ?

To answer the main question, sub questions are formulated, divided in two main clusters. These are linked to different methodologies. The first part, the ‘diversity’ part, relates to the possibilities that are found mainly in references and literature.

The second part is focusing on the case of Neukölln and is the practical part of the project.
Both spatial and social analysis on the larger scale will show the position of the area within the whole of Berlin. Neukölln is both a major district (called 'Ortsteil') and smaller district (called 'Bezirk'). The project zooms in on the smaller district of Neukölln. The social analysis will conclude in a map with social recommendations. The spatial analysis will conclude with spatial recommendations. Together they form the conditions for strategic interventions, which will be introduced in the next chapter.
SPATIAL ANALYSIS
CITY AND LARGER DISTRICT SCALE

WHOLE CITY      LARGE DISTRICT

INFRASTRUCTURE

The smaller district (the marked area) is crossed on the northern side with the S-bahn ring, that provides medium distance public transport in the city.

There are two U-bahn (metro) lines going from south to north within the area. The line through the Karl-Marx strasse goes further to the northern districts, while the other line (Hermannstrasse) stops at the crossing with the S-bahn.

Two important traffic lines are at the borders of the smaller district. On the east and north is the current A100 and E36. The A100 is going to be extended to the other traffic line on the east side of the area: 96a.

So the biggest part of the area is within the central transport ring and has a good connectivity because of this line. Two main infrastructure lines are going from south (from the centre) to the north, of which one is also the main connection line for the outer districts.

Figure 41  Source: http://www.stadtentwicklung.berlin.de/
Figure 42  Source: http://www.stadtentwicklung.berlin.de/
Figure 43  Source: Own image
Figure 44  Source: Own image
Figure 45  Source: Own image
Functions

The area is on the east and west bordered by two big green areas. On the East is the Treptower Par, which is part of a green ‘finger’ toward the outside of the city. On the west side is the new green space of the former airport Tempelhof and the park Hasserheide.

The long U-bahn line through the Karl-Marxstraße is also the main central urban area. Between the infrastructure lines of the S-bahn, A100 and 96a and the canal is an area that is used for industry.

Social Analysis

City and Larger District Scale

‘Bezirksprofile’ Description

Northern part:
- Quarters with old buildings, realized around 1900, dominate in this area. These are the original buildings.
- The high percentage of foreigners and their corresponding infrastructure are characteristic for Neuköln.
- The border with Kreuzberg is winning attractiveness. It is also called “Kreuzkolln”. In spite of the heavy social problems, whole quarters have turned into a lively extension of the Kreuzberg scene. This very young development is visible in a very humble rehabilitation state of the houses and with attraction of galleries, gastronomy, the development could be similar on long term ‘revalorization’ as in Kreuzberg, Friedrichshain or Prenzlauer Berg.
- Next to these densely built areas are scattered areas with an idyllic, small-city character (Rixdorf)

Southern part:
- Loosely built-up areas with in the south starting with suburban character. This is followed with ‘Wohnsiedlungen’ originating in the 30s-60s. North of these housing estates is an area with a garden city character and one family housing in Rudow and Buckow. Special is the Gropiusstadt (’62 to ’73) with large allotments that have been reevaluated after improvements on the housing and social measures.
SOCIAL ANALYSIS
OF NEUKÖLLN (AND PART OF ALT-TREPTOW)

The social analysis structures and simplifies the social data about migration (background and inhabitation length) and unemployment. Combined these can indicate the gentrification stage with smaller precision and indicate the areas that are in need of protection. It will be used later to indicate the character of the specific neighbourhoods.

In the whole district, the inhabitation length is for a large amount less then 5 years. The area in the middle and to right that have 50 to 60 percent inhabitants for more then 5 years have a large amount of social housing.

Especially in the areas to south of the Karl-Marxstraße the unemployment is above 12%.

Figure 51 Source: own image with information from http://fbinter.stadt-berlin.de/fb/index.jsp, adapted

Figure 52 Migration background. Source: own image with information from http://fbinter.stadt-berlin.de/fb/index.jsp

The biggest migration groups in all of the areas or the Turkish or the 'European 28'. The second largest group is always one of these two immigration background groups as well. The statistics of the municipality make a differentiation between immigration background from the older European countries: EU15 and the newer European countries: EU28.

On the next page a top 3 of biggest immigration background groups is made per area, in the grey map, that also shows the amount of immigration background in total. (The darker colours indicate an area with more immigrants.)

The other map shows the top 3 in colours, in combination with the functions that are specific for these migration backgrounds. This is then simplified to two different colours: the red areas have the Turkish as biggest immigration background, the blue have the European as biggest.

LENGTH OF INHABITATION

UNEMPLOYMENT
Immigration Background

Mostly European immigrants

Mostly Turkish and Arabic immigrants

Turkish community

50 51

Current Quartiersmanagement

Categories: media and culture, greenery, parent support, child support, citizen and family centre, ‘task force’

http://www.richard-quartier.de/Startseite.584.0.html

Core points are education, work and integration. (Funding, working places for sewing etc., Special programs for children)

6 years ago empty stores etc were the main problem, now these are in use with new galleries and stores. This also created increasing rents, so now increases in new rents of at least 10% are normal. The QM started a working group for affordable rents, and organises meetings with inhabitants.

http://www.rollberg-quartier.de/

Old buildings mostly single owner. Hauptstraßen, der Hermann- and Karl-Marx-Straße international stores, newly are art galleries, ateliers and cafés

50 51

“With more then 200 discussions, the voluntary tenant council has a feasible and effective approach as a resident advocate.”

Increased rents and housing shortage core problems, but QM has no real influence on acc...
This map shows the combination of the most important aspects of the social analysis. There is a differentiation visible between the northern part - the most gentrified part - that has less high percentage of immigration background, and as biggest immigration background European (both the new and old European countries).

On the south the majority of immigration background of Turkish and Arabic. In between is a 'transition' area.

In the areas that are marked with black lines, a larger percentage is inhabiting the area for more than 5 years. These areas have also higher percentages of jobless. In these areas protection and local projects are mostly needed. (In the middle area, there is already a quartiersmanagement that helps with local projects.)
**Urban fabric**

- **1900s TRADITIONAL BUILDING BLOCKS**
  - **URBAN RENEWAL**
  - **70s - 80s**
  - **1920-60s**
  - **SIEDLUNGEN**
  - **often open building blocks**

- **<1900**
  - **HUMBOLDTPLAN**
  - (with renewal within blocks)

- **60s**
  - **HIGH RISE +/- 70s**
  - **industrial/large scale**
  - **MIXED AREA**
  - **traditional blocks**

- **<1900 - now**
  - **RIXDORF**
  - **old town core**
  - (with small urban renewal)

- **20s renewal**
  - **within existing structures**

- **>90s (re)developing area**
  - **RIXDORF**
  - **old core**

- **TEMPELHOF**

- **KREUZBERG**

**Public functions**

- **Karte von Berlin 1:5000 (K5-Farbausgabe)**

- **Figure 64** Source: own image with information from http://fbinter.stadt-berlin.de/fb/index.jsp

- **Figure 65** Source: own image

- **Figure 66** Source: own image with information from http://fbinter.stadt-berlin.de/fb/index.jsp; maps.google.nl

- **Figure 67** Source: own image with information from tourist folder and shopkeeper folder from the area.
Spatially, the area can also be divided roughly into two areas. The red area represents vacant, unbuilt, allotment gardens and industrial areas. These areas have space to provide new projects for new user groups. The other black area is roughly the area where not much development is possible.

The areas with the exclamation marks are also open spaces, but have (potential) value, so they should stay open.
In literature different ideas are found that aim for diversification, accessibility and especially focus on the concept of ‘cities for people, not profit.’ These examples vary from small scale, bottom-up projects to larger redevelopment with less influence from the inhabitants or users. They can be linked to the different layers of the urban fabric for different typologies of solutions for their aims.

First, the general concept of the strategy will be explained. In the general strategy, these different layers in the urban fabric are explained. Because they can have different sorts of projects and are developed in a different manner.

For each layer, the different development strategy will be explained. Also, each of these layer will be linked to the references that are related to the layer.
Specific are the neighbourhoods. They have a differentiation of inhabitants that are the user groups of the area. In this case, projects can be more specific for their target user groups. The influence of the users can be made bigger, with new initiatives within the neighbourhood by giving them more control of some spaces in the neighbourhood. In this way, space is left for appropriation.

With participation of the inhabitants/users, the areas can become a collection of spaces that specifically relate to them. On this level, policies could help to protect the inhabitants for (further) gentrification.

The main aim at this layer, is to increase the diversity (in the whole of neighbourhoods). This means that neighbourhoods with open space or under used areas, could be used to increase the diversity, while other areas without the option for new development should be protected.

The in-between level exists of lines that are important for inhabitants of different districts. They can have a specific character but are more accessible lines within the urban fabric. They combine the diversity and accessibility aspects.

Generic are the lines and green areas that are used from people within the area as well as by other visitors. They are used by a large public. Here the accessibility is the main focus. Because it is a generic layer, development on this layer includes publicly used and known facilities that often will be planned top-down.
At this level maintaining and creating diversity is important. Depending on the character of an area - defined by both the spatial and social conclusion - different development and policies are proposed. Three different measures can be used to reach diversity.

First, gentrifying areas can be protected with policies. Currently, in some areas there is an article that protects the inhabitants of an area, the 172 (add source).

Secondly, with new developments in areas with spatial opportunities, the supply can be increased. This distraction can help to lower the pressure on the housing market in the district. Jane Jacobs explains this concept in her book (2009).

These developments are made with the main aim to provide for new user groups, instead of creating profit, relating to Marcuse’s concept of ‘Cities for people, not profit.’ This can be stimulated by involving the new users as actors in the development process. And with projects that need other than only financial input, or projects that involve a social housing corporation or nonprofit organization, the creation of new projects just for profit should not occur.

In third place, the inhabitants of the area can be given spaces for bottom-up projects to empower the current inhabitants. Leaving spaces for appropriation is a main principle in the concept of the right to the city. An other advantage of bottom-up projects in the areas is the natural change to the needs of the users. There are differences in user groups within different areas. This variety does not have to be static. By giving the inhabitants more influence, the spaces can naturally change with the change in the user groups/inhabitants of the area.

In the book ‘Stedelingen veranderen de stad’, they name Berlin for examples of bottom-up initiatives. (The community gardens) But they also remark that these initiatives are vulnerable and need protection from too uncontrolled market mechanisms. But it is a way to stimulate the motivation intrinsically and help the inhabitants to become part in the upgrading of the neighbourhood, instead of traditional excluding gentrification processes. (Van den Berg, 2013)

According to Mariska van den Berg, the focus on the ‘exchange value’ (the profit capacity of a city) has currently gained a counterpart that is focussing on the ‘use value’.

“In this dynamic the ‘inclusive city’ does not only benefit from top-down control of living environments, but also from initiatives in which the citizens themselves can give interpretation to their living environment.” (2013)

Bottom-up initiatives add to diversity in public space because of the different initiatives. In the public space people search space for their own ideas within the imposed spatial programmes - or protest against it. ‘They provide a diversity that fits within the idea of a democracy, that does not represent the common denominator (generic space; large-scale development), but ensures the differences and the public space in the city as a representation of the society in all its facets.’ (Van den Berg, 2013)

In this strategy both of these interpretations are represented, but in different layers of the urban fabric.
Depending on the character of an area, different interventions can be proposed. A combination of the social conclusion and the spatial conclusion are used to define the development (or the absence of development).

In these areas, the amount of inhabitants with a longer inhabitation length is around 50% to 70%. Also, the housing prices in these areas are not above average (yet). To keep the areas affordable for current inhabitants, that have lived here for a longer period of time, these areas will have no new development. An exception are small, bottom-up neighbourhood projects. The areas should get policies against gentrification.

The area is roughly divided into an area that is in the second or even partly ‘discovered’ phase. In these areas policies against further gentrification have the most importance.

In the three marked areas, the inhabitation length is longer on average then the other limited gentrified areas. These areas should be protected and have only bottom-up initiatives within the areas.

The spatial conditions determine if new development is possible. The central area is densely built and has few possibilities to develop without replacing existing structures or inhabitants. The red marked areas have empty spaces or non-urban spaces that have opportunities to be redeveloped.

The gentrification is in a later stage here. The rents have gone up and are going up still. In some parts with this ‘early’ gentrification stage, policies are existing to protect both the building stock and the inhabitants. Depending on the spatial situation, new social projects can add to keeping the areas affordable.

These ‘marginal’ stage of gentrification areas have less then 50% inhabitants living here for more then 5 years. Because of this shorter length of inhabitation, the areas are less affected with the problems of displacement. Bottom-up projects in these areas can benefit the inhabitants in these current economically weak areas.
Urban Resort made an agreement with housing corporations to rent the building for low prices for 5 years. They founded on the ability to pay principle: prices around lowest social housing prices and commercial rents below the average in Amsterdam. They use self-management for cost-reduction.

From 2007 until 2013 Urban Resort rented the whole building to artists, people in the creative sector, all sorts of small businesses. From 2013 the breeding place has moved to the backside of the building. Here it will stay for at least 10 years. Now they have 84 ateliers, music studios and offices.

Urban Resort collaborates with new functions in the “Volkshotel”: a hotel, flexible working places, restaurant, cafe and diverse halls. (Source: urbanresort.nl)

There was enormous interest in the project, therefore a selection of groups and collectives was made on these criteria: their common interest; their contribution to the building, to the neighbourhood and to the urban perspective. It is stated that the renters defer from the other breeding places, Cultural; ICT, development organization etc. are present and 40% is nonwhite, which is exceptional in Amsterdam.

To create public spaces, the building is rented to entrepreneurs: a youth organization, dance studio, and restaurant/club.

“At a temporary level, it has been possible to safeguard the space against gentrification, but the Volkskrant building has also become of subject of regeneration process the squatters tried to oppose.”

These projects are examples of bottom-up projects that can be used to strengthen existing communities.

Hustadproject, Bochum, Germany
The project started as participative art project (in the public space). But it developed as local self organization of inhabitants and social-societal organizations, that wanted to participate in restructuring of the area. They developed a temporary space/pavilion for workshops etc. and the ‘aktionsteam’ found funding for a permanent pavilion (because of lack of cooperation of the municipality) (Van den Berg, 2013)

This project is a useful example of a bottom-up project that tries to strengthen the economic position of the inhabitants.

In the project the existing qualities are the starting point for urban renewal and re-use. It was a private initiative of the artist van Heeswijk. The project produced a local marked, called: The Market of Tomorow. This is stimulating local production, while at the same time opportunities for production are created. The inhabitants are considered as possible producers instead of consumers.

Cooperative working places are created: A mobile kitchen; a textile workplace; local store and atelier. A new neighbourhood cooperation makes it possible to compete for tenders.

(Van den Berg, 2013)

In open areas new projects can be created. These projects can add new user groups to the district. This is an example of a project that is not aiming for the highest profit, but is stimulating small businesses and creative uses.

De vrije ruimte Amsterdam, NL
Broedplaatsenbeleid — low-cost spaces for subcultural producers to live and work
The existence of these modifying policies, oriented on some level towards greater social equity in urban regeneration process, opens up space for further demands. (Porter and Shaw, 2008)

Afrikaanderwijk, Rotterdam
By Freehouse

This project is a useful example of a bottom-up project that tries to strengthen the economic position of the inhabitants.

In point the existing qualities are the starting point for urban renewal and re-use. It was a private initiative of the artist van Heeswijk. The project produced a local marked, called: The Market of Tomorow. This is stimulating local production, while at the same time opportunities for production are created. The inhabitants are considered as possible producers instead of consumers.

Cooperative working places are created: A mobile kitchen; a textile workplace; local store and atelier. A new neighbourhood cooperation makes it possible to compete for tenders.

(Van den Berg, 2013)

These projects are examples of bottom-up projects that can be used to strengthen existing communities.

In open areas new projects can be created. These projects can add new user groups to the district. This is an example of a project that is not aiming for the highest profit, but is stimulating small businesses and creative uses.

In open areas new projects can be created. These projects can add new user groups to the district. This is an example of a project that is not aiming for the highest profit, but is stimulating small businesses and creative uses.

These projects are examples of bottom-up projects that can be used to strengthen existing communities.
§ 172

Erhaltung baulicher Anlagen und der Eigenart von Gebieten (Erhaltungssatzung)

This is a conservation statute. It means that within these areas:

1. The urban character due to its urban form is preserved.
2. The composition of the resident population is maintained.

On the site of Stadtentwicklung and Umwelt, it is explained that this instrument can be used to avoid possible negative urbanization impacts. As example under utilization of social infrastructure that can be created by displacement.

http://dejure.org/gesetze/BauGB/172.html

In Berlin there is a lot of property owned (and built) by ‘Wohnungsbaugenossenschaften’. Some of these cooperatives originate in the end of the twentieth century.

The ‘Genossenschaft’ was about uniting the non-owners, the economically weak for communal interest. (This is a difference with other business forms, that exist to make profit with participation of economically strong people.)

Three main principles are the democratic principle, the ‘Förderprinzip’ (promotion principle) and the identity principle. The first, the democratic, means every member has only one vote, independently from their share.

The promotion principle means that every member of the board and management has to be a member of the Genossenschaft. This ensures it is autonomous. Lastly, the renters are their own landlords. People looking for apartments united are their own builders/developers.

But since 1990 a few changes in the city policies have contributed to a strengthening of economic culture in which the effectiveness of the principles of the Genossenschaft is reduced, according to the document of Baugenossenschaft Neukölln (1999). In 1999, they still aimed to build and provide for housing, nonprofit oriented.

This traditional way of building in Berlin can be an interesting option for a new area. Because it is including the inhabitants and its main aim is to provide housing. It is an option to start new cooperations for the new developments. An other option for new developments could be that an existing Genossenschaft will be involved.
At this level accessibility is important for the inhabitants of the area. The diversity within one line is less than in the generic lines, but they add to diversity because of their specific character. These lines have often less meaning for people visiting from outside of the area or they are used by specific user groups from outside the area. The lines are existing and can be maintained with their own character. The left and right line in the centre have a lot of functions for the Turkish and for the Arabic communities. (shisha’s, coffeehouses with bakery and döner). The extra line to the right includes a lot of new shops (mostly homemade food, coffee and vintage). The line on the right is partly existing, with some coffeehouses and grocery shops. This line can be extended in an area that is not urbanized yet.
1. Sonnenallee

This mainly Turkish and Arabic street is especially busy in the northern part. Mostly hairdressers, café’s and grocery shops are here.

4. Rixdorf

The central red area is the old core of Rixdorf. Small parks are used by inhabitants.

5. Alt-Treptow

Here mainly the grocery stores form a centre, combined with some public functions and a park.

2. Weserstraße

This street - less used by cars, with a high amount of bicycles - has a lot of new shops, café’s and restaurants. Especially in the northern part it is used by mainly young urban and European inhabitants from inside and probably also outside the area.

3. Hermannstraße

This street is characterised by local shops - often Turkish or Arabic - in combination with facilities for lower budget shops used mainly by inhabitants of the area. Centrally lies a shopping arcade that is combined with a job help centre.
At this level the focus is on increasing and maintaining the accessibility of the generic lines. By creating more space for pedestrians both in the existing area and by extending the area. Currently, the municipality is redeveloping the street with a larger space for pedestrians. Other interventions in the existing spaces could include the creation of more seating, or by replacing low rise buildings by more compact higher buildings and use the left over space, caused by the densification, to extend the public space. By extending the area that is part of the central line, more places to stay can be created. A park that is currently not used very intensive can be made part of the central line with opening the design towards the central area, and towards an other currently much used park (the Körnerpark). This example will be explained in more detail in the next chapter, but similar interventions could be made along this line, at other (not much used) spaces along the line.

Mark Francis introduces the concept of mixed life as alternative to mixed use. In mixed-use projects, a combination of different uses is created. This is creates more diversity in uses, but it does not have to involve a mixture of different user groups. Instead, it can even decrease mixture, if one specific group has all their needed functions in the same space. Mixed life is proposed, instead of the mixed use, to lead to a more inclusive and useful concept to guide future urban design. (Banerjee, 2011)

Francis introduces different authors to explain the conditions for making a mixed-life space:

**Michael Walzer**
*Political philosopher*
- “Open-minded spaces” are designed for a variety of uses including unforeseen and unforeseeable uses, used by citizens who do different things and are prepared to tolerate, even to take an interest in, things they do not do. (Banerjee, 2011)

**Charles Jencks**
*Architectural theorist & landscape*
- Improvised design as ‘enformality’
- Entertain new ideas and approaches and be tolerant to a range of known activities while also being receptive to unknown users and uses.
- (Banerjee, 2011)

**Walter Hood**
- ‘Evolving public space’
- Provide for spontaneous activity
- Provide for improvisational activity
- Create a physical framework to allow common daily activity and practices to emerge.
- (Banerjee, 2011)

**Summed up are the important qualities for mixed-use places:**
- They connect
- Provide for appropriation
- Spontaneity of activity
- Adaptable
- Offer comfort, relaxation, active & passive engagement, discovery and fun
- Provide for public access
- Freedom of action
- Choice
- User claim and control
- Symbolic or real community ownership
  (Banerjee, 2011)
The examples of inclusive spaces are, according to Francis: Community/urban gardens; farmers’ markets; flea markets; large parks; riverfront development; guerrilla gardening; sales of locally produced goods.

These examples attract a diverse segment of the public. (Banerjee, 2011) This can be reached by designing public space that is open for multiple interpretations and that can be claimed by people on short term basis. These spaces do have a basis that is designed and that helps to create opportunities for appropriation. (Also for the design of the basis, the designer can have input from users.)

A lot of these projects change a mono-functional space, claimed by a few, in an area that has multiple functions and that is claimed by different groups. Examples of this are the ReBar projects: former parking lots transformed to parks, with fixed elements that can be changed by users. Similar is the example of the mono-functional highway, transformed into a park lane in the case of Octavia Boulevard, San Francisco.

Other examples include waterfronts and central squares. These spaces offer comfort, relaxation, active & passive engagement, discovery and fun. They can be appropriated on temporary basis. Examples are the waterfront in Malmo, the River Bathing Ship within the project area, and the Pioneer Courthouse Square.

In Lafayette square park in Oakland, there were problems with different user groups claiming the space. In this case, Walter Hood accommodated these different user groups by giving especially the less powerless (homeless) fixed elements for appropriation.

The difficulty with the mixed-life examples given by Francis, is that they often stimulate gentrification. (It did in the case of the Octavia Boulevard for example) Because the quality of the spaces are improved and they become publicly known, the prices in the surrounding areas are going up. This could eventually make the areas less mixed.

The new park Tempelhofer Feld is an other important example of a claimed space by multiple user groups, for nonprofit reasons. It is a space for people and a space where the ‘spectacle’ is limited. This transition of airport to park, also had an influence on the Schillerpromenade area.

Lafayette square park, Oakland, Ca,

The assignment: creating a vision for an open space troubled by homelessness, confusion over issues of use, dilapidated physical elements and poor image ability. (According to Hood Design Studio): translate that into standards that created new forms and uses for the park. Outfitted with water, showers, bathrooms and electrical plugs. Included in the process: City of Oakland officials and active community groups.

- So it does provide for daily activities. Includes a lot of detailed elements that can be used.
- Is not very adaptable, and is very defined (until small details)
To give an example of the generic lines strategy, the focus will be on one new area along the central line. Also the change in lines will be stimulated by the development of a new area, which is also one of the examples for the areas. To explain the area layer, a few other areas will be explained as well.
THE SPECIFIC LAYER

For the specific layer, different actions, depending on the situation of the specific area. These differences are explained in the strategy.

Three examples will illustrate the differences and the spatial implications, per situation.

First, an area with no new development will be exemplified. This is one of the areas where the inhabitation length is often longer than 5 years, and where housing prices are not above average.

Second, an example will be given on how to act within a density urbanized area that is in a marginal stage of gentrification.

Ending with the ‘new area’, an extension of the urban area. This area can be used for distraction and to create a new spaces for new users.

KIEHLUFER AREA

In this specific area, there are no new developments proposed. The open plot in the center of the neighbourhood can be used to create a bottom up project. For example a neighbourhood center as shown in the impression in fig. 113.

Figure 112  Source: Own Image

Figure 114 Impression of a possible bottom up project. Source: Own Image, using an image of http://www.modernehippies.nl/noorderparkbar/

Figure 115 Open plot Source: Own Image
This area has a dense building structure. The building stock originates from the beginning of the twentieth century as a workers neighbourhood. The building stock consists of relatively small apartments, mostly of 3-room apartments.

The Schillerpromenade is one of the areas with the highest increasing rents. Rent prices of 7 to 14.60 per square meter (basic rent) can be found in the area (immobilienscout.de, 2015) It is next to the Tempelhof, the old airport that transformed into a park in 2008.

Because of the high amount of private housing, that already has become more expensive, the new developments could contribute to make a new balance in the amount of affordable houses by creating partly social housing or housing development by cooperations.

No new development is possible within the current structure, but on the edge is a former graveyard currently unused. Here a new entrance to the park can be made, to stimulate this entrance instead of the current informal entrances through the area.

Schillerpromenade

Characteristics:
- Densely built
- (Mostly) built in 1900-1914
- Closed urban blocks
- 5 Storeys
- Private housing stock (but with lots of rented housing)

Quartiersmanagement area

>12% unemployed

Highest increases in rent in whole of Berlin
MAINTAIN PATH WITH LARGE TREES
SMALL PAVILIONS
POSSIBLE:
MAX: 12x12x8
NEW PARK (LANE)
EXTENDING THE URBAN AREA

In this design on the layer of the areas, a new area will be added to provide for new groups of inhabitants and users. The area is currently an industrial area with some allotment gardens.

Also, with adding this new area and with replacing the S-bahn station to the north that will make the distribution of the stations more equal, existing lines can be given more emphasis by positioning the station at the end (in a more urban area). The line along the canal can also get more emphasis as generic line with a new ‘end point’.

The repositioning of the station will also place the station in an area that has opportunities for new development, instead of an area that is densely built.

The area will change from an mainly industrial area, to an mixed urban area. So, the function regulations/land use should be changed to mixed urban functions. This current industrial area has large plots and is oriented towards the car. Often, the spaces between the building are open and used for parking. These spaces can be changed and used to create an urban environment. Therefore, the urban blocks are made smaller, similar to the surrounding blocks in adjacent areas. It will be oriented towards slow traffic and public transport, instead of the car. The open spaces could get more quality, combined with a densification of the built fabric.
In the image, a possible outcome of new development is shown. The red lines are the two specific lines. The bigger line is the Sonnenallee. Towards the north, this line is already in use by Arabic and Turkish user groups. In this area a lot of shops are closed and dilapidated. With a new end to the S-bahn and with new developments the use of this line can be extended.

This is similar in the case of the Weserstraße (the smaller red line). To the north, there are a lot of new shops (as shown in the previous chapter). This can be extended in proximity to the new station. The street profile provides for an opportunity to create new street life, with a large pedestrian path, seating and a lively plinth.

The generic green line is, just as the other lines through the area, currently much used towards the north. This line can be extended to this new S-bahn station. In figure 113 and 114 the current street life and profile are visible. The line is already providing a buffer between the generic and the bordering neighbourhoods. The profile exists of a park lane close to the canal that is separated from the other side of the street (housing) with a buffer of vegetation.
These isometric views show two of the urban blocks. The exact structure of the blocks is not provided in a master plan, but these examples show two different possibilities. These possibilities are for different possible new inhabitants/users of the new area. Which variation is preferable, depends on what is demanded.

In the first example, the buildings are partly re-used. Similar to the example of the Volkskrant Building, diverse small businesses or other types of activities can occupy these spaces. They can form a community and use the courtyard for gathering as well. These can be opened during the day and closed off at night, similar to a lot of the traditional courtyards in Berlin.

The second example is less focussing on community spaces. The inside of the courtyards is divided into plots, instead of a community space. The existing allotment gardens can be maintained, because they fit into the individual (and informal) structure. The blocks have more traditional housing (that could be developed by a Wohnbaugenossenschaft). It introduces a mixture with one family houses on the neighbourhood streets, or within the block.
CENTRAL ‘GENERIC’ LINE

One of the ‘generic lines’ is the current centre of Neukölln. Currently, it only offers few places for staying and has mainly indoor spaces (a shopping mall and rathaus). This central spine is already in use by a diversity of user groups. It just does not use its potential as public space with overlapping meanings for different users. There is not much space for spontaneous activity. That is why the quality of the open space should be changed. And new spaces are added to this central public line.

The design of the central area should have more qualitative spaces for staying. In the main street seating can be added along the small squares of for example the Rathaus. Also the street profile can be changed to a more pedestrian friendly route. The municipality is already changing this current profile. These changes are shown in fig. 120.

The main example that is focused on, are the Lessingshöhe and Thomashöhe. These parks are just behind one building next to the Karl-Marx street, the central line. They are currently hidden behind vegetation and they do not have clear entrances.

This space will be a part of the generic line. So it should become a mixed-life space that can be publicly known and used. Therefore a new design will offer better accessibility and provide for a diversity of users with offering these mixed-life elements. For example passive and active engagement.
The Thomas- and Lessingshöhe can be made more visible and accessible by opening the park toward its surroundings. With big staircases it will be connected to the popular Körnerpark (shown in fig.127 and 129) and to the central line, on both sides of the park.

The closest to the Karl-Marx street is currently a playground, hidden behind vegetation. This will be transformed to a square with a pavilion to invite people passing by on the main Karl-Marx street to take a look in the park. The square can also be used as an extension of the market on the Karl-Marx Platz, located on the opposite side of the Karl-Marx street. (See fig.129)

In the middle of the park are now garbage bins and car parking. These visible elements are not inviting people to explore this area. By replacing these functions in a less visible space (at the side of the park), the centre will have a fountain to invite people that pass the central line, as well as it creates an element for passive and active engagement.
Surrounding public spaces

The references in the pictures show the style of the new elements.

The design offers a space with more objects that can be claimed by different user/societal groups. The new staircases can be used as seating and provide for passive
engagement, looking toward the Körnerpark and the new square. The central fountain and the pavilion have a similar function and can attract people from the Karl-Marx Straße.

New elements (for seating, relaxing) are added on the two hills, with sloping sides. They can mark new smaller ‘corners’ of the park that can be used by different users.

The designs refer to the style of the Körnerpark. Similar materials are used (gras, sand, vegetation and white formal concrete elements). Close to the Körnerpark the stairs are straight, but towards the north they become curved. The style of the park becomes curved and more natural, to refer to the round forms of the current Höhes.

The section in figure 153 shows the transition with the housing block, bordering the park on the eastern side. This block is separated from the generic with a bufferzone. Existing playgrounds on the side of this street are maintained. Because of a height difference that is accentuated along the east side of park (with vegetation and concrete walls/elements) the difference between the main public park and the neighbourhood is made.

Also visible in the plan is that the current fluid transition of the park into the neighbourhood on the north-west entrance is maintained in the new design to maintain the transition zone of ‘generic’ to ‘specific’ space.

The examples of the mixed-life projects concluded with the remark that these projects have often stimulated gentrification. With these buffers in the direction of the housing areas it is aimed to inhibit these effects.

While on south side of the park the generic character is stimulated. Here are already some new functions (a theater and gallery) that could benefit from an increase of the accessibility.
Figure 171: 1:2000 plan of Lessingshöhe and Thomashöhe. Source: Own Image.

Legend:
- Existing vegetation/trees
- New trees/vegetation
- Sand
- Pavement (cobblestones)
- Grass
- Wooden seating
- Flowery vegetation
- Height lines
- Material lines
- Concrete element lines
EPILOGUE
To stimulate and/or maintain accessibility for a diversity of social groups in a central gentrifying area, a strategy is proposed. The strategy proposes to use different interventions on different layers. In a framework of ‘generic’ lines and spaces the accessibility and inclusivity is stimulated. While the areas form a basis in which different user groups can be present and stimulated or protected, depending on its specific characteristics.

For these different layers examples are given to show the implementation of the strategy. The examples show how to extend this network of areas within a currently industrial site to provide for new specific spaces for new user groups. This should reduce pressure on the gentrifying neighbourhoods. Stimulating and protecting the current inhabitants could be further elaborated in depth, but examples of neighbourhood projects and a possible location for bottom-up projects is indicated. The elaboration of providing an accessible generic layer is shown in the example of the new Lessingshöhe and Thomashöhe. Here focus is on accessibility of a new public space, as well as providing boundaries between this new public area and the specific neighbourhoods bordering the park.

Figure 176 Source: Own Image
**REFLECTION**

The relationship between the theme of the graduation lab and the subject

The topic relates to public space. And the project tries to anticipate on the gentrification issues, and stimulate a design that increases or maintains diversity and accessibility. This is also described in the goals of the urban fabrics studio: Study of how context variables that gave rise to existing urban fabrics are changing and how to anticipate or stimulate these changes by design. The strategy is formed to react to these problems with gentrification, it offers solutions on how to stimulate the accessibility and diversity of user groups.

The relationship between the project and the wider social context

How stimulate/maintain accessibility for a diversity of social groups in a central gentrifying area [in the case of Neuköln, Berlin] is the research question. This is related to the right to the city concept. They aim for a democratic redistribution of surplus value and aim for cities for people, not profit. The debate about the right to the city is topical, because gentrification is a problem in Berlin. There are protests against gentrification and against large scale development, favouring private developers to make exclusive projects. The project resulted in a strategy with key examples, to develop the area not for profit, but to provide this right to the city by creating accessibility for a diversity of social groups.

The relationship between research and design

The diagram shows the process. The research was a large part of the project. First, with literature relating to the problem statement and for the problem analysis. The strategy is supported with the literature and examples. With social and spatial analysis by mapping, and with fieldwork the strategy was formed.

In the planning beforehand, the methodology was not specific enough. This led to intuitive choices for the specific locations (in the diagram: fieldwork to design). Afterwards reconsidering the analysis and looking at the city scale helped to form the strategy and to explain the specific location choices.

The strategy and design is eventually linked back to the examples and literature used, but this could have been done more consistently during the project by making more explicit conclusions.

**Recommendations**

The subject of the project was extensive. Hence it included different aspects and ideas to develop the area in a manner that aims for an inclusive city, related to the ideals of the right to the city movement. Because of this, these projects could be developed in depth. The organisation of the bottom-up projects and the actors involved in the new developments, and the realization of a project with an existing or new Wohnbaugenossenschaft are interesting to explore further. For this an investigation of the housing market and needed typologies could also give more insight to the needed developments.
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