

Uwe Altrock

## Urban regeneration



CC license: CC-BY-SA 4.0 International

URN: 0156-559923189

*This is a translation of the following entry:*

Altrock, Uwe (2018): Stadterneuerung. In: ARL – Akademie für Raumforschung und Landesplanung (Hrsg.): Handwörterbuch der Stadt- und Raumentwicklung. Hannover, 2441-2450.

*The original version can be accessed here:*

urn:nbn:de:0156-55992318

Typesetting and layout: ProLinguo GmbH  
Translation and proofreading: ProLinguo GmbH

Recommended citation:

Altrock, Uwe (2018): Urban regeneration.

<https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:0156-559923189>.

# Urban regeneration

## Contents

- 1 Definition and causes of the need for urban regeneration
- 2 Guiding principles, strategies and fields of action for urban regeneration
- 3 Prerequisites for and implementation of urban regeneration measures
- 4 Participants, their roles and instruments for stakeholder cooperation
- 5 Current trends

References

Additional literature

**This article first elucidates the understanding of the concept and term urban regeneration<sup>1</sup> and the change of key guiding principles, strategies and fields of action which are based on this. This is followed by an overview of the legal framework in the Special Urban Development Law and in particular on the logic of the interplay between participants, instruments and resources.**

**The article concludes by considering current trends in relation to urban regeneration.**

---

<sup>1</sup> In German contexts, the term 'Stadterneuerung' is sometimes also translated as 'urban renewal'. Here, we translate this term as 'urban regeneration' to avoid confusion with the US usage of 'urban renewal' (which corresponds more closely to the German term 'Flächensanierung').

# 1 Definition and causes of the need for urban regeneration

---

Urban regeneration means all interventions in the urban built stock, which go beyond the ongoing maintenance and regeneration of buildings and open spaces by their respective owners. Hence, urban regeneration is generally understood as ‘a comprehensive and integrated vision and action which seeks to resolve urban problems and bring about a lasting improvement in the economic, physical, social and environmental condition of an area that has been subject to change or offers opportunities for improvement.’ (Roberts 2017: 18). To this end, private and public resources are used to carry out regulatory or building measures on private and public sites in a demarcated area over a certain period. With the help of regulatory measures, the conditions are created to adapt the built structures to the current standard. Building measures may relate to the creation or modification of built structures or free spaces.

Systematic measures of urban regeneration in the aforementioned sense are carried out only if a need is perceived for an intervention by the public authorities beyond ongoing maintenance work. In fast growing cities, in particular, where the focus of urban development is on new construction projects at the peripheries, changes to the built stock are made as well, but they are often initially limited to individual sites. Strong demand in the existing centres of a growing city may then lead to significant changes, e.g. in the form of demolition and new construction works. However, the term *urban regeneration* is only used when the public sector systematically creates the conditions for controlling this development at least to some extent, e.g. through legal and financial interventions.

The background to the implementation of urban regeneration measures is the fact that the neglect of building measures or unfavourable location factors may detract from the attractiveness of certain areas in the city in the long run. In expanding cities, this is the case not least when land in the inner city is to be granted a change of use for potential urban development, for example because the options for expansion at the peripheries are deemed to be limited. Above all in stagnating or shrinking cities, this is frequently the consequence of a gradual reduction in the intensity of use in certain areas and a declining demand for real estate.

Urban regeneration is frequently triggered when real estate owners lose interest in adapting their built structures to changing demand, or even in maintaining them in a functional condition. In the case of private owners, this may be caused by a market failure due to the prisoner’s dilemma’: if an area is not very attractive, investment in an individual building or a smaller free space will be deemed useless or even unprofitable by the owners, as the otherwise still unattractive environment will discourage potential tenants or buyers. In this situation, the owners wait for other owners or the public sector to lead the way with investment. In the case of housing companies which own large parts of the area, on the other hand, the reasons for the neglect may also relate to the company’s market assessment or the investment capabilities of those companies.

If large parts of the area are under the control of the public sector (as may be the case in socialist countries), political or macroeconomic reasons may sometimes play an important role, too. For example, in the German Democratic Republic (GDR), the industrialisation of housing development and the focus of housing policy on the creation of new-build, modern residential

buildings in large-scale prefab apartment blocks, located mostly on the city outskirts, meant that many inner city neighbourhoods were deemed to be incapable of renewal and were eventually demolished. As part of urban renewal<sup>2</sup> measures, rules and regulations were established during the third quarter of the 20th century even in countries with market economies; this development placed large swaths of land under the control of local authorities or of public, semi-public or of private housing authorities, or development or project companies acting with a public mandate.

## 2 Guiding principles, strategies and fields of action for urban regeneration

---

Urban regeneration has been taking place for hundreds of years. Cities frequently addressed the need for modernising outdated, redundant structures when certain urban neighbourhoods were no longer able to satisfy demands that had changed due to strong economic growth dynamics or major social upheavals, while the public authorities or property owners were unable to make the modifications themselves. This frequently involved expanding transport infrastructure or other infrastructures, which could not have been realised without interventions in private land ownership. In the 19th century, for example, intensive urban redevelopment measures were undertaken and existing structures were cleared for new streets in some European cities in connection with the expansion of the railway system, the dismantling of city fortifications and other military changes or industrial urbanisation. Similar trends continued into the early 20th century. These measures were frequently combined with a fundamental restructuring of urban boroughs inhabited by a supposedly socially deprived population. The associated attempts to ‘heal’ (or regenerate) urban neighbourhoods came not infrequently at the expense of local residents, who were displaced from their established environment by the demolition works.

In the Federal Republic of Germany, early efforts to develop a range of instruments for urban regeneration in the wake of some regional model projects, in particular in Berlin and in North Rhine-Westphalia, provisionally ended only with the adoption of the much debated Urban Planning Funding Act (*Städtebauförderungsgesetz*) in 1971 (BBR [Federal Office for Building and Regional Planning] 2001; BMVBS [Federal Ministry of Transport, Construction and Urban Development] 2011). This created the conditions for the stabilisation of area-specific urban regeneration measures, as they have reflected the core of urban regeneration as part of the system of ▷ *Urban development promotion* until the present day. It is based, on the one hand, on the provisions of the Special Urban Development Law in the Federal Building Code (*Baugesetzbuch, BauGB*), according to which special legal regimes may apply to regeneration areas as identified by municipal bye-laws to remedy urban development problems (‘urban deficits’) in a speedy manner (cf. also section 3). In the case of comprehensive regeneration, these provisions provide legal options for local authorities, such as the possibility of conditional approvals and rights of pre-emption when carrying out construction or demolition works, and measures to change the use of privately owned land to implement their regeneration objectives. On the other hand, it aims to provide assistance for regeneration projects with funding from grants from the federation and the federal states if regulatory or building measures generate unprofitable costs. It is presumed that the use of public funds in these cases creates significant trigger effects (mobilisation of additional

---

<sup>2</sup> In the sense of the German term ‘Flächensanierung’

## Urban regeneration

private means) and bundling effects (mobilisation of additional public funding) in areas under urban regeneration (cf. e.g Spars/Busch/Heinze et al. 2011).

In the 1970s, the notion of urban regeneration was defined in the Federal Republic of Germany by the objective of regenerating outdated urban built stock in areas spanning across multiple sites. The focus of urban regeneration was on the historical cores of cities and the expansion areas of the 19th and early 20th century: this is where the collision between the contemporary requirements for built spatial structures and the old, often historically valuable built stock became obvious at an early stage due to their advanced age.

At first, a general strategy of urban renewal was often established for these areas, as part of which outdated urban built stock was earmarked for demolition and subsequently replaced with modern constructions after reallocation of the regained site. This approach aimed at comprehensively renewing built and functional structures that were no longer up to date. Due to the stark intervention in private property, the destruction of valuable historical buildings and the displacement of tenants from affordable housing, the urban renewal measures soon met with resistance in the course of its implementation, especially from local residents. These conflicts were also among the roots of the movement of citizen action groups. Triggered, among other things, by the experience gained with careful and sensitive model projects and the increasing participatory role of affected parties and residents in planning projects, which were significantly influenced by the International Building Exhibition in Berlin in 1984/1987, the guiding principle of 'careful urban regeneration' gradually prevailed, especially in the 1970s and 1980s.

The roots of this guiding principle include – as far as the approach to built stock especially in historical city centres is concerned – the emergence of the notion of a preservation-based regeneration of valuable historical ensembles beyond individual buildings as 'urban conservation of historic monuments' and the preservation of important ancillary buildings that would be suitable for housing, work or social infrastructure in densely built historical neighbourhoods. In addition, it also focuses on the preservation of established social networks and on upgrading strategies that were developed jointly with residents. Ever since, regeneration measures have prevailed, especially in the renewal of historical neighbourhoods that attempt to contain the loss of built structures as far as possible and, ideally, to allow the established local population to remain or to at least manage the measures in a socially acceptable manner (Bodenschatz 1987; Bodenschatz/Bräuer 1994; *SenBauWohn* [Senate Administration for Building and Housing] 1990).

In the German Democratic Republic, the trajectory of urban regeneration was characterised by a strong urban development policy focus on the industrialisation of housing development. The historical inner cities became increasingly derelict because there was a shortage of the skilled trades required for their regeneration. The implementation of the housing development programme adopted in 1973 at first accelerated this trend and later resulted in urban renewal measures in historical city centres. Prefab housing was used, especially in the 1980s, as part of the redevelopment of these areas after demolition. Parallel to this trend, more careful approaches to urban regeneration were gradually adopted in the German Democratic Republic. They placed greater emphasis on the conservation and further development of historical images of the city, as well as on pragmatic repairs and the modernisation of old buildings (Kegler 2012).

By the end of the 1980s, the fields of action of urban regeneration had already become more diversified. After initial approaches of regeneration and qualification of large housing settlements erected after 1945, the concepts and strategies of urban regeneration in reunified Germany substantially changed in the 1990s and in particular during the transition into the 21st century. This was caused among other things by the social transformations of the 1980s and 1990s.

As a result of reunification, the Federal Republic of Germany's instruments for urban regeneration were transferred to the former German Democratic Republic. In the early 1990s, there were still large parts of valuable, historical old town cores, which urgently required regeneration. To this end, the by then tried and tested approaches to the urban conservation of historic monuments were supplemented by instruments and equipped with their own urban development promotion programme.

The economic structural change, the overcoming of the Cold War and the privatisation of infrastructure operators had given rise to a large number of industrial, military and infrastructural brownfield sites, which could not be appropriately dealt with using the conventional guiding principles and instruments employed up to that time. New approaches to revitalisation in line with the model of the International Building Exhibition Emscher Park and comprehensive conversion strategies were developed for this purpose.

Furthermore, it became clear, firstly in North Rhine-Westphalia, Hamburg and Berlin, that the building and investment-oriented approach to urban regeneration might reach its limits in socially disadvantaged neighbourhoods, especially if it did not sustainably improve the living conditions of the population and their social and economic options. The 'social urban regeneration' approach (▷ *Socially Integrative City*) was developed based on the experience gained in other EU member states.

Finally, the decline of shrinking cities required measures especially in Eastern Germany that initially focused on demolishing obsolete buildings in socialist large housing estates and aimed to stabilise the housing market as part of an urban regeneration process (▷ *Urban redevelopment*<sup>3</sup>), but which later sought to achieve a comprehensive upgrading of shrinking cities, where traditional building and investment-oriented regeneration measures did not appear to be promising (BMVBS 2011).

### 3 Prerequisites for and implementation of urban regeneration measures

---

Urban regeneration measures are usually triggered by urban deficits (cf. Haag/Menzel/Katz 2007). 'Urban deficits' (cf. section 136(2) of the Federal Building Code) are deemed to exist where 'in its existing state of physical development or condition, an area fails to meet the general needs of the people living or working within it in respect of healthy living and working conditions and general safety' (material deficits) or 'an area is seriously impaired in its ability to meet the requirements placed on it as a consequence of its position and function' (functional deficits) (BMUB [Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation, Construction and Nuclear Safety], 2017).

---

<sup>3</sup> In the sense of the German term 'Stadtumbau', which is sometimes also translated as 'urban restructuring'

## Urban regeneration

Hence, the existence of urban deficits is a prerequisite in particular for the implementation of measures that are to be undertaken in accordance with the provisions of the ▷ *Special Urban Development Law*. This regulates the legal, procedural and financial requirements for the execution of regeneration measures and other processes of area-specific urban regeneration in the aforementioned sense.

So-called comprehensive regeneration measures are introduced by means of preparatory investigations (section 141 of the Federal Building Code). They serve as a basis for determining the objectives and purposes of the regeneration, and a regeneration area is established by a redevelopment statute (section 142 of the Federal Building Code). In these cases, the local authority's approval is required for demolition and construction works and for changes of use in order to pursue the regeneration objectives (section 144 of the Federal Building Code). The local authority undertakes regulatory measures (in particular relocations, land-use regulations, the acquisition of sites, the clearance of sites and the provision of local public infrastructure) (section 147 of the Federal Building Code), which are followed by private and public construction works (repairs, upgrading, new building and the relocation of business operations) pursuant to section 148 of the Federal Building Code. In a last step, the costs of the regeneration measures are determined (section 153-155 of the Federal Building Code). If the land value increases due to the regeneration works, the local authority may claim the increased value by means of compensatory charges.

The process ends with the repeal of the redevelopment statute (section 162 of the Federal Building Code). In the event of a simple regeneration process, compensatory charges are not levied. To safeguard the regeneration objectives after completion of the works, if necessary other legal instruments in addition to urban land-use plans, such as preservation statutes and urban development enforcement orders (cf. sections 172-179 of the Federal Building Code), may be employed by the local authority to enable it to influence the actions of private owners to a certain extent.

In addition to these processes that rely on the aforementioned provisions for regeneration areas to implement the objectives of urban regeneration, additional urban regeneration processes of a more 'collaborative' nature have been developed in recent years (section 171a-f of the Federal Building Code). They are based on the realisation that in areas that suffer from a particularly severe loss of functions, the active involvement of property owners, companies and civic initiatives is indispensable and should take place on a contractual or voluntary basis to achieve stabilisation. In these cases, the need to identify a regeneration area by means of a bye-law and the resulting legal provisions can be dispensed with.

The federation and the federal states provide financial assistance for urban regeneration as part of ▷ *Urban development promotion* (section 164a and b of the Federal Building Code). Financial assistance for comprehensive, area-specific measures – except for 'urban redevelopment', which intervenes to a much greater degree in the urban design structure of an entire city (cf. section 171a-d of the Federal Building Code) – is granted for coordinated individual measures that are mutually reinforcing in their respective impacts and are generally intended to upgrade the area concerned. This interplay is regulated by means of integrated urban development strategies, which are elaborated and adopted by the local authorities with the participation of local residents, and which are generally a prerequisite for financial assistance.

Urban regeneration may also be undertaken for preventive or retroactive maintenance. Due to the prerequisite of existing deficits, this is rather an exception in the German system of urban development promotion. Preventive measures are possible, in particular as part of the *‘Aktive Stadt- und Ortsteilzentren’* (‘Living Town and City Centres – Preservation and Development of Town and City Cores’) urban development promotion programme funded by the federal and state governments, which aims to protect urban cores against the ‘trading down’ of vital commercial areas due to competing locations at the urban peripheries. Retrospective ‘care’ of an area is in contrast to the logic of the temporary nature of urban upgrading as part of urban development promotion. Such measures may be necessary and opportune if it is to be assumed that the local stakeholders themselves will not provide for stability, attractiveness and quality of life due to difficult general conditions. This may be the case, for example, in areas with a high turnover of residents, which play an important role as ‘first-stop neighbourhoods’ for the low-threshold integration of newly arrived population groups. If the upgrading of those areas to a higher level of quality is in conflict with this function, it must be expected that this trend will be perceived as conspicuous in a social sense for an extended period or even negatively stigmatised. The ‘Social cohesion – Building coexistence in the neighbourhood together’ urban development programme funded by the federal and state governments is frequently used to attempt to stabilise social networks and support structures – established at no great expenditure of public resources – beyond the actual grant period.

## 4 Participants, their roles and instruments of stakeholder cooperation

---

In most cases, urban regeneration in Germany occurs in the context of urban development promotion. This means that the local authority conducts the process concerned, if appropriate, with the use of fiduciary agencies or commissioned representatives (section 157-161 of the Federal Building Code). Property owners are then mainly involved in the context of the building works or measures. Residents and other affected persons, in particular those operating businesses or commercial enterprises, are taken into account as part of the elaboration of urban strategies. If they suffer disadvantages as a result of the urban regeneration measures, these should have been reduced in the context of a social plan and perhaps a hardship allowance, and compensated on a financial level in certain cases (section 180-181 of the Federal Building Code).

Additional instruments for cooperation between stakeholders have been developed in the course of a more collaboratively organised process for social urban regeneration and urban development, which are now being increasingly used in other fields of action in relation to urban regeneration. These primarily concern management structures and funding solutions.

Particularly in cases of social urban regeneration, neighbourhood management can serve to network local stakeholders, to actively involve them in urban regeneration processes and to mobilise social capital. This type of approach is relevant because the urban development grants are available only for investments and measures to lay the ground for or support investments in the borough, while social urban regeneration also relies on non-investment-based strategies that aim to provide more direct support to the population in the affected area to achieve the envisaged stabilisation of local social and economic structures. To this end, neighbourhood management

## Urban regeneration

also strives to exploit funding sources beyond urban development promotion and persuade potential public agencies, e.g. the job centres, social welfare offices, youth welfare offices or the like, to collaborate. In urban centres, but also in large housing settlements, management structures have become quite common and have taken over the responsibilities of conventional on-site offices; but in addition, they also strive to create networks of stakeholders and to mobilise stabilisation approaches that go beyond urban development promotion.

Fund solutions aim above all to generate additional financial grants beyond the urban development or to strengthen the participation of citizens in the decision-making process through quickly realisable small projects. The neighbourhood funds, project funds, contingency funds, etc. developed to this end as part of urban development promotion engage civic organisations and active individuals in the area and thus contribute to the networking between local stakeholders. On an international level, such as the EU initiative JESSICA, urban development funds in urban regeneration refer to mechanisms that use public funds for loans.

Urban regeneration measures often take place outside the framework of urban development promotion, especially in residential neighbourhoods of contemporary urban life and on large-scale brownfield sites. In these cases, the land owners play a key role in its implementation. Housing companies, for example, sometimes manage upgrading and redevelopment processes on their own. In so doing, they assume tasks that otherwise frequently lie with the public sector, often including tenant advisory services and neighbourhood management.

In regard to brownfield sites, the situation is different: they may become the subject of urban regeneration measures, especially when they require extensive and unprofitable regulatory measures to establish realistic prospects for urban revitalisation in the first place. Due to their advantageous location, e.g. close to an inner urban transport hub or along a waterway, these measures are often allocated to public or private developers, who then assume the key responsibilities for regeneration. Local authorities remain involved in the elaboration of an urban development solution for subsequent use in these cases through competitions or similar processes; such subsequent use is frequently secured in a legally binding manner through project-based, binding land-use plans (*vorhabenbezogener Bebauungsplan*) combined with urban development contracts.

## 5 Current trends

---

The current range of urban regeneration instruments has been enriched by further elements. Various trends play a role in this regard. It has become common practice to seek to implement urban regeneration measures rather through collaborative cooperation involving a range of diverse participants. 'Hard', formal steering instruments, such as those provided for by the Special Urban Development Law, are used only sparingly. It should also be noted that the results of earlier regeneration periods have often aged considerably or are due for another round of regeneration measures in the face of a changed social situation (Altrock/Pietschmann 2011). This concerns adapting to changed residential needs, barrier-free access, reducing the maintenance costs for public spaces and facilities as well as adapting design elements to current taste but also to aggravated competition for inner-city centres through new consumption habits and options. Currently, the energy-oriented regeneration of the built stock as part of the energy transition

is becoming increasingly important. Strategies for expanding the energy supply to entire neighbourhoods are also being developed in this connection. However, the area demarcations and funding mechanisms developed for this frequently deviate from those of neighbourhood renewal as part of urban development promotion, which means that they require other sponsors and financing models. It is to be expected that more of the aging built stock will become the subject of urban regeneration efforts in future. This is true in particular for commercial areas as well as older retail trade locations on the urban peripheries and older detached houses in the suburbs. This will require a reassessment of the allocation of responsibilities between the public authorities and private owners as part of their regeneration and present additional challenges for an integrated approach to area-based urban regeneration.

## References

---

- Altrock, U.; Pietschmann, H. (2011): Langfristige Wirkungen der Städtebauförderung und erneuerter Sanierungsbedarf in historischen Altstädten. In: Die alte Stadt 37 (4), 293-306.
- BBR – Federal Office for Building and Regional Planning (Ed.) (2001): Städtebauförderung – historisch gewachsen und zukunftsfähig. Bonn. = IzR – Informationen zur Raumentwicklung 9/10.2001.
- BMVBS – Federal Ministry of Transport, Construction and Urban Development (Ed.) (2011): 40 Jahre Städtebauförderung. Berlin.
- Bodenschatz, H. (1987): Platz frei für das neue Berlin! Geschichte der Stadterneuerung in der ‘größten Mietskasernenstadt der Welt’ seit 1871. Berlin.
- Bodenschatz, H.; Bräuer, M. (Eds) (1994): Stadterneuerung im Umbruch: Barcelona, Bologna, Frankfurt am Main, Glasgow, Hamburg, Köln, Kopenhagen, Leipzig, München, Nürnberg, Paris, Rostock, Rotterdam, Wien und Berlin. Berlin.
- Haag, T.; Menzel, P.; Katz, J. (2007): Städtebauliche Sanierungs- und Entwicklungsmaßnahmen. Ein Handbuch für die Praxis mit zahlreichen Mustern, Beispielen, Schemata und Übersichten. Stuttgart.
- BMUB – Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation, Construction and Nuclear Safety (2017). Federal Building Code (Baugesetzbuch, BauGB). Available at: [http://www.bmub.bund.de/fileadmin/Daten\\_BMU/Download\\_PDF/Staedtebaurecht/baugesetzbuch\\_bf\\_en.pdf](http://www.bmub.bund.de/fileadmin/Daten_BMU/Download_PDF/Staedtebaurecht/baugesetzbuch_bf_en.pdf) (Accessed: 04 March 2017).
- Kegler, H. (2012): ‘Rekonstruktion’ von Stadtzukunft: Stadterneuerung Ost in Praxis und Lehre oder 30 Jahre ‘VBWGZ’ – Berlin und Weimar. In: Altrock, U.; Kunze, R.; Schmitt, G.; Schubert, D. (Eds) (2012): 40 Jahre Städtebauförderung – 50 Jahre Nachmoderne. Berlin, 107-124. = Jahrbuch Stadterneuerung 2012.
- Roberts, P. (2017): The evolution, definition and purpose of urban regeneration. In: Roberts, P.; Sykes, H., Granger, R. (Eds): Urban regeneration. A handbook. 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition. London, 9-36.
- SenBauWohn – Senatsverwaltung für Bau- und Wohnungswesen (Ed.) (1990): Stadterneuerung Berlin. Berlin.

Spars, G.; Busch, R.; Heinze, M.; Müller, A.; Pavel, F.; Mattes, A. (2011): Wachstums- und Beschäftigungswirkungen des Investitionspaketes im Vergleich zur Städtebauförderung. Final Report. May 2011. [http://www.bbsr.bund.de/BBSR/DE/FP/ReFo/Staedtebau/2008/WachstumsBeschaeftigungswirkungen/Endbericht.pdf?\\_\\_blob=publicationFile&v=2](http://www.bbsr.bund.de/BBSR/DE/FP/ReFo/Staedtebau/2008/WachstumsBeschaeftigungswirkungen/Endbericht.pdf?__blob=publicationFile&v=2) (2 September 2015).

## Additional literature

---

Altrock, U.; Kunze, R.; Schubert, D.; Schmitt, G. (Eds) (1991–2017): Jahrbuch Stadterneuerung. Berlin.

BMUB – Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation, Construction and Nuclear Safety (Ed.) (2016): Städtebauförderung von Bund, Ländern und Gemeinden. [http://www.staedtebaufoerderung.info/StBauF/DE/Home/home\\_node.html](http://www.staedtebaufoerderung.info/StBauF/DE/Home/home_node.html) (24 March 2016).

BMVBS – Federal Ministry of Transport, Construction and Urban Development (Ed.) (2011): Sanierungsmaßnahmen in unseren Städten und Gemeinden – Final Report on the Research Project 'Langzeitwirkungen und Effektivierung der Städtebauförderung'. Berlin. = Stadtentwicklungspolitik in Deutschland 3.

Schmitt, G.; Selle, K. (Eds) (2008): Bestand? Perspektiven für das Wohnen in der Stadt. Dortmund.

Last update of the references: September 2017