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Abstract

Gentrification is a controversial phenomenon. Some are in favor of the process as a means of urban revaluation and creator of a social mix while others condemn it as a strategy that only benefits one group: the (upper) middle class. Moreover, gentrification's emergence is a controversial topic. While some researchers describe it as a policy and therefore a political agenda, others claim it is a shift of the market and thus a basic economic happening in the urban environment. However, observers are united by the opinion that gentrification needs to be controlled and negative impacts for residents need to be prevented. Two of such anti-gentrification measures used in London and Berlin shall be analyzed. Do they feature any potential weaknesses that could diminish their competence? Thus, essential actions against gentrificiations will be summarized, including improvements of the measures, which will be based on policies, activism and concepts of housing. However, it is to be identified how successfully the anti-gentrification measures are applied in these cities? An analysis of the measure's publicity shall highlight the citizens knowledge about these methods as it is required for a successful application.
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1. Introduction and Research Focus

It is a global and very current phenomenon: gentrification. However, research about it already started in the 1950s in London when the relocation of landed gentry into the British capital’s central working-class neighborhoods was ironically labeled gentrification. Nowadays, research on gentrification transformed into an intellectual battlefield. There are several theories on the causes of the process of gentrification’s formation within a neighborhood. These theories differ especially regarding the parties taking part in the process. Some researchers interpret the establishment of gentrification as a result of an area’s citizens as well as cultural and ethnic prosperity. Another opinion declares that the process is an effect of policy makers’ and real estate developers’ interest to transform a neighborhood in their favor. However, the outcome is well-established and can be very alarming for residents. While in some cases, gentrification can stabilize declining areas, other cases see established social structures of neighborhoods being destroyed and tenants displaced from their habitat. Nevertheless, actual solutions against the process have yet to be identified. In the cities of London and Berlin, particular methods were published to prevent gentrification. The success through publicity of these anti-gentrification measures is subject of this thesis.

Thus, the concepts of these methods are being analyzed. Hence, potential flaws that affect the application’s success can be exposed. Moreover, a quantitative online research on the anti-gentrification measures’ publicity will be executed in order to further analyze the quality of their implementation. Without a broad publicity in the population, the methods might not be applicable or are at least unable to exploit their full potential. This is resulting from the fact that these anti-gentrification measures are especially implemented to defend the tenants and their rights from the consequences of
urban regeneration. However, they have to get themselves involved to achieve their goal of defending their right to stay put.

Nowadays, gentrification is spreading in municipalities around the world – urban and rural. However, this thesis is working on and comparing London and Berlin for certain reasons. First, they share several commonalities. For instance, an intense housing crisis as well as strong and rapidly spreading gentrification. Therefore, there has been a lot of research on the process in both cities. Moreover, both metropolises are their countries' capital cities. However, the cities' gentrification processes are based on a completely different context. This is caused by a different political baseline and development in recent years. Administrative structures and consequential effects on the housing situation also differ. Especially the latter has a strong influence on the background of emerging gentrification processes. Thus, both capital cities have generated two different anti-gentrification measures adapted from each process's drivers and stakeholders. Moreover, Berlin is my field of expertise while London is my thesis supervisor Paola Briata's main field of study. Therefore, a confrontation of the process of gentrification as well as its main stakeholders and the applied measures against it in London and Berlin within this thesis appears to be very reasonable.

The thesis was guided by several basic research questions. First of all: What is gentrification? A formulation of a definition and framework will help to understand the complex process of gentrification. Furthermore, there is obscurity about the causes of gentrification. Is it a spontaneous process or rather driven by applied policies? There have been several studies about both theories. Yet neither of them has proved the other one wrong. Thus, potentially both are appropriate regarding different cities' contexts. Moreover, this thesis should clarify: what is the context of both capital cities regarding their infestation of gentrification and the drivers behind
it? Differing initial situations in London and Berlin are the reason for the different type of gentrification. Thus, the anti-gentrification measures differ in conjunction with the context. Moreover, it shall be analyzed what measures are used by the two cities against gentrification and how successfully applicable they are? As they were developed by different stakeholders, they do not only differ in reliability but also in adaptability. Thus, possible enhancements of the measures will be exposed. Therefore, the most applicable solutions against gentrification shall be summarized. Finally, an analysis of the measures' online representation will determine the anti-gentrification methods' publicity and will therefore define their applicability by the citizens.
2. Defining Gentrification

Gentrification is defined by the Oxford dictionary as the process of renovating and improving a house or district so that it conforms to middle-class taste. It was informed by the researcher Ruth Glass to describe the phenomenon of middle-class people buying houses in London’s working-class neighborhoods for low prices in the 1950s and 1960s (Lees et al., 2014a). According to Lees (2015: 49), gentrification can be summarized as the “breakdown of the patriarchal household”. While the number of households with three or more people declines, the number of households of singles, gay couples and childless couples rises within gentrifying areas. While the process can take place everywhere, including peripheral areas, most research concentrates on gentrification within central city areas. There, gentrification mostly takes place in central low-rent areas as well as former industrial quarters and districts characterized by an extraordinary urban environment like green spaces. The process can include the renovation of the existing housing stock or the construction of new exclusive housing (Briata, 2013).

The process of gentrification is a phenomenon that can be observed in cities around the world. It “has become a catch-all term used to describe neighborhood change, and is often misunderstood as the only path to neighborhood improvement. In fact, its defining feature is displacement. Typically, people who move into these changing neighborhoods are whiter, wealthier and more educated than residents who are displaced” (Hamilton, Curran, 2018).

But the displacement always has covert costs. The breakup of long-term communities can lead to people feeling alone and isolated. Often, displaced people suffer from a variety of physical and mental health issues which are caused by the stress of leaving their habitat and neighbors (Lees et al., 2014). Therefore, gentrification can be
characterized as a process of class colonization displacing the urban poor. It is a process of expulsion, exercise of power, and of discrimination of especially poor population groups (Helbrecht, 2016: 11).

In many western countries, a growing income gap creates social polarization of urban residents which turns low-priced inner city living into a rare good. According to Helbrecht (2016) this is a threat for the urbanity of cities because already Henri Lefèbvre described segregation as the enemy of urbanization.

The current process of gentrification can also be understood as a countermovement to the suburbanization in regards to the changing economic conditions. Following the entrance of women into the job market, the revitalization of central neighborhoods and a movement of families back into the center are therefore a consequence of a new role allocation (Harnack et al., 2012). Moreover, the process is part of the current international place marketing competition of leading cities. According to Atkinson (2008: 1), gentrified areas of global cities like London or Berlin evolve to enclaves of an “international professional managerial class”. A movement comparable to colonization can be observed. This international crowd favors to segregate itself from the remaining, especially the poorer population. Therefore, Atkinson (2008: 9) implies that „cosmopolitan elites in exclusive residential enclaves may have stronger ties to similar neighbourhoods in other global cities than to the city that surrounds them.” He compares these colonies with a city-state but on a neighborhood level. However, the process of gentrification differs in any city. Each features its own context that influences the power and interest in gentrification of the different players. These can be the inhabitants, politicians but also real estate developers.
Two Theories of Gentrification

There are two theories about the emergence of gentrification: it is either caused by the production represented by politicians, policy makers and developers through policies or by the market through consumption – the gentrifiers.

“Regeneration was always ever a gentrification strategy [...] a language as deliberately anodyne as it is ideological and mendacious; an environmentally friendly cover for class cleansing in the urban landscape” (Smith, 2011).

Ertelt et al. (2016: 108) define gentrification as “all housing industry enhancement strategies and politically volitional revaluations in neighborhoods, which for their success presume the direct or indirect expulsion of a low-status population group and/or effect a reduction of inexpensive housing stock.”

In many Western countries, gentrification has been associated with the introduction of diversity and social mixing policies to deprived neighborhoods by politicians. Therefore, the country applied gentrification as a policy for the creation of better chances for residents of centrally located deprived areas. As the exposure to cultural and social diversity is said to be one of the advantages and adventures of living in a dense inner-city area, policies in several countries aimed to improve this by moving members of the middle class into deprived neighborhoods. Politicians, planners and policy makers argue that this will increase the social balance. In the UK, the goal of state-led gentrification was to bring back the middle class to the central city, especially into working class neighborhoods. The office of the deputy prime minister (ODPM, 2005) commented that the incoming middle class can have a positive influence on the work
The ethics of the lower-class residents of deprived neighborhoods:

“People living in deprived neighbourhoods are less likely to work, more likely to be poor and have lower life expectancy, more likely to live in poorer housing in unattractive local environments with high levels of anti-social behaviour and lawlessness and more likely to receive poorer education and health services. Living in a deprived area adversely affects individual’s life chances over and above what would be predicted by their personal circumstances and characteristics.”

(ODPM, 2005, p. 6)

The Urban Task Force Report, released by a team led by Richard Rogers that was instructed to determine the matter of urban decline in the United Kingdom (Briata, 2017), stated:

“In responding to social problems we must avoid repeating the mistakes of the past. Developing large amounts of social housing in one location does not work. Many existing social housing estates have a strong sense of community – often more so than wealthier neighbourhoods – but there is not the economic capacity to make these neighbourhoods work over the long term. As a result, jobs and investment go elsewhere, exacerbating the physical isolation of many of these estates. In future, we must develop on the basis of a mix of tenures and income groups” (DETR, 1999: 45).

Lees’s research on the Aylesbury Estate (2012) in the district of Walworth – which became New Labour’s prime example of a deprived neighborhood and stage for Tony Blair’s first set-piece speech as Prime Minister – reveals the administration’s policy
behind gentrification. A stigmatism is being created or increased to verify the need for change and revaluation of the estates. However, she concludes that “recent research has been about the lack of, poor, weak, contradictory, and indeed sometimes false ‘evidence’ behind so-called ‘evidence based policy’” (Lees, 2012: 162).

The phase-out of state-subsidized affordable housing in Berlin and the degeneration of Council owned housing estates in London attracts investors to take over these properties and adapt the rent or purchase prices to the area’s standard or even higher. Helbrecht (2016: 9) explains the real estate industry’s raised interest in gentrification as a result that “since the financial crisis in 2008 and the thereby accompanying new and old love of investors for (residential) property as concrete gold, the real estate prices in many cities got into a dramatic upward spiral.”

The consumption-based theory identifies the gentrifiers as a community of consumers. They are mostly part of a new middle class that wants to be different from the old, mostly suburban middle class. Therefore, they are seeking to live in central areas close to pulling factors like cultural facilities.

“Gentrification is defined as a process by which poor and working class neighborhoods in the inner city are refurbished by an influx of private capital and middle-class homebuyers and renters.” (Ilkucan, Sandikci, 2005: 1)

The possibilities for the gentrification of an area therefore depend on a neighborhood’s features. A central location is crucial. Centrality however is not necessarily defined by a quarter’s distance to the center but by its connectivity within the city and towards important infrastructures like airports and railway stations. Moreover, an
existing social and ethnic mix of population and the attractiveness of the area’s architecture can instigate gentrification. Further factors are the proximity to other gentrified neighborhoods as well as cultural amenities and extraordinary household structures.

Ilkucan and Sandikci (2005) differentiate between two categories of gentrifiers: pioneers and followers. The former belong to the first group of gentrifiers that arrives at a neighborhood because of its advantages while ignoring the disadvantages and risks that the area might feature. After a couple of years of the pioneers establishing the neighborhood as a livable place, the followers start to move in. The risks for them are minimal and they are rather interested in making further investments in the area. Their arrival in the neighborhood cause the expulsion of original residents as well as some pioneers as they are not as wealthy as the followers and therefore unable to pay the even further rising prices. Some researchers like Caulfield (1994) also interpret gentrification of inner city neighborhoods as a “resistance to post-war urban development and the dominant ideals of suburbia.” (as quoted in Ilkucan, Sandikci, 2005: 4). While the old middle class either lives in suburban or modernist housing, the young middle class fancies moving back into dense central neighborhoods. Such neighborhoods offer a broader access to gastronomy and cultural amenities. This is the kind of gentrification that can be found in the city of Berlin. The process of consumption-driven gentrification can be divided into three phases. Döring and Ulbricht (2016) are summarizing them as followed:

a) initial stage: early pioneer phase

“It features a strong change of the population structure with a strong to medium mobility and the weakest change of the housing industry’s determining factors.” (Döring, Ulbricht, 2016: 29)
b) medium stage: pioneer to gentrifier phase

“These areas are characterized by a strong change of the population structure and housing industry’s determining factors with a strong to medium mobility.”
(Döring, Ulbricht, 2016: 29)

c) late stage: gentrifier phase to super-gentrification

“In contrast to the other phases this features despite a strong mobility the weakest changes of the population structure with a strong change in the housing industry’s determining factors regarding rent increase and the transformation of apartments into condominiums.”
(Döring, Ulbricht, 2016: 31)

Culture as Driver of Gentrification

A further driver of gentrification is related to the “culture” factor. Lees (2015: 48) argues that “a cultural new class, an expanding middle class of professionals, had instigated gentrification, not capital per se. This new middle class could be identified by their left-liberal politics, lifestyles, consumption habits, aesthetics, and tastes. This new class desired an alternative to the hegemony of postwar suburbanization – urbanism. They were pro-urban”. This creative group advances urban spaces and becomes a producer of social and cultural infrastructure’s enhancement and an accompanying change of reputation and market value of neighborhoods (Ertelt et al., 2016). Moreover, taste is a part of current gentrification in globalized cities. The taste of specific products, designs, ethnic food or architectural styles is attracting the new cultural class and results in them acquiring neighborhoods in which they find these factors. Especially ethnicity becomes a marketing tool as it can be
seen in Berlin’s districts Kreuzberg and Neukölln (see Figure 1) which feature the highest number of Turkish immigrants – as well as other Arabic nationalities – and are suffering strongly from gentrification. (Stock, 2013)

The cultural capital of a neighborhood – potentially increased by the pioneers – is transformed into economical surplus in the later phases of gentrification. Stock (2013: 100) reasons that "the cultural capital was in the long run powerless against the economic capital." However, pioneers often feature a positive connotation
while their actual influence on the creation of an asymmetry of power is misconceived. Even cultural capital alone has the power to displace residents. Therefore, Lees (2014a: 54) warns against the concentration of cultural functions as they feature disruptive impacts on local communities: “Artists and cultural producers in general trigger gentrification processes because their presence is attractive to more affluent consumers and dwellers that share their aesthetic values and lifestyle.”

Pro & Contra of Gentrification

Several countries’ policy makers, just like in the United Kingdom, identify gentrification as something positive. The policy shall help the municipalities to renew deprived city quarters. Moreover, a benefit is seen in the occurring social mix of lower and middle class. There are three explicit arguments in policy debates for the mix of social classes:

“First, the ‘defending the neighbourhood’ argument claims that since middle-class people are stronger advocates for public resources, socially mixed neighbourhoods will fare better than those without middle-class households. Secondly, the ‘money-go-round’ argument claims that tenurially and socioeconomically mixed neighbourhoods are able to support a stronger local economy than areas of concentrated poverty. Finally, the ‘networks and contacts’ argument draws on [...] bridging and bonding social capital to promote social mixing as the way to generate social cohesion and economic opportunity.” (Lees, 2008: 2451)

Thus, a stabilization of declining areas can be accomplished and vacancy rates can be reduced (see Figure 2). Urbanists also
see a chance of the reduction of suburban sprawl through the revaluation of decayed city areas. This new confidence in central city neighborhoods can result in more encouragement of dwellers and developers as well as increased viability of further redevelopment. Thus, property values rise which benefits private owners. Finally, the increased tax revenues of new inhabitants as well as profiting home owners lead to a higher budget for municipal spendings on infrastructure and culture. (Atkinson: 2008)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stabilisation of declining areas</td>
<td>Displacement through rent/price increases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased property values</td>
<td>Secondary psychological costs of displacement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced vacancy rates</td>
<td>Community resentment and conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased local fiscal venue</td>
<td>Loss of affordable housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouragement and increased viability of further development</td>
<td>Unsustainable speculative property price increases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction of suburban sprawl</td>
<td>Commercial/industrial displacement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased social mix</td>
<td>Pressure on surrounding poor areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation of property both with and without state sponsorship</td>
<td>Loss of social diversity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2: Positive and negative effects of gentrification according to Atkinson, R. 2008. own representation, 2019.
Moreover, gentrification can not only be used as a measure to create a social mix of classes within a neighborhood, but also to reduce an ethnic mix. Policy makers argue that neighborhoods with a high foreign population not only feature a strong stigmatization, but also hinder integration of immigrants through creating barriers against interaction with the local society. To prevent or dissolve spatial segregation, gentrification is used in neighborhoods with a high share of foreigners to enhance prices and the real estate pressure. This causes the displacement of poor immigrants and replacement through a wealthier population mostly originating the country of the policy (Briata, 2012). Therefore, the British government favors gentrification policies and has been using it to redevelop and transform central working class neighborhoods as well as ethnic neighborhoods.

However, Lees (2015) describes that an influx of middle-class dwellers into a deprived neighborhood does not necessarily enhance social cohesion. Contacts between the low-income and high-income households tend to be rather restricted. During her research on the Aylesbury Estate in London, Loretta Lees (2014a) interviewed residents suffering from the quarters revitalization. Interviewees describe their own and their acquaintances’ experiences of gentrification. They report loneliness, depression and even deaths as the result of relocation to other distant neighborhoods and out of the familiar living environment.

Moreover, the hipster crowd of metropolises like Berlin – who mostly represent the pioneers and to some extent also the followers in the process of gentrification – uses self-initiated urban redevelopment to create new central living spaces in neighborhoods without a bourgeois stigma. Lees (2014b) calls this phenomenon “hipsterfication”. In the case of Berlin, the urban renewal takes place in districts that were neglected by developers and investors due
to their location in close proximity to the Berlin wall. However, the displacement of lower classes caused by gentrification and rising housing prices produce a problem for the city’s government. The number of social housing units has been decreasing in past years and the construction of new flats is too slow to serve the high demand of displaced Berlin residents. Therefore, the city’s as well as its districts’ governments are not in favor of gentrification and have created legal measures to hinder the process.

Gentrification does not only concern a neighborhood’s residents. It also has an effect on local business owners. They must decide if they want to adapt their services to the new wealthy residents instead of keeping their original prices and products. But often, their businesses get displaced by shops serving the new residents. Gentrification can destroy the whole social ties of a neighborhood created by residents and businesses. These aspects forced London based activists to object the production-led gentrification of their neighborhoods. In Berlin, however, the policy makers themselves identified this process as problematic for neighborhoods. The two approaches of Berlin’s government and London’s activists to hinder gentrification shall thus be analyzed in the following chapter.
3. Anti-Gentrification Measures

Gentrification is a controversial phenomenon. Some are in favor of the process as a means of urban revaluation and creator of a social mix while others condemn it as a strategy that only benefits one group: the (upper) middle class. However, the groups behind these opinions are very different in the two analyzed cities. While in London gentrification is also the product of urban renewal and social mixing policies, and therefore initiated by politicians, the Berlin administration is strongly against the process and the resulting expulsion of the original population through a new cultural class. Therefore, the government uses the Milieuschutz, a measure provided by the German Town and Country Planning Code to prevent gentrification. Given the United Kingdom's current urban policy’s role in producing gentrification, the citizens have to help themselves. Therefore, the Staying Put – an anti-gentrification reference book for residents fearing displacement from their homes – was created. The following chapter shall further analyze in which contexts these measures were created and what they actually effectuate.

Gentrification in London

London is home to approximately nine million residents. Being the capital city of a mostly mono-centric country, London is the United Kingdom's leading cultural, economic and financial center. The city is also the country's most important transport hub served by six international airports as well as national and international high-speed trains. Historically, London has always been the center of a big trade and expedition nation. Thus, the city became a very multicultural city, housing citizens from the former colonies and Crown Colonies. However, being the British monarch’s residence city, London has an extensive international importance beyond the

The city’s highest level of administration is the Greater London Authority, which is presided over by the Mayor of London. The current Mayor is Labour’s Sadiq Khan. On a more local level, the city is divided into 33 London boroughs with each featuring a representative Council (see Figure 3). The public housing estates are owned and maintained by them. However, the estates’ negligence through the Councils leads to an increased disposal to real estate developers for redevelopment. Therefore, while gentrification can be found everywhere in London, numerous processes are happening in Council owned housing estates. The cause is the value gap, the margin between the low rental income and the potential income of selling the flat as a condominium (Harnack et al., 2012). This led

Figure 3: Boroughs of London, own representation, 2019.
to a decrease in investments and maintenance in the estates. The conversion of apartments into condominiums, however, was not affordable for all population groups living in the estates.

Lees (2014a: 925) points out that the decline of the Aylesbury and other estates happens simultaneously to new policies on Council housing by the Thatcher government: “In the 1980s with the legislation of Thatcher’s right to buy the Council housing system began to implode [...]” Moreover, the abolishment of the Greater London Council split the power over London to the local authorities and mainly to the national government. Especially significant strategic projects like the regeneration of the Docklands area were decided by the national government (Briata, 2017).

Lees (2014a: 924) continues to reason that “New Labour’s new urban renewal [...] was the final death sentence for monolithic Council estates in Britain.” Before that, Labour leaders actually used housing policies to prohibit gentrification. However, when the party started to lose political control, New Labour used the decay of Council estates as an example of grievances in the British societies that they would tackle after the election. They commissioned the Urban Task Force to uncover the matters of urban decay in British municipalities. They concluded that “cities, especially the inner cities, had been abandoned to the lower income groups (including immigrants), generating the phenomena of social polarisation” (Briata, 2017: 138). Indeed, poverty concentrated in the majority of Council estates. To modify the Council estates’ reputation in favor for their planned policies, the government and real estate developers began a media vilification against not only the building stock, but also against the residents. Housing estates were portrayed as criminal hotspots. Therefore, a policy of gentrification was introduced to create mixed communities without any acknowledgement of the already socially and ethnically mixed population groups (Lees, 2014a). These
privatizations of public estate housing combined with the financial crisis of the late 2000s transformed London’s real estate market into a center of speculation and risk-free investments. (Briata, 2017)

Moreover, the Urban Task Force proposed the development of environmentally sustainable, well connected and socially mixed neighborhoods while avoiding urban sprawl. Therefore, the London Plans from 2004 and 2011, that were established by the respective Mayor of London – Ken Livingstone followed by Boris Johnson – after New Labour re-introduced the Greater London Authority, distinguish areas for regeneration. They defined five development corridors, four towards the city’s airports and one towards the Olympic site in Stratford. Within these corridors, 38 Opportunity Areas and seven Areas for Intensification were designated (Briata, 2017). The former are brownfield land with potential for development while the latter are built up areas that feature a capacity for further densification and redevelopment. Both types of areas feature good public transport links or the potential to receive such. These areas were the focus point of redevelopment in London. In the case of Stratford, the 2012 Olympics were part of the area’s major regeneration program. Thus, the British researcher Loretta Lees (2008) draws the conclusion that public-led gentrification was the only form of urban policy that was promoted in London over decades. An opposition against gentrification is therefore only organized by residents and researchers.

**Staying Put: by the People for the People**

The Staying Put is an anti-gentrification reference book for residents fearing displacement from their homes. It was created by Loretta Lees in collaboration with the London Tenants Federation, the Just Space network and the Southwark Notes Archive Group. The handbook summarizes the experience of gentrification in
Council estates in London and how the communities can organize themselves against displacement. However, while being centered solely on experiences in London, the proposed measures can be applied in the whole United Kingdom as well as abroad.

As the manual is written for Council estate residents, the Staying Put’s first chapter explains gentrification to the reader and summarizes what it will cause and how to identify the process within a neighborhood. Former gentrification of Council estates in London mostly led to a total displacement of the population even though the residents theoretically can make use of their right to return. However, the need to relocate twice during the reconstruction, as well as the disingenuous approach of the developers and housing estate officials mostly lead to people giving up their neighborhoods in favor for a more peripheral location because there was not any uncertainty for the future. (Lees et al., 2014)

To stop this development, the Staying Put handbook’s second chapter informs the residents about measures against the gentrification of their neighborhood. It highlights the importance of teamwork. A group of residents has to work together and combine forces and knowledge to start a campaign against plans for the neighborhood. Moreover, communication is the key, not only in between tenants to hinder Councils from separate negotiations, but also to spread the campaign’s message with the public. Thus, the

---

1 A tenant run membership organization bringing together social housing tenant organizations to control policy and practice on estates and communities.

2 An informal alliance consisting of organizations and community groups to unify opinions on the creation of official planning strategies like the London Plan.

3 A local group opposing gentrification in Southwark.
Staying Put anti-gentrification handbook features several proposals on organizing public relations. The media can be integrated into the process by sending a press release or offering interviews. However, with blogs as well as Facebook and Twitter profiles, a community organization can promote itself independently though the audience reached is particularly smaller. Moreover, a good organization of the participation in public consultations is described as a key part to appear professional. This is important for community organizations of tenants as their opposition is often considered as experts. (Lees et al., 2014)

Ultimately, Staying Put’s third chapter introduces community alternatives that could hinder gentrification caused by demolition or redevelopment. The first presented measure is community planning, a participatory form of neighborhood planning following the bottom-up principle. A Community Plan’s aim is to create a positive conception for the estate and to oppose the Council’s new plans. It is community-led and therefore represents the interest of the estate’s residents. It can be produced through workshops as well as walkabouts, surveys and interviews. A second alternative is the Neighborhood Plan. A community can create a Neighborhood Forum that represents the residents and business owners and the area’s diversity. This forum can create a Neighborhood Plan which has to be homogeneous with the local borough’s Local Plan. Finally, the Neighborhood Plan has to be approved in a local referendum. The concept of Lifetime Neighborhoods (LTN) can be integrated into a Community or Neighborhood Plan. The idea of LTNs is to create places that meet the residents’ needs at all stages of their life. Solutions that are independently from the political agenda include the Community Land Trusts (CLT). Such a trust owns the land and sells the houses on it for a fair price to homeowners which additionally have to pay a small lease for the land. Therefore, housing prices are independently from increasing land value. Moreover,
Co-operative housing, Community Self-Build Housing as well as Community Housing Associations are being introduced. These are self-organized and controlled forms of housing. However, a lot of gentrification in London happens through demolition of housing estates. Instead, residents could convince the Council owning the housing estate to opt for a refurbishment instead. This alternative features lower economic, environmental and especially social costs. (Lees et al., 2014)

On the basis of the Staying Put anti-gentrification handbook, Loretta Lees organized a scientific workshop on gentrification in Southern Europe at the University of Roma Tre. Lees, the Italian researcher Sandra Annunziata as well as several other speakers presented cases of gentrification in Greece, Italy, Portugal and Spain. In the end, Annunziata presented an anti-gentrification toolkit for cities of Southern Europe. It comprises examples from Athens, Madrid and Rome and will be available in English, Greek, Italian and Spanish (Katsinas, 2017).

In summary, the Staying Put handbook against gentrification is an unofficial guideline that contains the information residents need to distinguish and battle gentrification within their neighborhood. It was created by activist organizations and researchers and aims for an illiterate audience whose habitat is in danger to become a playground for the upper classes and real estate speculation.

**Gentrification in Berlin**

Berlin features a population of about 3.5 million. Thus, it is the second most populated municipality in the European Union after London. In the context of Germany, Berlin is a city state surrounded by a very structurally lagging region and therefore very isolated. The Federal States of the former German Democratic Republic GDR act
like a boundary to the economically strong west of Germany. The relocation of the capital functions to Berlin after the reunification were more of a symbolic nature to express the country’s new unity in a city that was suffering the most from the division. Moreover, Berlin was historically the capital of Germany since the union of several kingdoms in the 19th century. Thus, Berlin received its old relevance. However, the so-called economic miracle in the Federal Republic of Germany in the 1950s and 1960s as well as the city’s peculiar situation left Berlin without the headquarters of Germany’s big corporations. Siemens even left Berlin and moved its headquarters to Munich. Thus, Germany – historically a very polycentric country – just strengthened its structure. Therefore, other functions are distributed to other cities like Frankfurt (finance,
transport), Hamburg (export economy), Munich (industry), Cologne (media) and several other cities. Berlin is only the German center of culture and politics. Thus, its international importance is regarded relatively low in the ranking of Global Cities: Beta. Therefore it is ranked lower as other German cities like Hamburg (Beta+), Munich (Alpha-) or Frankfurt (Alpha) as well as other European capital cities like Stockholm (Alpha-), Brussels (Alpha) or Paris (Alpha+) (GaWC, 2018). Berlin is governed by the Ruling Mayor. That is currently the Social Democrat Peter Müller. He is leading a coalition with the Green party and Leftist party. Berlin’s urban development however is dictated by the Senator for urban development and housing, currently Kathrin Lompscher from the Leftist party, as well as the current Chief Building Director Regula Lüscher. However, the city is divided into 12 districts (see Figure 4). Each features their own administration with mayors and senators who manage portfolios like housing. The chore against gentrification is operated on this government level.

Berlin is the current German capital of gentrification. Nowhere else saw such a dramatic increase of housing prices and rents within the last years (Helbrecht, 2016). Berlin’s population is growing undamped. However, the city is suffering from a housing shortage. Döring and Ulbricht (2016: 17) reason, that “currently, the housing situation in Berlin is characterized by a surge in demand in all market segments and an extensive scarcity especially in the lower pricing segment.” Just like in London, the phase-out of subsidies for affordable housing created dramatically rising rents and the interest of landlords to convert rental apartments into condominiums.

However, the city administration’s approach to gentrification changed drastically during the last decades. After the reunification, urban renewal in the former Eastern border district Prenzlauer Berg was a strategy for state intervention. Municipal policies towards
gentrification were initiated. Moreover, the change from the German Democratic Republic GDR's welfarist policies towards the Federal Republic of Germany FRG's neoliberal approach of a free market led to a change in the district's economic situation. The housing stock, mostly decayed pre-First World War buildings that were dispossessed during the communist dictatorship, was returned to the former owners. The municipality identified several urban renewal areas (Sanierungsgebiete) within the district. However, Bernt and Holm (2009: 316) clarify that within these "the official agenda of urban renewal was defined as follows: [...] The renovations must be oriented to the needs of the residents. [...] In principle, urban renewal should allow the residents to stay in the area. The rent increases

Figure 5: Berlin's spiral of gentrification according to Ertelt et al., 2016, own representation, 2019.
shall therefore be oriented to the capacities of the residents." Thus, the urban renewal strategy was against displacement. Renovations were subsidized with public money and obligations were created that would secure affordable rents. However, Bernt and Holm (2009) indicate that tenants still moved out, not for economic reasons but rather because of cultural problems with newly arriving residents from the West. Following a financial crisis, the city of Berlin had to cut subsidies and dialed down urban renewal interventions. Therefore, renovations of the housing stock led to harshly rising rents in all gentrifying neighborhoods. The process became a real problem and spread out rapidly. Gentrification is a movement within the city of Berlin. As soon as it has transformed a neighborhood it starts influencing the adjacent neighborhood. Ertelt et al. (2016) describe it as a spiral that started from Kreuzberg and continued in Mitte, Prenzlauer Berg, Friedrichshain, Neukölln and finally further, non-gentrified parts of Kreuzberg (see Figure. 5).

Moreover, gentrification in Berlin is characterized by the cultural factor. The city's rich culture attracts gentrifiers from all around the world according to Stock (2013: 9):

“This new middle class, that often followed Berlin's reputation as a subculture metropolis from different regions of Germany and Europe, acquired districts through their everyday cultural symbolic consumer behavior."

This international crowd is comparable to the group described by Sassen (1996) as part of her global cities theory. A transnational élite is capturing the central city areas of this world's most glamorous and thriving cities. Therefore, the city's government took actions against rising rents and the volitional displacement of tenants and created a policy against luxury renovations: the Milieuschutz.
Milieschutz: a German Policy

To conquer the process of gentrification in its neighborhoods, the city of Berlin is strongly relying on the so called Milieuschutz (milieu conservation) policy. It is a statute to slow down the increase of the rent height in districts threatened by gentrification. Thus, Milieuschutz areas are being implemented in these neighborhoods. Such conservation areas can be introduced corresponding to §172 passage 1 of the German Town and Country Planning Code:

“The municipality can through the measure of a land development plan or other by-laws designate zones, in which
1. for the conservation of the urbanist characteristic of the area due to its urban pattern,
2. for the conservation of the composition of the resident population,
[...] the demolition, the modification or change in use of physical structures require permission.” (§172 (1) BauGB)

Therefore, the Milieuschutz is a legislation used to not only save the urbanist characteristics but also the grown compositions of ancestral residents in specific areas in Berlin and the rest of Germany. However, only a few cities are actually implementing the policy (e. g. Berlin, Frankfurt). Several zones have been implemented in several of Berlin’s districts like Mitte, Kreuzberg and Neukölln. All of these districts feature an ongoing gentrification process. In a determined Milieuschutz zone, the conversion of apartments to condominiums requires permission. (Bezirksamt Neukölln, n. y.)

Moreover, the demolition, the modification or change in use of physical structures require permission. This includes the installation of central heating, the completion of the bathroom to a contemporary
configuration and the installation of infrastructure for water, electricity and cable television. Moreover, the installation of modern insulating windows, an energetic restoration (e.g. the insulation of facades) and the development of the attic can be performed with a permission. However, within a Milieuschutz zone, no permission is granted for the merge of flats, the addition of balconies larger than 4 m² to a building as well as the installation of built-in kitchens and additional bathrooms and balconies. (Bezirksamt Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg, n. y.)

Additionally, within the Milieuschutz zone the municipality has a pre-emption right on plots of land that are built up by apartments (Bezirksamt Mitte, n. y.). This measure can help to prevent the sale of an apartment block to a developer who plans to exchange tenants for a wealthier clientele.

By the end of 2018, the city possessed 55 Milieuschutz areas (Schütze, 2018). They are spread throughout the districts of Charlottenburg-Wilmersdorf, Friedrichshain-Kreuzberg, Lichtenberg, Mitte, Neukölln, Pankow, Reinickendorf, Tempelhof-Schöneberg and Treptow-Köpenik (see Figure 6). Thus, only three of Berlin’s districts have not implemented Milieuschutz areas: Marzahn-Hellersdorf, Spandau and Steglitz-Zehlendorf. All three of them are located at the edges of the city. However, only the latter is a wealthy district. The other two are some of Berlin’s poorest districts. Yet, their peripheral location does not qualify them as areas interesting for gentrifiers.

All of these measures shall lead to an absence of gentrification caused by the revaluation of flats as well as the conversion of currently affordable apartments to luxurious condominiums. The Millieuschutz is based on the German Town and Country Planning Code and is being applied by the governments of Berlin’s districts.
Following this introduction of London’s and Berlin’s political context and their different gentrification processes resulting in varying methods against it, the next chapter will further concentrate on the applicability of these anti-gentrification measures. Therefore, the methods’ publicity will be analyzed to identify its distribution among the citizens. Moreover, the anti-gentrification measures shall be analyzed for weaknesses.

Figure 6: Milieuschutz areas (Hoppen, 2018).
4. Improvements to Anti-Gentrification Measures

Given the introduction of London’s and Berlin’s anti-gentrification measures in the prior chapter, the research also exposed the measures’ flaws. On these findings, improvements of the methods and solutions to the problems will be proposed. Thus, there will be a differentiation of measures eligible for both political contexts. The liberal policies of London as well as Berlin’s regulations take a completely different position in the creation and control of gentrification. These essential actions against gentrification that will be summarized can be subdivided into three categories: policies, recognition and concepts of housing.

London: Change of the Policies

Policies

—> for gentrification

It cannot be ignored that gentrification policies are a very common tool in several countries to imply urban regeneration. These countries are very unlikely to change their approach. However, these policies promoting gentrification should not and naturally do not necessarily lead to the expulsion of tenants. This can be seen in the example of early gentrification in Prenzlauer Berg, Berlin (Bernt and Holm, 2009), presented in chapter three. Therefore, existing policies that are supposed to improve the neighborhoods’ security and sanity should provide their enhancements to every social class and not only the upper classes. Thus, public subsidies can be introduced to perform urban regeneration without shifting all the costs on the landlords and consequently also on the tenants. This would stall the expulsion of lower income tenants. Therefore, urban regeneration processes should be financed by the Council or the public housing corporation instead of profit-intrigued real estate developers.
More Recognition

—> unbiased news coverage
News networks do know about the importance of the topic gentrification in public and therefore should not only cover about it but also report about solutions. However, in the case of the United Kingdom, where gentrification is a government policy, there is no coverage of anti-gentrification measures in the main stream media – besides a very critical report about Germany’s anti-gentrification policy. Thus, news outlets should not be too close to the state. Their meaning and duty is to question politicians and policies. Current political occasions and some governments’ handling of free press (e.g. Hungary, Turkey, USA) should remind everybody of the importance of independent news reports.

—> public participation and contact
Moreover, the Staying Put anti-gentrification handbook highlights the tenants’ increased need for public participation. Gentrification processes within a neighborhood can be stopped or weakened by the representation of a community’s necessities. Measures of public participation in the case of London, as introduced in the Staying Put anti-gentrification handbook (Lees et al., 2014), are the creation of Community Plans and Neighborhood Plans in public workshops. The latter can be extended by the concept of a Lifetime Neighborhood to verify the areas’ capability to host people of all ages. Moreover, the interference of tenants can lead to refurbishment of old housing estates instead of their demolition. This can be defined in a Community Plan. Often, renovation is much cheaper than demolition, but the latter one is preferred by real estate developers as it raises their profit though higher rents or condominium prices of new built housing. However, the renovation of old residential buildings avoids the displacement of residents and can even be executed while the tenants stay in the apartment.
From all measures against gentrification, activism needs to be strengthened the most. Especially in areas of policy-based gentrification as policy makers in cooperation with real estate developers and the media try to denunciate and villainize the tenants of old run-down Council housing estates. Tenants have rights to co-determine and help shaping the re-development of their neighborhood. And their voices should be heard, not ignored. Thus, the community has to prove their strength and force the Council and developers to measures of public participation. Then, the community can influence the planning in their favor providing that the other parties actually are aware of the fact that public participation is the citizens' right. Often, public participation events are hosted, but their outcomes are being ignored in further stages of planning. Thus, the outcomes of such events should become legally binding arrangements and not just some kind of feedback. Given the current situation, the citizen often give up at this point instead of creating formal complaints against this statutory violation. However, the applicability of the Staying Put anti-gentrification handbook could be increased by the organization of workshops for interested citizens. In a personal environment, tenants threatened by gentrification could receive advice from Loretta Lees’ partners: the London Tenants Federation, the Just Space network and the Southwark Notes Archive Group.

**Concepts of Housing**
The concepts of housing proposed in the Staying Put anti-gentrification handbook (Lees et al., 2014) are very crucial and interesting implementations to accomplish an independency from Council housing and the rising danger of these complexes' disposal to real estate developers planning urban regeneration. Thus, they are summarized here as a good example for London citizens.
Community Land Trust
To avoid legal problems with Council Housing Associations and real estate developers, there are several possibilities of creating affordable living space relatively independent. First of all, there is the Community Land Trust (CLT). The concept implies that the land is owned by such a trust while the housing units are sold to individuals. Tenants only have to pay a minor lease for the site. Thus, the condominiums’ worth develops independently from the more drastically rising land prices. Therefore, the acquisition of these flats is below the average market price.

c- operative housing
Developed and controlled by a democratic collective organization, co-operative housing offers low rents to tenants who are simultaneously organization members. The concept is based on self-management. Thus, tenants have to take responsibilities of a housing association themselves and organize repairs and other services. Therefore, the maintenance of an expensive housing corporation and facility management is redundant which makes an impact on tenants’ rents. An example for such a co-operative housing organization are the Coin Street community builders (Coin Street, n. d.).

community self-build housing
This concept is based on the idea that citizens are given the chance to build themselves a home. Thus, Councils provide empty land that could be developed. Moreover, the government often gives funding. Community self-build housing has been introduced at the Internationale Bauausstellung IBA (international construction fair) in Hamburg from 2006 until 2013. It was promoted in the area’s second development phase that was planned to be built after the exhibition (IBA Hamburg GmbH, 2015). The construction fair always presents new ways of construction or types of housing. Even during
the fair’s duration, people are actually moving into the apartments and houses. The community self-build housing needs a legal basis. Therefore, it could be implemented as “a series of individuals; a community company; a mutual co-operative or a Community Land Trust.” (Lees et al., 2014: 34). The ownership of the land can be organized through a Community Land Trust. However, it can be also owned by the builder-owner.

—> Community Housing Associations

However, current tenants of Council estate housing who want to keep their flat can create a Community Housing Association. Such an association represents the will of a community and has the ability to prevent the disposal of a housing estate to a real estate developer and instead organize the apartments’ disposal to their residents. The success of this – as well as the other measures – has been reported in the Staying Put anti-gentrification handbook (Lees et al., 2014).

These proposals are meant to be implemented in order to prevent or weaken gentrification and the expulsion of tenants from their apartments. Some are part of the anti-gentrification measures applied in London and Berlin, while others are enhancements or additions to them. They can be applied to policy-based gentrification, like neighborhood activism or the housing concepts that release tenants from a dependence on Council housing. But also consumption-based gentrification can be stalled, especially by the implementation of refined policies. This improvement can be achieved through the extension of the policy’s action time as well as the fixation of the rental price during an apartment’s new tenancy.
Berlin: Extending the Political Goals

Policies

—> against gentrification

A government’s goal should be its citizen’s protection. Therefore, policies against gentrification should be aimed for. Because especially the poorer part of the society needs the (local) government’s support to have the same chances on well-located and connected apartments. However, in recent years this support was lost when the social housing stock declined in both Berlin and London. Thus, local governments have to make sure to concentrate on all citizens and not only the upper class and large companies. Yet, especially Berlin has a high share of privately-owned rental flats (Hoppen, 2018). However, these flats are not owned by private real estate companies but rather by private individuals. Thus, policies bringing a disadvantage for the owners will hurt rather the city’s residents than big real estate companies. While the Milieuschutz policy according to the German Town and Country Planning Code only foresees prevention of the urban pattern and special urbanistic characteristics, it affects the owners' proprietary rights, which is the main criticism of the Milieuschutz policy at the moment (Engel & Völkers, n. d.). Thus, an anti-gentrification policy should be based on either the constitutional law or the propriety rights and prevent the tenants instead. Moreover, the determination of standards used as orientation for approvals should be defined by the law.

The most dangerous stakeholders in the process of consumption-led gentrification are the followers. Not only do they displace the original tenants but also several pioneers (Ilkucan and Sandikci, 2005). Thus, the followers are the group of gentrifiers that finally destroys the social networks and habitats of residents. Therefore, an optimal policy against gentrification would prevent the arrival of this second group of gentrifiers. This can be accomplished by
ensuring that tenants will stay able to afford their rent and will not be forced out by the apartments’ owners. This can be achieved by the methods of the Milieuschutz policy, but only for a limited time. Thus, the anti-gentrification policy’s action time has to be extended. Moreover, the District Councils need to increase their number of employees in order to prevent missing approval deadlines.

—> example Mietpreisbremse: a German policy
Germany recently introduced the policy called Mietpreisbremse („rental price brake“). The policy’s concept foresees that when a new tenant moves in, the landlord can only raise the prices to 10% above the area’s medium rent (Berlin, 2015). However, there is an exception for first tenants in either new buildings or after very luxurious renovations. Here, the owner has the right to determine a rent that actually covers his high expenses. Therefore, this policy works well together with the Milieuschutz policy which makes luxurious renovations subject to regulatory approval. Thus, under the combination of both German policies, only new flats – as well as a few that receive approval for luxurious renovations – have no set limit for the rent’s rate.

—> against misuse of apartments: Airbnb and subletting
In this period of globalization, traveling’s importance has risen inexorable as a hobby and activity. Enjoying the free time at the most beautiful beaches or discovering the world’s most bustling cities’ nightlife feature a new significance in today’s society. But modern travelers do not prefer to stay in big and clinical hotels. Thus, both cities, Berlin and London, feature a huge amount of Airbnb apartments to accommodate tourists. However, this leads to an illegitimate conversion of apartments into short stay homes for tourists while citizens struggle to find a flat. Additionally, it is striking that Airbnbs are especially established in gentrified neighborhoods, like Berlin-Mitte, Prenzlauer Berg and Kreuzberg (fig 7). Therefore,
the bed and breakfast places are intensifying not only the housing shortage, but also the price increase and gentrification in a neighborhood.

As a solution against the problem of apartments’ misappropriation, laws against Airbnb and subletting can be introduced. Sweden has a relatively new law from 2013 that restricts apartment owners’ possibilities to sublet. However, this particular law might not work in Germany in the exact way as many private people own a flat or multi-party house as a safe form of investment and rent it out in the long term. A big share (64%) of Berlin’s rental apartment stock is organized this way (Hoppen, 2018). However, this is still seen as subletting as they are not living in there themselves. Thus, for the case of a housing market like the German one, laws should only concentrate on actual short time period subletting to tourists. Moreover, this law also led to an increase of rents in Swedish cities as the rates are not based on an average rent paid for similar apartments nearby anymore but on the cost of ownership (Landes, 2013). Thus, a law that keeps rents low, prevents the exorbitant increase of rents between the tenants’ transition but forbids subletting apartments for short time periods to tourists should be composed.

More Recognition
—> public participation and contact

Even in the well-reported case of the Milieuschutz policy, many tenants still don’t know their rights they receive from the law. Therefore, they do not report violations against the policy to the administration. Thus, a stronger presence of policy makers in the streets and at neighborhood events would increase the citizens’ level of integration into the political debate and therefore increase their knowledge of their own rights as tenants within a Milieuschutz area. Germany has recently developed a rich culture of public participation, especially regarding construction projects. Also the
German Town and Country Planning Code features a paragraph that guarantees public participation in planning processes:

“The public is preferably precociously informed about the planning’s common aims and objects, itself fundamental distinctive solutions, that are considered for the renovation or development of an area, and the planning’s estimated impact.” (§3 (1) BauGB)

Thus, there should be a legal obligation of public participation outcomes. Especially when the decision will affect several hundreds or thousands of flats for lower income families. This should be a tenant’s right throughout every political opinion on urban renewal processes.
Concepts of Housing

→ increase of new construction
Most of new residential developments are built for the upper middle class. But there is a need for the construction of affordable housing, too. Only this way, a social mix like in the gentrification’s ambitions can be created. A concept to instruct developers to build a share of affordable flats in new developments are inclusionary zoning policies (Schneider, 2018). They arrange affordable flats within developments in wealthier middle class neighborhoods, and therefore act in contrast to urban renewal policies that bring a wealthier population into working class neighborhoods. To really take the pressure of the housing market, more affordable flats have to be constructed. The city of Berlin, however, has the official governmental goal recorded in the coalition agreement to expand the public housing stock by almost 60,000 apartments. But only half of this increase shall be implemented by new construction (SPD et al., 2016). The rest shall be carried out by the acquisition of old housing stock. Yet, this does not take the pressure from the housing market as it only secures low prices to existing flats. However, Berlin’s housing market is in a crisis due to the high number of new residents moving into the city. Thus, the cities of London and Berlin – as well as other gentrifying municipalities – need to build new housing stock. Moreover, they should bring back the concepts of social and affordable housing to new developments.
5. Research on Measure's Applicability and Publicity

The prior chapters saw the response to several of the more basic research questions about the process of gentrification and specific methods against it. The next question, however, is how successfully applicable are the anti-gentrification measures introduced in London and Berlin? The answer shall be revealed in this chapter. The applicability of the measures is linked to their publicity as in both cases the citizens need a specific knowledge about the legislation in order to advocate for their right to stay put. Therefore, this analysis of the measure’s publicity and applicability is the core outcome of this thesis. Thus, according to Pruzan (2016), a framework of this research has been created to help organize thoughts and tasks.

Research purpose: This research shall reveal which anti-gentrification measures are successful or if they feature potential weaknesses. If so, improvements and other solutions can be proposed later.

Conceptual framework: Gentrification is featuring negative consequences because people are getting displaced from their homes or businesses and real-life social networks are being destroyed, independently from who is the driving force behind it. Therefore, different anti-gentrification measures were created that feature various approaches.

Research question: To potentially improve them, the research shall reveal how applicable the anti-gentrification measures are. How well is the public informed about their existence? Are the anti-gentrification measures discussed frequently? What are their strengths and weaknesses?
**Methods:** A web media research, including (online) news articles, magazines, neighborhood newspapers as well as TV-reports, shall examine the actual situation of people and give a feedback to the different anti-gentrification measures. Furthermore, online blogs will be analyzed for a more honest opinion of people concerned by gentrification. Moreover, a deeper analysis of the anti-gentrification measures’ theories shall examine further weaknesses that have to be overcome.

**Validity:** The media is not scientific, however it has a good overview of the current situation of gentrification and people that are threatened by it. In order to make an anti-gentrification measure successful, the people living in gentrifying neighborhoods need to be informed about its existence. Thus, its media coverage is important to spread the method. However, media reports can be following a newspaper’s or its readers’ ideology and thus be biased. Therefore, a well-balanced selection of neighborhood newspapers, city-wide or national newspapers should be analyzed.

**Own limitations:** Moreover, several own limitations have to be considered. Gentrification is a very sensible topic. People that have potentially a lot to say are however very difficult to find. There is only a limited chance to locate people that moved several years ago. Moreover, making a difference between people that were actually displaced through increasing rents or the conversion of their apartments into condominiums and people that just moved in the same time frame but for other reasons like living closer to the workplace or school is very difficult. Therefore, studying the (movement of) displaced people is within a short amount of time simply impossible. Moreover, statistics about gentrification are scarce. Thus, it is difficult to measure on the development of theses statistics if there has been any change in gentrification that was caused by the anti-gentrification measures. The thesis’s
short project schedule also hinders field trips to London and Berlin for quantitative interviews and surveys as well as field research. Furthermore, the anti-gentrification measures’ applicability is depending from their publicity with tenants. Thus, this part of the thesis research is restricted to a media research instead of an analysis of statistics.

**Staying Put: the Phantom Measure**

In the beginning of the research on the Staying Put’s functionality, London’s big conservative newspapers were scanned. More precisely, the web archives of The Times, The Independent, The Daily Mail as well as The Daily Telegraph were browsed for the keyword Staying Put. However, no result regarding the anti-gentrification measure could be found. Also, the addition of further keywords (e.g. gentrification, Loretta Lees) to the search did not lead to any findings. Also the liberal Guardian did not feature any articles regarding the Staying Put anti-gentrification handbook. Thus, it seems that the big newspapers either do not recognize the importance of informing the citizens about their possibilities and rights to tackle gentrification or they are simply sharing the government’s opinion that the urban renewal policies bring a positive development to the neighborhood. However, their news coverage can be also influenced by the readers’ conservative views. In an article about the Milieuschutz policy in Berlin and its impacts on the housing's condition due to the absence of exorbitant renovation work, the readers comments condemned the policy and the fight against gentrification:

“That [...] place looks like a derelict dump. I guess that is what happens when the hyper-regulatory state tells apartment owners that they cannot renovate or modernise their dwellings.” (AdamCMelb, 2016)
“The best and most fool proof anti gentrification measure Berlin can pass could be English classes and an all expenses one way ticket to Detroit. They are guaranteed low rents there.” (Starwars102, 2016)

Therefore, it can be concluded that London’s big main stream media does not inform the citizens about the Staying Put anti-gentrification handbook due to several especially political reasons. Also local papers like the Wandsworth Times do not report about the proposed methods. The coverage of the anti-gentrification measure therefore takes place on protest groups’ and neighborhood unions’ websites and blogs only.

In a post on the Policy Press blog of the University of Bristol (2015), Lees is commenting that her research and the implementation of Staying Put are very important to her as she lived in several Council estates. Moreover, she believes that – much stronger than in other places in the UK – the gentrification of Council estates is especially a problem in her hometown London. Therefore, stopping gentrification is a heartfelt wish of hers. Thus she is very proud about the Staying Put’s success even outside of the UK. Amongst others, a couple of Swedish municipalities have adapted the proposed practices she claims.

The handbook’s spread within gentrifying estates took off in local neighborhood organizations’ blogs soon after its release. The blog of the Alton Estate (roeregeneration, 2015) – one of the largest Council housing estates in the UK situated in the Borough of Wandsworth – shared the e-book in early 2015 with the tenants. And even before, in late 2014, the coalition for a sustainable Brent Cross Cricklewood redevelopment (2014), a tenant union fighting the approved plans for the redevelopment of Brent Cross Cricklewood in the Borough of Barnet, promoted the e-book on its blog. After five years of
consultation with the Barnet Council failed and the project was approved, the tenants formed the coalition in 2008. Therefore, the suggestions of Staying Put were much appreciated by the group's members.

However, the need for self-organization of tenants features an issue in the application of the methods proposed in the Staying Put anti-gentrification handbook. Low income inhabitants of Council housing estates often cannot afford spending their time protesting for their rights at a workshop for public participation. Instead they have to work – sometimes in several jobs – to afford even the low rent of the neglected estates. Moreover, spare free time gets spend with the family instead. Thus, it is much harder for a lower income family to advocate for their rights compared to a high income family.

**Headliner Milieuschutz**

In comparison to the Staying Put handbook, the Milieuschutz is very present in the media reports. While politicians declare in interviews that they found the perfect solution against gentrification, representatives of the real estate industry as well as researchers share a rather negative overall impression of this measure. Moreover, blogs of tenant unions share an insight of the aggrieved parties' opinions.

To begin the research on the policy's publicity and media coverage, three of Berlin's main newspapers’ webpages were browsed. The web archives were scanned for articles with the keyword Milieuschutz. Thus, the archives of the Berliner Zeitung as well as the Morgenpost and the Tagesspiegel were searched. The research focused on articles published within the last 5 years in the period form 01.01.2014 to 31.12.2018. The goal of this step was to determine the media's and public's interest on this anti-gentrification measure.
In all three of the newspapers, the number of articles on the Milieuschutz policy has been increasing each year (see Figure 8). While the Berliner Zeitung released 97 articles on the Milieuschutz from 2014 to 2018, the Tagesspiegel published 192, and the Morgenpost even 222 articles.

A report in the Tagesspiegel, a conservative gazette that is especially popular in the western parts of Berlin and features the highest circulation of subscription newspapers in Berlin, covers that Berlin’s Senator for urban development Kathrin Lompscher (Leftist party) advocates the edict of new Milieuschutz areas. However, they continue that in a survey, the Institut der deutschen Wirtschaft...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Newspaper</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berliner Zeitung</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tagesspiegel</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgenpost</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 8: News coverage on Milieuschutz 2014-2018, own representation, 2019.
Köln e. V. (Institute of German economy Cologne) claims that the anti-gentrification measure Milieuschutz represents a massive interference into the proprietary rights. Moreover, the institute claims that the prohibition of renovations thwart the achievement of a carbon neutral housing stock. An additional point of criticism of the Milieuschutz is that it only benefits the tenants of an area but completely ignores another group: people looking for a flat. Therefore, natural movements of a housing market are blocked. (Bünger, 2019)

Berlin’s Senator for Finance Matthias Kollatz (Social Democrats) announces that he wants to increasingly appreciate the pre-emption right. The Institut der deutschen Wirtschaft criticizes that the money should be rather used to build new apartments to expand the social housing stock instead of reducing the private housing stock. The current policy only benefits a small percentage of Berlin’s population while blocking chances for the rest of the population. Especially handicapped residents suffer from the regulations as renovations to improve accessibility are seen as luxury renovations and therefore not licensable. Bünger (2019) summarizes the institute's criticism as follows:

“The goal of a city should not consist of using selective means to make districts unattractive for arriving residents or even block their access but to improve the municipal area’s attractiveness and size to provide preferably many improved alternative residential locations and foster the city’s growth and wealth.”

Another report by Bünger and Duwe (2017) in the Tagesspiegel covers real estate agents’ incomprehension of the regulations. The foundation of the Milieuschutz, the Town and Country Planning Code, is not an instrument for rent control and the protection of
tenants but serves the preservation of urbanistic singularities. Therefore, Berlin's politicians and policy makers are diverting it from its intended use. Likewise, the director of economy and politics of the IHK Berlin (chamber of commerce) sees Milieuschutz areas critically as they intervene in corporations’ and property owners’ legal positions concerning property and are therefore not a reasonable instrument for urban development. A status quo is being conserved while a sustainable development of city quarters is being prohibited. She criticizes that Berlin's District Councils are rather restraining contemporary construction and renovation (Bürger and Duwe, 2017).

The fact, that the Milieuschutz is especially a political measure to attract voters, is being referred to by an article in the Berliner Morgenpost, a mostly liberal journal but with a conservative impact. The report claims that Berlin's Social Democrats use the Milieuschutz to enhance their low approval rating. Just during the half time of the current legislative period in 2018, the party’s chairman of the parliamentary group proposed to expand the Senate's power by allowing it to establish Milieuschutz areas in districts that would not act themselves. Moreover, the party wants to gain the pre-emption right for the whole municipal area. (Berliner Morgenpost, 2018)

But the Milieuschutz is not only desired by politicians and policy makers. According to a report of the Berliner Abendblatt (Reichgart, 2019) – one of Berlin's biggest main stream newspapers –, some residents of Berlin have trust in the measure. Recently, the residents of the district of Wilmersdorf started an online petition to introduce their neighborhoods as Milieuschutz areas. Wilmersdorf is not a district that experiences gentrification, however, the rich neighboring district Charlottenburg, site of large investments and speculations, is applying pressure on rents. Therefore, the residents see the advantage in the temporary ban of transforming apartments
into condominiums. Moreover, the residents feature a high mean age regarding the Berlin average. Older people are more likely to suffer from the expulsion and therefore separation from their familiar social and built environment. Therefore, it can be understood why the district’s residents are wishing for a measure that protects them from rising rents and social shifts in their neighborhood. Residents of Neukölln are also keen to implement the whole district as a Milieuschutz area according to the local paper Kiez und Kneipe (2015). The pressure of revaluation scares the people. However, local politicians are skeptical about the request.

Criticism about the Milieuschutz can even be found on television. The Rundfunk Berlin-Brandenburg (RBB), the public-service broadcasting’s regional channel for the Berlin and Brandenburg region, commented on the measure's introduction in the area of Pankow. In a satirical clip for the Abendshow program, it was criticized that the Leftist party would – by implementing the Milieuschutz in the area – ban the installation of elevators in the buildings to avoid the expulsion of the elderly. However, the elderly were actually defined as the group that benefits the most from such an upgrade. The spot concludes that after the policy implementations, the area would look like it did before 1990. It closes with the joke that not everything was bad back then. This pun developed because it is often used by older people criticizing the modern western lifestyle that moved into the Eastern part of the city, even though the GDR was – as is generally known – heavily violating basic human rights like freedom of travel or property. (Abendshow, 2019)

Given the rising criticism from the real estate industry towards the Milieuschutz policy, the German real estate agency Engel & Völkers held a panel discussion with Berlin-Kreuzberg’s construction councilor Florian Schmidt, as well as several representatives of research and the real estate industry. The summary of this event
was posted on their website (Engel & Völkers, n. d.). While Schmidt used the forum to affirm his confidence in the future distribution of Milieuschutz areas, Michael Vogtländer from the Institut der deutschen Wirtschaft Köln e. V. claimed that the policy is unsuitable to calm down the housing market:

“Tenants in the housing stock have to be saved, but the market must also stay attractive for lessors: if more and more private lessors challenge the profitability through increasing regulations, the supply will be only reduced further.“ (as quoted in Engel & Völkers, n. d.)

Moreover, it was criticized that the administration is too focused on introducing new Milieuschutz areas throughout the city while a lot of potential for the creation of housing through redensification remains unutilized. This is especially resulting from the Leftist party's ideology to save extensive Socialist housing areas as a built memorial of their sole reign in the GDR. In addition, it was again criticized that the Milieuschutz is an invasion into the right of ownership. (Engel & Völkers, n. d.)

Another opponent of the Milieuschutz is the Berliner Mietergemeinschaft (Berlin tenant collective). On their blog, they criticize that the protected areas are like a “rag rug” (Möller, 2018) and only save a minor part of the population. Therefore, tenants have to organize themselves and apply pressure on politicians. The tenant collective's researcher Möller (2017) composed a paper about the Milieuschutz policy's ineffectiveness. He claims that while now, in times of rent-raising renovations and real estate speculation, the Milieuschutz is seen as a means to attenuate the crisis. However, there are many limitations making the instrument ineffective. The Milieuschutz is no element of the tenancy law recorded in the German Civil Code. It is a planning instrument that can only be
applied if the resident population’s composition has to be saved regarding specific urbanistic reasons. Theoretically, this would only apply if the imminent expulsion of tenants would seriously change the utilized capacity of public infrastructure (e.g. schools and kindergardens). Thus, the Milieuschutz is not an instrument to save individual tenants, but the community’s demographic and social structure. Therefore, rent increases that are not resulting from extensive renovations will not be affected.

The Milieuschutz determines that the transformation of apartments into condominiums require permission. The District Council has a time span of four months to decide whether the transformation will be permitted or not. However, if there is no reaction of the district administration within this time frame, the application is seen as permitted. Due to the mostly understaffed District Councils’ inability to process all requests in time, transformations often receive permission this way. The same occurs with the districts’ pre-emption right for buildings that are being sold within a Milieuschutz area. Therefore, the Milieuschutz is rather some gesture politics that the politicians propose but fail to actually implement.

A further point of criticism by Möller (2017) is that renovations can take place within a Milieuschutz area to bring a building’s condition to a contemporary standard. However, this standard is measured city wide and not within the neighborhood. Therefore, the aimed current standard is still higher than a current standard of contemporary flats within the same neighborhood.

Several of the Milieuschutz’s regulations do not result in an improvement of a tenant’s rights and struggles. For instance, apartments cannot be transformed into condominiums within the first seven years after the establishment of a Milieuschutz area. Additionally, the tenants are secured for another three years until
the condominium’s new owner can request his right of personal use. Thus, a tenant is saved from expulsion for ten years. However, the whole city of Berlin is covered by a law that grants a decennial cover from expulsion through a flat’s owner. Therefore, the Milieuschutz does not really feature any improvement for tenants of apartments that are aimed to be transformed into condominiums.

Moreover, Möller (2017) criticizes the regulations of the District Councils’ pre-emption right in a Milieuschutz area. While some of Berlin’s districts do not show any interest in buying housing stock others again miss the deadline for requesting their right because of missing staff. However, if a district decides to buy a property, it will not pay the fair market value, but a market value that the district establishes in a survey. Therefore, the owner may be pressured to keep the property against his actual will as his loss through a sale to the district would be too high. Regarding this, it has to be remembered, that not every property owner is a big pension fond or real estate venturer. Such properties are also owned by individuals that see their retirement provisions in danger if they lose money on their property’s sale. Moreover, the legality of a purchase below the fair market rate covered by the pre-emption right is unsettled.

Within the designated areas, the transformation of apartments into condominiums can be delayed. However, to avoid shifting effects, the regulations of a Milieuschutz area would have to see a citywide enforcement. Furthermore, Möller (2017) requests adequate human resources for Berlin’s District Councils. However, he also concludes that to fight the housing crisis, housing policies have to be targeted on the construction of more affordable housing.

Several sources, including big newspapers that – because of their very conservative interpretation and clientele – might be biased to favor the politicians views as well as blogs of tenant unions share a
rather critical view on the Milieuschutz. Economists and researchers conclude that the measure is an actual intervention in the owner’s proprietary right. Also the tenant unions will not acknowledge the measure’s assistance but claim that it only slows down the process of gentrification instead of stopping it absolutely.

The analysis has shown that the Milieuschutz is quite well known by Berlin’s population. This is resulting from the fact that it is a policy implemented by the public authorities. Therefore, it receives a lot of news coverage. Moreover, gentrification is an affair of the heart for the historically mostly working class population of Berlin. Their expulsion through rich West Germans and foreigners forming a cultural and international, intellectual class thus shall be stopped by this policy implemented by the current government representing a rather socialist political orientation. Furthermore, besides some criticism on the policy’s legal foundation as well as its concentration on existing housing stock, the policy’s fundamentals are very promising. Meanwhile, London’s political context and history regarding Thatcher’s and New Labour’s reforms sympathizes with gentrification as a policy to implement social and ethnic mix in neglected areas. Thus, a measure against urban renewal of Council housing estates only finds interested parties in the (potential) victims of gentrification and displacement. Thus, there is no surprise that the Staying Put anti-gentrification handbook was directed to Council estate residents to give advice. However, the tenants’ opponents are policy makers and professional real estate companies with excellent lawyers and charismatic public relations employees. Thus, it is an enormous challenge for the tenants to organize themselves against them and enforce their demands of affordable flats and the chance to stay put. Residents therefore might need more guidance than just receiving leads through a small handbook of a mere 36 pages.
6. Conclusion

Over 60 years of research have resulted in the realization that gentrification is a global phenomenon. And while it is mostly happening in the world’s metropolises, even small towns and rural areas can feature this process. That is given to the fact that there are varying drivers of gentrification and additional factors pushing it. Politicians and policy makers can cooperate with real estate developers seeing potential for speculation, or an area’s cultural amenities and ethnicity can attract a moneyed middle class looking for an ‘adventurous’ neighborhood to live in.

The process of gentrification can have several effects on neighborhoods: positive as well as negative. Declining areas can be stabilized and vacancy rates reduced through gentrification. Moreover, the social mix can be increased. Furthermore, there is increased investments in decayed buildings and thus an increase in property tax which benefits a municipality’s budget for investments in infrastructure, service and culture. Thus, an area’s streets, schools and libraries amongst others will benefit from the new middle class that is being introduced in the neighborhood. However, gentrification can also lead to a loss of affordable housing, especially in the case of London, where Council housing estates were sold to greedy real estate developers. Moreover, gentrification displaces tenants and destroys a neighborhood’s grown social structures. There are several secondary psychological costs caused by displacement that were barely studied.

Thus, neighborhoods with an increased need of revaluation should take in pioneers of gentrification. Their dedication for small investments and creativity can lead to an improvement of the neighborhood’s status and reputation. However, the followers are the types of gentrifiers a neighborhood should avoid to attract. With
them comes the interest of expansive and expensive renovations and new constructions in the neighborhood which leads to the destruction of the price structure. Rents as well as prices for groceries will rise. This will finally lead to the displacement of original tenants. Thus, policies need to be created that save the tenants and not increase their displacement, like it is happening in London. Instead, policies like the German Milieuschutz are much-needed. However, the policy should be based on a better legal framework than a passage about defending distinguished urban design in the Town and Country Planning Code. Instead, a policy protecting the tenants’ rights should be based on a separate paragraph on the legitimacy of rent increase or the transformation of the flat. Moreover, the appropriate legal base might not be the building but the constitutional law or the tenancy law instead. But even policies favoring gentrification do not necessarily lead to gentrification like the mentioned example of Berlin-Prenzlauer Berg shows. Public subsidies for renovations to private apartment building owners can improve living standards while keeping the rent increase at a minimum. The Council housing estates in the United Kingdom, which are Loretta Lees’ main research topic, could also receive more budget as they are already publicly owned. Thus, a disposal to private real estate developers would be needless and tenants could stay.

However, the battle against gentrification is not just the duty of policy makers. Tenants need to notice and counter the process, too. Moreover, the residents need to organize themselves against negative effects of gentrification. Every tenant has the right to participate in public participation workshops and events, as presented in the Staying Put anti-gentrification handbook. Furthermore, an increased publicity of the gentrification in a neighborhood can bring an interest by the public and therefore force the stakeholders to change or even abandon their plans of redevelopment. The people
need to use their chance to remind policy makers and real estate developers that a range of housing types is required to prevent the displacement of low-income tenant households and actually create the social mix they promise. Unfortunately, the tenants’ legal position is permeable. There is no guarantee that the outcomes of discussions at public participation workshops are being integrated into the proposed development. Thus, several concepts of self-organization of housing advocated in the Staying Put anti-gentrification handbook can lead to an independence of residents from Council housing, housing corporations as well as speculative real estate developers. However, the implementation of the presented anti-gentrification measures can only be successful if the people participate. Even when policies are set up to guard citizens, they still have to be informed about their rights in order to oppose extralegal activities of their landlords that policy makers might not notice. Thus, the applicability of anti-gentrification measures is heavily influenced by its publicity. Information about these methods can be spread in the news, on community groups’ blogs and neighborhood events. The analysis has shown that both measures feature a completely different importance in the daily discussion about gentrification. Thus, the more discussed Milieuschutz policy is much more applicable as tenants are much more informed about their rights after a glance into the newspapers. The Staying Put handbook suffers as an anti-gentrification measure from the British political approach to gentrification. Given that the politicians and big newspapers favor gentrification as a policy for social mix and urban regeneration, it does not get the same recognition from the press as Berlin’s Milieuschutz policy. Moreover, after the creation of the book, barely any effort has been made to spread, evolve or even implement the measure together with the people in need of help against displacement.
The collection of pulling factors and key stakeholders of gentrification as well as the comparison of different anti-gentrification measures has shown that the process is very diverse. Each city features a different context that influenced the shaping of urban redevelopment. For each town, the context has to be detected in order to deliberate on the most applicable and successful measures to conquer expulsion of residents from their flats and the destruction of their social ties within a neighborhood. However, a cooperation of private individuals with policy makers would create the most sustainable fusion of powers and measures to prevent the negative outcomes of gentrification. State-led gentrification is much more difficult to conquer than consumption based gentrification. Thus, the weak applicability of the Staying Put anti-gentrification handbook is not astonishing. Given that gentrification is a widespread policy and urban movements of affluent middle-class citizens are happening naturally, gentrification will stay an urban challenge for all types of built environment. However, a threatening crash of the housing bubble produced through the superfetation of luxury housing properties as a sole resource of investment might soon decrease rents and the housing shortage as the transformation of public housing into expensive redeveloped areas will not take place. A city’s residential market and international urban trends are heavily influenced by the global economy’s situation. Last but not least, the future political development will have a huge influence on the international gentrifying expats. Will the current uprise of nationalist parties block the national labor markets for foreigners and therefore end the gentrifiers' cosmopolitan lifestyle? However, gentrification will remain a challenge to a municipality’s public employees and citizens. Thus, only time will show how the relatively new methods will operate. However, their quite diverse level of distribution within the population’s knowledge shows that their success and applicability will differ heavily.
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