

CIRJE-F-919

**Urban Land Policy in Frankfurt am Main at the Turn of the
Twentieth Century: A Case Study of a German ‘Social City’**

Satoshi Baba
The University of Tokyo

February 2014

CIRJE Discussion Papers can be downloaded without charge from:

<http://www.cirje.e.u-tokyo.ac.jp/research/03research02dp.html>

Discussion Papers are a series of manuscripts in their draft form. They are not intended for circulation or distribution except as indicated by the author. For that reason Discussion Papers may not be reproduced or distributed without the written consent of the author.

Urban Land Policy in Frankfurt am Main at the Turn of the Twentieth Century: A Case Study of a German 'Social City'

Satoshi Baba*

Abstract

Germany's urban land policy (*kommunale Bodenpolitik*) attracted the attention of foreign countries. There were also many contemporary publications about this policy in Germany because it was a precondition for city planning, which included housing and transportation policies. The aim of this paper is to clarify Frankfurt am Main's land policy at the turn of the twentieth century, especially under Franz Adickes' era.

Adickes, the third senior mayor (1891-1912), carried out urban land policy as a consciously planned intervention in the land market. His land policy had two additional objectives: The first was securing land for administrative buildings and public facilities. The second was the facilitation of city extension and the preparation for future incorporation. Frankfurt's municipal land increased from 4,229.17 ha in 1900 to 6,370.19 ha in 1913.

Land purchased by the city consisted of 11,649 estates during the period 1895-1915. Conversely, land sold during the same period consisted of only 2,465 estates because it was difficult to set land prices. As a result, the *Erbbaurecht* (Heritable Building Right) was utilized as a substitute measure for land sales.

Though Frankfurt's urban land policy produced good results, it was forced to change owing to 'the predominance of purchasing policy' and increasing debt. Thus, the state government also became involved with the land and housing policies. The land policy shifted from the stage of 'social city' to that of 'social state' after World War I.

* Graduate School of Economics, The University of Tokyo, 7-3-1, Hongo, Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo 113-0033, JAPAN, e-mail: sbaba@e.u-tokyo.ac.jp

Introduction

Germany's urban land policy (*kommunale Bodenpolitik*), implemented from the late nineteenth to the early twentieth centuries, attracted the attention of foreign countries.⁽¹⁾ There were many contemporary publications about this policy in Germany because it was a precondition for city planning, which included housing and transportation policies.⁽²⁾ In recently published articles, H. Böhm quantitatively analysed Germany's urban land policy.⁽³⁾ In Japan, M. Sekino and S. Oba researched the cases of Ulm and Duisburg respectively.⁽⁴⁾ The aim of this paper is to clarify Frankfurt am Main's land policy at the turn of the twentieth century, especially during Franz Adickes' term in office (1891–1912).

(1) At the turn of the twentieth century, British philanthropists and local politicians took note of the German urban administration system, particularly its land policy (S.Baba (2006); S. Baba (2007). T.C.Horfall(1904) is a typical publication on this problem.

(2) K. von Mangoldt (1904), K. Th. von Inama-Sternegg (1905), W. von Kalckstein (1908), W. Gemünd (1914), N. Robert-Tornow (1916), and L. Pohle (1920) dealt with urban land policy in general. W. Weis (1907) [Mannheim], K. von Mangoldt (1908) [Berlin], O. Münsterberg (1911) [Danzig], B. D. A. Berlepsch-Valendàs (19--), R. Görnandt (1914), and F. Eychmüller (1915) [Ulm] dealt with individual cities.

(3) H. Böhm (1990, 1995, 1997).

(4) M. Sekino (1997); S. Oba (2002).

1. What is urban land policy?

According to H. Böhm, urban land policy can be divided into two elements: direct and indirect. Indirect land policy began with the Prussian 'Building Line Act' (*Fluchtliniengesetz*) of 1875, which gave construction authority (*Bauhoheit*) to local governments.⁽⁵⁾ It meant that an aspect of administration was transformed for public service (*Leistungsverwaltung*) instead of for public order (*Ordnungsverwaltung*). Land use was then limited to maintain public order in the latter and was positively limited for public purposes in the former.⁽⁶⁾ Zoning bylaws and the *Lex Adickes* of 1902 can be included as indirect land policies.⁽⁷⁾

Direct land policy, which came into existence later, consisted of the acquisition, use, and disposal of municipal land by local governments. It had been executed in earlier times, but municipal governments' freedom to dispose of land was limited by city bylaws all over the German Empire. The aims of land policy, however, changed significantly in the wake of Prussia's ministerial decree (*Ministerialerlass*) of 19 March 1901, which stated: 'A main cause for the current difficulty is unsound land speculation. Needless to say, it could be overcome partly by an amendment of the act. An effective measure for the control of land speculation, however, is shown by land accumulation by municipal governments'. It suggested the cautious disposal of municipal land to prevent land speculation and that the activities of building cooperative associations and public utility housing building companies be worthy of attention.⁽⁸⁾

Thus, the state (Land) government ordered that local authorities carry out an active land policy to overcome a housing deficiency. At the turn of the century, the governments of German cities like Altona, Frankfurt, Saarbrücken, Düsseldorf, Krefeld, Gelsenkirchen, Köln, and Hildesheim established 'land funds', separated land transactions from general accounts, and delegated control right to the land funds. Based on such organizational restructuring, many cities began to execute their land policy.⁽⁹⁾ Table 1 shows the ranking of municipal lands in German cities from 1896/97 to 1912/13. Many large German cities, including Frankfurt, extended their property; except Görlitz, which continued to own over 30, 000 ha.

Land and housing policies were closely connected. G. Gretschel and W. Steitz included the land policy within the housing policy, subdividing the former into: (1) the monitoring of price fluctuations in the land market; (2) the extension of municipal land property; (3) and the disposal of municipal land with conditions or provisions by way of the *Erbbaurecht* (Heritable Building Right) for public purposes.⁽¹⁰⁾ According to Gretschel, these policies were closely connected because the land policy was regarded as the municipality's sphere of activity, which could exert influence on the housing system.⁽¹¹⁾ Frankfurt's land policy was also considered as a complementary measure of its housing policy.⁽¹²⁾

There were criticisms against the urban land policy and the extension of municipal land. W. Gemünd accepted that municipal authorities conducted land transactions and obtained

gains on disposals, unless they were set against the private sector, because landownership was useful to city planning, housing, and consequently municipal finances.⁽¹³⁾ However, he adopted a critical stance toward the continuing expansion of municipal land. On the one hand, the disposal of disadvantageous land imposed a burden on municipal finances. On the other hand, the municipality's land monopoly was unfavourable to people who wanted small houses. Private companies that provided a large amount of housing could satisfy both private and public interests. Municipalities should promote free competition in the land market as much as possible.⁽¹⁴⁾

(5) H. Böhm (1990), pp.140-141.

(6) H. Böhm (1990), pp.141-142.

(7) H. Böhm (1995), pp.24-25; H. Böhm (1997), pp.64-70.

(8) Cited in: W. von Kalckstein (1908), pp.1-2.

(9) H. Böhm (1990), pp.155, 157; H. Böhm (1995), pp.25, 31; H. Böhm (1997), pp.70-73.

(10) G. Gretschel (1911), pp.3-4; W. Steitz (1983), pp.396-397.

(11) G. Gretschel (1911), pp.15-16.

(12) W. Steitz (1983), pp.403-404, 417-421. The following publications were concerned with Frankfurt's housing policy at the turn of the twentieth century: F. Adler (1904); E. Cahn (1912); E. Cahn (1915); H. Kramer (1978); W. Steitz (1983); G. Kuhn (1998); T. Goto (1995); S. Baba (2004b).

(13) W. Gemünd (1914), pp.19-26, 50.

(14) W. Gemünd (1914), pp.26-39, 50.

2. The formation of Frankfurt's urban land policy and its implementing organisation

The *Stadtkämmerei* (Municipal Property Office) was established in 1825 and administrated municipal land and buildings. It integrated the *Forstamt* (Forest Office) in 1869 and administrated municipal forests thereafter.⁽¹⁵⁾ In 1866, Prussia annexed Frankfurt and the first 'senior mayor' (*Oberbürgermeister*), H. D. Mumm von Schwarzenstein (1868–1880), undertook to dispose of unnecessary municipal land because the municipality was forced to cover major expenses for building urban

infrastructure such as schools, roads, water and sewerage systems, market halls, and bridges. The finance authority was reluctant to issue a public bond to fundraise for it. The simplification of the land disposal procedure was promoted during Mumm's term in office. In 1879, a list of sellable municipal land was drawn up for an estimated amount of 30,753,473 Mark. The amount of land purchased exceeded the sales of municipal land during the 1870s (except in 1871) with difference of about 7,325,000 Mark. This was the result of Mumm's active urban construction policy; the concept of urban land policy had not yet emerged.⁽¹⁶⁾

Johannes Miquel, the second senior mayor (1881–1891), pursued fiscal austerity. The long-term implementation of the land policy was difficult and the disposal of municipal land stagnant. There was one rare occasion during that period when building lots in Konstablerwache and Neue Zeil were sold and another when the municipality bought the so-called Luisenhof and Rothschild's Gunthersburg estate. This cannot yet be considered as 'urban land policy' in the strict sense. Thanks to restored budget health during Miquel's term in office, however, the preconditions for the development of a land policy by Franz Adickes were created.⁽¹⁷⁾

Adickes, the third senior mayor (1891–1912), assisted by the *Stadtkämmerei*, made and put forth a plan for road construction and city extension. His plan was gradually called the 'urban land policy' and understood as a consciously planned intervention in the land market.⁽¹⁸⁾

His land policy had two objectives: The first was securing land for administrative buildings and public facilities like schools, cemeteries, parks, and water supply systems, as well as ground for alignment. The second was the facilitation of city extension and the preparation for future incorporation (*Eingemeindung*). The acquisition of land estates facilitated negotiations with surrounding communities. The cooperation of public charity foundations was sometimes useful in purchasing land.⁽¹⁹⁾

C. Varrentrap, a councillor and later deputy mayor, was simultaneously the director of the *Stadtkämmerei* and the finance office. A. Seidel, a councillor, had been vice director since 1890. Both competent officials promoted Adickes' urban land policy. Varrentrap, especially, put large sums of money into land purchases until his retreat in 1906.⁽²⁰⁾

The *Stadtkämmerei* accomplished organisational reforms during the Adickes Era. The

Magistrat proposed the establishment of the land fund on 6 November 1891. It aimed to manage land that was not used by the administration. It could not enjoy subsidies from the city's general account because the city council was reluctant to subscribe. The *Magistrat* and city council resolved in principle that the land fund should use profits from municipal land sales to purchase necessary land.⁽²¹⁾

Thereafter, two special funds were established. The 'Road Construction Fund' (*Straßenneubaukasse*) was established in April 1893 to construct new roads and expand existing ones. Fiscal resources were derived from tax revenue from land transactions; surplus money from the municipal tram (5,000 Mark the first year and 20,000 Mark per year thereafter); and subsidies from the general account based on the issue of a bond (100,000 Mark the first year and 170,000 Mark per year thereafter) in addition to the profits made from municipal land. To implement the work, a joint committee from the *Magistrat* and city council was established and land worth 4,756,500 Mark was purchased in the first year.⁽²²⁾

'The Special Fund for Municipal Land Property', which was called the 'main office of Adickes' land policy', was established in October 1897 for the planned construction of a river port, railways, and embankments in the Ostend District and surrounding area. It was entrusted with land as the outfit's allowance. According to the property list at the inauguration, its initial capital was worth 26,161,000 Mark.⁽²³⁾ Though the initial operation was satisfactory, it ran a deficit after the purchase of Fischersfeld for the East River Port (*Osthafen*) project, which had to be compensated for with a loan from the 'Central Pay Office' and the issue of a bond.⁽²⁴⁾ Though the two funds smoothly accomplished their task in the beginning, they were abolished on April 1924 and April 1926 because of World War I, post-war disorder, and hyperinflation. Authority and duties were divided among several offices, but land transactions and management devolved to the newly established 'Settlement Office' (*Siedlungsamt*) under Ernst May's leadership.⁽²⁵⁾

(15) L. Vogel (1934), pp.8-11.

(16) L. Vogel (1934), pp.13-30.

(17) L. Vogel (1934), pp.30-32.

- (18) L. Vogel (1934), pp.32-33.
- (19) L. Vogel (1934), pp.34-36.
- (20) L. Vogel (1934), pp.31-34, 71.
- (21) An die Stadtverordneten-Versammlung. Bericht des Magistrates, die Verwaltung und den Stand der Gemeinde-Angelegenheiten im Verwaltungsjahre 1892/93 betreffend (=Magistratsbericht), p.102; 1893/94, p.101; L. Vogel (1934), p.36.
- (22) Magistratsbericht, 1893/94, p.102; L. Vogel (1934), pp.39-40.
- (23) Frankfurter Zeitung, 16 February 1913, Institut für Stadtgeschichte Frankfurt am Main (=ISG), Magistratsakten (=MA) U477/IV, no.200-201; L. Vogel (1934), pp.36-38. cf. Magistratsbericht, 1897/98, pp.IX-X, 196.
- (24) ISG, MA U771/I, no.148; L. Vogel (1934), pp.38-39.
- (25) L. Vogel (1934), pp.40-41, 65-66.

3. Overview of transactions and the expansion of municipal land

(1) Extension of municipal land

Alongside organizational reform, a detailed list of municipal land was made based on a city council resolution passed on 8 September 1891 and presented on 1 April 1894 – later than originally scheduled.⁽²⁶⁾ The list was to be made yearly. Table 2 shows the figures for 1894, 1900, 1905, 1910, and 1915. We should note that forest accounted for 84.7 per cent of the total 3, 996.77 ha of municipal land in 1894.⁽²⁷⁾

After Adickes became senior mayor, Frankfurt actively extended municipal land. Table 2 and 3 show the increase of municipal land area and its evaluation from 1894-1915. It increased from 4,229.17 ha in 1900 to 5,713.54 ha in 1910 and peaked at 6,370.19 ha in 1913. We can say that municipal land was extended by almost 60 per cent within 20 years. Extensions were especially remarkable in the 1900s. The *Magistrat's* annual report of 1904 stated that the *Stadtkämmerei's* work increased because of 'a considerable increase of municipal land,' 'frequent land consolidations and large amount of land expropriation'.⁽²⁸⁾

As a result of the land policy, the proportion of forest in municipal land decreased from 70.1 per cent in 1905 to 59.4 per cent in 1915, though the area of municipal forest itself expanded from 3,409.48 ha to 3,772.7 ha during the same period.⁽²⁹⁾ The total area of

Frankfurt city was 9,391 ha in 1900 and 13,477 ha in 1910.⁽³⁰⁾ The proportion of municipal land was 45 per cent in 1900 and 42.4 per cent in 1910. The highest figure in the pre-war period was 47.3 per cent in 1913.

Table 4 shows how much municipal land was used for housing and agriculture at the beginning of the twentieth century. It totalled 735 ha in 1901, 1,183 ha in 1905, and 1,387 ha in 1910. It reached a peak of 1,603 ha in 1913 and decreased to 1,525 ha in 1915. Its proportion was relatively stable and consisted of around 25 per cent of the total municipal land area. In addition to housing and agricultural land, municipal land categories consisted of land for public buildings, transport facilities, water and sewerage, parks, and cemeteries. Land for transport facilities (from 28 ha to 466 ha) and water and sewerage (from 69 ha to 308 ha) was significantly extended from 1894 to 1915.

Table 5 indicates that some of Frankfurt's municipal land was situated outside the city boundary, which expanded especially after 1908, representing almost 20 per cent of its total land area in the 1910s. Frankfurt incorporated eleven communities belonging to the 'Frankfurt Country District' (*Landkreis*) in 1910. Before the incorporation, Frankfurt owned approximately 860 ha, or ca 21 per cent of the country district's total area.⁽³¹⁾ Undeniably, municipal land extensions were a driving measures toward the incorporation of surrounding communities.

A document from the *Stadtkämmerei* to the *Magistrat* dated 4 August 1902 mentioned: 'As is commonly known, the city of Frankfurt has considerable land within the area of surrounding communities of Ginnheim, Eschersheim, and Eckenheim. In our opinion, it is a good idea to extend the property at appropriate prices for the interest of the city in the future'.

We can conclude that Frankfurt's municipal government intended to purchase land from surrounding communities in anticipation of future incorporation.⁽³²⁾

(2) Overview of land transaction

Table 6 shows aggregate data of the city's land transactions. Land purchased between 1895 and 1915 consisted of 710 estates with houses, which amounted to 60.59 ha in area worth 79,674,982 Mark and 10,939 estates without houses totalling 2,108.03 ha worth 1,266,995,471 Mark. Conversely, land sold during the same period consisted of only 73

estates with houses (6.98 ha worth 7,668,940 Mark) and 2,392 estates without houses (436.59 ha worth 81,558,288 Mark). Almost all of these transactions concerned estates without houses.

Compared to purchased land, land sold was much smaller both in number and in area. The proportions were only 10.3 per cent and 11.5 per cent for land with houses and 21.9 per cent and 20.7 per cent for land without houses respectively. Municipal land was extended because only a part of the purchased land was put up for sale.

If we calculate average selling prices for 1893 and 1894, the results are as follows: land purchased with houses in 1893 were valued at 13,424.6 Mark and those without houses at 606.2 Mark; land for sale with houses in 1894 were valued at 11,114.4 Mark and those without houses 1,868.1 Mark. The average price of land with houses for sale was lower than for purchased land and the prices of land without houses rose over threefold. In conclusion, the city purchased large amounts of land and realised a profit by selling roughly a fifth of it. In the next chapter we elucidate land transactions in detail.

(26) Magistartsbericht 1891/92, p.83; 1892/93, p.96; 1893/94, p.98. cf. L. Vogel (1934), pp.28, 43.

(27) L. Vogel (1934), pp.28-29, 42-43.

(28) Magistratsbericht 1904, p.303.

(29) Magistratsbericht 1893/94, p.97; 1899, p.195; 1904, p.305; 1909, p.19; 1914, p.23.

(30) S. Baba (2000), p.25.

(31) S. Baba (2000), p.27; S. Baba (2004a), p.132.

(32) ISG, MA U796, no.9.

4. Details of land purchases

(1) The land purchasing process

The *Stadtkämmerei*'s (Municipal Property Office) documents are the most important for our research on municipal land transactions; however, almost all of them were lost during the bombardment of 1944. We utilised the *Stadtkämmerei*'s remaining documents and relied mainly on the *Magistratsakten* (Documents of the *Magistrat*) and city council minutes to elucidate land transaction details.

First, we will examine the basic land purchasing process using the *Magistratsakten*. Usually, to complete land purchases the following process was undertaken: (1) the *Stadtkämmerei* made a proposition to the *Magistrat*; (2) a resolution regarding the proposition was sent from the *Magistrat* to the city council; (3) the *Stadtkämmerei* was authorised by the city council to purchase land; (4) the *Magistrat* gave the *Stadtkämmerei* final authority. According to city council minutes, however, the city council entrusted its standing civil engineering committee to check propositions before authorising the *Stadtkämmerei*. Some small land transactions, however, were made without city council deliberations. The city council and *Magistrat* rarely rejected the *Stadtkämmerei*'s propositions.⁽³³⁾

The following two examples can be retraced in detail. According to a document dated 23 November 1900, the *Stadtkämmerei* proposed the following purchase to the *Magistrat*: (1) four estates owned by Franz Eckstein in the Frankfurt city area (Gewann III: 497D (2.58 a.); 555A (2.12 a.); 659A (6.02 a.); and 602A (9.65 a.)); (2) and three estates owned by the Hens family heirs (Gewann III: 555A (2.12 a.); 659A (6.02 a.); and 602A (9.65 a.)). The asking price of these estates was 15,366 Mark. The *Stadtkämmerei* expressed its intention to purchase the land since the asking price was fair and the estates were necessary for road building and to extend municipal land.

This proposal was sent to the city council on 27 November after receiving the *Magistrat*'s approval. On 11 December, the council granted the *Stadtkämmerei* with the authority to purchase the above-mentioned estates based on the civil engineering committee's review. Once this process was completed, the *Magistrat* granted authority to the *Stadtkämmerei*.⁽³⁴⁾

From the *Magistrat*'s documents and the city council minutes we can obtain a lot of helpful information such as location, square measurement, price, and reason for purchase of each estate for sale. From these data, we can grasp general and more detailed features of land transactions made by municipal government. For example, an estate agent mediated between seller and buyer. On 19 September 1900, a seller named Eckstein offered an estate for sale to Stern-Simon, an intermediate broker. On 29 September, the *Stadtkämmerei* assessed the asking price and decided to ask for a discount – from 160 Mark to 150 Mark per Rute (the total amount was 3,061 Mark). Simon-Stern accepted the

assessment and made a formal offer on 23 November. After purchasing authority was given, the *Stadtkämmerei* formally accepted Eckstein's offer on 28 December 1900 and payment was made 2 February 1901. The registration was completed on 7 April.⁽³⁵⁾

From this case, we can see that a lot of time and money and many procedures were required for each transaction. Table 6 shows that over 11, 000 land purchase transactions were conducted from 1893 to 1915, requiring an enormous amount of work.

(2) Aims of and reasons for land purchases

We will explore the aims of and reasons for municipal land purchases in the Frankfurt city area (including Sachsenhausen) during the following two periods: 1900–1901 (ISG, MA U745/III) and 1909–1910 (ISG, MA U745/VIII).

From 1900–1901, land was bought for future road construction (III, no.1, 5, 8, 12, 20, 34, 41, 45, 47, 68 and 76) and the enlargement or integration of municipal land (III, no.1, 8, 12, 18, 20, 36, 41, 45, 47, 63, 65, 68, 76 and 93), though they were not always mentioned simultaneously as reasons for purchase. It was estimated, however, that purchased land would be particularly useful in the future for the latter reason (III, no.1, 36 and 47). 'Use' mainly consisted of disposal and leasing of land and house building. The city intended to own land for more appropriate uses by means of integration. The construction of the East River Port was another important reason for acquiring land during this period.

From 1909–1910, we notice that most purchases were related to the building line (VIII, no.1, 7, 11, 13, 15, 39, 51, 53, 59, 64, 67, 70, 77, 79, 81, 85, 87 and 94). It may be that the building line was more easily assigned than before because land readjustment and replotting were implemented through the *Lex Adickes* of 1902 and its amendment act of 1907.

(3) Prices

Land prices varied considerably because of location, shape, or purchasing conditions. Prices ranged between 243 Mark and 4,258 Mark per are from 1900–1901. Proposals made to the *Magistrat* was usually based on the estimation that the asking price was fair. If it was too high, price reduction negotiations were conducted previous to the proposal.

When estates were assessed as indispensable for the future sale of municipal land, the city did not hesitate to purchase them knowing that they were more expensive than the market price (III, no.105). In some cases, asking prices were decided by the expert appraiser (III, no.63) and in others by local trends. Some estates in the city district (Gewann III) were purchased at 1,185 Mark per are because ‘the price was usual in this district’ (III, no.14, 18, 20, 45). An estate in Bornheim District was estimated on the grounds that ‘it is not too high considering land price in the neighbourhood’ (III, no.113).

Prices ranged between 324.7 Mark and 2,824.6 Mark per are from 1909–1910. We can see that the price difference narrowed, though the lowest price increased. The *Stadtkämmerei* assessed land prices based on its own calculations and proposed purchases after comparing them with asking prices (VIII, no.5, 15, 18, 32, 36, 49, 59, 64, 74, 79, 89, 91, 96). This is characteristic of this period and it is supposed that the *Stadtkämmerei* established its own assessment system.

(4) The purchase of large-scale estates

Purchased estates varied in area. According to table 6, the average area of estates with houses was 8.53 a. and 19.24 a. for those without houses. It is presumed that most estates were about 20 a. in area and those over 1 ha were not taken into account.

Large estates also came on the land market and their transactions were often directly connected to city planning. The East River Port project’s land transactions were the largest in scale. An estate of the Holy Spirit Hospital (*Hospital zum Heiligen Geist*) (279 ha 16 a.) in Riederwald was sold to the city for ca. 736,871 Mark in 1904 for this project.⁽³⁶⁾ Following this massive transaction, the city purchased estates that were over 10 ha from surrounding communities, like Fechenheim, and from public charity foundations like the Orphanage (*Waisenhaus*), the Holy Spirit Hospital, and the General Alms Chest (*Allgemeiner Almosenkasten*).⁽³⁷⁾

Additional large-scale land transactions made under Adickes’ regime were as follows: (1) Barckhausen’s family estate in Bockenheim (1902; ca. 62 ha; 994,000 Mark); (2) Bethmann’s estate in Niederad (1905; ca. 26 ha 63 a.; 1,647,000 Mark); (3) Tornow’s estate (1907; 104 ha; 6,817,000 Mark);⁽³⁸⁾ (4) Goldstein’s farm estate in Schwanheim (1909; 156 ha 81 a.; 5,625,000 Mark);⁽³⁹⁾ (5) ‘Russian estate’ in Vilbel (1911; 108 ha 63

a.; 2,000,000 Mark).⁽⁴⁰⁾

Among them, we will dwell on Tornow's estate. Eugen Tornow moved from Berlin to Frankfurt in 1885 and quickly accumulated a large amount of land inside and outside the city through masterful transactions. When he died single in 1904, most of his property was offered to the International Construction Company for ca. 11 million Mark. Since the company could not purchase all of his property, it consulted the *Magistrat*. The latter bought up only the land that was useful for city planning.⁽⁴¹⁾ According to the International Construction Company's letter to the *Magistrat* dated 25 June 1907, a part of its offer was related to the development of the area south of *Mainzer Landstraße*.⁽⁴²⁾ The contract between the company and the city imposed an obligation on both parties to construct and maintain roads, water and sewerage, streetcars, and houses.⁽⁴³⁾

(33) A land transaction was once rejected on July 1906. (Mitteilungen aus den Protokollen der Stadtverordneten-Versammlung der Stadt Frankfurt am Main (=Mitt. Prot. StVV) 1906, §706, p.371; §776, pp.417-418). This case was tabled again in 1909 and approved (ISG, MA U745/VIII, no.22).

(34) ISG, MA U745/III, Bl.45-46; Mitt.Prot.StVV 1900, §1196, S.528; §1263, pp.550-551.

(35) ISG, Stadtkämmerei vor 1926, 68.

(36) Magistratsbericht 1903, p.797; 1904, p.813. The city sold 7.52 ha of municipal land for 451,110 Mark to the Holy Spirit Hospital and the payment was deducted from the amount of its estate.

(37) Magistratsbericht 1909, p.36; 1910, pp.18-19; 1911, p.18; 1912, p.18.

(38) L. Vogel (1934), S.49-50.

(39) Magistratsbericht 1909, p.36.

(40) Magistratsbericht 1911, p.20.

(41) W. Klötzer (1996), p.482; Mitt.Prot.StVV 1907, §684, p.392; Magistratsbericht 1897, p.219.

(42) Schreiben von der Internationalen Baugesellschaft an den Magistrat vom 25.Juni 1907, ISG, MA, U852; Mitt.Prot.StVV 1907, §684, pp.392-393.

(43) Mitt.Prot.StVV 1907, §684, pp.392-398.

5. The ‘utilization’ of municipal land

(1) The sale of municipal land

As mentioned above, sold land was much smaller in area and number than the purchased land. Sale and purchasing procedures were similar in some ways and quite different in others. For example, a document sent on 9 June 1909 from the *Stadtkämmerei* to the *Magistrat* proposed that municipal land situated north of Riederwald should be sold for small house construction. The proposal was reviewed by the city council and empowerment of sale was given to the *Stadtkämmerei* on 16 July 1909. On the same day, the *Magistrat* gave the prefectural governor in Wiesbaden the sale notification.⁽⁴⁴⁾ This notification procedure, which can be confirmed in other transactions in the same period, was supposed to be a duty of the disposal.⁽⁴⁵⁾

Another characteristic of municipal land sales was a procedure that the *Stadtkämmerei* should be granted authority over various lots at the beginning of every year by the *Magistrat* and the city council. According to a document dated 28 January 1910, for instance, the *Stadtkämmerei* proposed that authority should be given to the ‘Joint Estate Committee’ of both municipal institutions for the sale of 58 listed estates.⁽⁴⁶⁾ This yearly procedure lasted from 1896 to 1914 and the number of estates for sale increased steadily.⁽⁴⁷⁾

It is difficult to know to whom municipal land was sold. Table 7, however, shows that 11 estates (12 ha 27 a. in total) were ceded to public housing companies, building associations, or the Royal Railway Administration for the construction of small housing.⁽⁴⁸⁾ Prices were usually lower than market prices. The city stipulated the terms of use or redeemable rights in the contracts to prevent land speculation. The supervisory authority monitored construction and buyers had to observe building maintenance regulations.⁽⁴⁹⁾

In the city’s opinion, however, only a part of municipal land was disposed of and land speculation was unpreventable.⁽⁵⁰⁾ In 1899, the Frankfurt Lodger Association asserted that the city and public charitable foundations should lease instead of selling their land. If they sold at high prices, they would make excessive profits. If land were sold at low prices, private speculators would make undue profits.⁽⁵¹⁾ At the 25th meeting of the German Public Health Association in 1900, Adickes also expressed that local authorities

should be prudent in selling municipal land if they wished to remain public. We can imagine that it was quite difficult to set land prices.⁽⁵²⁾ As a result, the *Erbbaurecht* (Heritable Building Right) was expected to be a substitute measure for land sales.

(2) The establishment of the *Erbbaurecht* (Heritable Building Right)

The *Erbbaurecht* was stipulated in articles 1012–1017 of the civil code that was constituted in 1896 and executed in 1900. It consisted of the right to own, sell, and inherit a building on and under a plot of land. This right was transferable and inheritable. It could also be applied to a plot of land that was not solely being used for a building and could not be abated even after a building's dismantlement.⁽⁵³⁾

The *Erbbaurecht* was not highly valued when the civil code was drafted; it became increasingly important after its enforcement. As a result of urbanization, there was a sharp rise in land prices and housing shortages in the second half of the nineteenth century. The German Land Reformer League was established under the leadership of Adolph Damaschke in 1898 to support the use of the *Erbbaurecht*. Jurists like Rudolf Sohm, Heinrich Erman, Paul Oertmann, Arthur von Posadowsky-Wehner (Treasury Secretary and Secretary for the Interior), and Theobald von Bethmann-Hollweg (Chancellor of the German Empire) were active advocates of the *Erbbaurecht* because its owner could construct his own building without owning the land.⁽⁵⁴⁾

The *Erbbaurecht* was an advantage not only for leaseholders but also for landowners. The latter could obtain rent and were free to use their land after contracts were terminated. If local authorities and states had vast areas of land, the *Erbbaurecht* was expected to have following effects: (1) it could be a measure of city planning from the viewpoint of public welfare; (2) it could be an effective countermeasure against land speculation; (3) it could exercise an indirect influence on housing policy.⁽⁵⁵⁾ Therefore, we can conclude that the *Erbbaurecht*, as exercised by local authorities and states, was presupposed by urban land policy.⁽⁵⁶⁾

Frankfurt was one of cities that utilised the *Erbbaurecht* during the earliest stage. Adickes was positive about the municipal government's active engagement with regard to housing problems. He was cautious, however, about municipal housing construction that was actively carried out in cities like Ulm and Freiburg. He constructed only housing

for city officials because he thought that public housing subsidies would generate injustice among taxpayers.⁽⁵⁷⁾

The *Erbbaurecht* was Adickes' favourable instrument for the utilization of municipal land. In 1894, he introduced a bill to lease municipal land with 'the Joint-Stock Company for Small Housing' to construct 44 small houses on Burg Street. The contract contained a feature of the *Erbbaurecht*. The city council rejected the bill because of defects in the plan. On 7 July 1900, Adickes then proposed the introduction of the *Erbbaurecht* in the civil code, which was established a few years before. The *Magistrat* approved his proposal on 10 July.⁽⁵⁸⁾

In his memorandum, Adickes stated that it was probably impossible to prevent unsound land speculation if municipal land was sold without forethought. He thought that leasing land according to the *Erbbaurecht* was a wiser measure than the disposal of municipal land.⁽⁵⁹⁾

According to the *Magistrat's* decision on 10 July 1900, the *Stadtkämmerei* offered a list of municipal lands which would be subject to the *Erbbaurecht* on 9 August and sent contract conditions to the *Magistrat* on 9 January 1901. Then on 1 February, the *Magistrat* proposed to the city council that the *Erbbaurecht* be temporarily set for 2 years and the city would offer capital to the borrowers for up to a maximum of 500,000 Mark.

The city council set up a special committee to consider the proposal. On 23 April 1901, the committee admitted the *Magistrat's* proposal in principle and obtained the city council's approval in each case. Opinion was divided, however, on the inclusion of private companies in the right owners and the debate was not concluded that day.⁽⁶⁰⁾ On 7 May, the special committee presented twelve standards to be included in *Erbbaurecht* contracts like location, contract term, and the duties of right owners etc. The city council finally approved them and the *Magistrat* accepted the special committee's proposal on 10 May.⁽⁶¹⁾

The *Erbbaurecht* system was introduced as a result of this process. The first contract in Frankfurt was concluded in 1899 between the Joint-Stock Company for Small Housing and the *St. Katharinen* and *Weißfrauen* Foundations. It aimed to build 253 small houses along *Mainzer Landstraße*.⁽⁶²⁾ Table 8 shows the list of contracts concluded by the city of Frankfurt during the period of 1900–1913. It shows that municipal land totalling 16.51 ha

(208 contracts) was afforded based on the *Erbbaurecht*.⁽⁶³⁾ Frankfurt was where the *Erbbaurecht* was most actively applied in Germany. The above-mentioned area, however, proved too small by comparison to the area of purchased municipal land (443.57 ha).

There were some obstacles in the diffusion of the *Erbbaurecht*. From the legal viewpoint, the civil code's stipulations were quite ambiguous. For example, it was uncertain what kind of rights could be vested to the owners except for the right to use the site.⁽⁶⁴⁾ Even in Frankfurt's case, the *Erbbaurecht* was not often used because of limitations in the contract terms – the pre-emptive and supervision rights of the city etc. The Non-Profit Building Company and the Franken-Alee Joint-Stock Company used the *Erbbaurecht* only once in their beginnings.⁽⁶⁵⁾

In 1900, the city established bank loans for owners through the *Erbbaurecht*.⁽⁶⁶⁾ According to Table 8, a total of 7,155,022 Mark was provided by the city to *Erbbaurecht* owners. In May 1901, the *Magistrat* obtained the city council's consent to lend money to leaseholders for a maximum of 500,000 Mark.⁽⁶⁷⁾ The following principle was resolved by the *Magistrat* on 24 February 1903: up to 90 per cent of necessary construction costs were to be paid by city officials and teachers; between 75–90 per cent by state officials and teachers; and up to 75 per cent by other individuals who leased municipal land using the *Erbbaurecht*.⁽⁶⁸⁾ Thus, the use of this right for small housing began.⁽⁶⁹⁾

As W. Bangert pointed out, however, public utility building companies and building associations were reluctant to use the *Erbbaurecht* because they could not get a loan from the state insurance institute if they used it.⁽⁷⁰⁾ Conversely, H. Kramer claimed that the increase of public utility housing after 1900 was related to the introduction of the *Erbbaurecht* – 1,700 houses were constructed on a site where the *Erbbaurecht* was used in 1914 and 1,414 of these were by public utility housing companies. They represented 25.7 per cent of the total houses built between 1900 and 1914.⁽⁷¹⁾ We should neither oversell nor deny the *Erbbaurecht*'s significance.

(44) ISG, MA U477/IV, no.149-151.

(45) ISG, MA U477/IV, no.154-158.

(46) ISG, MA U477/IV, no.160-165.

- (47) ISG, MA U477/III,U477/IV. The number of municipal lands listed during this period increased from 17 in 1896 to 88 in 1914.
- (48) The area of municipal land sold between 1901-1913 amounted to 17 ha 86 a. in Stettin and 12 ha 85 a. in Köln. Frankfurt was ranked third following these two cities (R. Kuczynski (1916), p.34).
- (49) R. Kuczynski (1916), pp.33-34, 55, 57; W. Steitz (1983), pp.417-420.
- (50) W. Steitz (1983), p.421.
- (51) W. Bangert (1937), p.56
- (52) W. Gemünd (1914), pp.32-33; M. Sekino (1997), p.82.
- (53) Bürgerliches Gesetzbuch vom 18. August 1896, §1012-§1017. cf. D. Pesl (1910), pp.58-59; N. Robert-Tornow (1916),pp.82-83. The articles of the civil code were quite brief and information was lacking on rent, the duration of the right, and the treatment of buildings after the right's extinction.
- (54) A. Damaschke (1922), pp.131-135; E. Tanaka (2001), pp.97-102.
- (55) E. Tanaka (2001), pp.104-105; cf. F. Adler (1904),pp.72-73; D. Pesl (1910), pp.59-65; N. Robert-Tornow (1916), pp.83-84.
- (56) In his primary work 'The Land Reform', Damaschke argued that the *Erbbaurecht* was a utility of 'municipal landowning' (A. Damaschke (1922), pp.122-138).
- (57) W. Bangert (1937), pp.60-61.
- (58) Magistratsbericht 1899, pp.XVI-XXIV; L. Vogel (1934), pp.51-53.
- (59) Magistratsbericht 1899, pp.XIX. cf. R. Kuczynski (1916), p.74.
- (60) Magistratsbericht 1900, p.271; Mitt.Prot.StVV, 1901, §496, pp.272-277.
- (61) Magistratsbericht 1900, p.271-272; Mitt.Prot.StVV 1901, §548, pp.294-296.
- (62) Magistratsbericht 1898/9, pp.XIV-XV; 1899, p.XXIV; L. Vogel (1934), p.53.
- (63) R. Kuczynski(1916), pp.75-77; W. Steitz (1983), p.422. The number of *Erbbaurecht* contracts at the time of the *Stadtkämmerei*'s dissolution in 1926 was 320 (companies and associations – 31; officials and teachers – 201; and other individuals – 88) (L. Vogel (1934), p.55).
- (64) E. Tanaka (2001), pp.108-111; W. H. C. Gratzhoff (1918), pp.18-19.
- (65) W. Bangert (1937), pp.57-58.
- (66) R. Kuczynski (1916), p.89; W. Steitz (1982), p.178; W. Steitz (1983), p.421.

(67) Magistratsbericht, 1900, pp.269-272; F. Adler (1904), p.76; L. Vogel (1934), pp.53-54.

(68) Magistratsbericht, 1902, pp.290-291, 336; F. Adler (1904), p.74. By 1914, 8 million Mark was provided by the city for the housing of *Erbbaurecht* owners (E. Cahn (1915), p.51).

(69) H. Rößler (1903), p.11.

(70) W. Bangert (1937), pp.57-58.

(71) H. Kramer (1978), p.148.

6. Assessment of the urban land policy

How can we estimate urban land policy in Frankfurt under Adickes' term of office? Along with data from other materials, an anonymous article in the *Frankfurter Zeitung* in February 1913 gives us some insight.⁽⁷²⁾

The city of Frankfurt, under Franz Adickes, carried out its land policy to solve housing problems and prevent land speculation. Georg Voigt, the fourth senior mayor (1912-1924), stated at a city council meeting, however, that an enormous amount of municipal land should be utilised for general purposes and municipal finance (part I). According to Table 3, the municipal land area in 1910s was maintained at ca. 6,300 ha. The *Magistrat's* annual report that year suggested that the *Stadtkämmerei* began to restrict land purchases in the suburbs, apart from estates considered necessary for special city purposes. The same report in 1913 expressly stated that 'the *Stadtkämmerei* was extremely discreet about purchases of land'.⁽⁷³⁾

Table 9 shows the estimated value of municipal land and its composition on 31 March 1912. It consisted of land with buildings worth ca. 6,620,000 Mark (5.8 per cent); levelled land for building worth ca. 15,590,000 Mark (13.7 per cent); land for future development worth ca. 28,880,000 Mark (25.3 per cent); agricultural land worth ca. 46,080,000 Mark (40.4 per cent); land with *Erbbaurecht* contracts worth ca. 3,710,000 Mark (3.2 per cent); and land for public purposes worth ca. 13,310,000 Mark (11.7 per cent). The total estimated value was ca. 114,180,000 Mark. The author of the article noted that the high proportion of agricultural land imposed a burden on municipal government finance. According to the *Magistrat's* annual report of 1910, the amount

required for ‘the Special Fund for Municipal Land Property’ was worth ca. 3,870,000 Mark.⁽⁷⁴⁾ In fact, the tax burden per capita in Frankfurt increased from 35.52 Mark in 1890 to 63.51 Mark in 1913, outstripping that of Berlin (24 Mark and 43.3 Mark respectively).⁽⁷⁵⁾ The amount of debt per capita also increased from 273 Mark in 1896 to 627 Mark in 1907; it was the highest amount among German big cities.⁽⁷⁶⁾

Based on these facts, the author assessed the land policy. Using municipal land, the city satisfied the demand for schools and parks and supplied building land to individuals and private associations. Most of the objectives set by the city, however, were not achieved. Land speculation was not thwarted and it could not sell municipal land at moderate prices because purchasing prices were increasing. According to the article, the biggest failure was ‘the predominance of purchasing policy’. The city could not counter land speculation by selling or exchanging municipal land and control rising land prices. Furthermore, the city overestimated the tempo of its development and the demand for land. As a result, the urban land policy caused financial problems and prompted criticism toward it. What is a proper land policy? It should facilitate the construction of small houses by private and public utility housing companies on municipal land and the acceptance of shares and debt guaranteed on the condition that dividends and rent be restricted (part III).⁽⁷⁷⁾

The author’s article struck at the heart of the situation. The urban land policy did accomplish some results, especially the construction of small houses; however, purchasing land became its own goal, beyond its original intention, resulting in ‘the predominance of purchasing policy’. Thus, the purchase of land was kept to a minimum and pursued to effectively utilise enormous amounts of municipal land.

Gemünd expressed a similar view on Frankfurt’s urban land policy in 1914. The city had continuously expanded municipal land – only a part of which was sold to private companies. Whereas some advocates defended the policy, there were also many criticisms: (1) the city raised land prices because of competition with private companies; (2) land speculators moved outside Frankfurt’s boundary due to competition from the city and a heavy tax burden. Consequently, the city hardly purchased any new land and could not regulate land prices. At any rate, it was almost impossible for the city to assume the construction of all its housing – a greater part which was relegated to private companies.⁽⁷⁸⁾ Based on his own statistical analysis, E. Cahn agreed with the critical view

that the urban land policy inflated private sector prices more than land speculation.⁽⁷⁹⁾

Criticism against Frankfurt's urban land policy was valid in a way, but we would like to point out that it achieved greater results than its critics suggested. Indeed, the *Magistrat* extended municipal land without controlling land prices and increased the city's debt. As Chapter 4 elucidated, however, the East River Port project that consisted of river port construction, industrial park development, and the redevelopment of the West District, including Gutleuthof, considerably determined Frankfurt's development. The urban land policy during Adickes' term in office set the preconditions for that. It should be evaluated in consideration of such an achievement.

(72) 'Die Grundstückspolitik der Stadt Frankfurt am Main I-III', *Frankfurter Zeitung* vom 16, 22, und 27 February 1913, ISG, MA U477/IV, no.200-202.

(73) *Magistratsbericht* 1910, p.18; 1911, p.18; 1912, p.17; 1913, p.14.

(74) *Magistratsbericht* 1910, p.XXXV.

(75) *Magistratsbericht* 1911, p.37.

(76) W. Steitz (1983), pp.406, 408.

(77) The provision of municipal land by using the *Erbbaurecht* should be added to municipal land policy, though the article strangely does not mention it.

(77) J. Pfitzner (1911), p.13; W. Steitz (1982), pp.171, 174.

(78) W. Gemünd (1914), pp.40-47.

(79) E. Cahn (1912), pp.13-16.

Closing remarks

Though Frankfurt's urban land policy, as carried out by Franz Adickes, produced good results, it was forced to change owing to a surplus of land and increasing debt; thus, demonstrating the limits of land and housing policies of local authority. Though state (Land and Reich) measures were requested and prepared, progress was only finally made during World War I.⁽⁸⁰⁾ The ambiguity of civil code clauses and mortgage settlement difficulties were obstacles to the *Erbbaurecht*'s diffusion. General provisions were therefore revised in Frankfurt in 1914. The most important event, however, was the '*Erbbaurecht* Act' of 15 January 1919. Instead of repealing articles 1012 to 1017 of the

civil code, this special act was meant to resolve the mentioned stipulations.⁽⁸¹⁾ Note, ‘the Act for the Resolution of Emergent Housing Deficit’ was enacted on the same day.⁽⁸²⁾ The *Erbbaurecht* was aimed to resolve the serious national housing problem that intensified during World War I. This meant that not only urban authorities carried out the land policy but the state government as well.⁽⁸³⁾

The state (Land) government also became involved with the housing policy. The ‘Prussian Housing Act’ was enacted on 28 March 1918. This act was comprehensive and included the ‘Building Line Act’ and the *Lex Adickes*.⁽⁸⁴⁾ On the same day, ‘the Act of State Assurance for Second Mortgages’ that laid out direct provisions regarding state (Land) government funds for small housing construction was promulgated.⁽⁸⁵⁾ At the central state (Reich) level, social housing construction was promoted based on rent tax that was introduced in 1924.⁽⁸⁶⁾

Urban authority was also the driving force of social housing construction under the new legal framework and Frankfurt was typical in its policy approach.⁽⁸⁷⁾ In 1926, the *Stadtkämmerei* was abolished and its main activities were transferred to the newly established ‘*Siedlungsamt*’. This department under Ernst May was in charge of social housing constructions like the *Siedlung Römerstadt*. Consequently, land policy shifted from the stage of ‘Social City’ to that of ‘Social State’.⁽⁸⁸⁾

(80) In 1892, H. Rößler, the deputy chairman of Frankfurt’s city council, advocated for the establishment of a housing act at the central state (Reich) level, which he considered necessary for housing policy success at the local level (H. Rößler (1903)).

(81) E. Tanaka (2001), pp.121-130; Reichs=Gesetzblatt, Jg.1919, pp.72-82.

(82) Reichs=Gesetzblatt, Jg.1919, pp.69-72.

(83) E. Tanaka (2001), pp.49-50; H. Kruschwitz (1930), p.9.

(84) D. Berger-Thimme (1972), pp.220-235; L. Niethammer (1979), pp.363-384.

(85) For articles and comments regarding the ‘Prussian Housing Act’ and the ‘Act of State Assurance for Second Mortgages’, refer to P. Hirsch (1918).

(86) T. Goto (1999), pp.20, 24-27, 31.

(87) T. Goto (1995); T. Goto (1999), pp.461-555.

(88) For the relation between ‘Social City’ and ‘Social State’, refer to U.Reulecke(1995),

pp.9-10.

References

Adler, F. (1904), *Wohnungsverhältnisse und Wohnungspolitik der Stadt Frankfurt a.M. zu Beginn des 20. Jahrhunderts*, Frankfurt am Main.

Baba, S. (2000), *The Incorporation of Hoechst to Frankfurt: Expansion of a Big City and Reorganization of the Surrounding Area*, *Socio-Economic History*, Vol.66, No.1 (in Japanese).

Baba, S. (2004a), *The Incorporation Policy of German Cities, 1854-1930*, *The Journal of Economics*, Vol.70, No.3 (in Japanese).

Baba, S. (2004b), *The Senior Mayor (Oberbürgermeister) in Imperial Germany*, K.Imai and S.Baba (eds.), *Comparative Historical Studies on Urbanization: Japan and Germany*, Keizai-Hyoron-Sha: Tokyo (in Japanese).

Baba, S. (2006) *British Perception of German Town Planning and Urban Administration at the Turn of the Twentieth Century: A Case of T.C.Horsfall of Manchester*, *The Journal of Economics*, Vol.72, No.2; Vol.72, No.3 (in Japanese).

Baba, S. (2007), *Housing Policy in Birmingham and Town Planning Movement at the beginning of the Twentieth Century: the Activities and Ideas of J.S.Nettlefold*, *Socio-Economic History*, Vol.72, No.6, (in Japanese).

Bangert, W. (1937), *Baupolitik und Stadtgestaltung in Frankfurt a.M. Ein Beitrag zur Entwicklungsgeschichte des deutschen Städtebaues in den letzten 100 Jahren*, Würzburg.

Bauer, T. (2003), *Das Alter leben. Die Geschichte des Frankfurter St.Katharinen-Weißfrauenstifts*, Frankfurt am Main.

Berger-Thimme, D. (1976), *Wohnungsfrage und Sozialstaat. Untersuchungen zu den Anfängen staatlicher Wohnungspolitik in Deutschland (1873-1918)*, Frankfurt am Main.

Berlepsch-Valendàs, B.D.A. (19--), *Bodenpolitik und gemeindliche Wohnungsfürsorge der Stadt Ulm*, München.

Böhm, H. (1990), Stadtplanung und städtische Bodenpolitik; in:
H.H.Blotevogel (Hrsg.), Kommunale Leistungsverwaltung in europäischen Städten vom Vormärz bis zur Weimarer Republik, Köln u.a.

Böhm, H. (1995), Bodenpolitik deutscher Städte in der Zeit vor dem ersten Weltkrieg, in: J.Reulecke (Hrsg.), Die Stadt als Dienstleistungszentrum. Beiträge zur Geschichte der "Sozialstadt" in Deutschland im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert, St.Katharinen.

Böhm, H. (1997), Bodenpolitik deutscher Städte vor dem ersten Weltkrieg, in: K.H.Kaufhold (Hrsg.), Investitionen der Städte im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert, Köln u.a.

Cahn, E. (1912), Die Wohnungsnot in Frankfurt am Main, ihre Ursachen und die zu ihrer Abhilfe in Frankfurt a. M. zu ergreifenden Maßregeln, in: Die Wohnungsnot in Frankfurt a. Main. ihre Ursachen und ihre Abhilfe, herausgegeben vom Institut für Gemeinwohl, dem Sozialen Museum, dem Verein für Förderung des Arbeiterwohnungswesens und verwandte Bestrebungen und dem Deutschen Verein für Wohnungsreform, Frankfurt am Main.

Cahn, E. (1915), Die gemeinnützige Bautätigkeit in Frankfurt am Main. Eine Übersicht, 2. Aufl., Frankfurt am Main.

Damaschke, A. (1922), Die Bodenreform. Grundsätzliches und Geschichtliches zur Erkenntnis und Überwindung der sozialen Not, 19. Aufl., Jena.

Eychmüller, F. (1915), Grundstücksmarkt und Städtische Bodenpolitik in Ulm von 1870-1910, Berlin u.a.

Gemünd, W. (1914), Die Kommunen als Grundbesitzerinnen, Stuttgart.

Görnandt, R. (1914), Die Boden- und Wohnungspolitik der Stadt Ulm, Berlin.

Goto, T. (1995), Social Housing Construction in Germany in the 1920s: A Case of Frankfurt am Main, "Shogaku-Ronkyu", Vol.39, No.1 (in Japanese).

Goto, T. (1999), Political Social History of German Housing Problem, Tokyo (in Japanese).

Gratzhoff, W.H.C. (1918), Kommunale Wohnungspolitik. Zukünftige Aufgaben der Gemeinden zur Ergänzung der staatlichen Wohnungsfürsorge, Berlin.

Gretzschel, G. (1911), Kommunale Wohnungspolitik in Deutschland, in: Bericht über des IX. Internationalen Wohnungskongress. Wien, 30. Mai bis 3. Juni 1910, 1.Teil:

Referate, Wien.

Hirsch, P.(1918), Führer durch das Preußische Wohnungsgesetz und das Bürgschaftssicherungsgesetz vom 1. April 1918, Berlin.

Horsfall, T.C. (1904) , The Improvement of the Dwellings and Surroundings of the People: the Example of Germany; Supplement to the Report of the Manchester and Salford Citizens' Association, Manchester.

Inama-Sternegg, K.Th. von (1905), Städtische Bodenpolitik in neuer und alter Zeit, Wien und Leipzig.

Kalckstein, W. von (1908) , Kommunale Bodenpolitik, Leipzig.

Klötzer, W. (1996) , Frankfurter Biographie. Personengeschichtliches Lexikon, Zweiter Band M-Z, Frankfurt am Main.

Kramer, H. (1978) , Die Anfänge des sozialen Wohnungsbaus in Frankfurt am Main 1860-1914, in: Archiv für Frankfurts Geschichte und Landeskunde, Heft 56.

Kruschwitz, H. (1930) , Deutsche Wohnungswirtschaft und Wohnungspolitik seit 1913, in: Zimmermann, W. (Hrsg.), Beiträge zur städtischen Wohn- und Siedelwirtschaft. Schriften des Vereins für Socialpolitik, Bd.177, München.

Kuczynski, R. (1916) , Das Wohnungswesen und die Gemeinden in Preußen. Zweiter Teil: Städtische Wohnungsfürsorge, Schriften des Verbandes deutscher Städtestatistiker, Heft 4, Breslau.

Kuhn, G. (1998) , Wohnkultur und kommunale Wohnungspolitik in Frankfurt am Main 1880 bis 1930: Auf dem Wege zu einer pluralen Gesellschaft der Individuen, Bonn.

Mangoldt, K. von (1904) , Die Städtische Bodenfrage. Eine Übersicht. Vortrag, gehalten in öffentlichen Versammlung des 4. Verbands-Tages Deutscher Mietervereine in Dresden, am 6.Sept. 1903, Göttingen.

Mangoldt, K. von (1908) , Bodenspekulation oder gemeinnützige Bodenpolitik für Groß-Berlin ? Ein Reformvorschlag, Berlin.

Müller, B. (2006) , Stiftungen in Frankfurt am Main. Geschichte und Wirkung. Neubearbeitet und fortgesetzt durch H.-O.Schembs, Frankfurt am Main.

Münsterberg, O. (1911) , Die Bodenpolitik Danzigs, Danzig.

Niethammer, L. (1979), Ein langer Marsch durch die Institutionen. Zur Vorgeschichte der preußischen Wohnungsgesetzes von 1918, in: Ders. (Hrsg.), Wohnen im Wandel. Beiträge zur Geschichte des Alltags in der bürgerlichen Gesellschaft, Wuppertal.

Oba, S. (2003), The Formation of Urban Area: Emergence and Development of Public Intervention, Kyoto (in Japanese).

Pesl, D. (1910), Das Erbbaurecht. Geschichte und wirtschaftlich dargestellt, Leipzig.

Pfitzner, J. (1911), Die Entwicklung der kommunalen Schulden in Deutschland, Leipzig

Pohle, L. (1920), Die Wohnungsfrage. II, Die städtische Wohnungs- und Bodenpolitik, 2. Aufl., Berlin und Leipzig.

Reulecke, J. (1995), Einleitung, in: Ders. (Hrsg.), Die Stadt als Dienstleistungszentrum. Beiträge zur Geschichte der ‚Sozialstadt‘ in Deutschland im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert, St. Katharinen.

Robert-Tornow, N. (1916), Verwaltungsrechtliche Wege städtischer Bodenpolitik und ihre wirtschaftliche Bedeutung, Königsberg.

Rödel, V. (1986), Fabrikarchitektur in Frankfurt am Main 1774-1924. Die Geschichte der Industrialisierung im 19. Jahrhundert, Darmstadt.

Rößler, H. (1903), Die Aufgaben von Reich und Staat in der Wohnungsfrage, in: Verein Reichs-Wohnungsgesetz (Hrsg.), Vorträge von A. Damaschke und H. Rößler, Die Kampf gegen die Wohnungsnot, Frankfurt am Main.

Steitz, W. (1982), Kommunale Wirtschaftspolitik im zweiten deutschen Kaiserreich. Das Fallbeispiel Frankfurt am Main, in: Fritz Blaich (Hrsg.), Die Rolle des Staates für die wirtschaftliche Entwicklung (Schriften des Vereins für Socialpolitik : Gesellschaft für Wirtschafts- und Sozialwissenschaften, n. F. ; Bd. 125), Berlin.

Sekino, M. (1997), History of German Municipal Government from Perspective of Public Finance, Tokyo (in Japanese).

Steitz, W. (1983), Kommunale Wohnungspolitik im Kaiserreich am Beispiel der Stadt Frankfurt am Main, in: H.J. Teuteberg (Hrsg.), Urbanisierung im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert: historische und geographische Aspekte, Köln.

Tanaka, E. (2001), Study of German Land and House Lease Law from Comparative Perspective, Tokyo. (in Japanese)

Vogel, L. (1934), Geschichte der ehemaligen Stadtkämmerei, Frankfurt am Main, 1825-1926, Frankfurt am Main.

Weis, W. (1907), Die Gemarkungs-, Boden-, Bau- und Wohnungspolitik der Stadt Mannheim seit 1892, Karlsruhe.

Table1 The Ranking of Municipal Land Property in German Cities from 1896/97 to 1912/13 (ha)

	1896/1897		1901/1902		1908/1909		1912/1913	
1	Görlitz	30,990	Görlitz	31,062	Görlitz	31,141	Görlitz	31,310
2	Berlin	11,466	Berlin	14,748	Berlin	18,576	Berlin	20,411
3	Breslau	5,140	Stettin	5,001	Rostock	11,453	Rostock	11,586
4	Stettin	4,625	Breslau	4,978	Breslau	6,714	Brandenburg a.F	7,147
5	Frankfurt a.M.	4,076	Straßburg i. E..	4,800	Stettin	5,483	Breslau	6,925
6	Magdeburg	2,569	Frankfurt a.M.	4,465	Frankfurt a.M.	5,362	Stettin	6,537
7	Liegnitz	2,325	München	3,535	Brandenburg a.F	5,092	Frankfurt a.M.	6,366
8	Hannover	1,928	Leipzig	3,402	Frankfurt a.O.	5,010	Leipzig	5,449
9	München	1,621	Danzig	3,046	München	4,752	Frankfurt a.O.	5,120
10	Aachen	1,073	Liegnitz	2,330	Leipzig	4,720	München	5,001

Source: Statistisches Jahrbuch Deutscher Städte, Bd.7, 1898, p.24; Bd.12, 1904, p.15; Bd.17, 1910, pp.14–15; Bd.22, 1916, pp.15–16.

Table 2 Components of Municipal Land in Frankfurt (1894~1915)

	articles	1894.3.31		1900.3.31		1905.3.31		1910.3.31		1915.3.31	
		area are	value Mark								
A	I	79	2,895,980	112	4,155,380	180	6,665,078	167	12,941,078	134	11,348,967
	II	1,238	17,521,787	1,905	22,581,903	2,757	32,792,895	3,451	45,996,591	5,217	56,835,495
	II	133	9,877,600	216	10,777,600	190	13,041,992	190	13,041,992	284	13,284,305
	IV	213	8,982,213	240	9,435,543	232	9,102,703	207	8,965,625	230	8,923,694
	V	909	1,684,394	1,039	2,863,357	4,416	5,716,556	5,585	9,401,759	6,392	15,270,969
	VI	2,755	7,242,230	3,883	11,018,406	4,071	18,394,915	35,127	34,941,282	46,624	43,310,352
	VII	6,924	1,438,044	7,559	2,592,523	11,168	3,974,641	30,209	6,515,221	30,767	7,899,036
	VIII	-	-	141	2,476,478	201	5,780,178	440	6,776,356	463	7,113,107
	IX	260	695,910	354	1,036,214	400	1,563,825	400	1,584,112	451	2,351,748
	X	91	1,360,926	84	1,348,334	71	1,318,343	66	1,309,615	52	359,409
	XI	76	737,410	76	737,410	37	471,760	37	471,760	37	472,600
	XII	3,307	8,379,583	3,307	8,408,583	3,307	8,413,883	6,896	9,616,617	3,895	8,588,082
	XIII	2,971	1,707,150	4,068	2,246,681	6,564	3,509,984	7,100	4,209,455	7,967	5,622,809
	XIV	443	3,285,232	1,531	10,251,848	1,873	21,289,713	2,684	34,505,537	1,389	31,478,658
	XV	1,850	13,506,383	2,433	12,429,745	4,111	23,962,094	4,580	27,650,097	386	9,077,855
	XVI	15	39,440	14	34,942	13	31,887	14	34,672	17	43,725
B	I	10,011	8,636,368	12,091	12,453,162	38,885	22,498,926	25,696	21,924,582	4	16,290
	II	3,663	2,598,426	4,230	2,644,372	4,036	5,167,863	6,559	6,800,530	36	19,750
	III	11,893	3,471,092	12,239	2,969,384	12,193	5,833,607	13,387	7,173,137		
	IV			9,026	2,671,607	10,096	8,514,719	10,098	7,532,557		
	V					823	299,535	1,805	870,137		
	VI					1,308	452,532	4,986	3,100,976		
	VII					11,899	2,725,443	6,404	1,785,943		
	VIII					495	50,985	3,307	1,536,588		
	IX					1,279	458,043	1,305	523,043	1,304	522,843
	X					4,397	219,835	4,397	219,835	4,397	219,835
	XI					3,654	182,680	3,826	220,634	3,433	514,941
	XII					789	39,450	789	39,450	774	154,750
	XIII					126	5,025	126	5,025	126	5,025
	XIV					5,811	781,161	21,645	6,457,442		
	XV					138	46,019	872	346,910		
	XVI					2,391	370,702	1,176	988,700	2	2,390
	XVII					1,341	330,293	3,118	1,815,482		
	XVIII					-	-	-	-		
	XIX					3,926	894,146	6,023	1,426,251	15	2,922
	XX					1,024	675,476	2,206	1,200,307		
XXI					1,157	560,104	8,710	4,858,796	143	85,788	
XXII							2,666	1,192,561			
XXIII							719	203,782			
									52	4,186	
C	VIII-XXI	14,123	1,107,765	17,393	1,650,928						
	forest land	338,723	5,363,350	340,978	5,700,632	340,948	5,793,947	343,874	5,927,067	377,270	6,842,016
	total	399,677	100,522,282	422,917	130,485,031	486,304	211,930,937	570,847	294,111,504	491,860	230,371,546

Source: Magistratsbericht, 1893/94, S.97; 1894/95, S.99; 1899, S.195; 1900, S.230; 1904, S.305; 1905, S.22; 1909, S.19; 1910, S.24; 1914, S.23.
note: Format was altered after 1910.

Table 3 Expansion of Municipal Land in Frankfurt (1894~1915)

year	area ha	value Mark	notes
1894	3,996.77	100,522,282	
1895	4,005.69	103,962,742	excluding Bockenheim
1896	4,059.37	109,855,967	including Bockenheim
1897	4,076.49	114,320,367	
1898	4,160.71	119,276,485	
1899	4,204.38	125,633,711	
1900	4,229.17	130,485,031	
1901	4,433.87	151,348,733	
1902	4,464.72	159,414,530	
1903	4,521.72	166,262,836	
1904	4,553.88	177,148,516	
1905	4,863.04	211,930,937	
1906	4,959.47	224,112,666	
1907	5,024.07	238,782,522	
1908	5,260.89	257,520,416	
1909	5,361.72	273,502,831	
1910	5,708.47	294,111,504	reasons for disagreement are unexplained.
	5,713.54	318,151,447	
1911	6,247.77	331,573,301	
1912	6,337.37	337,243,589	
1913	6,370.19	345,803,044	
1914	6,357.57	349,222,837	
1915	6,354.19	351,576,200	

Source: Magistratsbericht, 1893/94, p.97, 1894/95, p.99; 1895/96, p.165; 1896/97, p.171; 1897/98, p.195; 1898/99, p.195; 1899, p.195; 1900, p.231; 1901, p.231; 1902, p.287; 1903, p.287; 1904, p.305; 1905, p.23; 1906, p.23; 1907, p.19; 1908, p.19; 1909, p.19; 1910, pp.24-26; 1911, pp.24-26; 1912, pp.28-31; 1913, pp.26-27, 33; 1914, pp.22-23, 28.

Table 4 Municipal Building Land and Rural Land (1901~1915)

year	area ha
1901	735
1902	744
1903	789
1904	803
1905	1,099
1906	1,183
1907	1,200
1908	1,364
1909	1,420
1910	1,344
	1,387
1911	1,564
1912	1,573
1913	1,603
1914	1,536
1915	1,525

Source: Magistratsbericht 1900, p.231; 1901, p.231; 1902, p.287; 1903, p.287; 1904, p.305; 1905, p.23; 1906, p.23; 1907, p.19; 1908, p.19; 1909, p.19; 1910, pp.24-26; 1911, pp.24-26; 1912, pp.28-31; 1913, pp.26-27, 33; 1914, pp.22-23, 28.

Table 5 Development of Municipal Land and Property of Foundations in Frankfurt (1894–1926)

unit: ha

year	Municipal Land			Property of Foundations			
	inside boundary	outside boundary	subtotal	inside boundary	outside boundary	subtotal	
1894	3805.22	200.82	4006.04				
1896	3871.86	204.63	4076.49				
1897	3955.85	204.87	4160.72				
1898	3978.37	226.01	4204.38				
1899	3991.02	238.15	4299.17				
1900	4150.57	283.29	4433.86	789.14	1096.86	1886.00	6319.86
1901	4159.45	305.28	4464.73	748.02	1241.51	1989.53	6454.26
1902	4189.75	331.97	4521.72	792.94	1221.50	2014.44	6536.16
1903	4198.99	354.88	4553.87	792.83	1242.76	2035.59	6589.46
1904	4486.22	376.81	4863.03	497.33	1251.93	1749.26	6612.29
1905	4576.87	382.59	4959.46	494.88	1295.94	1789.62	6749.08
1906	4600.04	424.03	5024.07	479.61	1466.06	1945.67	6969.74
1907	4710.71	550.18	5260.89	473.48	1566.26	2039.74	7300.63
1908	4764.64	597.07	5361.71	459.93	1664.53	2124.46	7486.17
1909	4776.02	932.45	5708.47	426.56	1821.86	2248.42	7956.89
1910	4804.99	1438.96	6243.95	1036.68	1194.07	2230.75	8474.70
1911	5329.78	1003.82	6333.60	1030.78	1232.09	2262.87	8596.47
1912	5305.08	1061.35	6366.43	1026.31	1236.69	2263.00	8629.43
1913	5292.91	1060.95	6353.86	1023.71	1250.66	2274.37	8628.23
1914	5296.00	1066.24	6352.24	1022.14	1251.04	2273.18	8625.42
1915	5270.61	1065.67	6336.28	1021.16	1250.93	2272.09	8608.37
1916	5266.68	1061.88	6328.56	1021.16	1249.55	2270.71	8599.27
1917	5258.98	1068.36	6327.34	1020.80	1249.58	2270.38	8597.72
1918	5261.16	1065.23	6326.39	1026.73	1254.88	2281.61	8608.00
1921	5213.74	1077.15	6290.89	1012.68	1245.05	2257.73	8548.62
1924	5128.60	1134.97	6263.57	1007.11	1245.14	2252.25	8515.82
1925	5252.66	1124.41	6377.07	1020.60	1257.79	2278.39	8655.46
1926	5306.83	1128.22	6435.05	1029.01	1269.60	2298.61	8733.66

Source: Statistisches Handbuch der Stadt Frankfurt am Main, 1905/06, p.299; 1906/07, p.121; 1907/08, p.127; 1908/09, p.127; 1909/10, p.124; 1910/11, p.120; 1911/12, p.149; 1912/13, p.136; 1913/14, p.145; 1914/15, p.128; 1915/16, p.117; 1916/17, p.114; 1917/18 und 1918/19, p.156, 1906/07 bis 1926/27, p.474.

Table 6 Land Transaction of the City of Frankfurt (1893–1915)

account year	Purchased Land						Sold Land					
	estates with houses			estates with no houses			estates with houses			estates with no houses		
	number	area ha	value Mark	number	area ha	value Mark	number	area ha	value Mark	number	area ha	value Mark
1893	7	0.36	–	37	3.94	–	2	0.08	–	39	3.59	–
1894	5	0.88	–	64	9.12	–	–	–	–	31	1.83	–
1895	12	0.38	1,077,500	110	52.89	1,548,363	–	–	–	47	1.46	1,044,739
1896	15	3.68	1,258,650	92	10.99	850,039	–	–	–	28	3.53	467,221
1897	28	4.69	2,974,516	309	72.85	2,271,993	1	0.33	210,000	62	4.63	2,632,758
1898	58	2.04	5,815,591	498	54.32	4,067,407	8	0.16	110,000	102	6.69	2,543,205
1899	33	2.99	3,125,780	570	33.22	2,853,881	–	–	–	163	8.33	4,287,958
1900	41	4.68	9,071,678	729	94.06	4,852,465	–	–	–	139	8.29	5,479,535
1901	36	3.33	3,656,172	351	42.74	2,978,747	5	0.17	681,500	124	14.42	3,573,720
1902	85	2.59	4,108,009	465	64.81	5,487,512	5	0.16	715,000	177	9.43	5,114,478
1903	74	5.41	9,465,592	330	40.48	5,331,995	6	0.85	615,391	149	11.05	4,273,818
1904	58	3.55	10,937,850	399	330.7	10,067,958	–	–	–	108	16.13	5,345,343
1905	53	5.08	7,397,058	450	126.23	11,055,455	15	0.75	1,293,951	262	29.83	4,432,006
1906	63	6.93	6,188,595	371	78.23	4,391,182	10	0.84	1,390,905	85	17.39	2,962,685
1907	31	1.37	249,168	2,355	241.47	14,091,409	4	0.18	276,845	30	4.97	2,918,266
1908	28	3.29	3,737,239	928	180.03	9,893,660	–	–	–	53	75.44	3,644,496
1909	25	1.79	2,272,434	1,452	383.42	17,105,392	5	2.5	1,110,060	66	31.29	7,751,453
1910	24	1.8	3,306,778	508	43.91	5,808,292	–	–	–	86	7.98	5,208,990
1911	15	1.81	1,175,468	315	144.8	5,785,017	2	0.22	216,500	204	97.51	5,713,462
1912	11	1.25	1,290,700	247	45.76	3,713,334	2	0.22	151,370	157	11.68	3,951,526
1913	6	0.53	558,691	308	38.74	4,354,201	3	0.21	200,500	213	42.22	4,851,502
1914	8	1.1	1,069,658.50	116	19.06	7,823,461	5	0.36	558,143	69	14.91	2,008,340
1915	6	2.3	937,854	36	9.32	2,663,708	2	0.03	138,775	68	19.41	3,352,787
	710	60.59	79,674,982	10939	2108.03	126,995,471	73	6.98	7,668,940	2392	436.59	81,558,288

Source: Statistisches Handbuch der Stadt Frankfurt am Main, 1905/06, p.299; 1906/07, p.121; 1907/08, p.127; 1908/09, p.127; 1909/10, p.124; 1910/11, p.120; 1911/12, p.149; 1912/13, p.136; 1913/14, p.145; 1914/15, p.128; 1915/16, p.117.

Table 7 Sales of Municipal Land for Construction of Small Housing (1900–1913)

year	area	Purchaser	value	value per m ²	Provision of Funds	Repurchase right
	ha		Mark			
1901 1905 1909	5,499	Officials Housing Association	222,740	40.51	no	no
1903 1910	5,522	Joint-Stock Company for Construction of Small Housing	264,512	47.9	no	no
1906	3,120	Frankfurt Public Utility Housing Company	700,000	224.36	no	yes
1908 1909	54,648	People, Construction and Saving Association	1,244,620	22.78	no	no
1913	3,548	Frankfurt Public Utility Housing Company	117,793	33.2		
1913	39,554	Griesheim Public Utility Housing Company	197,770	5	no	no
1913	10,825	Frankfurt Royal Railway Administration	411,350	38	no	no
Total	122,716		3,158,785			

Source: R.Kuczynski (1916), p.36; W.Steitz (1983), p.419.

Table 8 Provision of Municipal Land by Erbbaurecht in Frankfurt (1900–1913)

year	Erbbaurecht leaseholder	number	total area (are)	term (year)	rent (Mark)		mortgage lending by City (Mark)
					total	per m ²	
1901	Frankfurt Public Utility Housing Company	1	60.83	78	4,400	66	*
1901	Joint Stock Company "Frankenallee"	1	21.75	62	2,044.41	94	**
1902	People, Construction and Saving Association	1	16.33	63	1,428.88	88	225,000
1902	Frankfurt Housing Private Limited Company	1	22.04	61	2,479.50	113	229,320
1902	Joint Stock Company for Construction of Small Houses	1	12.96	71	5,000	386	300,000
1903	People, Construction and Saving Association	1	15.41	61	1,360	88	139,500
1903	Officials and Teachers	14	119.43	61	27,993***	70–145	645,000
1903	Private Individuals	11		61			
1904	People, Construction and Saving Association	1	12.78	61	1,124	88	129,600
1904	Officials and Teachers	32	142.76	61	***	70–145	970,400
1904	Private Individuals	5		61			
1905	People, Construction and Saving Association	1	36.54	61	4,384	120	138,000
1905	Officials and Teachers	11	58.6	61	***	70–145	397,000
1905	Private Individuals	14		61			
1906	Frankfurt Housing Association	1	20.71	61	2,400	116	70,000
1906	Officials and Teachers	4	34.07	61	***	70–145	188,000
1906	Private Individuals	5		61			
1907	Officials and Teachers	32	134.21	61	14,588	70–145	1,158,840
1907	Private Individuals	4		61			
1908	Officials and Teachers	2	8.6	61	1,119	130	72,810
1909	Mirheim Joint Stock Company	1	60.5	71	5,627	93	****
1909	Private Individuals	3	335.57	61	49,570	59–150	–
1911	Officials and Teachers	3	134.08	61	4,968	10–145	157,670
1911	Private Individuals	4		61			
1912	People, Construction and Saving Association	1	36.74	60	3,674	100	324,900
1912	Frankfurt Housing Association	1	7.84	60	1,067	136	111,375
1912	Tram Officials, Construction and Saving Association	1	19.48	60	2,143	110	192,600
1912	Officials and Teachers	15	153.92	61	16,607	85–165	612,740
1912	Private Individuals	9		61			
1913	Tram Officials, Construction and Saving Association	1	20.97	61	3,460	165	388,800
1913	Officials and Teachers	17	165.33	61	19,622	70–220	1,352,765
1913	Private Individuals	9		61			
Total		208	1,651.45				7,155,022

Source: W. Steitz (1983), p. 423.

Notes: (1) Land not for construction was included. The total estimated value of land was 4,200,826 Mark.

(2) * The City subscribed for the Company's shares at total value of 199,750 Mark.

(3) * * The City guaranteed a debt of 2,100,000 Mark to the Company. In addition to this estate, the Company leased land of 204.81a from the Orphanage in the form of Erbbaurecht contract. (4) * * * Rent was included to the total value of 1903.

(5) * * * * The City guaranteed a debt of 612,000 Mark to the Company.

Table 9 Appraised Value of Land Property of the Special Fund

articles	31. March 1911		31. March 1912	
	Mark	%	Mark	%
Estates with houses	6,408,529	5.6	6,616,564.47	5.8
Levelled Estates	17,165,376.75	15.0	15,592,530.50	13.7
Shortly developable land	27,338,378	23.9	28,879,579.50	25.3
Rural land	46,709,712.10	40.8	46,076,549.60	40.4
Estates provided by Erbbaurecht	3,592,888	3.1	3,705,764.50	3.2
Land ceded without charge or prepared for the public purposes	13,246,357.20	11.6	13,306,925.70	11.7
Total	114,461,241.05	100.0	114,179,913.89	100.0

Source: Magistratsbericht 1911, p.39.