

INVENTORISATION OF MODERN HERITAGE: URBANISM AND LANDSCAPE

Thursday 13 March 2014 - Keynote Masterclass

'Housing, Modernism and Cultural Heritage'

Poul Sverrild (Director, Forstadsmuseet, Hvidovre, Denmark)

A HISTORICAL SETTING

As a small nationstate on the northern fringe of continental Europe Denmark has throughout history been heavily influenced from the continent and periodically from Britain and Sweden. Denmark was basically a protestant country since the sixteenth century, and due to the very fertile soil and traditions for sailing based on agriculture and commerce from the beginning of times till the middle of the 1950's.

Geographically and politically Denmark was reduced from the status of a major regional power to a small-nationstate over a period of 300 years - culminating in a defeat to Germany in 1864 - whereafter Denmark came to hold a population comprised of only Danes.

Industrialisation came late to Denmark but began to accelerate around the middle of the nineteenth century. At the same time we were given our democratic constitution passing the political power from the sovereign king to a parliament run by the liberal bourgeoisie and the nobility.

From the beginning of the 20th Century the governments were based on the freeholding farmers classes. And since the middle of the 1920's the social democratic party has been dominant in forming the governments.

This is the framework within which we created our version of the welfare state and its many physical statements.

AN OUTLINE OF DANISH HOUSING HISTORY

The emerging industrialization around the middle of the 19th century created a new class of workers that did not relate to the traditional organization of the Danish society. This rapidly growing group of underprivileged citizens were deprived of the fundamental rights that followed employment in the traditional trades, where the employer was not only responsible for wages but also housing and food. This meant a radical change of the well-known household structure creating a large number of small economically unstable households in need of tenements.

The phenomenon with loosely employed workers and the growing shortage of dwellings in Copenhagen had

been observed for a period, but it was an epidemic of cholera in 1853, that brought on an acute awareness, that something had to be done about the housing of the new social group - the unskilled worker with only loose connections to the employer.

The background for horrible housing conditions in especially Copenhagen was the combination of an explosive growth of the population with the cities status of fortified town. Because of the fortifications the town could only grow by densification.

Housing had - due to the state of the society - not been a public issue at all before and even now - in the wake of the cholera - it was only brought up privately by a small group of physicians, who together with a well-known architect created the earliest Danish social housing project. It would later turn out to be typical for Denmark that well-known and estimated architects to engage themselves in the design of the Danish equivalent of social housing.

From the first philanthropical phase the housing issue from the 1860's went through a help to self-help phase, where the former mentioned physicians and others helped the workers of the industry to buy land and build terraces. The aim was in Denmark as elsewhere clearly to aid the establishment of a politically responsible class of industrial workers, therefore the dwellings would end up in individual ownership that was presumed to promote conservative values.

In the 1890's the first national legislation was passed providing cheap building loans to associations of workers. Still the aim was individual ownership - but now to the individual small houses in gardens that were to become the predominant physical shape in Denmark for at least the next century.

A new kind of associations turned up just before WW1, when workers organized themselves aiming to provide dwellings on a rental basis, where there was collective ownership and no profit-possibilities or profit-temptations for the individual member of the association.

The system with privately organized non profit housing associations to provide dwellings for first of all the working classes was how "social housing" was to be organized in Denmark. Municipal or government owned housing never came to play a role here. In principle the sector provided housing for anyone, not only the

INVENTORISATION OF MODERN HERITAGE: URBANISM AND LANDSCAPE

Thursday 13 March 2014 - Keynote Masterclass

'Housing, Modernism and Cultural Heritage'

Poul Sverrild (Director, Forstadsmuseet, Hvidovre, Denmark)

poorer sections of society. Till the late 1960-s this secured a very broad social basis for the recruitment of tenants and prevented a marked profile as "social housing".

Parallel to this non-profit development of housing projects the town grew due to the sector of private rental flats, which till the middle of the twentieth century was predominant in the towns and where it had created new slums towards the end of the nineteenth century.

Thirdly there was a movement of middle- and lower-class citizens buying small plots of land from the 1890s and building individual houses in the next generation of suburbs.

The non-profit housing associations grew from a very modest start between the world wars to become the dominant factor behind shaping the new city. Helped by prominent architects the associations developed new architectural forms and functions and set new standards for the working-class dwellings measured by size, installations and access to healthy surroundings.

Due to the growth of the non-profit housing associations and the strong ideologies behind the workers housing movement the best Danish architects got excellent conditions to develop and experiment in the housing sector through most of the 20th century.

In a partnership with the government the associations after WW2, developed the building sector from handicraft to industry, from small scale to grand plan, from brick to concrete, on-site to prefab and from skilled to unskilled workers.

All this took place in the new suburbs. The associations raised the quality of living tremendously aiming to provide the average family with a room for each member of the family plus all modernities. Besides they supplied the projects with open space, healthy green areas, integrated shopping facilities, kindergartens, and so on. This took place within the framework of the overall planning-agenda, that advocated the rational modernist approach to organizing.

And in short the non-profit associations succeeded. Aided by the growing sector of individual one-family houses. The housing-shortage was practically extinct by the early 1970-s and the housing standards were unparalleled.

In Denmark as elsewhere in the western world this development shortly after collided with globalization, export of industrial work-places and import of immigrant workers.

The glorious epoch of seemingly endless growth for the associations ended with the realization of big scale residential plans of the 1970's. The criticisms against consequences of the industrialization of the housing-sector had been audible from around 1970, but the political and economical interests in the sector were of a such volume, that it took nearly a decade to turn from the post-war modernist ideas and ideals to new agendas.

Already the new big plans were threatened by ghettoization caused by the dwindling number of industrial workplaces leading to unemployment and an immigration no one had the means to handle in Denmark, technically they were threatened by crumbling concrete and economically they were threatened by high interests on loans.

Meanwhile the lamented visionary smaller-scale non-profit housing projects from the 1950's began to be threatened by a combination of ageing and a shift in the social profile of the dwellers.

The agenda in modernist suburbia and social housing projects in Denmark has ever since the 1970's been dominated by the seemingly endless problems caused by social segregation, materiality, economy and aesthetics. This has for long overshadowed the fact, that the government, the associations, the architects and the entrepreneurs actually did the job everybody wanted done: Abolishment of the housing shortage.

New technology, new architecture, new materials, new production principles and new planning ideals did actually facilitate the building of the sufficient number of dwellings. The technical standards were high in the fully industrialized housing plans - reaching the highest level around 1971, where one of the large plans west of Copenhagen operated with flats with two toilets and a bathroom for working-class families.

We are actually talking about a success here. The creation of the physical framework of the welfare state. And all the goals that were formulated at the starting point were accomplished. Only the world did change along the way.

INVENTORISATION OF MODERN HERITAGE: URBANISM AND LANDSCAPE

Thursday 13 March 2014 - Keynote Masterclass

'Housing, Modernism and Cultural Heritage'

Poul Sverrild (Director, Forstadsmuseet, Hvidovre, Denmark)

LISTING AND THE DANISH WELFARE STATE

The first Danish legislation on the listing of buildings was passed in 1918. The listing was based on architectural qualities and/or heritage value. The number of listed buildings soon after the passing of the law passed one thousand and rose rather slowly to just under 3.000 in 1980. Over the following 15 years the number of listings trebled to just over 9.000.

Today we are still about this level, as a number of buildings over the later years have been delisted while at the same time the introduction of new listing objects have diminished. We have had focus on local varieties in building culture, buildings where the functions are no longer relevant and of course buildings drawn by prominent architects.

Today the listed buildings in Denmark give a very precise picture of the building culture of the nobility till the end of their epoch, a similarly detailed and precise picture concerning the farmers class, that dominated Danish politics till the 1920's. Lastly the listings shed light on the culture of the bourgeoisie through the works of the renowned architects of the 19th and early 20th centuries.

Over the last decades a strong effort has been made by the national listing agency to modernize the approach to listing. On one side the preservation of older industrial sites has been high on the agenda, and on the other there has been an effort to modernize the thinking around listing.

Architects have been predominant in the Danish listing work, and that has had at least two effects:

- The works of architects are considered the core of the effort.
- Buildings illustrating the bourgeois values and aesthetics and the bourgeois social geography weigh heavily.

The Danish listing agency has over the past decades initiated projects to raise the general attention to the listing value of building stock concerning other sectors and different social geographies, than have been habitual.

This far we have hardly seen results of this effort, but I think this has more to do with conservatism of the acting heritage experts than with the policy or

policymakers. The listing agency has long been aware of the significance of the history of the welfare state and the parallel history of democratization of most sectors in Denmark. So we have been listing schools, hospitals, court buildings, town halls and the like - but always buildings created by renowned architects - thus basically safely staying on safe grounds.

For instance has none of the so-called central-schools from the 1940's and 1950's that facilitated equal access to higher education for the youth from the rural areas and thus securing the geographical cohesion in modern Denmark, been listed. Because they were generally built by local architects. But their role in developing the foundation of the Danish welfare model is essential. Should we get around to have one of them listed, it is probable, it will be one of then few sketched by a renowned architect!

The history of housing and the effects of housing policies has not received the same listing-attention as the official buildings of the welfare state. Even though housing constitutes the largest building stock of the period.

The housing sector should of course attract interest, when you are concerned with the heritage of the welfare state, since access to healthy and affordable dwellings are among the main pillars of democratization.

And this brings me to my main point concerning inventorization: we have been suffering from cultural and social blindness! And still are.

In a newspaper article in a major Danish daily in 2007 I made a quick survey concerning listed buildings in the suburbs of Copenhagen. My goal was to check the connection between the social geography and the number of listed buildings with the aim of pleading for new strategies in Danish listing practise.

Of course in the article I could deliver precisely the expected picture of the situation, but nevertheless it was an eye opener and definitely one of the reasons for my later involvement in inventorising and listing work at a national level.

But to the clear message communicated in the article: The social geography around Copenhagen has been fairly simple in the period between 1850 and about 1980. In a semicircle west of Copenhagen going from north to south you find steadily diminishing wealth and

INVENTORISATION OF MODERN HERITAGE: URBANISM AND LANDSCAPE

Thursday 13 March 2014 - Keynote Masterclass

'Housing, Modernism and Cultural Heritage'

Poul Sverrild (Director, Forstadsmuseet, Hvidovre, Denmark)

education level of the population, and property values naturally follow the same pattern. So to identify the suburbs belonging to a bourgeois tradition and those of a working-class tradition is pretty simple.

In the article I stressed two observations: First I did the simple calculation to show how many citizens there was for one listed building in the two respective parts of the suburban geography. Not surprisingly it showed, that in the bourgeois areas it took about 1.500 citizens to one listed building and in the working-class areas it took more than 45.000 citizens to one building!

So 30 times as many citizens to one listed building in the areas that communicate the history of industrialization and democratization than in the area that communicate the unbroken history of the value sets of the ruling classes.

The second thing I focused on in the article was the listing criteria that could be identified in the 8 listed buildings in the working class suburbs. It was fascinating to see, what the listings were about:

- One military listing - pre-suburban hangars from 1917
- One school listing - an early 18th century building commemorating an absolute monarch, who for religious reasons wanted the farming population to become literate
- Two technical listings - concerning waterworks for Copenhagen from earliest 20.th century
- Two rural listings - farmhand houses
- One nobility listing - a castle belonging to a Danish prime-minister who in the 1920's tried to roll back the wages for Danish workers!
- One architectural listing - a town hall designed by Arne Jacobsen, probably the internationally best known Danish architect of the time.

So only one of eight listed buildings in the working class area seems to deal with the history of the local suburban population - the town hall, but going into the matter, it becomes clear, that this listing is more about the architect than about the welfare society, democracy or indeed the migrant based suburban culture.

Behind a demand for some kind of representative quality in the listing practice is the logical assumption,

that listing in a democratic society not only serves to preserve cultural expressions by the ruling classes or strengthen national identity. As part of a precious heritage, the listed buildings should function as identity builders or markers for the whole of the population!

As listed buildings in a country are thought to represent the absolute top of the national building culture it implies, that the culture represented by the listed buildings hold a similar position.

The signal then is very clear: We as a society send a message to the huge populations who live in the industrialized suburban housing landscapes where we practically tell them, that their homeland is without value to society and history. And then we thereby leave it up to themselves to figure out what their own value may be. This seems to be the ground where the architect and the historian have split - at least in Denmark.

I'm often met with a question from architects dealing with the traditional building heritage: Do you really want to list buildings that lack qualities in aesthetics, in design, in materials, buildings that seem to communicate a history of negativity, bringing up words like monotony, industrial, social catastrophe, concrete, ugliness?

The answer in short is: Yes.

This conflict demonstrates that the two fields in the listing legislation, the architectonic and the historical represent different approaches, methods and valuations. Being a historian it is natural for me to wish for the same kind of influence on listing as the architects have had since the first legislation on listing. And of course we should at least give same priority to heritage values as to architectural values.

THE SUBURBAN MUSEUM AND SUBURBAN BUILDING STOCK

- How do we find what we can't see?

The Suburban Museum covers two working-class municipalities west of Copenhagen comprising a population of about 85.000 inhabitants. The museum has developed from two local historical archives. But it acquired a museum profile in a process where on the one hand the local building stock demanded attention and the population on the other hand demanded

INVENTORISATION OF MODERN HERITAGE: URBANISM AND LANDSCAPE

Thursday 13 March 2014 - Keynote Masterclass

'Housing, Modernism and Cultural Heritage'

Poul Sverrild (Director, Forstadsmuseet, Hvidovre, Denmark)

intensified and different communication of the local environment.

The first of the two goals was helped by a governmental decision to have the building stock prior to 1940 inventoried by the municipalities. It was not extremely relevant in suburbs with most of their building stock raised after 1945. But the municipality of Hvidovre decided together with my institution, that we would finance the inventorization of most of the non-profit housing associations building projects up till 1960.

This project ran parallel to the introduction of a new communications project developed by the museum. Under the title "History in the Street" we had a vision of communicating history and stories in public space and where they had happened or otherwise gave meaning to communicate. At the time around the year 2000 we considered it the ultimate democratization of the citizens access to their own history.

As a museum this project changed our ideas of the role of the physical surroundings, and we intensified our work with a number of the obviously more interesting housing plans, industrial areas and individual houses.

The so called heritage atlas we assisted the municipality and the national agency to produce was supposed to establish the foundation of a register of all buildings worthy of preservation. A register that could be used in future municipal and local planning. Only - the projects economy dictated about five minutes inventory work for each building. Plus the job was done by an out-of-town drawing office with no prior knowledge of suburban building culture.

I need not say much more. We and the planning department in the municipality since have had all kinds of trouble with the results. On the other hand we now had at least a feeble foundation, that indicated some knowledge of what we did not know.

An important experience was, that the use of the officially recognized inventorization method called SAVE was unable to trace the qualities of the working class suburb. So we would have to develop a new method based on a stronger local knowledge combined with more emphasis on different historical disciplines.

Meanwhile the general interest in the building-stock of the welfare society was rising and coming into focus at a national level - probably due to a combination of the growing need for renovating and a feeling that welfare

classic was about to become history.

Around 2007 four municipalities in Denmark were chosen to become the first "cultural heritage municipalities" working out strategies to stage the local history and building stock as assets in the future development of the municipalities.

The Suburban Museum aided by the municipality was elected on the basis of a project, where we wanted to develop a methodology to identify heritage qualities in the different structures in the suburban landscape. The main conclusion of the two-year project was, that it was imminent to start the inventorisation not by concentrating on the building stock but on the immaterial history of the periods and only then turn to the built landscape.

Through access from the cultural historical angle do we have the opportunity to identify what we chose to name the significant or driving history/stories in a particular built environment.

After identifying these intangible elements, we turn to the actual built environments and buildings to search for the tangible elements that can illustrate the chosen line of history. Naturally we primarily identify historical elements of local meaning, but also regional and national heritage values are registered and finally of course listing proposals may come into consideration.

The main effect of the project - besides developing the method which we actually have implemented in the municipality at all levels of planning from municipal to local level - was once more to point to the unknown or unnoticed qualities in suburbia.

Shortly after a major Danish foundation, Realdania, launched a project that should define the many building categories and structures, that were created and erected in the Danish suburbs in the period between 1945 and 1988, when 1.5 million houses were built in Denmark.

I took part in this project that established new knowledge of what actually was out there - at least at a typological level. The new focus was underlined as the national heritage agency shortly after indicated that it would positively listen to listing proposals concerning the building stock from the period between 1945 and 1960 and with an emphasis on buildings relevant for shedding light on the history of the welfare society.

INVENTORISATION OF MODERN HERITAGE: URBANISM AND LANDSCAPE

Thursday 13 March 2014 - Keynote Masterclass

'Housing, Modernism and Cultural Heritage'

Poul Sverrild (Director, Forstadsmuseet, Hvidovre, Denmark)

The signal was received at the Danish National Association for Building and Landscape Culture that appointed a committee whose members from the start were all architects except for me. We took upon us the task of identifying and choosing buildings and projects and we immediately ran into trouble on two fronts. First of all we found out, that we lacked a common language and lacked knowledge of each others professional and cultural biases.

Secondly most of us come from and are educated in the two largest towns in Denmark - meaning that our knowledge of what went on in the smaller and more distant localities was very limited. You might expect that in a small country like Denmark covering only 17.000 very accessible square miles the knowledge of what goes on even at the outskirts of the country is well known. This is not the case.

The fact that the educated and ruling classes live and most often grow up in the same small geography north of Copenhagen means that for instance politicians, civil servants, architects and other intellectuals have similar backgrounds and refer to identical physical and cultural frameworks.

Among the effects of this phenomenon are the uniform choices of references to art, landscapes and of course architecture. Combined with tradition of writers leaning on one another - and this seems to go for architectural writers as well as historians - it leads to known architecture being architecture known by and written about by this group.

Once mentioned buildings seem uncritically to slip into later literature. Similarly - buildings once forgotten or never discovered seem to be doomed to a life in the dark. And the central point here is, that the overseen architecture tends to lie in the parts of the social geography, not known by the intellectuals.

Here - I think - lie the answer to a natural question. How could we at Forstadsmuseet, where we had been so central in developing the national interest in the suburban building stock as late as the beginning of the 21st century discover the heritage value of an outstanding 1950's housing project? And even a project that laid the foundation for the later internationally renowned Danish dense/low-tradition?

Well, of course we knew of the existence of the project, we knew it was an experimental housing project, we

knew it was among the earliest pre-fab slab projects, but it was not in the literature. Not until an architect from the Royal Academy of Arts in Copenhagen in the year 2000 published a book on experimental housing projects of the 1950's.

ARCHITECT SVENN ESKE KRISTENSEN

As before mentioned there was a tradition of engaging the most renowned Danish architects in the social housing sector. In the post-war period they would become the driving force behind the thorough process of standardization, industrialization and prefabrication in the building sector, and in the 1950's they combined the development of modern apartments with all modernities in healthy surroundings while at the same time experimenting with materials, processes and plans.

The housing associations had from a low level in before WW2 over the 1950's achieved volumes that enabled them to undertake large housing plans. And with a united parliament behind an offensive housing policy in the post-war era the associations found the road open for a vast expansion.

Within the experimental climate evolving around planners, architects, entrepreneurs and associations the process was driven by people like the architect Sverre Christensen, whose works I have focused on over a longer period.

But also internationally more renowned architects like Arne Jacobsen (Arhus Town Hall and St. Catherine College Oxford) and Jørn Utzon (the Sidney Opera) were engaged in developing new forms and structures in Danish housing architecture.

But foremost in the work with the standardization and industrialization processes was the architect Sverre Christensen who at the same time was behind big housing projects of more traditional character.

He has created the first full-scale prefab housing projects in Denmark, he introduced standardization, his studio held at its height in the early 1960's more than one hundred architects, and he was appointed Royal Inspector of Buildings and lectured at the Royal Academy of Arts.

Sven Eske Christensen was well known, a number of his works have been listed, but considering his role in

INVENTORISATION OF MODERN HERITAGE: URBANISM AND LANDSCAPE

Thursday 13 March 2014 - Keynote Masterclass

'Housing, Modernism and Cultural Heritage'

Poul Sverrild (Director, Forstadsmuseet, Hvidovre, Denmark)

the development of the housing qualities in the non-profit housing sector, it is remarkable, that none of his works in this sector are listed. I interviewed Sverre Christensen in the late 1980's and touched upon his housing project Grenhusene which I at the time knew about but had not recognized the qualities in.

His response was to me a clear signal, that it was not anything special, and I got the idea that it had to do with the fact, that the project was postponed for about five years before being built, and therefore was somewhat out of time when it was finished.

Point is, as the building project was not hyped at the time of its realization, it never entered the circle of architectural communication - it did not exist. Therefore, years later when we had the great shift of architectural paradigms in the early 1970's and the promotion of Danish dense/low projects began, Grenhusene were forgotten, and now it was the famous Jørn Utzon who was ascribed the role of promoter of the Danish dense/low tradition even though his project was built by traditional materials, did not offer a fundamentally new layout and had no radical qualities. But it was a project that through materiality, aesthetics, geography and social scope appealed to the traditionally biased architects.

The absence of Grenhusene from the architectural canon is actually the result of a number of factors. As mentioned we have at the outset the lack of pride in the architect who had so many other works going on. Therefore a lack of contemporary references. We have a location in a working class area where no relevant persons could confront it daily. We have dwellers of a social class, that generally were of little interest to intellectuals of the time - beyond of course in theory. We have a negative materiality - as concrete and pre-fab from the early 1970's held only negative connotations. We have an ownership that prevents any interest from the property-market. And lastly the main qualities of Grenhusene lie not in the aesthetic side of architecture but in the history of technology, the modernist history of experimenting with new materials, functions and plans, and in the history of the welfare state and the housing sector in the post war years.

GRENHUSENE

Sverre Christensen in Grenhusene tried to break new ground in the layout "and I spent a long time

pondering; I believed there were a sufficient number of housing blocks out there, and I also thought there were enough terraced houses in the municipality. Then I spent time in the country and could not stop thinking, why don't we construct small houses with a small garden. People don't have the time or strength to take care of a large garden, so what about implementing the system they have in Dragør (small ancient town near Copenhagen) and in Vesuv (probably refers Pompeii). Suddenly one day I sat on the beach with a stick in my hand and made drawings in the sand, which I often did, and all at once I believed I had the idea of Grenhusene."

Sverre Christensen's inspiration from mediterranean and old Danish urban structures led to a layout far from the classic terraced houses or even chainbuilt-houses, that were common in the period - a structure later to be named dense-low. The housing project was planned in 1953 but due to financial difficulties the project was postponed for nearly five years.

He designed 158 dwellings with attached joint facilities: shops, community houses, laundries, garages, garbage-handling etc. (Integrated shops and community houses were not realized, but later a superfluous laundry was turned into a community house.) The 85 m² dwellings (+ 6,5 m² sheds) have individual shielded gardens which offer total privacy in- and outdoors combined with a semi-public meeting-place for the nearest neighbours in the joint aisle. There is no access by car to the individual dwellings, and parking is organized along the main access-road, that encircles the plan.

As part of the rational planning/construction all the technical installations (pipes, cables etc.) are placed under the aisles, and bathroom, scullery and kitchen is consequently located next to the aisle. The inner walls were designed as light constructions ready to be moved in accordance with the needs of the inhabitants.

The esthetics of the architecture were based on a Danish/Scandinavian combination of modernist ideals, regional characteristics and functionality with emphasis on the last. As a state-subsidised experimental project there was a demand for the use of the newest materials and technologies, low-cost production and the use of mainly unskilled workers. Grenhusene in a number of ways preceded later national building regulations on modular constructions which probably had to do with Sverre Christensen's engagement in the rationalization of building processes on national

INVENTORISATION OF MODERN HERITAGE: URBANISM AND LANDSCAPE

Thursday 13 March 2014 - Keynote Masterclass

'Housing, Modernism and Cultural Heritage'

Poul Sverrild (Director, Forstadsmuseet, Hvidovre, Denmark)

and Scandinavian levels.

In Grenhusene he implemented new techniques, scales and functions and chose an honest construction-communicating design and miming the design of medieval Scandinavian wooden buildings he used prefab slabs to create concrete façades that visualise the actual construction. Likewise the project presents an experimental approach to inner walls and foundation principles.

Grenhusene has now been proposed for listing, and the National Heritage Agency has been considering the proposal for half a year, and we have no indications as to whether it will succeed, but we have a feeling that this project may still be a little too radical to pass.

LISTING HINDRANCES

I should like to mention a last paradoxical hindrance to the work with the heritage values in the non/profit housing projects. We have a tenants democracy that has developed since 1959, and which by now has reached a level, where the local tenants have the decisive vote on all decisions on matters concerning the estate.

This means, that anything possibly involving raises in rents will probably meet with massive and decisive resistance. As a majority of the tenants belong to groups with less than average education and mating economies, it also takes lots of convincing work to make them love the idea of the consequences of possible heritage value. On the other hand you meet a massive pride amongst the tenants in these housing projects, a pride that key be channelled into love for heritage valuation if the circumstances are right.

But quite natural they are more focused on possibilities in for instance alternative energy-production, insulation, freedom to tear down walls and so on. And since they are not part in the commercial market there is no possibility to gain economically from recognized heritage values in their estate.

It is a paradox, that the first massive opposition to our listing proposal came from the tenants whose homes we are praising and want to preserve. We have for decades in Denmark had blind spots in our search for buildings worthy of preservation. We seem to be in a process of modernization and at least we experience

a positive will at the heritage agency level. But in the process of securing building stock in underprivileged areas, suburban landscapes shaped after modernist principles and built in cheap or ordinary materials we meet resistance not only from architects with classic biases but also from the inhabitants, who for decades have been told, that their housing plans were without value. And lastly we are now fighting the climate-lobby, who will change any building to save a little energy.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Poul Sverrild is Museum Director at Forstadsmuseet (The Suburban Museum) in Copenhagen. The Suburban Museum is an urban eco museum covering the municipalities Hvidovre and Brøndby. The artifacts exhibited by the museum are the buildings and infrastructure of the municipality and the story-telling is based on traces of life lived. The Planning Departments in the municipalities therefore are close collaborators of the museum. Communication with the public mainly takes place virtually and in public space.

Poul Sverrild holds an M.A. (research degree) in history from the University of Copenhagen and is currently engaged in a PhD-study at the University of Aalborg. He has been on the scene of historical suburban studies in Denmark since this discipline appeared around 1980. His work covers irregular dwellings, history of social housing, local history, valuation of cultural heritage in suburban building-stock and museum strategies.

His current work aims at identifying periods when the suburban landscape took new turns expressed in physical change leading to new social realities. These are discussed in light of the centre-periphery relationship between old-town and suburb, using the old working-class suburb Hvidovre next to Copenhagen as a case study and covering the period between 1800 and 1980.

Poul Sverrild is engaged in listing modernist building culture at a national level, is a cultural heritage partner for drawing offices in renewal projects and offers lectures on housing history locally, nationally and internationally.

INVENTORISATION OF MODERN HERITAGE: URBANISM AND LANDSCAPE

Thursday 13 March 2014 - Keynote Masterclass

'Housing, Modernism and Cultural Heritage'

Poul Sverrild (Director, Forstadsmuseet, Hvidovre, Denmark)

SOURCES

² Politiken 23.09.2007 "Udfordring. Find forstæderne i kulturarven

³ Forstadens Bygningskultur 1945-1989. Realdania 2010

⁴ Hermann,E.: 50'er boligen. 2000

⁵ Interview with architect Svend Eske Kristensen, 1989, Forstadsmuseet. Later quotations from Svend Eske Kristensen are from the same source.