

# ICOMOS

INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL ON MONUMENTS AND SITES  
CONSEIL INTERNATIONAL DES MONUMENTS ET DES SITES  
CONSEJO INTERNACIONAL DE MONUMENTOS Y SITIOS  
МЕЖДУНАРОДНЫЙ СОВЕТ ПО ВОПРОСАМ ПАМЯТНИКОВ И ДОСТОПРИМЕЧАТЕЛЬНЫХ МЕСТ

Our Ref. GB/AS/783bis

Charenton-le-Pont, 21 October 2016

H.E. Mr Michael Worbs  
Permanent Delegation of Germany to  
UNESCO  
Maison de l'UNESCO  
1, rue Miollis  
75732 Paris Cedex 15

World Heritage List 2017

**The Bauhaus and its sites in Weimar, Dessau and Bernau [extension to Bauhaus and its Sites in Weimar and Dessau, (ii)(iv)(v), 1996] (Germany)**

Dear Sir,

ICOMOS is currently assessing the nomination of "The Bauhaus and its sites in Weimar, Dessau and Bernau" as a World Heritage Site, and an ICOMOS evaluation mission has visited the property to consider matters related to protection, management and conservation, as well as issues related to integrity and authenticity.

In order to help with our overall evaluation process, we would be grateful to receive further information to augment what has already been submitted in the nomination dossier.

Therefore we would be pleased if the State Party could consider the following points and kindly provide additional information:

### **Comparative analysis**

ICOMOS would be pleased if the State Party could clarify whether there are other buildings constructed by the Bauhaus building department or any other buildings that were part of the Bauhaus schools that could be considered as a possible extension for the existing series.

### **Restoration programmes for buildings**

The nomination dossier provides information on the major conservation projects that were undertaken. Some information about the restoration of the ADGB Trade Union School Building in 2008 is included.

ICOMOS would be pleased if the State Party could provide further documentation regarding the restoration of this particular building that took place in 2008.

### **Management**

As this is a serial nomination which needs to satisfy the current requirements for the management of series, this proposal for an extension is an opportunity to put in place a coordinated management for the overall series – the original components and these two additional ones.

On page 96, the dossier states that owners and authorities work together in a steering group while on page 126, the dossier states that the steering group "will" act as communication platform.

ICOMOS would be pleased if the State Party could clarify whether the steering group is operational and if not, when it will be put in place.

We look forward to your responses to these points, which will be of great help in our evaluation process.

We would be grateful if you could provide ICOMOS and the World Heritage Centre with the above information by **Friday 18 November 2016 at the latest**.

We thank you in advance for your kind cooperation.

Yours faithfully,



Gwenaëlle Bourdin  
Director  
ICOMOS Evaluation Unit

Copy to      Bauhaus Dessau Foundation  
                  UNESCO World Heritage Centre



Permanent Delegation  
of the Federal Republic of Germany  
to UNESCO

9, rue Maspéro, 75116 Paris

Mrs. Gwenaëlle Bourdin  
Director  
ICOMOS Evaluation Unit  
11, rue du Séminaire de Conflans  
94220 Charenton-le-Pont

**Ambassador Stefan Krawielicki**

Permanent Delegate of the Federal  
Republic of Germany to UNESCO

TEL: +0033 (0)1.55 74 57 30

E-Mail: L-unes@pari.diplo.de

Paris, 18.11.2016

Dear Madam Director,

In reference to your letter of 21 October 2016 (Ref. GB/AS/783bis) please find attached the requested additional information on the nomination "The Bauhaus and its sites in Weimar, Dessau and Bernau". If you need any additional clarification or information, please do not hesitate to contact me again.

I would like to take this opportunity to convey to ICOMOS the appreciation of my delegation for the valuable support provided during the entire nomination and evaluation process.

Please accept, Madam Director, the assurances of my highest consideration.

WH List 2017\_ "The Bauhaus and its sites in Weimar, Dessau and Bernau [extension to Bauhaus and its Sites in Weimar and Dessau, (ii)(iv)(v), 1996]"\_Additional Information Request

### **Comparative analysis**

*ICOMOS would be pleased if the State Party could clarify whether there are other buildings constructed by the Bauhaus building department or any other buildings that were part of the Bauhaus schools that could be considered as a possible extension for the existing series.*

There are no further buildings which were created in the building department of the Bauhaus. A close connection between theory and practice in the training of architects at the Bauhaus was achieved only under the direction of Hannes Meyer. This resulted in the Houses with Balcony Access in Dessau and in the ADGB Trade Union School in Bernau as unique products. Apart from this, only drafts which were not realised were developed in the building department. All other buildings, which are summarised under the term "Bauhaus buildings", were planned by architects working at the Bauhaus or closely affiliated with them in their private firms. This, e.g., applies to the employment office by Walter Gropius or the buildings by Carl Fieger and Richard Paulick in Dessau. There are no plans for designating further buildings for an expansion of the Bauhaus world heritage site. Only the named buildings can be considered for the extension since they are the only ones to testify to the outstanding architectural quality of the work of the Bauhaus building department under the leadership of Hannes Meyer.

## Restoration programmes for buildings

*The nomination dossier provides information on the major conservation projects that were undertaken. Same information about the restoration of the ADGB Trade Union School Building in 2008 is included. ICOMOS would be pleased if the State Party could provide further documentation regarding the restoration of this particular building that took place in 2008.*

### Reconstruction of the ADGB Trade Union School, 2002-2010

The cautious reconstruction and conservation project carried out between 2002 and 2010 was led by these two guiding principles:

1. The aim was to *document and research the entire history of the structures and the changes added after the original construction in 1930*. Comprehensive historic archive research and all available technological means were employed, as well as a large amount of new findings continually added during the conservation process. Due to this high preservation standard and careful approach toward the original substance the project took more than eight years to complete.
2. Furthermore the goal was to *preserve as much of the original structure as possible and to make it visible again by removing more recent layers of construction*. During the GDR era (1949-89) several conversions and additions took place in all buildings of Meyer's Trade Union School. It turned out that most all of these conversions did not remove the original substance; instead, these measures only concealed the architecture from 1930 underneath more recent additions. While the visibility of the materials was of central importance to Meyer's perception of architecture, this was not shared by his successors in the GDR. Under the coverings, the original substance and a lot of particularly distinctive elements were largely preserved and uncovered again from 2002 to 2010. *These structures only had to be repaired or cleaned; they are visible today as they were built during the period of their construction.*

The reconstruction of the overall complex of the ADGB Trade Union School comprised prudent decision-making which accompanied the construction activities and was based on an assessment of the objects. As a result, the structure dating back to the construction period – and which was hidden under numerous layers of construction following a varied history of use – could be uncovered to a comprehensive extent and protected in the long run. With the continuation of the former trade union

school as an education centre of the chamber of trade, a consistency of use which permitted the far-reaching preservation of the architectural monument and a minimisation of the required interventions in the building structure was found. The cautious reconstruction in line with the provisions on the protection of monuments met with such a high level of approval that the *baudenkmal bundesschule bernau e. V.* association (whose tireless dedication in the cooperation with the involved owners and authorities contributed greatly to the great success of the measures carried out) was awarded the “*Silberne Halbkugel*” (“*Silver Hemisphere*”) by the German National Committee for the Preservation of Monuments. This is the highest award presented in Germany for the communication of the aims of the preservation of historical monuments.

### **Stock before reconstruction**

As a result of the many conversions and additions during the GDR era, the stock of buildings as created during the period of construction in 1930 was partly concealed. In this context, the expansion by the architect Georg Waterstradt at the beginning of the 1950s constituted a respectful approach to the building by Meyer and Wittwer. The architect sensitively considered the buildings and expressly referred to the Bauhaus when designing a complex of buildings in the immediate vicinity, which took up the structural arrangement of staggered buildings, the understated design and the choice of materials of the original building from 1930. However, politically, the reference to the architectural language of the Bauhaus was not considered desirable during the early 1950s, which were shaped by “*Stalinist Reality*”, even though Hannes Meyer had been involved in major urban planning projects in the Soviet Union in the early 1930s. This resulted in the structural connection between the new and the old building in the architecture of the “*national tradition[s]*” of the GDR. Although access was only possible through the one-story connecting building and, as a result, access was changed and the head building of the old building was converted in terms of its communal functions, these conceptually well thought-out and planned interventions can be considered the only artistically valuable construction contributions during the GDR era. Therefore, it was correctly entered in the list of monuments of the state of Brandenburg in 1992. All other changes were purely functional and were not considered worthy of preservation. Under the coverings, the architecture from 1930 was largely preserved and uncovered again from 2002 to 2010.

### **Concept for the preservation of historical monuments**

In preparation for the work activities, which were carried out on the Federal Trade Union School from 2002 to 2007 and on the teacher residences from 2008 to 2010, fundamental parameters for the reconstruction and repair of the overall complex

were determined as early as in 1998 after an initial inventory had been prepared. On this basis, the later additions and extensions on and in the building were removed cautiously. In this process, the surprisingly well preserved original structure of the building from the construction period (which was hidden behind later layers of construction) was uncovered again.

Comprehensive historic archive research formed an important part of the process of determining fundamental data and it resulted in numerous documents, such as detailed construction drawings, construction invoices and product information being found – which proved to be helpful in the later planning phase. The monument preservation concept was developed in steps and only determined finally during the construction process on the basis of the uncovering of the building. In this context, the fact that the new use works with structures and functional processes very similar to the original trade union school was very advantageous.

### **Building structure, head building**

In the context of the reconstruction, an approach to the original concept of the ADGB Trade Union School was pursued: The main entrance was moved back to the original location and the main auditorium was cleared of later installations. However, the two-story head building retained its changed cubic volume. Ruptures in the historic layers can still be seen in the head building of the school. As a result of the interventions during the 1950s, the main entrance was moved. It had been planned by Meyer and Wittwer so that it connected all functional areas with each other in one continuous line. As a result, this axis originally extended from the entrance straight into the glass corridor. After the subsequent extension, the new connecting building created formed the entrances to the expanded building complex. At the time, a new auditorium was created in the Waterstradt building so that the old building lost its most important function, while the old assembly hall was changed through the installation of a kitchen and of a second level. Based on a restoration examination, the original colour version of the interior from the 1950s was restored in the connecting building.

In the lobby, a large part of the structure from the original period of construction was uncovered. Large parts of the structure from the original period of construction only had to be repaired or cleaned and particularly distinctive elements, such as the ridged reinforced concrete binding beams, turned out to be in surprisingly good condition. Moreover, the steel structure of the glass corridor from the period of construction largely only had to be refurbished throughout the building. Gaps in the steel-glass structure of the corridor which were caused by the dismantling of later constructions as well as the conservatory were added. The precondition for such an approach has always been that constructions and products of the original design were clearly documented in the inventory and that this was possible with current

means. In the past, the ceiling of the dining hall had been replaced by an illuminated glass ceiling. Because of their special significance in this central room and the special effect of the material, the decision was taken to authentically reconstruct the glass component ceiling. While the supporting structure was preserved without any changes, the skylights in the ceiling were implemented with glass blocks which corresponded to the products used during the construction period in terms of dimensions and design. In order to optimise this situation in terms of energy use, this ceiling was given a glazed roof. Moreover, the part of the exterior wall of the lobby built from glass blocks was also reconstructed authentically since the glass blocks had a unique and diffuse effect on the light in the room. In view of the central importance which the visibility of the materials had in Meyer's perception of architecture, this step represented the return to the concept of the Bauhaus director. The restoration of the floors in the building also has to be seen in this context. As a result of changes or wear and tear over the years, these could not be preserved in the building. Concurrently, the materiality and, in particular, the colouration of these areas in the students' living quarters had a special conceptual significance. Existing residual areas and building historical records permitted the detailed restoration of the floors in all areas.

### **Residential buildings**

Wet rooms were installed in the living quarters of the student in the student apartment blocks; while, at the same time, historic sanitary facilities were preserved. New steel windows were used to replace the wooden windows from the GDR era. In this process, the narrow profile cross section and the fitting technology of the historic model were approximated very closely. Energy-efficient insulating glazing compensates any heat losses caused by thermally non-insulated steel profiles and a controlled ventilation system in the area of the window connection counters construction physical problems.

According to the colour design of the design by Meyer and Wittwer, every apartment block was to be allocated one colour in order to facilitate orientation for the residents. The residential areas were originally equipped with Salubra wallpapers in corresponding colours. However, these have not been preserved. Through restoration examinations, the respective colours were determined. Since a restoration of the wallpaper covering of the walls was out of the question, the correct colour of the walls was ensured with a coat of paint. It has to be emphasised that, in particular, in the halls of the residential blocks the wall structure - in part, with interior insulation on the exterior walls, original glass bricks and facing bricks - as well as the radiators from the construction period were preserved.

### **School building**

After the dismantling of covers installed later, the school complex was largely preserved in the version as built during the period of construction. In particular, the light



support structure of the connecting corridor to the upper floor made of reinforced concrete had been covered and was uncovered during the reconstruction. On the ground floor, the almost perfectly preserved glass facade of the gymnasium, which was to open the building towards the green space in front of the building according to the concept by Meyer and Wittwer, was hidden behind this. In order to ensure that the hall can be used in accordance with current requirements, ball impact-resistant glazing reflecting the rhythm of the facade was installed in front of the historic elements on the inside. The interior of the hall has largely been preserved in the original version. Even the wall bars still date back to the period of construction. In the western part of the ground floor the former library is used as a gymnastics hall today, and sanitary facilities were added. Again, great care was taken to ensure that the spacious windows were restored in keeping with the original version as in the residential segment. This segment has largely been returned to its original appearance.

The connecting hall with the staircase and the three seminar rooms on the upper floor with their butterfly ceilings were preserved in terms of their room structure and with the windows from the period of construction. The original windows in the classrooms were simply upgraded with energy-efficient insulating glazing. Moreover, the radiators also date back to the period of construction. In replacing the linoleum flooring, special attention was paid to the detailed structure of the pedestal with its easy-to-clean design by Meyer and Wittwer.

### **Facades and roof**

After the original structure had been uncovered, measures on the facades and the roof could be restricted to a minimum. The yellow exposed brickwork of the original building – as well as the red brick of the extensions from the 1950s – were largely in good condition; minor damage was repaired.

The glazed surfaces on the dining hall and the conservatory were reconstructed since the original version was lost during the GDR era. This was possible because of the good existing sources and available design drawings from the construction period. The glass block surfaces on the residential building which ensure the rhythm of the façade reflecting the functions of the buildings could be preserved. During the construction process the sound workmanship of the execution of the building proved to be noteworthy. Flashings on roof connections and edges were preserved in spite of the installation of a set-back insulation layer. As a result, the lower structure of the roof finish and the graceful look of the attic could be preserved. New design interventions resulted from the restoration of the old access axis as described above. The new main entrance and the side entrance were given a glazing which transcends the floors and illustrates the structure-altering cut into the shell from the 1950s. At the same time, the measure was restrained in terms of design and, first and foremost, illustrates the position of the old entrance. The glazing creates trans-

parency and permits viewing the lobby and the glass corridor. As a result, the original concept of the consistent access axis can be experienced.

### **Teacher residences**

After the Second World War the teacher residences underwent changes resembling those on the school building. Here too, the original structure was preserved under these construction layers from later periods of use. The existing windows were replaced by windows which largely correspond to the original design in terms of their separation and profile dimensions – resembling that on the school building. The existing intact interior insulation made of Torfoleum was reinforced and wall surfaces were restored. In part, doors and installations were still preserved and missing parts were replaced with the help of these models.

### **Outdoor facilities**

In the outdoor facilities, the most important design elements which are relevant in order to understand the concept of Meyer and Wittwer were presented in detail in a comprehensive analysis. The reference to nature was an important design parameter for this building concept which influenced visual axes, landscape topography and the design of living areas. The encompassed volumes of space, the window and door openings as well as the facade design as a whole were also based on the natural conditions on the site to a high degree. Therefore, during the reconstruction, the initial step was to remove vegetation, trees and shrubs which emerged later from the surroundings of the buildings. In particular, the north-western area was re-designed as an open space which permits a connection between the individual parts of the building. Moreover, the original terrace with a seating area in the area of the head building was restored – and now harmoniously ties in with the connecting building. The building bordering it to the south-east was given a staggered arrangement in line with the design created during the construction period as in the case of the building structures of the residential segment. As a result of the restoration of the terraces in front of the residential units, the gardens of the teacher residences were returned to their original arrangement. Surrounding the gardens with fences was also in line with the original design. These measures created the starting point of a gradual development of the outdoor facilities which has been pursued in close cooperation between the state, the municipality, the owners, the authorities in charge of the protection of listed buildings and the association since 2014 and is in keeping with the principles for the protection of monuments.

## Management

*As this is a serial nomination which needs to satisfy the current requirements for the management of series, this proposal for an extension is an opportunity to put in place a coordinated management for the overall series - the original components and these two additional ones. On page 96, the dossier states that owners and authorities work together in a steering group while on page 126, the dossier states that the steering group "will" act as communication platform. ICOMOS would be pleased if the State Party could clarify whether the steering group is operational and if not, when it will be put in place.*

This steering group has been established and has begun its work. Therefore, the statement on page 96 is correct. The group has evolved from the cooperation among all sites of the world heritage site spanning many years. For example, in 2000, an exhibition on the ADGB Trade Union School was shown at the Dessau Bauhaus building in 2000 and the "Triennale der Moderne" has been carried out at the sites in Weimar, Dessau and Bernau as well as Berlin since 2013. Since 2014, the application for the extension of the world heritage site has been processed jointly. At the meetings of the steering group on 16th July, 6th September and 1st November 2016, the joint presentation and communication of the Bauhaus world heritage site was improved, for example by preparing a joint flyer for the world heritage site and by establishing links to the websites of the participants involved. In future, meetings are scheduled to take place twice a year and on special occasions.



Permanent Delegation  
of the Federal Republic of Germany  
to UNESCO

9, rue Maspéro, 75116 Paris

Mrs. Gwenaëlle Bourdin  
Director  
ICOMOS Evaluation Unit  
11, rue du Séminaire de Conflans  
94220 Charenton-le-Pont

**Ambassador Stefan Krawielicki**

Permanent Delegate of the Federal  
Republic of Germany to UNESCO

TEL: +0033 (0)1.55 74 57 30

E-Mail: L-unes@pari.diplo.de

Paris, 23 February 2017

Madam Director,

In reference to your letter of 19 December 2016 (Ref. GB/AS/729bis/IR) please find attached the requested additional information on the nomination "The Bauhaus and its sites in Weimar, Dessau and Bernau". If you need any further clarification or information, please do not hesitate to contact me again.

A hard copy of the documents will be sent as soon as they will have been received. The World Heritage Centre will receive a copy of this letter and the attachment.

Please accept, Madam Director, the assurances of my highest consideration.

*Krawielicki*

B  
A  
U  
H  
A  
U  
S  
  
D  
E  
S  
S  
A  
U  
  
Monika Markgraf  
Wissenschaftliche Mitarbeiterin

Stiftung Bauhaus Dessau  
Bauabteilung  
Gropiusallee 38  
06846 Dessau-Roßlau, Germany  
Telefon +49-340-6508-211  
Fax +49-340-6508-226  
E-Mail markgraf@bauhaus-dessau.de  
www.bauhaus-dessau.de

An: Kultusministerium des  
Landes Sachsen-Anhalt  
Felix Meister, Referat 45  
UNESCO-Weltkulturerbe

Turmschanzenstraße 32  
39114 Magdeburg

Betreff: Arrondierung Welterbestätte

Dessau-Roßlau,  
den 21. Februar 2017

WH List 2017\_ "The Bauhaus and its sites in Weimar, Dessau and Bernau  
[extension to Bauhaus and its Sites in Weimar and Dessau, (ii)(iv)(v),  
1996]"\_Interim report\_Additional Information  
Beantwortung der Fragen im Schreiben vom 19. Dezember 2016

Sehr geehrter Herr Meister,

im Anhang finden Sie die Beantwortung der von ICOMOS mit Schreiben vom 19.  
Dezember 2016 gestellten Fragen mit der Bitte um Weiterleitung.

Bitte leiten Sie dann wie besprochen auch den Link zu folgenden Dokumenten  
in englischer Sprache weiter: Bernau\_arch-aujourd'hui-366b, Des-  
sau\_besucher\_broschuere\_2016\_engl, Dessau\_Dessau Foundation\_magazin\_8\_engl,  
Dessau\_handout\_toerten\_engl\_2015, Dessau\_MastersHouses\_flyer\_engl, Hannes-  
Meyer\_coop\_katalog\_2015, UNESCO\_WorldHeritage\_flyer\_engl, Weimar\_Bauhaus  
2016\_Thüringer Tourismus\_Ansicht).

Mit freundlichen Grüßen

*i.a. M. Markgraf*  
Monika Markgraf

B  
A  
U  
H  
A  
U  
S  
  
D  
E  
S  
S  
A  
U

Dr. Claudia Perren  
Director and CEO

Bauhaus Dessau Foundation  
Gropiusallee 38  
06846 Dessau-Roßlau, Germany  
T +49-340-6508-300  
F +49-340-6508-5300  
perren@bauhaus-dessau.de  
www.bauhaus-dessau.de

To:

ICOMOS Evaluation Unit  
Ms Bourdin  
11 rue du Seminaire de  
Conflans  
94220 Charenton-le-Pont  
France

Re: WH List 2017

Dessau-Roßlau,  
21. February 2017

WH List 2017\_ "The Bauhaus and its sites in Weimar, Dessau and Bernau  
[extension to Bauhaus and its Sites in Weimar and Dessau, (ii)(iv)(v),  
1996]"\_Interim report\_Additional Information

Dear Ms Bourdin,

The Bauhaus Dessau Foundation has received your letter of 19 December 2016. We thank you for sending us the Interim Report with information on the current status of the evaluation. We are pleased to supply the required information in a concise form attached to this letter. We very much hope this information helps to clarify the points raised by the ICOMOS Panel members regarding aspects of the proposed Statement of OUV, regarding the boundaries as well as the presentation of the sites to the general public.

A selection of English texts on the Bauhaus and its sites was sent to you on 21 February 2017.

We are looking forward to the results of ICOMOS' evaluation of the nomination, which to our conviction attests to the global importance of the Bauhaus and the modern architecture in the 20th century in all its complexity.

Yours sincerely,



Dr. Claudia Perren

Attachment

**WH List 2017\_ "The Bauhaus and its sites in Weimar, Dessau and Bernau [extension to Bauhaus and its Sites in Weimar and Dessau, (ii)(iv)(v), 1996]"\_Interim Report Additional Request**

**1\_ Proposed statement of Outstanding Universal Value**

*Could the State Party review slightly the proposed statement of Outstanding Universal Value included on page 125, so that all the components of the series (already inscribed and proposed as extension) are clearly related to and satisfy criterion (ii)?*

We are grateful for the Panel's observations and the opportunity to clarify the relation of all components to criterion (ii). Please note that the highlighted letters mark the slight review of the Statement of OUV included on page 125, so that all the components of the series are clearly related to and satisfy criterion (ii).

**Criterion (ii)**

The Bauhaus buildings in Weimar, Dessau and Bernau are central works of European modern art, embodying an avant-garde conception directed towards a radical renewal of architecture and design in a unique and widely influential way. They testify to the cultural blossoming of modernism, which started here, and has had an effect worldwide.

**Criterion (iv):**

The Bauhaus itself and the other buildings designed by the masters of the Bauhaus are fundamental representatives of Classical Modernism and as such are essential components of the image of their period of the 20th century.

**Criterion (vi):**

The Bauhaus architectural school was the foundation of the Modern Movement which was to revolutionise artistic and architectural thinking and practice in the 20th century.

8 February 2017

**WH List 2017\_ "The Bauhaus and its sites in Weimar, Dessau and Bernau [extension to Bauhaus and its Sites in Weimar and Dessau, (ii)(iv)(v), 1996]"\_Interim Report Additional Request**

**2\_ Boundaries**

*Could the State Party consider changes in the boundaries of the buffer zone in the Houses with Balcony Access so that they are extended and adapted to the streets and plot systems of the neighboring area?*

Following your valuable advice the boundaries of the buffer zone for the Houses with Balcony Access have been expanded. They now include the area of the expansion plan by Hannes Meyer and the Bauhaus construction department. As a result, the area for the effective protection of the Houses with Balcony Access now essentially represents the original historical situation at the time of the construction of the Houses with Balcony Access. Now, both the innovative and groundbreaking structure with the division into multi-storey buildings and low-rise buildings as well as the system of the access roads are located within the area of the buffer zone as essential elements of Bauhaus planning. In the north, the connection to the housing development planned by Walter Gropius to the buffer zone is re-established. In the west, the buffer zone is concluded by the terraced buildings which were planned by Gropius' assistant, Richard Paulick, and built on the basis of the development plan developed at the Bauhaus. The boundaries of the buffer zone for the Houses with Balcony Access were adjusted exactly to the boundaries of the streets and plots of land. The improved buffer zone will to our conviction ensure a maximum of protection for both the Houses with Balcony Access and their historical setting.

8 February 2017





## VI The Houses with Balcony Access, Dessau-Roßlau

property: 0.97 ha  
 buffer zone: 25.03 ha

N 51° 48' 3" / E 12° 14' 39"

Peterholzstraße 40, 48, 56; Mittelbreite 6, 14  
 06849 Dessau-Roßlau

Date: January 10th, 2017  
 Scale: 1:1000  
 Spatial reference: ETRS 89 / UTM Zone 32 N  
 Base Map: Cadastral Map (© LVermGeo LSA 2013, 010213)

- Nominated component part
- Buffer Zone



**WH List 2017\_ "The Bauhaus and its sites in Weimar, Dessau and Bernau [extension to Bauhaus and its Sites in Weimar and Dessau, (ii)(iv)(v), 1996]"\_Interim Report Additional Request**

**2\_Boundaries ADGB Trade Union School Bernau**

*Could the State party consider changes in the boundaries of the nominated area in the ADGB Trade Union School in order to include some of the open space surrounding the buildings that initially belonged to the land, which was part of the Bauhaus project?*

In accordance with the proposal of the ICOMOS Panel to complete the nominated area of the ADGB Trade Union School by including existing appertaining outdoor facilities, we have amended the nominated area for this component as follows (cf. application, layout plan fig. 22, fig. 62, fig. 67 and master plan, p. 168/169). It now includes:

1. the driveway roundabout (design by Hannes Meyer) in front of the building complex consisting of the school and the boarding home,
2. the historic western forest edge of the area along the driveway up to the level of the transformer building,
3. the rear outdoor area located to the south and east of the teachers' residential buildings and the school and boarding home complex, including the terrain levels included in Meyer's plan and the ground water pond surrounded by trees,
4. the free spaces to the east and north of the building structures and
5. the free space located between the school and boarding home complex as well as the north-western expansion buildings (which do not form part of the complex) from the 1950s, including the pergola with the terrace behind the entrance segment.

In effect we confidently propose the following changes to the nominated property of component (VII):

## **(VII) ADGB Trade Union School, Bernau**

Address: Hannes-Meyer-Campus 1, 5-11,  
16311 Bernau near Berlin

Nominated component, total area: 3,4414 ha

VII. ADGB Trade Union School Bernau with outdoor facilities: Local sub-district Bernau, cadastral district 6, sub-plots 196 (in part), 197 (in part), 234, 236 (in part)

This includes:

VII.1 School building, Hannes-Meyer-Campus 1: 0.30 ha

VII.2 Teachers' houses, Hannes-Meyer-Campus 5-11: 0.067 ha

VII.3 Transformer building, Hannes-Meyer-Campus 11: 0.002 ha

Buffer zone: 17.24 ha

Coordinates of the centres:

VII. ADGB Trade Union School with outdoor facilities: N 52° 42' 23" / E 13° 32' 19"


VII.1 School building, Hannes-Meyer-Campus 1: N 52° 42' 24" / E 13° 32' 39"

VII.2 Teachers' houses, Hannes-Meyer-Campus 5-11: N 52° 42' 21" / E 13° 32' 37"

VII.3 Transformer building, Hannes-Meyer-Campus 11: N 52° 42' 19" / E 13° 32' 38"

Buffer zone: N 52° 42' 18" / E 13° 32' 40"

8 February 2017



## VII The ADGB Trade Union School, Bernau bei Berlin

- nominated property
- buffer zone

nominated property: 3,18 ha  
buffer zone: 17,24 ha

N 52° 42' 23" / E 13° 32' 39"

Hannes-Meyer-Campus 1, 5 - 11  
16311 Bernau bei Berlin

Date: February 1st, 2017  
Scale: 1:1000  
Spatial reference: ETRS 89 / UTM Zone 33 N  
Base Map: Cadastral Map (© Geo-Basis-DE / LGB 2015)

0 50 100 200 Meters



**WH List 2017\_ "The Bauhaus and its sites in Weimar, Dessau and Bernau [extension to Bauhaus and its Sites in Weimar and Dessau, (ii)(iv)(v), 1996]"\_Interim Report Additional Request**

**3\_ Interpretation**

*Could the State Party consider to elaborate further on the presentation of the Bauhaus and its sites as a whole to the general public? And in particular, to provide more material written in English, in relation to the centenary of the Bauhaus, which will take place in 2019?*

For years, the Bauhaus World Heritage site as a whole and the parties in charge of the individual components have intensified their efforts to communicate the importance of the Bauhaus movement and its tangible sites. Examples of this include the execution of the "Triennale der Moderne" since 2013 and the continuous expansion of the joint PR work of all components of the Bauhaus World Heritage site. Based on its international importance, the verbal and written communication of this world heritage site in several languages plays a major role. For example, tours of the Bauhaus buildings are offered in English, French, Italian and Spanish and an audio-guide is available in seven languages (German, English, French, Spanish, Italian, Japanese and Chinese). The information on all elements of the world heritage site in the English language ([bauhaus100.de/en/](http://bauhaus100.de/en/)) will be expanded, in particular with a view to the 2019 Bauhaus anniversary. In addition to event-specific materials and the web offering, the owners of the Bauhaus site also provide constant offers in English, such as, e.g., the publication "the co-op principle – Hannes Meyer and the Concept of Collective Design" (Dessau, 2016), flyers presenting the entire Bauhaus world heritage site and tours. These offers are constantly expanded and supplemented and a short overview of this was sent to the ICOMOS headquarters in digital form concurrently with this letter. The presentation of the World Heritage site as a whole is the focus of these enhanced offers.

8 February 2017