2.1: Research Track

EXTENSIVE GREEN ROOF STUDY ON A RETROFIT BUILDING IN BERLIN, GERMANY: REPORT AFTER 34 YEARS OF MONITORING

Manfred Koehler
Green Roof Center, University of Applied Sciences Neubrandenburg, Germany

Abstract

This report describes the continued observation of the plant development on a green roof on a retrofit building in Berlin from 1986 to 2019. These ten extensive green roofs with a total area of 655 m² have different exposures and slopes. This project symbolizes a shift in the urban planning paradigm in post-war Berlin away from demolishing blocks of the housing that survived World War II to gradual renovation of the remaining historic rented courtyard buildings. Over the same period, the understanding of cities as ecosystems has grown. That means that concepts relating to local energy generation, waste management, and new modes of traffic as well as more greenery were key elements in the design. Green roofs were an essential means of adding vegetation to the urban scape. The systematic study included a full neighborhood block. A smaller part of the block was realized and financed as a case study. These extensive roofs were one of the first installations on sloped roofs with pre-produced turf mats in Germany. In total, 124 vascular plants were found over the 34 years of observation. Only five of these plants were dominant for the entire period. A new technology at the time, reinforced, pre-produced turf mats were used to also cover the steep green roof parts only initially to prevent erosion. The main findings were that the species richness is not related either to the area or the slope of the roofs. Significantly better growth performance is related to environmental factors, especially in wet or humid conditions compared to dry years. The roof turf mats represent a stable vegetative cover over all the years. Such types of extensive roofs, cultivated on pre-produced turf mats, provide reliable protection against erosion that require little maintenance. In 1984 such mats were pioneering roof technology, and the long-term observations confirm the quality of this type of construction, making this project a role model for retrofit projects in North America as well.

Introduction

This project is not the first modern extensive green roof of Berlin (MEG), but it was the first based on an ecosystem study for a whole Berlin city block. The team headed by Martin Küenzlen collected data about abiotic, biotic, and social facts for Block 108 in Berlin-Kreuzberg to pioneer a green multi-criterial concept for an inner-city block (Autorenkolletiv 1981). This neighborhood with its rental tenements typical for Berlin dates from the early period of industrialization at the start of the 20th century and was in great need of renovation by the 1980s. The interesting feature of these typical Berlin blocks dating from around 1900 in relation to urban planning was that they were characterized by social mixture of inhabitants with more imposing apartments on the street fronts and much smaller apartments in the courtyard areas. These blocks also rent shops to small businesses. This is a role model for a diverse inner-city mixture with a high urban density. The typical four-story buildings had eaves of 22 m, which was the limit set by fire safety regulations. The attics were not used, because the weak U value of 1.42 W/(m²·K) was an energy challenge not just in winter but also in hot summers. However, this roof top area had the potential for quality living spaces—especially if extra insulation is combined with green roofs. Green roofs were known and sometimes used in Berlin as extra insulation as well as a fire protection method (Rüber 1860).

This project is an ecological example for a compact city with more living space on the same ground. The International Building Exhibition in Berlin from 1979 to 1984 (Liepe et al., 2010) was the framework used to improve and to establish such visionary concepts. On this basis, and financed as a study by the German Federal Ministry of Interior (there was no ministry specifically for environmental issues at that time) in cooperation with the State of Berlin, it became possible to realize the concept as a demonstration project. Monitoring was part of this concept. This is the stage where the author became involved as part of the research team led by Professor Reinhard Bornkamm.

Research questions related to green roofs that were explored in this project were: Are green roofs possible on steep roofs up to 45° inclination? Is it possible to avoid erosion by using pre-produced turf mats? This was one of the first green roof projects in which this technology, including a special seed mixture, was tested. How long do these large-scale green roofs last? The relevance of this project for the North American market is that multi-story retrofits with green roofs is a growing market in many projects. The green roofs were included in the annual monitoring conducted by the author from the planning phase up to 2019. Preliminary reports for the first years are printed in (Koehler 2007; Koehler and Poll 2010; Koehler and Schmidt 1988). In these sources, the aim and selected methods are described in detail. This paper will be the final report of this project.

Methodology

Roof Construction

The roofs have an insulation layer of Styrofoam under the timber construction. In the sloped roofs are integrated thrust thresholds against erosion. Because of the inclination of all roof parts, an additional drainage layer is not used. The single layer of 10 cm growing media is a mixture of expanded clay, sand, and humus. Some soil characteristics: usable field capacity 15.4 liter/m² (in 10 cm), pH value: 7.6, total C: 3.9%, total N 0.1%, lead 202 ppm, cadmium 0.34 ppm, and copper 19.4 ppm in the beginning stage 1985. There were less changes since the second improvement in 2009 (Koehler and Poll 2010). The vegetation layer is a pre-produced reinforced mat containing a mixture primarily of the following plants: *Dactylis glomerata, Poa pratensis, Koeleria pyramidata, Lolium perenne, Festuca rubra, Poa compressa, Allium schoenoprasum*, and *Sedum acre.*



Figure 1. The numbers in the circles represent the 10 roofs with different slopes. The numbers in the squares are the plots for some test seeds without turf mats in the first project stage between 1986 and 1988. These plots were covered completely after a few years by the surrounding roof vegetation.

(Source: Koehler and Schmidt 1997)



Figure 2. Details of the green roof installation in September 1985. Upper row: Scaffolding and lifting the older roof to construct the roof level apartments. Lower row: Installation of the thrust-thresholds and the PVC layer. Lower right: With the final turf mat layer.

The turf mats had a vegetation coverage value of about 84% in the first year. The green roofs had no irrigation installed, but the residents in the back building understand, that irrigation has a double benefit for cooling their rooms and to support the vegetation. This irrigation only worked in the first two years.

Research Methods

Each year in May/June, a full plant observation was performed by recording the cover value of each plant species on the sub roofs separately. Also observed were some data related to plant height and phenology information as well as special features, such as any erosion and the need for maintenance. For the basic description and some initial results (Table 1). The values for *Allium* as an indicator plant were recorded separately.

Table 1 Characteristics of the 10 green roofs and some species numbers

Roof number	Inclination in °	Exposure	Size in m²	Total number of vascular plants in 34 yrs	Av. species per year	Av. cover in % vascular	Cover in % of *Allium*
1	2–3	Flat	42	56	15	94	65
2	45	West	54	49	13	87	53
3	10	North	61	55	14	91	56
4	10	North	61	56	15	91	58
5	30	North	15	48	15	93	54
6	2–3	East	46	59	15	91	59
7	45	East	48	45	14	80	29
8	30–45	South	110	51	15	86	36
9	2–3	Flat	110	54	18	83	49
10	45	North	110	44	14	92	42
	Total green roof size		655 m2	Total number of vascular plant species			124

The planted species that were originally present in the turf mats are marked in the figure 4 tables with an "x", while perennial plants are marked with an "m" (see Figure 4). Weather data were analyzed on the date of the annual data collection. The information were summarized by identifying a dry year with a "t" ("trocken") and a wet year marked with a "f" ("feucht"); see figure 4. This is intended to interpret plant cover and species composition relative to weather data. Over this period, 18 years were classified as wet and 16 years as dry.

The annual data sets were prepared in Excel including the presented graphs. For statistical tests, SPSS, version 27, was used.

Results

The following interpretation was based on the ten roofs. The intention to also monitor several plots without any vegetation mats was only successful for the first years. After only a few years, all areas are settled initially by annuals, such as *Bromus tectorum*, and after a few more years they resembled the typical turf mats around them, dominated by *Allium schoenoprasum* and *Festuca ovina*.

There was almost no maintenance required, apart from replanting on the ridge, and no tree seedlings were found on the roof mats. A remarkable feature for the entire observation period is the domination of *Allium schoenoprasum.* The value for this species is therefore highlighted here. On Roof 9 there were also some lichens from the genus *Cladonia,* particularly *Cladonia rei*, discovered across a few percentage ground cover of the area. This is due to the poor growing media and the improving environmental conditions in the city center of Berlin.

Species Richness and Size of the Roofs

All data for the 10 roofs in the 34 years are represented (Figure 3). The trend line shows that size is not a relevant factor for a higher number of plant species. This result is due to the use of the green roof mats, which completely covered an area of more than 80% from the start. Therefore, there was only very limited space for additional introduced plant species. In this project, the primary goal was to have full vegetative cover to prevent erosion. This was achieved for all main parts of the roofs. The only difficult area was the ridgeline of Roof 7. Some *Sedum* plantings here solved this problem in the first years.



Figure 3. The relation between number of vascular species and roof size, as an average value over all years.

Similarity Between the Roofs

The correlation for the plant species across all 10 roofs resulted in a high expected significance (Table 2). A slightly lower correlation is apparent for Roof 9 on the courtyard building at Paul-Lincke-Ufer 44a. The dominance of *Poa bulbosa* and high numbers of *Erodium cicutarium* are due the harsh windy weather conditions on this roof with fewer vertical structures that block wind. The absolute number of vascular plant species at this time was 124.

Table 2. Correlation between the ten roofs, with high correlation values.

		Roof 1	Roof 2	Roof 3	Roof 4	Roof 5	Roof 6	Roof 7	Roof 8	Roof 9	Roof 10
Roof 1	Pearson – Correlation	1	0.898**	0.966**	0.890**	0.861**	0.923**	0.919**	0.933**	0.846**	0.910**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000

How do the annual weather conditions influence the cover values, number of species, and the cover of *Allium*?

Over the total of 34 years, 16 were characterized as "wet" and 18 were characterized as "dry" when the weather data were analyzed. These data are prepared for the *t*-test analysis by SPSS.

Table 3. Paired *t*-test procedures for the 16 wet and 18 dry years over the observation period by the criteria: cover value in % of all vascular plants, number of vascular plants per year, and coverage of *Allium* in %.

Species/ Treatment	x mean	Stand dev.	N roofs	Stand.-error mean	Paired –T-Test	Sig. (2-sites)
Cover of vascular plants-dry	*87.0*	*5.98*	*10*	*1.89*		
Cover of vascular plants-wet	90.5	3.78	10	1.20	-3.248	0.010*
Number of vascular plants-dry	*14.1*	*1.85*	*10*	*0.59*		
Number of vascular plants-wet	15.5	1.35	10	0.43	-3.50	0.007*
Cover of Allium- dry	*48.7*	*9.42*	*10*	*2.98*		
Cover of Allium -wet	52.6	12.16	10	3.85	-2.86	0.019*

The results of this test confirm that the rainier conditions significantly influence the criteria of vegetation coverage, with 3% more coverage being significant at the 1% level. In addition, the 1.5 more plant species for the years under wet conditions is also significant at the 1% level. *Allium* also benefits from the wet conditions with a higher coverage of about 4%, which means significant at the 2% level.

The summary of all information for Roof 1 (Figure 4) is consistent with the other nine roofs having similar graphs. The graph shows the general mechanism of colonization over time. First, it confirms the success in making the right plant selection in the turf mats. The plant species marked with "X" are dominant the whole time. It is also shows that some of these only persist for a few years at the beginning, such as *Dactylis glomerata* and *Koeleria pyramidata*, and are also accompanied by some pioneer weeds in the beginning. On the other hand, over time additional introduced/spontaneous plants appear on the roof but only as accompanying plants with low cover values. Considering the goal of achieving long-term, complete, and low-maintenance green cover, the project was successful. In an attempt to achieve high biodiversity in line with recent aims of the green roof movement, it has relatively low values compared to other projects with the total number of 124 species. They sort in three categories of "pioneers", "all time representatives" and accompanying species (Table 4).



Figure 4. Roof 1 as an example, representative of all 10 roofs of this project. On the x axis are all plant species listed, with perennial plants The y axis shows the cover value for the years, and the scale on the right hand shows the research years including the cover values of the years. The peak cover values of the time between 1986 and 2019.

Table 4. The total amount of the 124 plant species in the 34 observation years can be categorized into the following groups (data from figure 4).

Pioneer species: of the first 3 year(s) such as:	All time present species (in 30-32 years): the basic composition of these roofs.	Spontaneous species in 23-10 of the 34 years.
Echinochla crus-galli *Phleum pratense* *Poa pratensis* *Lolium perenne* *Festuca rubra*	*Poa compressa* *Festuca ovina s str.* *Bromus tectorum* *Allium schoenoprasum* *Sedum acre*	*Cerastium semidecandrum* *Vicia sativa angustifolia* *Medicago lupulina* *Vicia hirsuta* *Sedum album* *Arenaria serpyllifolia* *Bromus hordeaceus* ssp. *hordeaceus* *Trifolium arvense* *Myosotis arvensis* *Bromus sterilis* *Sisymbrium loeselii* *Trifolium campestre* *Sedum sexangulare*

Discussion

This survey monitors a stabilized extensive green roof. There are some phases of annual changes, initially characterized by several accompanying plants. Annual variation in the biomass is connected to annual weather conditions. The amount of rain in the vegetative growth season significantly influences the vegetation cover. The pre-produced turf mats provide full vegetation cover for the pitched roofs at all times. They start with a wider range of species that adapt to the different environmental conditions accompanied by a few spontaneous plant species. However, these only persist for a short period of a few years. The important feature is the stable, underlying species collection over the entire period.

Green roof technology competes with typical hard roof covers, such as clay roof tiles with more than 80 years life expectancy or concrete roof tiles, which have a life span of 40-50 years. This primary requirement to last a similar period is confirmed here over more than 30 years' observation and no visible damage during this time. The main aim that green roofs can also compete with hard-roof versions of shingles on pitched roofs is confirmed. This also confirms the observation of the remaining older green tar roofs from the beginning of the 20th century (Koehler and Poll 2010).

Figure 5 The PLU (Paul-Lincke-Ufer) roofs today: the green roofs are well developed, and the climber has covered all the facades. All areas are in good condition and will thrive for years to come.

Over the observation period, the annual care of the roof vegetation was limited to an annual survey and minor replanting around the chimneys and near some technical installations. The climate conditions are characterized by long dry periods in summer and harsh winter conditions, similar to conditions that are typical across wide areas of the United States, meaning that the general findings are relevant. The project results are best compared to other publications about green roofs in Germany. The best comparison is with the housing terrace project in Hannover that was completed in 1985 (Catalano et al. 2016). Pre-produced turf mats were installed here as well, with a grass mixture of *Festuca rubra, Festuca ovina, Agrostis capillaris, Lolium perenne*, and *Poa pratensis*. The plant species observations were performed in 1987, 1999, and 2014. Between 1987 and 1999 the number of species increased, while in 2014 the species were stable at the same level, which means all ecological niches are covered. The grasses that were initially present were largely substituted by incoming local spontaneous plants. The decrease in *Festuca rubra, Agrostis capillaris, Lolium*, and *Poa pratensis* are similar to the results seen in Berlin.

The further example are studies from the Stuttgart region, conducted by Thuring and Dunnet (2014) and (2019), for which the original documents detailing the initial plant species are available. The documentation was based on only one plant species observation at the end of the 30-year period. It helps to compare the nine projects of Thuring, which have different sizes, inclinations, and locations, with each other. The basic result is that, again, a number of the initial species are no longer present, but the roofs overall have an adequate layer of vegetation and will thrive for the next few years. The adaptive strategies of competition winning species are related to stress-tolerance and preferred ruderal strategies.

Koehler and Poll (2010) compared the PLU roofs as an example of “modern extensive green roofs” with the older Berlin tar-paper green roofs and concluded that the modern mixtures of the soils are a significant factor behind the higher plant species richness. This research contributed to the survival and maintenance questions of extensive green roofs on multi-story buildings with poor accessibility for gardeners.

The lessons learned from this project are that extensive green roofs can be installed as long-lasting technology. The next important feature about the eco-functionality of extensive green roofs is the connection for more plant and animal biodiversity on roofs and the surrounding ground space areas. The analysis of several green roof projects (Koehler and Ksiazek-Mikenas, 2018, Ksiazek-Mikenas et al. 2018) reveals some solutions that can effectively enhance such biodiversity, such as a change in growing materials, substrate depths, developing several eco niches, and targeted maintenance.

Looking back over green roof development, from the visions of the team led by Martin Küenzlen to today, we see a shift from a simple and environmental ecological feature to a multi-purpose solution with several benefits, as stated in the publication by Oberndorfer et al. (2007) and the summary of evidence of Manso et al. (2021).

In contrast to a wide range of surveys of flat green roofs, surveys such as this one on pitched roofs are the minority, but as shown here they can be maintained over decades. A reduction in the plant species richness must be accepted, however. The technology of turf mats has become more specialized, with locally adapted mixtures being produced that are tailored for the specific projects. The lesson is that the normal flat roofs in Germany and the USA are the typical green roof solution, with an extra benefits for residents and neighbors. Roofs with a pitch of up to 45° are easy to manage, but steeper constructions should be executed using living wall technology.

Acknowledgements

This work would not have been possible without the visionary view of some architects in Berlin, such as Martin Küenzlen. Evaluation in the initial years was by the Ministry of Interior and the state of Berlin with a second evaluation (1988) by the BFN (Federal Agency of Nature Conservation) funded. Monitoring over the remaining years was part of a personal commitment by the author to monitor a selected number of green roof projects.

Links

https://fhxb-museum.de/xmap/media/S7/T1791/U26/text/fhxb_spk_gutber_00036a_72.pdf
https://gruendach-mv.de/ (homepage of the author).
https://www.stadtentwicklung.berlin.de/bauen/oekologisches_bauen/de/bausteine/index.shtml
(Webpage with a number or research paper, case studies of eco-buildings in Berlin, and the environmental mapping system with a link to current projects and reports.
https://berlin.museum-digital.de/index.php?t=serie&serges=28 (a collection of environmental studies from the IBA)

References

Autorenkolletiv. 1981. (Küenzlen, M, Draeger, W., Eberle, P., Henning, R., Hess, M., Lempelius, C., Leontopolus, K., Schaffernicht, R.; Thomas, P., Werner, U.) „Systemstudie zur Ökologischen Stadterneuerung für einen innerstädtischen Gebäudekomplex". Oekotop, *IBA Bericht*, UFOPLAN 8.78. https://fhxb-museum.de/xmap/media/S7/T1791/U26/text/fhxb_spk_gutber_0651a_72.pdf downloads: https://fhxb-museum.de/xmap/media/S7/T1791/U26/text/fhxb_spk_gutber_00036a_72.pdf

Bornkamm, R. 1995. "Die Entwicklung von Dachvegetation auf Substraten unterschiedlicher Mächtigkeit". Schriftenreihe für Vegetationskunde H.27: 87-95.

Catalano, C.; Marcenò, C., Laudicina, V.A., Guarino, R., 2016 "Thirty years unmanaged green roofs: Ecological research and design implications", *Landscape and Urban Planning,* 149: 11-19. https://DOI:10.1016/j.landurbplan.2016.01.003

Ellenberg, H., Weber, H.E., Düll, R., Wirth, V., Werner, W., and Paulißen. D. 1991. "Zeigerwerte von Pflanzen in Mitteleuropa". *Scripta Geobotanica Vol. 18*. Göttingen.

FLL (Autors: Lösken, G., Ansel, W., Backhaus, T., Bartel, Y.-C., Bornholdt, H., Bott, P., Henze, M., Hokema, J., Koehler, M., Krupka, B.W., Mann, G., Münster, M., Neisser, H., Roth-Kleyer, S., Ruttensperger, S., Schenk, D., Sprenger, D., Upmeier, M., Westerholdt, D.). 2018. "Dachbegrünungsrichtlinien – Richtlinien für Planung, Bau und Instandhaltung von Dachbegrünungen – Ausgabe 2018" *FLL*, Bonn, verv. 150 S.

Kaiser, D., Koehler, M., Schmidt, M., and Wolf, F. 2019. "Increasing evapotranspiration on extensive green roofs by changing substrate depths, construction, and additional irrigation." *Buildings*, 9: 173; doi:10.3390/buildings9070173. https://doi.org/10.3390/buildings9070173

Kouvelis, K. 1978. "Strategien für Kreuzberg". SenBauWohn Berlin (Hrsg.),

Koehler, M., and Schmidt, M. 1997. „Hof-Fassaden- und Dachbegrünung – Zentraler Baustein der Stadtökologie". *SchrR.TU Berlin*, LuU 105, 1-177.

Koehler, M., and Ksiazek-Mikenas, K. 2018. "Green roofs as habitats for biodiversity". *In: Perez, G., u. K. Perini (ed.). Nature Based Strategies for Urban and Building Sustainability*. 239-249. Elsevier Butterworth-Heinemann. ISBN 978-0-12-812150-4.

Koehler, M. and Poll, P. 2010. “Long-term performance of selected old Berlin greenroofs in comparison to younger extensive greenroofs in Berlin”. *Ecological Engineering*, 36:5, 722-729. doi:10.1016/j.ecoleng.2009.12.019

Ksiazek-Mikenas, K., John Herrmann, Menke, S.B., and Koehler, M., 2018. “If you build it, will they come? Plant and arthropod diversity on urban green roofs over time.” *Urban Naturalist, Special Issue* 1: 52-72. https://www.eaglehill.us/URNAonline/URNAspecialissues.shtml

Liepe, S., Poppitz, M., Scheffler, N., Sept, A. 2010: „Wissenschaftliche Studie IBA 1987“, Berlin, i.A., Senatsverwaltung für Stadtentwicklung Berlin Werkstatt Baukultur Kommunikation Oberste Denkmalschutzbehörde Am Köllnischen Park 3 D-10179 Berlin. Download: https://www.stadtentwicklung.berlin.de/staedtebau/baukultur/iba/download/IBA87_Endbericht_Karte.pdf

Oberndorfer, E., Lundholm, J., Brass, B., Coffmann, R., Doshi, H., Dunnett, N., Gaffin, S., Koehler, M., Liu, K., Rowe, B., 2007. “Green roofs as urban ecosystems: Ecological structures, functions, and services.” *Bioscience*, 57: (10): 823 - 833.

Rüber, E. 1860 (reprint). „Das Rasenbuch“. *Cotta’sche Buchhandlung* München. 90p.

Manso, M., Teotónio, I., Silva, C.M. and Cruz, C.O. 2021. “Green roof and green wall benefits and costs: A review of the quantitative evidence.” *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews,* 135: 110111. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2020.110111.

Thuring, C.E., Dunnet, N. 2014. “Vegetation composition of old extensive green roofs (from 1980s Germany)”. *Ecological Processes*. https://doi.org/10.1186/2192-1709-3-4

Thuring, C.E. ,Dunnet, N. 2019. “Persistence, loss and gain: Characterising mature green roof vegetation by functional composition.” *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 185: 228-236. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landurbplan.2018.10.026