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Planning System in general

1.1. History of the planning system

Historically the Russian population settled in areas directed by the capital city. Settlements, cities and fortresses, such as Voronezh, Eletsk, Kursk, Samara and others were established for the purpose of serving communication by the land and water. Prior to the middle of the 16 century most urban areas developed spontaneously. Later, according to an edict by Tsar Ivan IV on the subdivision of land, re-planning began with the aim of putting in order street networks, land use and land taxation. At that time the first prototypes of general plans appeared; these were usually worked out in Moscow. At the beginning of XVIII century, during the reign of Peter the First, state institutions were established with the responsibility for urban planning and development regulations. In 1709 the first Building Commission was established in St. Petersburg primary with the responsibility of state urban planner and controller. The emperor’s directives on red lines (street lines), fire-prevention measures, preference for the construction of stone buildings, the creation of green areas, and construction of embankments served as a sort of building code to produce a city of European pattern. Developers who violated established regulations were fined or even punished by loss of real estate. By 1720 the planning and development regulations had been established in all cities, including Saint-Petersburg. In 1765 Empress Ekaterina II established a Commission, responsible for the total subdivision of all lands in Russia and issued a manifesto requiring all owners to record their property boundaries. By the end of XVIII century the subdivision was accomplished in 18 provinces out of a total of 50. The Building Commission of Saint-Petersburg developed plans for 416 cities out of a total of 497. Subsequently, planning activities throughout the country were delegated to local authorities.

The Building Charter adopted in 1832 contained all of the key legal principles on urban planning and development applicable throughout Russia. In consequence of reforms implemented since 1870, representative bodies in cities were enabled to adopt building regulations according to the Building Charter. The Charter was in force until land nationalization in 1917. To the end of XIX century, real property was legally settled close to contemporary principles. The scope of legal norms and rules, as well as civil institutions to regulate rights and interests protection, were established. Land ownership was defined as follows: “The land owner has the right of full and exclusive supremacy concerning the surface of his lot within established boundaries, up in the air and down to the bowels of the earth”. The relationship between private owners was regulated by the law of neighboring tenements. The relationship between private owners and society was regulated by public law. By law the observance of society interests was under the responsibility of the building police, authorized to control the execution of public restrictions.
Law of neighboring tenements determined owner’s rights, limited by rights of his neighbors and settled on combined rights concerning objects located at the boundaries of lots. The rules established the location of buildings and windows in relation to neighboring lots, permissible accessory uses, water drainage directions and so on. Intrusion into neighboring space was prohibited or had to be regulated by easements. Exceptional cases were settled by agreements or court decisions. Most restrictions for private developers were aimed at protecting public interests. The Building Charter regulated fire-prevention, health safety, intrusion into public space, and reduction of the property value due to lack of architectural appeal of neighboring structures. All owners and developers had to comply with technical and sanitary requirements regarding durability, height of buildings and residential rooms (no less than 2.5 m.), roof slopes, and minimal courtyard sizes. The fire protection spaces between buildings were different for buildings made of wood to those made of brick; the width of access for fire engines was to be no less than 4.25m. The most detailed rules were applied to buildings bordering public space. Some deviations from common rules were permitted, and they were determined by each city individually. Towers, spires, and belvederes were permitted to be above the height of the buildings by an amount proportional to the length of the façade. Permissible projections to public space of bay windows and balconies were dependent on the size of the building façade and the corresponding floor level. Permissible projections of columns, pilasters or footsteps depended on the sidewalk width. Only the State Senate could repeal requirements adopted by the city representative body, the City Duma. The city executive body approved plans and facades of private buildings within city boundaries and issued building and rebuilding permits to owners and developers. The maintenance of lots and buildings, visible from public space, was also under regulation. The building police could not break into private space; disputes could only be settled in a court. City plans prepared by the city representative body were adopted by the Emperor. City plans as well as most requirements were valid only for the city-type areas; less dense suburban areas within the city administrative boundaries were regulated only by subdivision plans. The city plan represented street networks, blocks and public areas, location and purposes of public buildings, outlined areas permitted for wooden houses and lots to be condemned for state needs. The locations for temporary uses and for engineering infrastructure were not considered. All deviations, save subdivision of the private lot or reconstruction of a building after a fire, could be implemented only after adoption of amendments to the city plan.

Almost all Russian regulations and practices accumulated during 400 years of land use and development reforms were abolished by the Decree on Land, adopted in 1917, and the Decree on Private Property in Cities, adopted in 1918. “The private property right on land is barred for ever; the state owned land can not be sold, leased, mortgaged or alienated in any other way. All the land … is considered the common property of the people for the use of those, who work on it” (“Decree on land”). The Soviet urban planning and development institutions steadily
implemented state orders, ensured by capital investments and human and natural resources, distributed by the central government. The particular prerequisites for Soviet urban development were as follows: (http://www.strana-oz.ru/?numid=16&article=777):

- severe limitations on the use of land for non-state needs and on sizes of non-state buildings;
- development of settlements only according to plans and projects, adopted by state authority;
- country-wide standardization of urban planning, urban development and design documentations;
- construction and maintenance of centralized infrastructure systems by the state;
- budget financing of housing construction and maintenance;
- high density of residential areas; standardized apartments and low floor area per capita (13.5 sq. m to 1985), social homogeneity all over in the country.

During the Soviet period the planning policy resulted in:

- the location of many settlements according to the availability of natural resources and the demands of the defense sector;
- the concentration of large industrial enterprises and, as a consequence, population growth in big cities;
- withering away of small settlements.

To the end of Soviet period most grave urban problems were as follows:

- the settling system has not corresponded to new economic conditions since both the demand and communications became determined more by the market, than by the state plans;
- enormous portion of worn out buildings, first of all physically and morally worn out housing stock;
- problematic reconstruction of the mass standard housing due to its technical characteristics and to the type of development which has not considered lots’ boundaries for buildings;
- worn out transportation and engineering facilities;
- large suburban areas under summer residences of citizens (almost half of families at cities own garden-lots or dachas).

Soon after the start of “perestroika” the working out of urban planning documentation within all the Russia virtually stopped: public budgets were insufficient, the proper legal base was absent and capacities of private investors and developers were but questionable. By the mid of 1990s there appeared capable private developers at housing and commercial service sectors, some
cities adopted sort of zoning regulations based on soviet-time master plans. These regulations were analogous to US zoning patterns (in Russia at that time most foreign consultants on urban development regulation were represented by professional institutions of USA). Some municipalities adopted acts on impact fees to finance public facilities. In 1998 was adopted federal Urban Development Code, based mostly on western patterns, but failed to regulate all important rights and obligations of actors engaged in the field. To the end of 2004 there was adopted new federal Urban Development Code more relevant to professional expectations of planners and developers.

1.2. Basic principles
According to the last Urban Development Code the principles of legislation on spatial planning are as follows:

- securing of sustainable territorial development;
- balanced consideration of ecological, economic, social and other important prerequisites;
- preservation of cultural heritage as well as most valuable and sensitive natural areas;
- securing unimpeded accessibility to social and other relevant objects for invalids;
- possibility for all interested persons and associations to participate in spatial planning and land use regulation;
- responsibility of public bodies for favorable living conditions;
- observance of requirements regarding safety and prevention of extraordinary situations;
- responsibility for infraction of the urban planning and land development legislation;
- indemnification of damages, caused by the infraction of the law.

Spatial planning in Russia must be performed at all officially established public levels. By the Urban Development Code territorial planning schemes are to be produced by Federation, by regions and by municipal districts. There are allowed joint territorial planning schemes, produced by any combination of administrative territories. Master plans too are considered as documents of territorial planning and are performed by municipal urban okrugs and by other municipal settlements. The essential outcomes of the territorial planning decisions include:

- delimitation of land for different destinations (land categories) as for agriculture, for settlements, for industry and some special uses; for preserved natural landscapes, forests, waters;
- functional zoning (obligatory for master plans);
- location of areas, designated for objects, which are under responsibility of different levels (objects of federal, regional or municipal importance);
- tracing of most important transport and engineering communications;
• territories of cultural landmarks;
• specific land use conditions zones with boundaries and regimes settled according to federal legislation (cultural monuments preservation, sanitary, water protective areas etc.).

Decisions of the land planning documentation cover smaller areas within settlements and concern parameters of land planning elements (as streets, roads, blocks etc.), lots’ boundaries and land use requirements for each lot. This documentation is to be adopted by Federation, regions and municipal districts for their construction purposes (objects of appropriate importance and responsibility), and must be adopted by municipalities of settlements in all other cases: for municipal (public) and for private needs.

Save RF Urban Development Code there are other federal laws and by-laws, substantial for spatial planning:
• Land Code (adopted in 2001) which stipulates public and private land rights and legal regime regarding different land categories;
• Law on Cultural Heritage of Russia (2002);
• Law on Sanitary-epidemiological Prosperity of RF Peoples (1999);
• legislation on nature protection, including Law on Nature Protection (2002), Code on Waters, Code on Forests;
• Law on Prevention of Emergent Situations of Natural and Anthropogenic Character (1994);
• federal legislation on transport;
• sanitary norms, building codes;
• Regulation on environmental impact assessment (2000).

1.3 Objectives and scope
As an objective of urban planning and land development is declared sustainable development of territories, ensuring safety and favorable living conditions, prevention of negative impact from any activity upon environment, protection and rational use of natural resources for existing and future generations. Spatial or territorial planning essentially covers decisions concerning objects under responsibility of different public levels, specific land use conditions zones, functional uses for areas (at master plans). Land use and development code (zoning ordinance) specifies uses and parameters for lots located at different zones within settlements. Land planning determines general parameters of urban structures. As a whole urban planning and land development activity by law includes working out and implementation of all above mentioned documents, as well as engineering surveys, design documentation, building permits issuance, control of construction activity and land use control.
1.4. Functions

Urban planning and land development activity is responsible for spatial development of human environment by means of:

- rational use of natural resources;
- providing of human activity by the systems of engineering, transportation and social infrastructures;
- rational intercommunication between areas with different land uses;
- observance of restrictions established due to specific conditions (sanitary, preservation of natural and cultural objects, others);
- ensuring of safety and acceptable environmental qualities.

The issuance of urban planning decisions based on the rational balance of plenty tasks and interests, requires credible forecasts, regarding future social demands and possibilities as well as estimation of relevant territorial resources. Last years trends concerning social demands and possibilities in Russia are sometimes outlined in strategic plans, worked out and adopted by cities or larger areas (http://www.citystrategy.leontief.ru/). As a rule strategic plan is based on estimation of the considered area competitive potential, definition of area specific role in the division of labor. Plan poses development problems, goals, tasks and essential actions, including legislative steps, key programs and organizational changes. Within strategic plan or on its base are worked out demographic and economic forecast, employment trends. These outcomes represent important frame for territorial planning decisions, including accessible financial sources. Estimation of territories is carried out in all important aspects: as natural resource, as area accessible by transportation, there are considered functional uses, engineering facilities, quality of buildings and constructions, sanitary situation, objects of cultural heritage, possible extraordinary situations as floods, mudflows, fires etc. Decisions of territorial planning documents should integrate socio-economic goals and perspectives (including solvent demand and investors’ activity) and preferable uses of different areas.

1.5. Main Instruments of Implementation

According to the RF Urban Development Code, goals and tasks of territorial planning shall be specified for each territorial planning document. This document may not perform all the planning functions, for example, it may be designed only for protection of natural resources or for transportation development and it may be influenced by a specific socio-economic or territorial situation. A large part of Russian regions and cities are gravely concerned with deficiencies of investments and manpower resources. To overcome such deficiencies territorial planners usually rely on the development of all types of infrastructure, improvement of the urban environment, transparency of development regulations, and a balance between public interests
and interests of stakeholders and other parties. During the preparation of proposals, the following factors are considered: accessible financial and manpower resources; potential of different areas for development as nature reserves, agricultural land or urban complexes – existing developments, their significance, potential, catchments area.

At all planning levels, areas and objects for public use (federal, regional and local) appropriate to the map scale, shall be identified. For public areas, the requirements of the land use and development code (zoning ordinance) are not applied, but these requirements must be adopted by an act of the municipal executive body. Territorial planning documents include sections to be adopted (project proposals) and sections that contain substantiation of project proposals. Both parts contain maps and texts. Territorial planning documents may be presented by public bodies or associations for the conclusion of the State Expert Board. The function of the Board is to check the documents’ conformity to technical regulations (safety standards) and the rationality of planning proposals. A negative conclusion of the State Expert Board does not mean that a document cannot be adopted, but it makes the adopting body responsible for all consequences.

At the level of cities the most important instrument of territorial planning is the master plan, outlining functional zones and essential linear objects (as engineering and transport communications). Functional zones may include:

- residential zones of different types;
- zones for public and business objects;
- zones for manufactures;
- recreational zones;
- zones for objects of engineering and transportation infrastructures;
- special zones where dominate one type of usage (as cemeteries and crematoria, defense structures, prisons, waste products accumulation and treatment etc.).

List of functional zones is not limited by the RF Urban Development Code. By the master plan save functional zones are represented zones with specific land use conditions (established according to federal legislation on nature protection, public safety etc.) and, as proposals for acception by corresponding bodies, areas designated for future objects of federal, regional or municipal district responsibility. All proposals of the master plan in cases, they contradict to formerly adopted schemes or affect interests of other levels or neighboring territories, must be supplied by approvals of concerned parties. After adoption of the master plan and in accord with it respective municipality (city okrug or municipal settlement) works out land use and development code (zoning ordinance), which includes territorial zoning map (land use and development zoning map), land development requirements within outlined zones and procedure.
of zoning ordinance application. Maps of restrictions established due to specific conditions overlay the map of territorial zones.

In view of planning decisions of master plans there are usually distinguished polar types of areas:

- “urban framework” (sort of “skeleton”), including centers of different order, streets and roads connecting centers and adjacent uses, which engage great number of day-time visitors;
- “urban tissue”, covering more homogenous and inert areas.

Within urban framework as most important are usually considered radial transport lines (axes of planning sectors) and ring lines; the number of both types within city is considered as indicator of maturity for the city of certain size. In most cases planners consider, that floor area density must follow land value, i.e. its highest levels gravitate to urban framework, especially to very city center. There are not legal or normative acts, concerning urban framework and connected density difference, but according to professional tradition the mentioned issues are studied with the application of mathematical models (transportation mobility, land mass appraising etc.) and properly considered.

By law public hearings are obligatory before adoption of master plans, land use and development codes, land planning documentation. All territorial planning and land planning documents must be published and their accessibility is to be provided for any interested person or party.

Within three months after adoption of territorial planning document the administration head of relevant level adopts the plan of its implementation. Plan provides time schedule for all anticipated actions (adoption land planning documentation, construction designs, construction of public objects) and due financial supply. After adoption of the master plan there must be additionally established deadline for the working out and adoption of land use and development code or amendments to it. To coordinate the performance of the land use and development code and interests involved is enabled zoning commission, appointed by head of administration.

Land planning documentation includes three types of documents:

- land planning projects made for allotment of settlement structural elements, public areas and location of public objects (to be built and maintained at the expense of public finances);
- subdivision plats/projects for the establishment of land lots’ boundaries (to be recorded by conventional procedure in State Land Cadastre);
• building development plans, containing requirements and restrictions for each lot (according to land use and development code) and technical parameters for getting public engineering facilities.

Land planning documentation (save objects of federal and regional importance) is to be financed and adopted by municipal level, any expertise for that kind of documentation is not established, public hearings before adoption of land planning projects and subdivision plats are obligatory.

The execution of the design documentation is based on engineering-geological surveys. All design documentation (save family houses no higher than 3 floors and other buildings of the kind) must be delivered for state expertise and, by the initiative of developer, may pass non-state expertise. Public hearings are not obligatory at this stage.

1.6. Actors

The main actors of urban planning and land development activity are as follows:

• public bodies of federal, regional and municipal districts levels, responsible for legal and normative base, for working out and adoption of territorial planning documents, for the design documentation and construction of theirs objects, for approval of planning documents they are concerned (including approvals by representatives of different sectors, as ecology, monuments preservation, sanitary requirement etc.) and for supervision under construction process in cases, stipulated by law;

• state expert bodies to examine territorial planning documents and design documentation;

• public bodies of municipal cities and settlements, responsible for working out local normative acts, master plans, land use and development regulations, land planning documentation, design documentation and construction of theirs objects, approval of planning documents they are concerned, municipal land allocation, issuance of building permits, supervision under construction process and land use control;

• companies, providing public utilities;

• private developers;

• building contractors;

• physical and juridical persons involved in the planning and development activity: participate public hearings, deliver their proposals or objections to responsible public bodies or are appealing to courts;

• urban planning companies (owned by state, by municipality, private or mixed), individual experts;

• research companies and scientific experts;

• banks, courts.

Professional planners save planning work are often engaged in:
- working out of strategic plans of territorial development (for region or city);
- the working out of different legal act in the field (including acts on public land allocation and payments for public amenities), building codes;
- preparation of capital investments address programs for public infrastructures development.

Negotiations of public authorities or municipal representatives with investors, key developers, and real property owners, initiated with the aim to estimate initial situation for urban planning, represent the least formalized procedures and sometimes their results give cause for suspect in corruption. Once most part of land within settlements is still owned by the state, the laws on public land allocation are of utmost importance. Nowadays public land is not yet divided as owned by federation, region and municipality, therefore till proper delimitation and recording of public land, municipal settlements are enabled to allocate public land save plots, occupied by or designated for federal, regional or municipal district uses. Principles of the public land allocation are stipulated by the RF Land Code, and later amended by the Law on Adoption of Urban Development Code. These laws stipulate provision of open tenders for selling or leasing. In the case investor looks for a site not yet recorded in Land Cadastre, this investor, according to municipal body proposal, is allowed himself work out before bids a needed land planning documentation. In the case the lot, called for bids is allocated to other pretender, all expenditures of initiator shall be compensated. If there are not other claimants the first one gets a lot without bids. Lessee of land for housing, once worked out necessary documentation for land subdivision and then supplied new lots with engineering facilities, has an exclusive right to buy it.

1.7 Significance of transnational and trans-border aspects

According to legislation federal authority is obliged to establish in planning schemes objects, needed to perform international liability of Russia. Currently Russia is not fully implementing the Convention on the Protection of the Marine Environment of the Baltic Sea Area (Helsinki Convention). This was the conclusion reached by the board of the Russian Audit Chamber (March 2005), which considered the results of an audit of the effective use of government resources allocated in 2002-2003 for environmental measures under the Helsinki Convention. "… one of the reasons for Russia's failure to meet a numbers of its obligations under the Helsinki Convention is the severe lack of funding for environmental and water management measures," says the Audit Chamber press release. In 2002-2003 no funds were allocated in the federal budget for these activities. The documents presented by the board noted set of problems that prevent Russia from fully implementing the Helsinki Convention. The Russian Government has not yet solved problems on the division of responsibilities between the federal and regional authorities, institutions and organizations under whose responsibility issues concerning the implementation of the Convention fall. There does not exist any guiding
development program for implementing science-based measures intended to fulfill the Convention. "This means the functions of executive bodies are duplicated and their actions are uncoordinated, which creates serious difficulties for attempts to protect the marine environment of the Baltic Sea," the Russian Audit Chamber noted. The Board of the Russian Audit Chamber decided to send a letter containing this information to the Environment Ministry, to the Government and the Foreign Ministry. The report on the results of the audit is being sent to both houses of the Russian Parliament.

http://wefd32.info/compliance/of/the/russian/federation/with/the/convention/on/the/

As a successful project carried out with the participation of European countries became the construction of South-west waste disposal plant at Saint-Petersburg (accomplished in 2005). Government of Finland allocated for project implementation E10m, in project financing participated Sweden, Denmark and European Investment Bank. Last years some Russian research and project teams are actively involved in international projects (as under the aegis of Interreg, Tacis, Plancenter, UN Habitat).

1.8. Current and upcoming changes and challenges

The going on changes last years are diverse and not always positive. Most encouraging changes are:

- adoption by some dozens of cities land use and development regulation codes (zoning ordinances) or very similar documents with the aim to lessen bureaucratic arbitrariness;
- distinctive for many large cities growth of construction activity in housing and commercial sectors;
- going on improvement of architectural and technical diversity of buildings and constructions;
- initial development of mortgage credits;
- initial stirring up of the public participation and legal proceedings on urban development issues.

Meantime current trends are fraught with crucial problems. Deterioration speed of public utilities and housing stock keep ahead of pace of their modernization. Only in Moscow the land prices are high enough to resettle inhabitants by blocks, to demolish prefabricated housing built in 1960s and to develop vacant lots. Even in Saint-Petersburg, not to say of other cities and settlements, such a method is too unprofitable. There are attempts to find methods of partial modernization capable to repay investments but not yet successive. One may foresee that demolition will start when dwelling of the prefabricated stock housing of 1960s will be recognized as absolutely discomfort or even dangerous.
The low activity of apartments owners to form co-owners associations prevents to introduce competitive market into housing maintenance business and therefore to improve quality of service. The most part of condominiums are represented by houses built at last decade. In urban development activity, as well as in other spheres, the actions of executive bodies are not transparent enough not to suspect deliberate procrastinations regarding different approvals, permit procedures, and consequent corruption.

Not very evident nowadays but quite possible problems must follow to housing degradation and ethnic changes, introduced by immigration to large cities. Till the last time obvious segregation is not typical (save some luxurious gated communities in best suburbs), but there are enough presupposition to expect its expansion. Quite possible, that housing blocks built in 1960s – 70s will be populated by low-income groups, including some ethnic ones. Then Russia will face the challenge, typical for many western countries some decades ago.

The adoption of the last Urban Development Code was accompanied by adoption of some other legislative acts (“Housing package”), aimed to encourage housing development and maintenance activity. New Housing Code (March 2005) definitely determined housing rights of families with moderate incomes. This Code established that since March 2006 municipalities may appoint companies, responsible for maintenance of houses in cases, the capable inhabitants have not done it themselves in a due way (after establishing joint ownership of condominium). There are adopted some legal acts to encourage housing hypothec: establishment of agencies capable to redeem credit obligations, eviction rights of cities and creditors, possibility to lessen selling tax for housing transactions. At the same time under consideration of authorities is possibility of legal changes directed to adjust to market situation some housing expenditures: as real property tax, land tax and rent (now land payments for housing are extremely low, even for owners of 300sq.m. apartments at best locations). Efficacy of tools applied to regulate tariffs of local monopolies, providing urban utilities, are under discussion. (http://info.risp.ru/reviews/?id=7051)

2. Planning legislation and jurisdiction

2.1. Legal framework of planning

The essential law on spatial planning is the above mentioned RF Urban Development Code of 2004, other acts of all levels now are valid as far, as they do not contradict to the Code. Urban Development Code stipulates:

- competencies of different public levels in the urban planning and development activity;
- purposes, content, procedures of preparation, approval, representation to public, adoption and implementation of different documents (territorial planning schemes of
different levels, master plans, land use and development codes, land planning
documentation, design documentation);
• general obligations regarding the conduct of data systems in the field;
• the responsibility for infraction of the law;
• peculiarities regarding urban planning and land development activity at cities of federal
importance (Moscow and Saint-Petersburg).

To the urban planning and land development activity may be applied legislation on land, on
forests and waters, on natural areas under special protection, on historic monuments
preservation, other RF legal acts, in cases, the respective relations are not regulated by urban
planning and land development legislation. At each level of public bodies there are structures,
responsible for urban planning and land development activity, as working out of strategies,
adoption of relevant documents, implementation and control at all phases.

2.2. Legislation and jurisdiction on different levels

After adoption of new Urban Development Code federal executive bodies have to adopt, or to
amend existing normative acts regarding:
• procedures of territorial planning schemes approval and of actions exercised by
  conciliatory commissions;
• procedures of working out land planning projects by decision of federal executive
  bodies;
• the form of the building development plan;
• general stipulations regarding the land use at areas, for which land use and
development code is not to be established (natural areas under special preservation,
forest fund, water fund);
• technical regulations (safety standards which by 2010 must replace current numerous
building codes);
• types and performance procedures of engineering surveys;
• procedures of supervision under construction works;
• permit form for putting built up object into operation;
• procedures, regarding the conduct of urban planning and land development data
systems;
• regulations on performance of state and non-state expertise and on bodies enabled to
carry expertise works.

With the purpose to substitute multiple sectoral actions of planning control, which included
(according to requirements of United Nations European Economic Commission) also
environmental impact assessment, there should be amended Law on ecological expertise and
some other laws and white papers.
The set of new federal legal acts obligated regions and municipalities to introduce changes into their normative bases and in practical activity. List of normative which shall be worked out or amended at regional level include following subjects:

- actions of regional executive bodies on regulation of urban planning and land development activity;
- general stipulations on investors’ fees for facilities of public infrastructures at region;
- general procedures of working out and adoption of land planning documentation;
- general stipulations on land usage at regional public areas;
- the register of recorded land lots, reserved for public needs of regional level.

Approximate list of normative which shall be worked out or amended at municipal level include subjects:

- allocation of land lots and other real property objects to private parties;
- local land use and development code;
- register of recorded public areas of municipal importance;
- regulations on public land usage;
- recorded list of land lots, reserved for municipal public needs;
- actions of municipal bodies on working out and adoption of land planning documentation;
- list of lots, reserved for municipal needs.

2.3. Binding character

Territorial planning documents are to be adopted by all levels of public bodies: by state authorities (federal and regional), as well as by municipal self-government bodies. After adoptions these documents become obligatory for all public bodies. By means of territorial planning each public level creates its “territorial frame” establishing set of objects, which by law are under respective level responsibility.

For the Federation its “territorial frame” includes elements of federal engineering and transportation infrastructures; lands of forest and water resources (forest fund and water fund); objects of defense and safety (including those for protection of state boundaries); objects of cosmic activity; linear objects, providing activity of natural monopolies; federal offices; federal enterprises and institutions; territories of cultural monuments and natural areas under federal protection.

Regional “territorial frame” includes infrastructures of regional scale, agricultural areas, regional offices, enterprises and institutions; territories of cultural monuments and natural areas under regional protection. Municipal “territorial frame” includes all local infrastructures, municipal
offices, enterprises and institutions; social housing, territories of cultural monuments and of
natural areas under municipal protection.

In any level of territorial planning documents may be included proposals regarding
competencies of other levels to be delivered for approval to bodies concerned. This stipulation
is of importance in current situation, when many cities work out master plans before any
territorial planning initiative is taken at higher levels.

To reduce a bureaucratic procrastination and to improve cross-sectoral vision Urban
Development Code abolished previous multitude of sectoral expertises’ actions on planning
documents and instead enabled cross-sectoral “state” and “non-state” ones. At the same time
Code clearly stipulated responsibility of public bodies, adopting territorial planning documents
and of the Russian Federation (in case of positive State expertise conclusion) to aggrieved
parties.

The land use and development codes (zoning ordinances, containing development/zoning
regulations) shall be adopted by municipalities on the basis of respective master plans and they
are (as well as technical regulations) binding for all actors, engaged in land development
planning, elaboration of design documentation, construction and land use activity. Moscow and
Saint-Petersburg, as cities of federal importance, are enabled to adopt land use and
development codes by regional laws. According to regional laws of these two cities theirs
numerous municipalities (more than hundred in each) are not enabled to issue master plans or
land planning documentation.

The land planning documentation must be adopted by all public bodies to provide the
construction of respective (federal, regional, municipal) importance. Municipalities of cities and
settlements are obliged to enact land planning documentation for the rest of their territories,
including documentation worked out by private parties.

2.4. Possibilities of complaining and filing of lawsuits
Any person or party may appeal to administrative body or to court any decision, which abuses
appellant’s rights or interests. Last years such appeals are very active and engage many non-
governmental organizations. Most claims are caused by lack within cities of territories with all
necessary amenities and by very slow delimitation of public lands, not subject to privatization
and to development for private needs. Trying to encourage investors, municipal authorities often
allocate to private developers lots, which were considered by local residents as space,
designated for public parking, sport or green area. No doubts, meantime, that some appeals
originate by traditional soviet-kind mentality: most citizens are not yet accustomed to pay for
parking, sport facilities, play-grounds for dogs, to participate in the creation of common environment, but prefer to relay on public expenditures.

Since the mid of 1990s has started lawsuits on appeals of citizens and remedial associations counter actions infracting ecological legislation and human rights on favorable environment (as e.g. location of industries too close to residential blocks, construction at forest lands or at water protection areas). The exact statistic of lawsuits is not published, but according to estimations of experts to 2002 there were carried out some dozens of lawsuits and some decisions of RF Supreme Court was issued for benefit of plaintiffs. There are problems regarding judicial procedures which must be solved to promote appeals. Appellants are discouraged by long-term assizes (courts are overcharged) and financial responsibility of plaintiff in the case appeal is considered as unjustified. There is proposal of lawyers to provide reduced charge for appeals on environmental matters, according to Aarhus Convention (2000) (http://www.eco-net.ru/index.php?id=129). Besides efficient solutions are partly handicapped by the rapid transformation of legislative base (in last 15 years has changed federal legislation on land, nature and monuments protection, twice changed urban planning and land development legislation). Federal reforms trigger transformation of regional laws and municipal white papers.

2.5. Planning necessity and voluntaries

In the Urban Development Code of 2004 are not established direct obligations of planning documents issuance or requirements to their legal validity, but Code stipulates legality of actions dependent from the adoption of different documents:

- all public bodies are allowed to issue decisions on land condemnations and even on public land reservation only according to adopted territorial planning documents;
- land use and development code (zoning ordinance) may be adopted only on the base of adopted master plan;
- planning project must follow to land use and development code (zoning ordinance);
- subdivision project must follow to street lines (boundaries of blocks) and to general land distribution (“public – private”, “housing – service” etc.), established by planning project;
- Building development plans for new lots must follow to subdivision project; both for new and previously building development plan must follow to the land use and development code.

Such a through connection is aimed both to set in motion and to coordinate urban planning and development activity. Each document is valid until its abolition or amendment. The amendment procedure is the same, as one of adoption. Refusal to approve document within three moths by legally established parties means, that document is not valid in parts, not yet approved. Any territorial planning document may be delivered both by public bodies or any association for state expertise, but the negative conclusion of State expertise does not forbid its adoption.
In the new federal Code are not mentioned some types of planning projects which planners till the last time were used to perform: master plans for parts of settlement’ territory, development schemes for different sectors or fields (transportation, engineering, nature protection, housing location etc.), and development projects for blocks or large lots. Until the last years development projects represented location and parameters of buildings, green areas, drives, engineering facility settings. In former times, when land more than often was not subdivided to lots, development projects were performed to coordinate actions of different participants; later they were used for complicated situations, as e.g. plans for official approvals of planned units development (PUD, popular in USA) or zones d’aménagement concerté (ZAC in France).

National and regional territorial planning schemes may be adopted for the part of settlement territory as well as may be limited by specific sectoral subjects. Urban Development Code does not stipulate neither master plans for the part of territory or limited by specific sectoral subject. Meantime such documents may be adopted as amendments to valid comprehensive master plan. There are allowed sectoral territorial planning documents at federal and regional levels. Development projects are not forbidden by the Code, but these projects are not valid for coordination purposes, as to change requirements for specific lots: requirements established by zoning ordinance must be the same within the entire zone or sub-zone. Meantime there are in existing cities enough complicated sites where thorough coordination of development projects may yield a profit to all parties concerned. One might assume, that at this point new Urban Development Code will be amended.

3. Planning levels and specific aspects
3.1 Planning Institutions, their scope and binding character of planning
3.1.1 At national level
At the federal level urban planning is at the competences of RF Government, Ministry of regional development and Agency of construction, housing and public utilities. RF Government is enabled to issue decisions on the working out of federal territorial schemes, to adopt schemes and normative acts. The Ministry of regional development (established at 2004 instead of Gosstroy) is enabled to work out the strategy in the corresponding field, to act as the customer of territorial planning schemes, to issue normative acts. Agency of construction, housing and public utilities has to carry out state service in the field, to act as a customer of different works, to organize state expertise. Both the Ministry and Agency may act as customers of federal programs. Technical regulation is at the competence of the Ministry of technical regulation and metrology.
After the collapse of the Soviet system, no complete document of territorial planning has been issued at the federal level. At the same time, previously applied methods for issuing large-scale planning decisions and their implementation have become incapable of efficiency. The project of federal law “On the foundations of regional development regulation”, presented to the State Duma in 1999, remains unclaimed. Meanwhile, due to such Russia-wide factors as the appearance of large private companies demonstrating their specific territorial priorities, heterogeneous population density, and living conditions, and demographic decline, the problems regarding territorial planning goals, tasks, and methods have become of utmost importance and serve as subjects of professional discussions. The Concept of regional development, worked out by the Ministry of regional development in 2005, anticipates a policy directed on prior support of “engine-regions”, capable to develop economy and encourage the development process in backward areas. This policy is opposite to the current orientation of regional policy, supporting most territories at the expense of few regions-donors (as Moscow, Saint-Petersburg, Tumen Oblast, Leningrad Oblasts, etc.). Well-known Russian professionals (leaders in the field of methodological issues on strategic planning at the interregional scale, Ph.D. V. Glazithev and Ph.D. P. Schedrovitsky) support the idea of “engine-regions”, pointing out that the lack of human and infrastructure resources in some areas capable for development has become brakes for economic development of all the Russia. They stress that regions as administrative units should not be authenticated to units of social and economic activity, proposing to establish regional agencies of territorial development and to coordinate Russian territorial development instruments with European ones. (http://stra.teg.ru/library/32/1)

New RF Urban Development Code does not oblige to represent federal planning schemes for public hearings, but obliges to get approvals of regions and municipalities concerned. Before adoption of the federal scheme, there must be published the essential part of the document: the location of federal objects and the list of proposed undertakings. All parties concerned may deliver their proposals, objections, and appeal in the court decisions of adopted document. After the federal scheme adoption, the executive body within three months has to adopt the plan of its implementation, which includes the time-schedule for performance of following projects, for construction works as well as the financial substantiation of plan. The deviation from adopted planning decisions may be sued. Frustrated implementation plan most likely will be followed but by political consequences as the loss of voters confidence to federal public bodies.

3.1.2 At regional level
Regional legal bodies may adopt laws on urban planning and development, not conflicting to federal legislation. There are established regional executive bodies on urban planning, land development, and architecture as well as similar commissions formed by representative public structures. Normative acts, adopted by regional government, regulate coordination of activities
between specialized executive structures, as well as general principles of works (state service performance, control etc.). Orders and arrangements, issued by specialized executive body, specify procedures of activity within each subdivision and interactions with clients or parties under control. Executive bodies responsible for the strategy of territorial development at region are capable to act as customers of territorial planning schemes. The decisions to work up the scheme and to adopt it are to be taken by the regional government.

Some regions (as Chuvashian and Bashkortostan republics, Moscow oblast, Kaliningrad oblast and others) last years (before the adoption of the last Urban Development Code) have adopted theirs territorial planning schemes, including schemes for specified sectors (e.g. Nature protection scheme adopted by Mordovian republic). The implementation of documents adopted should be carried out through performance of regional and interregional programs, working up and adoption of master plans and land planning documentation by municipalities. For example the territorial planning scheme of Kaliningrad oblast lists 14 programs, including two transnational ones. For Moscow and Saint-Petersburg (by Constitution – cities of federal importance) as the document of territorial planning serves master plan. Master plans for Moscow and Saint-Petersburg adopted at 2005 by regional laws.

Urban Development Code does not stipulate the representation of regional planning schemes to public hearings, but obliges to get approvals of federal, regional and municipal bodies concerned. Before adoption of the regional scheme the part of the document must be published: maps with the location of regional objects and list of undertakings. Any party concerned may deliver proposals, objections and to appeal decisions of adopted document in the court. After regional scheme adoption the executive body within three months adopts the plan of its implementation, which includes the time-schedule for following projects, construction works and financial substantiation of the plan. The deviation from adopted planning decisions may be sued. Unperformed implementation plan most likely will be followed but political consequences as the loss of confidence to regional public bodies.

3.1.3 Local level
Municipal authorities are enabled to establish special executive bodies on urban planning and architecture as well as similar subdivisions within representative bodies. Such structures usually exist in municipal districts and cities, meantime smaller settlements have the accomplished structures but seldom. Normative acts issued by specialized department regulate coordination of activities between its subdivisions and interaction of department structures and employee with clients or parties under control. According to the new Code municipal districts covering settlements may work out territorial planning schemes for adoption by respective representative bodies, but till the last time such a schemes are not published. Municipal cities and settlements
must produce master plans and last years municipalities of Kazan, Tolyatty, Atchinsk, Lipezk, Staraya Ladoga and some other cities adopted them. Most settlements still rely on old master plans and one may assume that for many small settlements adoption of such document shall be problematic.

The Urban Development Code does not stipulate public hearings on territorial planning schemes for municipal districts, but schemes must get the approval of Federation and respective region if interests of upper levels are concerned, and in all cases must get the approval of municipalities bordering district and municipal settlements within district. Master plans before adoption must be submitted to public hearings. All decisions of municipal planning documents as well as deviations from adopted decisions may be appealed to court. After municipal planning documents adoption the mayor within three months adopts the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>planning institutions and theirs normative activity</th>
<th>planning process</th>
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plan of its implementation, which includes the time-schedule for following projects, for construction works and financial substantiation. The deviation from adopted planning decisions shall be sued. Unperformed implementation plan most likely will be followed but political consequences.

3.2 Planning process at different levels
The up-to-date process of planning at federal level can not be represented by any example, once such a documents have not been worked up in the form, stipulated by currently valid or even by previous Urban Development Code.

The planning documents performance process at regional and local levels is going on and generally is identical at both levels. After the head of administration takes decision to start works on territorial planning, an appointed customer (usually regional urban planning and architecture committee or department) issues preliminary project statement and delivers proposals to capable planning institutions to participate in imperative bids for respective project works. After the company of general contractor is determined, the project statement may be précised and parties conclude an agreement. The general contractor as a rule engages some other institutions and sometimes individual professionals. If there are adopted strategic documents on socio-economic trends regarding the area considered, programs or planning documents adopted at other levels, they serve as kind of frames for future decisions. Meantime there is quite possible to substantiate proposals to amend framing documents, formerly adopted.

Team of planners examine Initial territorial situation. Relevant data are supplied by different institutions, mostly by executive bodies of all sectors concerned. Analytical work is concentrated on current land use, land value, on established restrictions due to natural or cultural qualities of different areas, on transportation network and other accessible amenities. In most cases the territorial planning project is accompanied by demographic and economic forecasts, for the master plan usually are considered land market trends. Then essential problems, goals and tasks of territorial planning are formulated. There are many reasons to perform at the first stage sort of planning concept. Most important reasons are:

- multifold character of spatial planning problems;
- scope of contradictive interests (those of different social groups, economic sectors, immediate and perspective political goals, different areas etc.), affected by planning decisions;
- impossibility of formal optimization planning solutions (incommensurable criteria as e.g. nature protection, investments activity, political risks).

Current legislation does not mention concept stage, but in fact such a stage is usually allotted and its outcomes are published. The essence of concept represents realistic planning
alternatives, estimated with the use of important criteria and indicators (as private and public investments, territorial balance of land uses, development densities, times needed for house-to-work journeys, accessible green areas and engineering facilities, sanitary indicators and others). Concept is discussed with the participation of public bodies’ concerned, professional associations, non-governmental organizations, leading companies, banks, interested population groups of territory under respect and representatives of neighboring administrative areas. The selection of preferable variant follows to consultations between general project contractor, public customer and superior public authorities of the territory considered.

Both for territorial planning schemes and for master plans there are marked out different deadlines of implementation: immediate term (some 5 years), achievement term (10-15 years) and perspective (15-25 years). The perspective proposals are not subject for adoption, but serve to ensure the possibility of the long-term sustainable development. Usually all works carried out are computerized both for application of mathematical simulation models, necessary calculations and for map-making.

While planning works are going on, more than often emerge investments initiatives part of which are considered as reasons respectable enough to correct planning proposals. One of typical situation is, when companies and bodies, eager to force through some decision insist on its direct inclusion in the territorial planning document, but more than often the establishment of valid boundaries of such investment projects is possible only after adoption of land planning documentation.

As a rule the estimation of planning proposals by customer involves iterative procedure: responsible public body represented by urban planning and development division and engaged to everyday communications with parties concerned gets the interim draft of the document and inserts some alterations. Worked up territorial planning document at any level is subject to approval by competent bodies of other levels in cases the document proposes changes, concerning respective competencies, negative impact or respective ownership rights. In any case document is to be delivered for approval to bodies, governing neighboring territories. The approval procedure organization is carried out by the customer with the participation of general contractor and must follow to detailed stipulations of RF Urban Development Code. In the case of impossibility of parties to come to mutually acceptable solution within established time (three months) the document may be delivered for adoption in its approved parts. After approvals the document must be published and all interested parties or persons may turn to responsible public body with proposals and objections. Master plan besides is to be represented at public hearings. The part, subject for adoption includes two sections:

- text, describing planning goals, tasks and actions;
• maps representing planning proposals.

3.3 Participation
The process of public participation in territorial planning is different for two essential types of documents. Stipulations of Urban Development Code are based on assumption, that attention of the public at large to territorial planning schemes is but limited and there are not sufficient reasons to conduct public hearings. Any territorial planning scheme no less than three months before its adoption must be published and public bodies in charge are to consider public response to it. Interest of public bodies to take account to public reactions is motivated by aspiration to lessen the scope of future court appeals. Master planes too must be published before adoption for public response, but at the same time public hearings are to be performed. The key requirements to the procedure of public hearings are stipulated by Urban Planning and Land Development Code. Hearings must be held at each settlement (if there is more than one within municipal administrative boundaries), must be accessible for all interested parties and supplied by relevant expositions and professional comments. The body authorized to conduct hearings must be appointed by municipal executive authority. All written responses are to be recorded, hearings minutes and recommendations are to be published and delivered to the head of municipal administration. The head of administration may take decision on necessary corrective action before master plan adoption by municipal representative body. The public participation activity on environmental issues at Russia is monitored by Expert centre ECOM under Saint-Petersburg Association of naturalists (http://www.ecom-info.spb.ru/)

Similar procedures for public hearings are established by federal Code regarding municipal land use and development codes (zoning ordinances) and land planning documentation (Territorial planning projects and subdivision projects). Besides public hearings are obligatory before issuance of permissions to apply the conditional uses or parameters inconsistent to the land use and development code (which may be permitted only for irregular lots, loosing their value under requirements established for the zone).

3.4 Plans, maps
3.4.1 At national level
The territorial planning scheme of federal level may be performed as uniform one, or as set of documents regarding specified fields (thematic or sectoral schemes), it may cover all country territory or the part of it. The federal scheme includes planning regulations and respective maps. Regulations on planning include:
• goals and tasks of territorial planning scheme;
• list of undertakings to implement planning scheme and time schedule for implementation.
Maps represent:

- regional and municipal administrative boundaries;
- up-to-date and planned boundaries of different land categories: forest fund, water fund, preserved areas of federal importance, lands for the defense and safety needs;
- territories of cultural monuments;
- specific land use conditions zones;
- territories designated for objects of federal importance, relevant for the scheme: federal energy systems, nuclear stations, defense and safety objects, federal transport, communications (telephone cables, micro-wave radio links etc.), cosmic activity, linear objects of natural monopolies, other objects, necessary to carry out federal functions, established by Constitution and by international obligations of country;
- territories subject to risks due to extraordinary situations of natural or anthropogenic origins.

For the adoption of federal territorial planning scheme must be presented substantiations, including:

- substantiations of planning proposals to be implemented to deadlines: immediate term and achievement term;
- list of undertakings to be implemented;
- list of essential risk caused by emergent situations of natural and anthropogenic origins;

Maps for substantiation include:

- land use maps, boundaries of different land categories;
- maps of restrictions, adopted by regional and municipal territorial planning documents: monuments under cultural preservation requirements, natural areas under protection; specific land use conditions zones; areas of emergent situations and risks; areas of federal objects with negative impacts on environment;
- maps representing territorial analysis results, including results of engineering survey.

Maps representing planning proposals are used to insert corrections during an approval process.

### 3.4.2 At regional level

The regional territorial planning scheme may be performed as uniform one, or as set of documents regarding specified fields, it may cover all regional territory or the part of it. The regional scheme includes planning regulations and respective maps. Planning regulations include:

- goals and tasks of territorial planning scheme;
- list of undertakings to implement planning scheme and time schedule.

Maps represent:

- municipal administrative boundaries within region: municipal districts, cities, settlements;
• up-to-date and planned boundaries of different land categories: forest fund, natural areas under special protection of regional responsibility, lands for the defense and safety needs;
• agricultural lands;
• territories of cultural monuments;
• specific land use conditions zones;
• areas with the high level of risk caused by emergent situations of natural and anthropogenic character;
• territories designated for objects of regional importance, relevant for the scheme and areas of negative impact caused by regional objects.

For the adoption of regional territorial planning scheme must be substantiations, including:
• substantiations of planning proposals to be implemented to deadlines: immediate term and achievement term;
• list of undertakings to be implemented;
• list of essential risk caused by emergent situations of natural and anthropogenic character;

Maps for substantiation include:
• land use maps, boundaries of different land categories;
• maps of restrictions, adopted by federal and municipal territorial planning documents: territories of cultural monuments; specific land use conditions zones; areas of emergent situations and risks; areas of negative impacts on environment, caused by the planned location of federal, regional or municipal levels;
• maps representing territorial analysis results, including results of engineering survey.

Maps representing planning proposals are used to insert corrections at the approval process.

### 3.4.3. At local level

At the sub-regional level may be issued territorial planning schemes for municipal districts and master plans for cities and settlements. According to Urban Development Code the composition of municipal territorial planning scheme is similar to composition of regional scheme (see subsection 3.4.2.). The composition of master plans for cities (urban okrugs) and other municipal settlements do not differ. The master plan in the part to be adopted includes planning regulations and respective maps. Planning regulations include:
• goals and tasks of master plan;
• list of undertakings to implement master plan and responding time schedule.

Maps represent:
• city or settlement administrative boundaries, up-to-date and planned boundaries of settlements within municipal administrative territory;
• boundaries of agricultural lands, lands for the defense and safety needs, space explorations, forest and water funds, natural areas under special protection of federal and regional responsibility;
• up-to-date and planned boundaries of land for industry, energetic, transport, communication (telephone cables, micro-wave radio links etc.);
• boundaries of up-to-date and planned functional zones;
• territories of cultural monuments;
• specific land use conditions zones;
• territories designated for objects of federal, regional or municipal importance (under municipal responsibility are public infrastructures save federal and regional ones, municipal housing and public areas);
• areas with the high level of risk caused by emergent situations of natural and anthropogenic character;
• essential objects of engineering and transport infrastructures.

For the adoption of master plan must be represented substantiations, including:
• territorial analysis: trends, problems of its comprehensive development;
• substantiations of planning proposals to be implemented before deadlines: immediate term and implementation term;
• list of essential risk caused by emergent situations of natural and anthropogenic character.

Maps for substantiation include:
• land use maps, boundaries of different land categories;
• maps of restrictions, adopted by federal, regional and municipal district planning documents: territories of cultural landmarks; specific land use conditions zones; areas of emergent situations and risks; areas of municipal objects with negative impacts on environment;
• maps representing territorial analysis results, including results of engineering survey.

Maps representing planning proposals are used to insert corrections at the approval process.

3.4.4 Intermediate levels
The Urban Development Code permits the joint performance of territorial planning documents by executive bodies, representing different public levels or the same level. To initiate joint document are enabled both state bodies and municipalities. The proposal must represent content of document to be performed, financial sources and deadlines for planning works. The response on joint initiative must be delivered within a month. The negative response is forbidden regarding joint document on establishment of cultural monuments preservation zones for objects which are under federal or regional responsibility. After due agreement there is to be
established joint commission responsible for document performance. Conflicts may be appealed to court.

3.5 Sectoral planning

In now valid RF Urban Development Code are not established specific stipulations for sectoral schemes (as e.g. nature protection or transport network development schemes), and is not forbidden to insert to federal or regional territorial planning schemes amendments based on projections considering specific thematic field. Master plans must cover all the scope of relevant fields and later on may be amended through performance of thematic proposals of any kind. At present time it is difficult to foresee will thematic schemes be legally established as documents, different from schemes, established by Urban Development Code, or will they not. Till the last time the performance of thematic schemes was rather prevalent: Scheme of railroad transport development in Russia, Scheme of railroad and water transport in North-West macro-region, Energetic strategy of Russia, general schemes of transport development for Moscow and Saint-Petersburg, Housing location scheme for Saint-Petersburg and many others. By current Code all such schemes are to be incorporated into unified territorial planning documents. Meantime Code stipulates, that in the territorial planning documents must be represented zones under cultural monuments preservation requirements. According to Law on Cultural Heritage of Russia (2002), such zones and regimes (requirements) are to be established by the preservation zones project, which may be carried out simultaneously with the corresponding planning document. There are established three types of preservation zones:

- historic townscape preservation zone, to be located outright close to cultural monuments for preservation and restoration of historic townscape;
- historic townscape control zone aimed to preserve general characteristics of urban space;
- landscape preservation zone, designated to make available proper visual perception of cultural landmarks and to preserve historic landscape.

To stand as customers of preservation projects are enabled both public bodies and private parties, including cultural monuments' owners. The project statement for objects under federal responsibility is issued by RF Ministry of culture, for regional or municipal objects statement is issued by the regional body responsible for preservation of cultural heritage. According to the statement and relevant historic data on the cultural heritage and surrounding area there are performed works as follows:

- bibliographical, archeological, iconographic, architectural and other relevant research;
- graphical analysis of visual perception of monuments from different points of views (both existing and lost);
- photos of the landmarks and their surrounding made from nature and from accessible sources at archives (panoramas, prospects);
• substantiation of project proposals considering historic, planning, architectural, and landscape criteria;
• historic-cultural reference plan: area development history since landmarks appearance, essential development parameters, land uses, archeological data, objects proposed for recording as newly established landmarks, other existing landscape forming objects to be considered;
• the essential plan of all proposed preservation zones, current land uses and land property boundaries;
• explanatory notes: substantiation to proposals on boundaries of preservation zones and regimes (requirements) for different types of zones.

For the project adoption must be delivered:
• historic-cultural reference plan;
• the essential plan of all proposed preservation zones;
• explanatory notes.

After approval of bodies, responsible for respective landmarks preservation the project is to be delivered to RF Ministry of culture. Ministry represent project to RF Government for its adoption. Document adopted for the city or settlement must be incorporated in the land use and development code (zoning ordinance) to represent restrictions, established due to specific (historic heritage preservation) conditions.

4. Interdependencies

4.1. Hierarchy of planning levels
Traditionally in professional mentality of Russian planners the accurate stream for planning decisions issuance was directed “top-down”. But practically even in soviet times this succession was not of necessity for planning: the top directive “to build immediately” could disregard adopted planning document. Nowadays most planning decisions are adopted at municipal level (master plans), issuances of regional and moreover federal planning documents are tardy and therefore (by RF Code) state level documents must consider municipal planning decisions as obligatory or to issue in state documents proposals for municipal approvals. Law does not stipulate preferences for higher levels, but higher levels often may achieve necessary support through investments to territorial development, which accompany their urban development initiatives.

4.2. Harmonisation of different planning areas within the same level
The Urban Development Code stipulates two possibilities to harmonise interests of areas within the same level. First of all any territorial planning document must be approved by executive bodies, which represent neighbouring administrative units. The approval procedure and the subject for approval (negative impact) are outlined by Code. In the case the response to the
request for approval is not delivered within established time (3 months), the planning proposals are considered as approved. Planning document may be adopted only in parts, approved in a due way. The more complete way of harmonisation of interests is the performance and adoption of joint territorial planning schemes.

4.3. Harmonisation between multi-sectoral and sectoral planning

For harmonisation between multi-sectoral and sectoral (thematic) plans Urban Development Code provides, that all sectoral demands and requirements to territorial development are to be considered if they are adopted by unified territorial planning (multi-sectoral) documents as schemes and master plans. The sectoral requirements, based on federal legislation are obligatory within specific land use conditions zones (as nature protection zones, cultural monument protection zones, sanitary and water protection buffers), are applied for the adoption of any planning document and represented at zoning ordinance.

4.4. Harmonisation between different sectoral plans

All sectoral requirements, adopted according to federal legislation, are obligatory. Once these requirements are usually formulated in negative mode (“no less…”, “no closer…”, “not for housing…” etc.) the direct contradictions are but rare. Contradictions may happen e.g. in case when sanitary negative requirement oppose to positive demand to use the cultural landmark for inherent to it public or residential purposes. Resolution of such conflicts is not regulated by law, but may be settled by the lessening of negative impact or by changing of direct requirements. Decisions on development of infrastructures are to be coordinated in the course of performance of united territorial planning scheme or master plan.

4.5. Consideration of planning approaches in neighbouring countries and on the European level in the different planning levels

The decade 1990-2000 was marked by intensive participation of foreign professionals in the forming of legal base of urban development in Russia. Most of consultants were represented USA institutions and applied their efforts not so much to planning issues, which were not considered as prior in Russia for that time, but to implementation of zoning ordinances, impact fees and considerations, regarding land market factor. Foreign consultants worked at that time in many cities, though for sure mostly at Moscow and Saint-Petersburg. General principles of US zoning pattern were adopted in dozens of cities and nowadays these principles are accepted by the RF Urban Development Code. In the same decade sort of European experience was represented by AEECAU (Association Européenne d’etudes et la coopération en aménagement et urbanisme), whose members carried out many seminars in Saint-Petersburg, in some European cities (with the participation of Russian colleagues) and extended great many examples of relevant books and papers on French and German planning.
and land development experience. For some professionals, working at Saint-Petersburg and Leningrad oblast, European experience was accessible at seminars and some joint works last years carried out under the aegis of Committee on Spatial Development in BSR (CSD-BSR). Apparently, the general positive specificity of European urban planning and development experience is concentrated in course, as follows:

- the distinctness of rights and obligations of different public levels and bodies, engaged in spatial development issues, formed according to the subsidiary principle: i.e. upper levels are empowered only by competencies, which can not be successfully carried on by lower levels (at Russia expectancies of upper levels may be forced on the account of significant financial dependence of most regions and municipalities from higher level’s assistance);
- tendency to encourage development of polycentric settlement systems (at Russian regions there are noteworthy contrasts between one or two urban centers and other unfortunate settlements, but ideology of polycentrism is not yet popular enough);
- much more successive actions aimed to the protection of natural complexes and favorable townscapes;
- active public participation in urban development issues;
- distinctness of land use requirements as well as municipal obligations on community facilities.

The specific US experience in relation to European one is rather distinguished by prevalent concern to unification of owners’ rights at the expense of the quality of visual environment, important for society.

No doubts, that the implementation of European experience depends not only from professional skills of planners in charge, but no less from the legislative base, from its interpretations by executive stuff and lawyers, from the civil activity of public at large, not to mention economic situation. Almost for 20 years urban space transformations were typically concentrated on the development of lots, than on the large-scale planning issues. Now, due to almost 20-years long decline in the sphere of territorial planning, professionals in the field are mostly represented by persons close to pension-age. For sure, European experience for young planners would be of importance.

5. Planning practice

5.1. Saint-Petersburg Master plan
For city now known as Saint-Petersburg until 2004 the Master Plan of Leningrad and its oblast adopted in 1987, was considered as valid one. City authorities, taking into account political and socio-economic shifts triggered by perestroika, as early as in the beginning of 1990-s initiated contest on master plan revision concepts. There were represented four alternative proposals,
but following exhibition and discussions served as support to dominant opinion, that the moment for the adoption of such a document has not yet came. Few years later some features of legislative and political stability, growth of GRP and private investments to construction as well as intensification of problems regarding deterioration of stock and all facilities once again focused attention of city authorities upon urban planning tasks. To 2001 Committee on Urban Planning and Architecture, assigned by City Governor as master plan customer, issued planning assignment and arranged contest. Company HIPIgrad of Saint-Petersburg Ltd has come out on top of competition as general contractor.

As the sort of frame for New Master Plan was considered the Strategic Plan of Saint-Petersburg, approved by the City community in 1997. Strategic Plan, worked up by Leontief Centre with the participation of many professional institutions, businessmen, executive structures, defined essential issues, competitive capabilities, strategic course of City development, regarding both city economy and urban environment quality. Meantime Strategic Plan but partly filled up the gap, caused after disappearance of long-term socio-economic planning. Strategic Plan defined key directions, but has not represented quantitative indicators, necessary to substantiate spatial transformations for certain time interval. By request of general contractor there were performed demographic forecast (by Saint-Petersburg State University), socio-economic prerequisites (by Leontief Centre) and appraisal of land value ("Perspective" Ltd). Different executive structures and private companies conveyed data on housing stock, public service, engineering and transport facilities, environmental quality. Besides by the order of Committee on state control, usage and preservation of cultural monuments there were inserted corrections to preservation zones project. These corrections attended two tasks: to adjust preservation zones project to last federal law in the field and to clarify most part of restrictions (to put them down “on the table” for interested parties in advance). Substantial for the framing of the territorial development strategy was the consideration of City’s competitive abilities, outlined in Strategic plan and later specified at socio-economic prerequisites, issued by Leontief Centre. As most important factors of economic development were considered:

- transport-distributive and trade-mediatorial activity, based on the City unique location at the junction to Europe;
- quaternary activity: there are in the City multitude of scientific and educational institutions of federal importance;
- commercial service, including designated for tourists.

Besides stable budget income is provided by some manufacturing enterprises (as shipbuilding and energy machinery construction), still growing on.

There are problems which can not be tackled within current city administrative boundaries: like e.g. location of suburban public recreations and summer houses, location of some
manufactures, external transport development, preservation and regeneration of natural resources. To provide possible solutions planning assignment obliged to perform at Master plan proposals for coordination of planning decisions of Saint-Petersburg and surrounding Leningrad oblast within area, where interests of both regions are to be considered (60 km from the city centre) with the aim to develop suburban area of mutual interests according to concerned regions’ agreements.

Carried out analysis of socio-economic prerequisites, current development trends and territorial resources let to put forward key tasks:

- preparation of acceptable proposals regarding the volume, order and types of improvements regarding existing transport, engineering infrastructures and stock;
- planned enhancement of functional zoning, considering land rent income (e.g. now old industrial belt adjacent to City center hinders the effective usage of this area, attractive for residential development– see fig.1, 2 and 3);
- to prevent the concretion of central megalopolis territory with suburban small cities and settlements (such a concretion has started at the expense of agricultural and green areas under the pressure of short-run financial interests of St. Petersburg, Leningrad oblast and some private companies);
- cutting down the crude sewerage tapping into water area and decrease of negative impact caused by industrial enterprises and transport;
- withdrawal of transit freight traffic out of the most populated areas;
- the preservation and improvement of the city image: preservation historic centre structure, silhouettes of most popular embankments and steady melioration of expressionless buildings and blocks;
- localization of areas for special usage (as storing of waste products and treatment, ordnance yards etc.).

The selection of essential parameters of the city urban development was established at the Master plan concept stage on account of performance and assessment of five variants.
FIG. 1. NET POPULATION DENSITY AT SAINT-PETERSBURG AND PARIS
All variants were based on unified socio-economic hypothesis, rather "optimistic" one: stable resident population to 2015 (4.7 m.), GRP growth 2.5 - 3 times, multifunctional city profile. According to urban space transformations, variants represented different development efforts within built up and newly designated areas (renovation contra new development) as well as different rate of individual dwelling units (one-family houses). Assessment of variants was essentially based on the comparison of expenditures and rental incomes. To input the land market value were used data on real transactions, as well as opinions of professional appraisers. There were estimated the demand for the different uses and "best use" factor. Travel times for jobs and recreations were considered with the application of transportation models. Assessment, carried out by experts, gave grounds to prefer compromise proposal.

Fig. 2. Land market price at Saint-Petersburg

Fig. 3. Land market price at Nevsky avenue area
which settled some equal efforts for renovation and new development, about 30% of the floor area at vacant areas fall at one-family houses.

One has to note, that in spite the participation of Green-movement activists, the alternative regarding the amount of one-family suburban housing (at the expense of agricultural areas or natural landscapes) has left without definite assessment due to quite contradictive outcomes of residential suburbanization (see table with the comparison of variants).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>ACTIVE GROWTH OF SUBURBAN INDIVIDUAL HOUSING</th>
<th>LIMITED SUBURBAN INDIVIDUAL HOUSING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The preservation of suburban green areas for public uses</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The intensity of trips by individual cars</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of residential environment</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power inputs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction cost</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forming of active attitudes on ecological issues</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ variant gains;  - variant loses

One may assume, that in the long run the last criterion is of prevalent importance. Meantime by common opinion the gradual transformation of summer residences, located within one hour distance from city center, to year-round family houses would be positive change. To encourage such transformation Conception anticipated the development of necessary amenities.

The Master plan concept was examined by Saint-Petersburg branch of Architects association of Russia, Association of construction companies of Saint-Petersburg and by other influential stakeholders at the fields concerned. Concept was approved by Public council at City Governor. At all 20 administrative districts were settled exhibitions, provided by comments of responsible executives, by representatives of general contractor and by other professionals. Public participation resulted in the multitude of requests of citizens and associations to public bodies. Most part of responses was related to issues not to be considered by Concept, once referred to specific buildings, sites, social housing allocation and to the work of maintenance companies. Other part of responses was relevant to Concept and mirrored unavoidable conflicts of interests represented by groups with different values and preferences (as adherents of individual or public transport, protection or intensive renovation of cultural monuments, intensive suburban housing or conservation of public recreation areas). The expediency to consider public preferences dependent from the established goals, tasks, resources and the process of
consideration was not at any way formal. As result of discussions some proposals of preferable variant were amended at final Master plan stage. Most important adjustments were:

- enlarged green areas for public use;
- more transit transport lines were relocated from residential zones;
- within public-business zones distinguished specific public and commercial zones for medical and educational uses.

Some public proposals, though based on the quite respectable motives, could not be properly considered, once represented interests of minority. E.g. many residents of blocks at Vasilievsky island, facing Finnish gulf, remonstrate against new landfills at the shoal (about 4.0 sq. km) for the construction of the new passenger port, housing, business and entertainment complexes as well as objected to construction of speed highway, which planned trace joints north-west and south-west sectors of the city and crosses new-made territory. Meantime according to performed computations new speedway will be daily used by 125 thousands cars and lorries now crossing dense central City areas and causing negative impact on human health and on historic buildings. Any other west-side tracing than proposed, would result in much more negative outcomes. The construction of the new passenger port gives possibility to moor large-tonnage ships, to encourage tourist tours. At 2004 the Concept was approved by City Government and later approved by the City representative body.

All Master plan materials include 17 volumes. Within composite volume of Master plan, worked out according to new RF Urban Development Code there are presented sections as follows:

- Initial positions for Master plan performance:
  - goals and tasks of Master plan performance;
  - methodology of performance;
  - analysis of the previous master plan (1987) implementation process;

- Socio-economic premises for City urban development:
  - external interconnection of Saint-Petersburg;
  - demographic situation;
  - economic situation;
  - state of the housing stock;
  - state of public service.

- Premises for City urban development:
  - analysis of territories: potential, restrictions, problems;
  - natural complex;
  - environmental conditions;
  - cultural heritage;
  - engineering and transportation infrastructures;
- Master plan proposals:
  • goals and tasks of spatial development;
  • planning structure development;
  • functional zoning, strategy of land use transformations;
  • transport and engineering infrastructures development;
  • cultural heritage preservation;
  • arrangements regarding nature protection and environmental issues;
  • scope of immediate actions (to 2010).

- Actions for Master plan implementation:
  • cultural heritage preservation actions;
  • installation of land improvements;
  • sanitation of territories;
  • implementation of federal needs;
  • actions to prevent extraordinary situations of natural and anthropogenic origins;
  • actions regarding legislative and normative base.

- The essential maps of Master plan included:
  • survey plan (or reference plan) of the city and surrounding area;
  • scheme of the current and proposed land usage of suburban area (part of Leningrad oblast);
  • historic survey or historic reference plan;
  • the essential Master plan map for 2015 and territories reserved for 2025;
  • scheme of immediate actions to 2010;
  • scheme of hosing development and renovation;
  • scheme of international transportation corridors at Saint-Petersburg;
  • schemes of the external transportation development for 2015;
  • schemes of the engineering infrastructure development for 2015;
  • scheme of the land improvements and landscaping;
  • scheme of the sanitary purification;
  • scheme of entrails of the earth and nature protection;
  • scheme of protections against extraordinary situations of natural and anthropogenic origins.

Master plan anticipates:
  • growth of residential areas at the expense of agricultural and vacant lands (fig. 4 and 5)
• significant transformation of functional zoning, including growth of public, business and residential uses in central areas on account of industrial uses reduction;
St. Petersburg master plan. Functional (land use) zoning by 2003

- Agricultural zone: 20%
- Zone for recreation: 27%
- Special uses zone: 1%
- Zone for defense installations: 2%
- Zone for engineering and transportation infrastructure: 7%
- Industrial/manufacturing zone: 8%
- Public and commercial/business zone: 4%
- Residential zone for apartment housing: 10%
- Residential zone for individual housing: 5%
- Motor roads under regional responsibility: 4%
- Gardening plots: 2%
- Inner waters: 4%
- Vacant land: 6%
St. Petersburg master plan. Functional (land use) zoning by 2015

- Gardening plots: 1%
- Motor roads under regional responsibility: 4%
- Inner waters: 4%
- Vacant land: 1%
- Agricultural zone: 15%
- Zone for recreation: 28%
- Residential zone for individual housing: 9%
- Residential zone for apartment housing: 14%
- Public and commercial/business zone: 5%
- Industrial/manufacturing zone: 8%
- Zone for defense installations: 2%
- Zone for engineering and transportation infrastructure: 8%
- Special uses zone: 1%
FIG. 6. THE ESSENTIAL MASTER PLAN MAP FOR 2015 AND TERRITORIES RESERVED FOR 2025.
• renovation of mass industrial housing of 1960-es, elimination of dilapidated housing;
• significant transformation of the cargo transport complex (shift from the simple transportation and reloading to developed logistic services);
• perspective construction of international transportation corridor #9;
• twofold growth of the Saint-Petersburg sea port turnover of goods to 2015;
• transformation of the city railway dead-end junction to trough one and relocation of freight operations out of central areas;
• construction of two new bridges over Neva;
• creation of speed highway system roundabout of central and densely populated areas;
• development of the inter-city speed public transport lines, including new 41.5 km of metropolitan lines to 2015;
• construction of new treatment plants;
• complete sewage sediments utilization;
• complete hard waste treatment;
• protection of low-lying areas against flood;
• provision of gas fuel for all boiler-houses;
• cessation of raw sewage disposal to Neva, its confluents and Finnish gulf;
• enlargement of green areas.

Master plan materials were published, approved by City districts administrations, federal and regional executive bodies of sectors concerned. Then materials were represented at public hearings at all 20 City administrative districts. The most active remonstrance at this stage was triggered by landfills and speedway westward to Vasilievsky island, but the proposal remained in force. After getting the conclusion of the State expertise and some revisions to City Government was delivered:

• Master plan materials;
• The draft of the Law on master plan and monuments preservation zones project at Saint-Petersburg.

To the end of 2005 Master plan was approved by City Government and delivered to the City Representative Assembly. Master plan was adopted by regional law 21.12.2005.

The Master plan is not approved by Leningrad oblast. The Urban Development Code stipulates necessary approval of municipal master plans by bordering municipalities, but does not provide similar direct obligations for master plans of Moscow and Saint-Petersburg, as cities of federal importance. Most likely some issues, as going on development of the ring motorway and its adjacent areas (motorway crosses both administrative areas) as well as City intentions to use some suburban sites for circuitous railroad soon necessitate to insert into Master plan amendments, approved by neighboring region. http://www.stockmap.spb.ru/news/126964323/
No doubts the implementation of the Saint-Petersburg Master plan will encounter serious difficulties, caused rather not by qualities of adopted plan, but by situation turned out for decades. Its main features are as follows:

- along with new construction there shall be carried out the modernization of the stock at a pace close to the pace of construction typical since the end of 1950s (some 1,5 million sq. m per year);
- once in most houses some apartments are owned by the city (not privatized) and for most buildings the associations of owners are not established, the issues on settling (in a new place) and financing of modernization are complicated;
- the effective technologies for modernization of housing, built last 50 years (some 70% represented by prefabricated buildings) are not known; the examples of total demolition of such buildings by blocks and new construction are but in Moscow, where land prices are about 1,5 – 2,0 times higher than in Saint-Petersburg;
- facilities are wearing out with a speed exceeding going on modernization works;
- stability of the city population may be provided only on account of immigration, which currently include some exotic (for local population) ethnic groups: Uzbeks, Chinas, Abkhazians etc.

In current situation (which is typical for most Russian cities) one may expect the appearance of large rundown areas, concentrating low-income families, counting as well ethnic minorities. Such a City image may have negative effect on investment activity. Last federal laws are aimed to encourage development of owners’ associations and hypothes, but for successive physical modernization public bodies must undertake some extra steps to trigger resettlement of inhabitants from blocks to be redeveloped, as well as financial participation of families, eager to improve their living conditions. And modernization adequate to challenge of physical and moral depreciation is realistic but in the case of sustainable economic development.
5.2. Kaliningrad Master Plan

5.2.1 Kaliningrad as the object of territorial planning

Restoration and development plans of Kaliningrad, performed soon after World War II, conserved previous street network and existed facilities. Projects, performed later, were directed to radical modification of historic environment, enlargement of the planning network, creation of hypertrophied urban complexes. After disintegration of USSR Kaliningrad society found itself in a specific geopolitical position. Separation from essential Russian territory caused painful outcomes for regional economy and consequently for existence. Meantime new situation has its positive aspects. Now city population may apply efforts to tasks of mutually beneficial coexistence with European countries and to creation of dynamic Russian city adopting historic and cultural traditions.

Preceding Kaliningrad Master Plan was performed and adopted in 1993. Radical shift of socio-economic and political structure of Russia in 1990s triggered considerable transformation of urban development policy and required the elaboration of new Master Plan. New Master Plan was performed in 1999-2002 by Research-and-project Institute of spatial planning “ENCO” (St-Petersburg) on demand of the Kaliningrad city Committee of Architecture and Urban Development. Simultaneously the joined team of professionals from Kaliningrad, “ENCO” and Institute of Archeology (Russian Academy of Sciences) worked out the Project of monuments preservation zones for Kaliningrad. Master Plan was performed for three time horizons:

- immediate measures – 5-7 years;
- Master Plan implementation horizon – 2015;
- Perspective considered – 20-25 years.
5.2.2 Goal and tasks of new Master Plan

The essential goal of new Master Plan is to achieve the sustainable development of urban system at the expense of preservation and augmenting of all resources for future generations. As key tasks are accepted:

- Working out measures to improve urban environment by means of renewal and townscape works for all types of areas.
- Designation of suitable sites for the development of housing, manufacture, business, trade, research works, management, tourism, recreation and other land uses.
- Measures directed for preservation of cultural heritage.
- Measures on the greenery planting, landscaping, development of engineering and transport services.
- Measures to improve ecological situation.

5.2.3 State of territories

As the result of integrated analysis of city territory were specified problem situations as follows:

- Almost at all city territory (97%) the geological basement has but low load stability.
- City territory is subject to influence of natural and man-made processes: bottom water sets, swamping etc.
- Situation with the air pollution, caused by intensive traffic, industry, numerous of small boiler-houses is bad.
- Great part of housing and social infrastructure premises is located at ecologically inauspicious areas.
- Waters of Pregol river, Kaliningrad bay, many small rivers and ponds are ecologically unsatisfactory and not suitable for recreational use.
- Provision by green public areas is almost thrice less than required by valid normative.
- Drinking waters purification does not satisfy to standards, deterioration of water-supply system is significant.
- Development of some sewerage systems is not accomplished; existing systems are under required capacity level and worn out.
- City-wide storm water sewer system is absent.

The portion of ecologically problematic city areas is about 25%. Most crucial problems are concentrated at the city core, where resides great part of the city population.

5.2.4 Socio-economic prerequisites

For the Master Plan performance were considered: the Conception of Kaliningrad socio-economic development, based on Federal Program “Development of Kaliningrad Region by 2010”; some regional and city municipal programs; geopolitical city situation as well as
international experience of exclave areas development. The federal policy considering Kaliningrad region is oriented to development of multi-sectoral economy and communications with other regions of Russia, to use the advantage of exclave location at European economic space. In Federal Program there is anticipated the principle of actions focusing on prior directions, aimed to indemnify the regional isolation from Russian territory at large and to encourage export production, business and cultural ties. According to above mentioned documents, Kaliningrad shall carry out socio-economic functions as follows:

- International transport nodal point with the developed logistic complex.
- Industrial and research innovation center oriented on export. At the business sector must be developed: competitive and science intensive production, power complex, food industry, modern construction industry.
- Kaliningrad must be considered as promising international financial and educational center.
- The great cultural city potential must be used as catalyst for business and cultural activity.

The orientation on the multi-sectoral economic development requires territories, suitable for respective activities.

5.2.5 Demographic prerequisites

By 2004 population of Kaliningrad was 0.416 million (some 45% of Kaliningrad region population). The city population steadily increased almost for 20 years and only after 1990 started its decline, essentially due to decreasing immigration. At present time in Kaliningrad there is problematic situation: the birth rate since the end of 1980s fell down almost twice: to 7.0 per thousand citizens (average rate in Russia is 8.9). According to the experience of countries with developed economies for the enhancement of demographic trends there are needed integrated actions of federal, regional and local tiers to improve general economic situation, regional ecology, and medical service. Respective programs must support indigents, supply social housing and municipal services, encourage salubrious mode of life. In the case of successful actions the immigration to Kaliningrad region and its central city may rise. There was decided to base Master Plan on the “optimistic” variant: small population increase by 2015. Territorial resources within administrative boundaries are sufficient to locate some 0.48 million provided on average by 30.0 sq meter of the living space per capita.

5.2.6 Kaliningrad territorial system

In the Master Plan the spatial development of Kaliningrad is considered as integral part of surrounding settlements system. At the regional aspect the Master Plan anticipates:

- Prior development of the transport complex, as one of the key prerequisite to encourage investment in the region.
• Improvement of ecological situation in the region at large.
• Guarantee for the sustainable operation of regional power complex.
• Development of modern communications.
• Development of tourism and recreation facilities.
• Development of new work-places.
• Development of research and innovation activity.
• Improvement of investment opportunities at region.
• Possibilities for ecologically clean agricultural production.

Within regional territory there are three pronounced settlements systems, gravitated accordingly to Kaliningrad, Chernyakhovsk and Sovietsk. Kaliningrad, being the administrative center of region, is at the same time the node for the western group of administrative districts. All elements of the settlements system are joined by transport, cargo, labor, recreational and informational communications. At the Master Plan there are proposals regarding functional specialization of different areas within settlements system and infrastructures development. The planned ring road surrounding Kaliningrad will tie together radial roads, airport, and port complexes. Proposals concern the forming of the regional ecological frame, including natural areas under special protection, Kaliningrad greenbelt, system of coastal areas.

5.2.7 City planning structure development

The city planning structure (essential streets, squares, green- and water areas) is considered as significant historic, cultural and urban resource, which conserves features inherent to this city. For the forming of the city plan there were considered influential historic and geographic factors as follows:

• City location, suitable for commercial and cultural communications by the sea.
• Essential radial roads, leading to cities of Europe, Baltic countries and Russia.
• Dominating central position of the King Castle and historic defensive installations, which formed distinctive circular city plan structure.
• Typical for historic times features of engineering objects, aimed to prevent city from natural disasters, as channels, dams, bridges etc.

Master Plan provides the succession of historic features of urban environment, the development of existing planning structure based on radial and ring roads, reconstruction of historic green areas system, restoration and active use of cultural landmarks. The essence of proposed planning structure is formed by natural frame and urban framework, mutually interconnected. Natural frame is represented by the system of green areas: parks, squares, and boulevards, natural areas under special protection, forests, recreation areas, open spaces and waters. Urban framework is formed by:

• Medieval city core.
Multifunctional central zone.
Multifunctional service centers in all city districts and at essential entries to the city.
System of key transport lines.
Essential planning axes.

Principles for planning structure development include positions as follows:

- Development within existing boundaries at the expense of effective land use.
- Improvements and townscape accomplishment in all functional zones.
- Regeneration of historic areas, restoration of cultural landmarks, forming of the city specific silhouette, preservation of "garden-cities", new development with the consideration of architectural and townscape traditions.
- New residential development at ecologically safe areas, possibility of different housing types for different social groups.
- District public centers with pedestrian malls, parking, entertainment and sport facilities.
- Development of linear service areas along essential transportation lines.
- Renewal of the street-road network, construction of new bridges, road junctions and arterial lines, multistory and underground parking facilities, creation of bicycle lanes, development of embankments and mooring lines.
- More effective use of industrial zones.
- Implementation of measures aimed to lessen negative impact caused by industrial objects: resource saving; combination of centralized and local facility systems.

5.2.8 Development of functional zones

Zoning performed for the Master Plan is based on the outcomes of comprehensive territorial analysis, considers the city historic urban features, current land uses, characteristics of cultural landmarks and State Land Cadastre data. There were considered stipulations of the Land Code and Urban Development Code, valid standards requirements. Functional zones are represented at the Master Plan essential map:

- Residential zones with different permitted density and buildings height.
- Public and business zones of different kind: medical and social service objects; education establishments; sport facilities; offices, retail and commercial service etc.
- Multifunctional zones: public and business zone at city core; business-residential zone; zone for manufacture and trade.
- Zones for industrial and municipal enterprises.
- Recreational zones: city parks, squares, gardens, boulevards; forest parks, forests.
- Natural areas under special protection.
- Zones for engineering and transportation infrastructures.
- Agricultural zones.
• Special zones (cemeteries, some green areas).
• Zones for perspective urban development.

Specific land use requirements zones include: sanitary protection zones, essential engineering linear objects, aerodrome zone, cultural landmarks preservation zones, water-protective zones, mineral deposits, flood areas.

Functional zoning was performed under some principles:
• Location of housing and objects of social infrastructure within ecologically safe areas.
• Conservation of land uses in cases they do not contradict to valid standards and land use efficiency.
• Increase of multifunctional areas.
• Increase of recreational areas.
• Establishment of public-business zones instead of industrial ones at city central nodes.

5.2.9 Cultural landmarks preservation

Project proposals on Konigsberg-Kaliningrad historic heritage preservation are based on Master Plan section “Historic-cultural analysis of urban environment”. Proposals anticipate preservation both cultural and natural values, peculiar for the city as well as active utilization of landmarks for current purposes. In 1990s started the shift of public perception towards preservation of city general historic heritage. As a symbolic event of Kaliningrad authentication with medieval European city there was perceived the beginning of restoration of the cathedral located on Kant island (former Kneiphof city). There are going on restoration works upon some other landmarks and list of landmarks recorded is expanding. Save certain physical objects of preservation (buildings, constructions) there are established areas of urban environment to be preserved. As a legal base are considered federal, regional laws, municipal white-papers and stipulations of international documents on the historic heritage preservation.

5.2.10 Master Plan implementation measures

Master Plan is supplied by the list of actions to be implemented for comprehensive city development. Essential actions are as follows:
• Relocation of industrial enterprises from historic, recreational and natural areas to be preserved.
• Expansion of natural areas under special protection up to 10-15% from city territory.
• Creation of large sportive and landscape parks in all city districts and in suburbs, restoration of “Greenbelt” designed by architect E. Schneider.
• Green plantations in recreations, forest-protection areas, water-protection zones, coastal areas.
• Inclusion of the city into tourist tours crossing Baltic region: “Hanseatic cities”, “Amber Road”, “King’s Road” and others.
• Modernization of transport infrastructure.
• Renovation and development of highways, forming part of European transport corridors.
• Creation of improved shipping routes from Kaliningrad region to other regions of Russia: development of sea speed line “Kaliningrad – ports of Leningrad oblast”, deep-see terminal in Baltisk, container terminal in trade port of Kaliningrad.
• Renewal of airport Khrabrovo for getting international status.
• Regeneration of railroads and Southern railway station.
• Regeneration of existing bridges and creation of new ones across Pregol river and Sea channel.
• Development of two speed lines of the Kaliningrad city importance: “North-south” and “East-west”.
• Development of speed lines for cargo transport in parallel with railroads.
• Construction of parking complexes at the edges of the city core, by rail terminals and stations, to stimulate interchanges to public transport.
• Development of tramway lines in northern and southern new residential areas, development of trolleybus lines in the eastern city sector.
• Reservation of land for the construction of 10 multistory garages for the storage of cars at the winter-time.
• Creation of pedestrian zones and bicycle lines.
• Complex renewal and development of engineering networks and terminal objects.
• Application of resource-saving technologies according to ecological policy of BSR countries.
• Recession of level of subsoil waters at the area exceeding 3,610 hectares, restoration of the drainage network.

Master Plan of Kaliningrad has been introduced at public hearings, approved by regional and city municipal organizations, by State expertise. There is expected its adoption by the City Municipal Assembly.

6. Informal planning

6.1. Concept of socio-economic development strategy of RF regions
(Represented by the Ministry of Regional Development to RF Government in 2006)

6.1.1 Problems of socio-economic development of RF regions

Current socio-economic situation in Russia caused most grave consequences for settlements, which were developed for accomplishment of previous geopolitical tasks (military-industrial centers, closed administrative areas, one-function settlements, utterly dependent from the technology of their enterprises etc). By experts judgments the annual RF losses, produced by inefficient spatial arrangement constitute some 2,25-3,0% from GDP. Engineering and social
infrastructures often were developed in areas, where at this time they are not needed (e.g. 11-12% of electrogenerating power is not used for years, meantime in areas, which utterly need electric power there is a shortage of respective objects).

More than often infrastructures are outdated to the limit and their maintenance takes too much resources. E.g. experts note that 75% of the contemporary country housing stock is formed by precast concrete structures with highest power inputs in the world. Estimated thermal power deficiency in 190 cities is 20%.

Extractive industries tighten planned production capacity, absorb spare capital and best personnel. Most large projects on infrastructure developments last decade were carried out to provide transit economy. New large transport communications tie extractive areas with ports and boundary nodes to serve export. Deficiency of highly organized urban areas has become an obstacle for concentration in Russia of most important resources: qualified and mobile stuff, innovation techniques, brands, cultural values.

To the end of 1990s maximal breach of GRP per capita between Russian regions was 18,9: more, than the difference between “Golden billion” and poorest countries. To the beginning of 2000s the situation even worsened. By 2004 10-12 subjects of Federation create more than half of country GDP.

About a quarter of regions have but one-sector economy and these regions are very vulnerable to the economic shifts. Investments in Russia are predominantly concentrated on extractive industry, on large corporations, on big markets, but not on territorial klasters of production, competitive at the world scale.
Russian settlement system as the outcome of primary industrialization is not able to provide the reproduction of human resources within most regions. In 74 regions death rate exceeds birth rate. Since 1991 by 2001 the population of cities decreased by 3.4%. The village practically is not capable for self-reproduction. Under current birth-rate, death rate and without increase of immigration by 2050 the annual population losses may reach 1.8% and portion of pensionable aged population may enlarge from 20.5% (by census of 2002) to 34 – 35%. Reduction of RF population and general immigration trends, especially depopulation of areas bordering country boundaries in Siberia and Far East, create impartial prerequisites for the replacement of aboriginal population by emigrants from bordering countries and constitute conditions for geopolitical instability. Reduced number of children and teenagers may generate the crisis of manpower resources, difficulties for reproduction and development of material and intellectual country potential. By some factors (undeveloped housing market and transport, imperfect recording institutions) the territorial mobility of population, very important for economic progress, is restrained. Obsolete education institution is unable to supply the production by properly qualified stuff.

Within RF territory are formed “enclaves of unemployment and economic stagnation” which boundaries coincide with boundaries of some ethnic and religion groups. Such a regional features under certain conditions may produce conflicts and the threat for social and political
stability. The current budget levelling policy does not encourage economic development: leading regions lose the motives for development, backward regions keep dependant positions. The valid General Scheme of RF Territorial Development, embracing federal priorities regarding certain regions, capable to solve national tasks (GDP redoubling, poverty reduction, country integrity preservation) is absent. Different aspects of territorial planning activity are distributed among different departments. Reformation of infrastructures (as transport, communication, power engineering, housing maintenance) are not coordinated and synchronized at territorial level.

6.1.2 Principles of federal policy directed to regional development

Among key principles of federal policy there are proposed as follows:

**Principle of polarized (or focused) development** instead of the current budget levelling policy.

New principle anticipates focusing of financial, managerial, human and other resources in some “reference regions” (“development poles” or “development engines”) and expansion of innovative activity to other regions. So e.g. region of Paris dominates in France, Lombardi in Italy, agglomerations of Madrid and Barcelona in Spain, Tokyo, Kinky and Tokay in Japan etc.

There must be established new tools for the support of strategic projects of regional development: within frames of approved strategic priorities for regions Federation is to issue grants of support regional initiatives.

There must be within RF designated zones, different by goals and actions regulating socio-economic development:

- row materials zones;
- safety zones (some adjacent to state boundaries, fraught with conflicts or crisis);
- zones of technological transfer;
- zones of innovative development;
- zones capable to become “world cities”;
- old industrial regions;
- areas, formed but by primary industrialization.

**Subsidiary principle:** decentralization of power as much as local and regional tiers are capable to manage situations.

Region may be considered as “development engine” if it meets to following requirements:

- regional passenger and cargo traffic flows are steadily growing;
- region has research and educational center of federal or world-wide importance;
- in region (or city agglomeration) is formed strategic initiative important for the country;
- region is marked by its high research, technical, intellectual, skilled workers and socio-economic potential;
- regional input to GDP is significant;
• in region is achieved or may be achieved strategic partnership of authorities, civil society and business;
• within 10-12 years region may take the position as the developer for adjacent areas.

Totality of regions-development engines will form new framework of the spatial organization of Russia. This new structure may be incorporated by not only subjects of Federation, but by cities, agglomerations of cities, tied up by commonality of economy, social being, by common transportation networks. “Reference regions” shall be designated by the General Scheme of RF Territorial Development, where must be established regional functions and respective national tasks.

Reference regions may be supported at the expense:
• Development of infrastructures, first of all transportation ones; endowment of some transport nodes and corridors by federal status (federal importance); attachment of inward transport communications to international corridors; development of transport communications capable to encourage population mobility (speed railroads, freeways, air-transport hubs).
• Allocation in reference regions of territorial branches of federal authorities; endowment of reference regions by specific economic status.
• Support of economic pilot projects and cultural initiatives of federal importance; allocation of socio-cultural establishments of federal importance (national universities as centers of university districts, large cultural complexes, objects of infrastructure serving innovative economic etc.); forming the system of professional education considering interests of regional groups; forming of institutes capable to accept and to adopt migrants.

The production policy of modern society has more regional, than sectoral vector. High territorial competitiveness is based on strong positions of some klasters, which are represented by groups of geographically concentrated enterprises, mutually tied sectors, capable to support each other. Klasters might be specified by competitive environment within them and by klasters' competitive position at the world market.

6.1.3 Improvement of state and municipal management in regions

Prior tasks for the federal strategy of regional development include administrative reform at federal tier; implementation of new budget tools (financing of actions directed to certain established results) and private-state partnership. To improve the quality of management at subfederal levels must be anticipated actions as follows:
• Performance and adoption of federal program of assistance to socio-economic reforms at regional and local tiers; encouragement of incentives to implement strategic planning tools.
• Creation of the federal system capable to monitor regional socio-economic indicators.
• Assistance to interregional coordination of decisions on economic policy.
• Revelation and dissemination of the best regional and municipal practices on socio-economic reformations.

For the successful implementation of the development strategy the performance of the General Scheme of RF Territorial Development is indispensable. The Scheme key task is to produce zoning of RF territory including:

• designation of territorial types for the establishment of differentiated respective economic, social and regional policies;
• definition of functions and socio-economic development perspectives of the key strategic country regions;
• establishment of essential transformation of the RF settlement system;
• description of most important migration streams and respective regulation tools;
• designation of tools to be used with the aim to synchronize essential strategies of infrastructures development.

On the base of General Scheme shall be formed location plans for objects at different levels (as objects of federal energy systems, defense and safety, transport, information service, space technology etc.), location and development of specific land use requirements zones (as nature protection and other set by legislation). General Scheme is to be performed in close association with the performance of other territorial planning documents, stipulated by RF Urban Development Code for different tiers. General Scheme must be accomplished by 2009. Its principles must be established by the law on RF spatial development. Besides is needed a law on transboundary cooperation and joining the Russia to respective European Protocols.

There is necessity to extend the activity of existing Interdepartmental coordinating commission working under the Ministry of regional development. This commission must:

• to estimate Strategy and to insert necessary amendments;
• to estimate implementation of federal programs and to issue proposals on amendments;
• to prepare drafts of amendments to white papers, regulating socio-economic development of RF regions;
• to examine territorial aspects of the economic and social reforms going with the aim to prevent negative outcomes for regions.

6.1.4 Strategy implementation phases

At the first “project and research” stage (2005-2006) shall be performed investigations on constraints for socio-economic development of regions and organized concordance process regarding regional development priorities. As the result of the stage shall be the General Scheme directions.
At the second stage (2007-2010) shall be adopted the system of the state regulative measures, including white papers, aimed to guarantee General Scheme implementation. At the third “system transformation” stage (2011-2020) must be accomplished the implementation of programs and of the General Scheme of RF Territorial Development.

6.2. Strategic plan for St. Petersburg

6.2.1. Initial situation
In the beginning of 1990s intricacies regarding the adoption of harmonized socio-economic planning decisions, spurred St. Petersburg city authorities and experts to conviction, that only appeal to the city community and involvement of all active and interested parties into discussion may bring to effective solutions. There was important to make a turn from ideological and political confrontation to the consolidation of community on the base of pragmatic ideas regarding city revival.

At the very beginning of the work at Strategy the important role was performed by international organizations. The World Bank at the start of negotiations on credit for St. Petersburg historic center reconstruction expressed the will to see some plan of the city development, supported by the city community and therefore sustainable enough in spite of political conjuncture. World Bank experts cited as an example the Barcelona city with its long practice of strategic planning. Local personnel (first of all working at Leontief Center in St. Petersburg) have got into contacts with Strategic Planning Association “Barcelona 2000” and with some other cities of Europe and USA having similar experience. The St. Petersburg governor supported the idea of Strategic plan performance. For the first stage of works financial and technical assistance was provided by USAID. Works started in 1996.

The essential distinctions of the Strategic plan from planning documents, typical for soviet practice are as follows:

- Strategic plan does not hold detailed indications to production activity (who and how much must produce) and does not cover all sectors of economy. It is the action plan, produced with the aim to achieve but carefully selected goals, supported by community. Each project or action included in Strategic plan is supplied by indicators to monitor following implementation.
- Strategic plan is not long-term document. All projects and actions included are considered as immediate ones. The word “strategic” in this case does not mean “long run”, but refers to issues of strategic importance.
- Strategic plan is not a legal act. It is the result of public-private partnership: sort of social compact based on voluntary obligations of interested parties.
6.2.2 Actors involved and interactions

As key instruments for stakeholders participation were formed thematic commissions. These commissions served as labor bodies for performance, implementation, monitoring, adjustment and renewal of Strategy at specific sectors and issues. Thematic commissions included representatives of concerned structures, mainly members of Strategic Plan General Council. The General Council consisted of 150 persons, representing city administration, City Council, federal bodies, business associations and companies, non-governmental organizations, educational, scientific and cultural structures.

Much attention of Strategy moulders concerned relations with the city business structures. At the beginning the support of strategic planning received active support of business at large. But after first meetings at thematic commissions the situation diversified in several lines. There came to light chiefs of big enterprises, opposing to city authorities and capable to solve their problems independently or with direct assistance of federal public bodies. The second line was represented by enterprises closely connected with certain administrative subdivision of St. Petersburg and lobbying jointly sectoral projects (not always the most effective for the city). The third line was represented by small enterprises-outsiders lacking of access to administration and striving to get advantage through the participation in Strategy performance. At last the forth, most numerous line was represented by medium and stable enterprises, successfully working not due to administrative support, but rather in spite of administrative actions. Their quite reasonable climes concerned simplification of bureaucratic procedures, degression of taxes, control of natural monopolists, but more than often the changes requested were at the competence of federal legislators. Unavailability of public bodies to fulfill immediately requirements of last group caused critical attitudes and disappointment.

To encourage rational attitude and to improve confidence to Strategic plan its initiators needed time for enduring negotiations. For attraction of active professionals and citizens the first draft of Strategy was replicated (500 copies) and delivered through leading enterprises and other organizations. Text was represented at Internet site and delivered by e-mail. The essence of Strategy was published in city periodicals. For two months after publications interested organizations run hearings, delivered their remarks and proposals. At the same time the draft was examined by delegates of the city representative body, which issued proposal mostly concerning social sector. The Strategic Plan Project Office received 115 official letters with approximately 500 comments and revisions of sections or specific tasks. Thematic commissions prepared conclusions regarding collected responses for consideration at the second, equalized draft of the Strategy. To discuss second draft there was arranged the city-wide conference. Authors of responses were personally notified on public thematic sessions. As a consequence of conference the thematic commissions signed respective parts of the Strategic plan. Almost
200 organizations, participating in Strategy performance signed actions files, thus confirming their consent to participate in implementation. Declaration on Strategy was signed by 144 members of the General Council representing public bodies, Federation of trade unions, Association of manufactures, Chamber of commerce and industry, 7 universities, 20 research organizations, city division of RF Academy of Science, leading mass-media structures, Hermitage, Russian Museum, Mariinsk theatre and others.

The adoption of Strategy by General Board and approval by city administration did not mean the end of work with the Plan. Considering indifference and disappointment in going on reforms and customary for Russia gap between power structures and population there was the task of crucial importance: to encourage confidence of public at large, to draw public attention to actions of stakeholders for Strategy implementation. There was urgency in certain reorientation of mass-media, accustomed to stress scandals and to represent any action of authorities from the point of view of ironical outsider.

6.2.3 Plan structure
As a result of discussions there was formulated system of strategic goals. Essential goal “Sustained improvement of the quality of life of all categories of St. Petersburg citizens” must be achieved through actions at four important spheres of activity (four directions):

- Creation of a favorable business climate.
- Integration into the world economy.
- Improvement of the urban environment.
- Establishment of a favorable social environment.

Actions at each of four directions is subordinated to respective goals, tasks and implementation activities. As an example, direction “Improvement of the urban environment” includes 5 goals, one of which is “Improvement of physical environment”. This goal among 5 tasks includes a task “amelioration of the water resources”. Task includes three kinds of implementation activities:

- Monitoring of superficial waters and underground waters.
- The creation of the body responsible for the water resources management.
- Refinement of rivers and channels of St. Petersburg starting from the pilot project “treatment of the bottom sediments with the use of ecologically acceptable technologies”.

Each kind of implementation activity is supplied by indicators of implementation and by the list of responsible participants.
SUSTAINED IMPROVEMENT OF THE QUALITY OF LIFE OF ALL CATEGORIES OF ST. PETERSBURG CITIZENS

DEVELOPMENT OF ST. PETERSBURG AS A MULTIFUNCTIONAL CITY INTEGRATED INTO THE RUSSIAN AND WORLD ECONOMY AND PROVIDING A HIGH QUALITY OF LIFE AND ECONOMIC ACTIVITY

CONSOLIDATION OF ST. PETERSBURG’S POSITION AS THE MAJOR RUSSIAN CENTER FOR CONTACT BETWEEN THE BALTIC SEA REGION AND THE NORTH-WEST OF RUSSIA

IMPROVEMENT QUALITY OF LIFE AS A RESULT OF INCREASED EMPLOYMENT OF EXPENDITURES OF CITY FUNDS

CREATION OF A FAVORABLE BUSINESS CLIMATE

1. Elimination of constraints on business
2. Reduction of tax burden
3. Development of the real-estate market; reform of city-planning regulations
4. Improvement of labor mobility
5. Reallocation of financial resources towards investment in the real economy

2. INTEGRATION INTO THE WORLD ECONOMY

2.1 Strengthening of foreign trade and financial functions
2.2 Consolidation of competitive manufacturing industries
2.3 Promotion of St. Petersburg on the cultural and tourism markets
2.4 Development of science, education and innovation activity
2.5 Integration into the global information society

3. IMPROVEMENT OF THE URBAN ENVIRONMENT

3.1 Revival of the historical city center
3.2 Formation of zones of dynamic urban redevelopment
3.3 Development of inner-city and suburban transport networks
3.4 Development of the utilities infrastructure
3.5 Improvement of state of environment

4. ESTABLISHMENT OF A FAVORABLE SOCIAL ENVIRONMENT

4.1 Establishment of a stable social environment
4.2 Development of citizens’ educational and cultural potential
4.3 Accelerated resolution of the housing problem
4.4 Reform of housing-management and maintenance services
4.5 Restructuring of public transport
4.6 Improvement of the quality of administration of the city and regions
4.7 Creation of conditions for public safety
6.2.4 The implementation outcome

Strategic plan was not designed for certain implementation term: there was intention to monitor its execution and to insert due corrections. But in fact the full-scale monitoring summing up outcomes of Strategy adopted in 1997 was performed but in 2003, when the system of St. Petersburg socio-economic planning documents has altered. To 2004 the part of total 211 actions was accomplished, part was close to completion and the part in the process of implementation. But 28% of actions were poorly executed or not executed at all (look Fig. 10).

Fig. 10. Strategic plan for St. Petersburg: implementation results to 2004.

![Pie chart showing implementation outcomes](image)

AA – accomplished actions; AC – actions close to completion; AI – actions in process of implementation; BA – poorly executed actions; UA – unexecuted actions.

Among accomplished and close to completion actions are as follows:

- there are adopted measures to stimulate production activity as degression of taxes and other charges;
- received and used WB loan for reconstruction of some objects at city historic center;
- there was performed and adopted St. Petersburg Master Plan;
- city Land Use and Development Code (Zoning Ordinance) is under performance;
- there were adopted key city legal acts regarding real property operations;
- there is adopted law on bids for city contracts;
- encircling highway is under construction;
- city night-time illumination is significantly improved;
- Accomplished a clearway down to Neva right bank;
- encouraged the forming of condominiums in multi-apartment houses in which dominate privatized apartments (process is at the very beginning);
- there are established Internet site of city administration (www.gov.spb.ru), sites of all executive subdivisions, other state structures; the important issues on city
development are weekly discussed at direct TV transmission and with participation of city leaders; there is published magazine “City Administration Bulletin”.

As results of listed and other executed actions:

- the economic situation at the city improved notably: since 1998 to 2003 GRP has grown up 4.6 times, real population incomes – 1.6 times;
- created innovative centers, enlarged number of institutes of higher education and improved financing of research works;
- number of tourists, visited St. Petersburg since 2000 to 2003 enlarged 1.46 times;
- at some sites located at Neva and Finnish gulf embankments or adjoining arterial roads started the conversion of industrial sites into commercial and business zones;
- the housing hypothec bit by bit has started to develop;
- since 1997 to 2003 annual housing construction increased 2.3 times, floor area per capita increased by 18%.

Meantime considerable part of planned actions were to 2004 much less successful:

- the budget financing of construction and modernization of engineering and transport infrastructures is insufficient;
- there is shortage of sites, supplied with basic community facilities for construction;
- the improvement of dilapidated housing built in 1960s practically is not executed;
- actions on modernization of solid waste treatment system are not accomplished;
- the financing of state medical provision is inadequate: too many kinds of medical services are accessible but for cash;
- the financing of public transport development is low therefore social itineraries are gradually replaced by commercial ones.

In the upshot first Russian attempt of the strategic planning allows to issue some deductions.

- Under pressure of multitude of participants Strategy embraced rather too much actions (210). Some actions fell outside of the attention focus and could not gain proper support; others needed major modifications due to legal or administrative changes (including quite positive ones) triggered at federal level.
- Along with going on performance of some planned actions still there exists quite different activity system: some business leaders have not taken seriously new rules of game and stick to customary pattern. Thus with the participation of St. Petersburg authorities there are started some important projects, which replace rather more efficient alternatives, stipulated by Strategy adopted.
- Success in Strategy implementation and control depends greatly from persistency of mass-media and other interested participants.
• Strategy implementation was considerably handicapped by the absence of instrument, capable to provide direct impact on administrative activity: there was not adopted the plan of respective administrative actions.

• The performance of all documents of state planning at St. Petersburg is to be carried out candidly, aiming to support the creation of unified vector of activity for city authorities, business groups and other interested parties.