

The case of
Moscow, Russia

By Alexey Krashenninokov

Contact

Professor Alexey Krashenninokov
Moscow Architectural Institute
Botanichesky per. 12-60,
Moscow, 129010, Russia
Tel. +7 095 229 32 07
Fax. +7 095 229 33 35
E-mail: alvalk@newmail.ru



I. INTRODUCTION: THE CITY

A. The Urban Context

1. National Overview

The Great October Socialist Revolution of 1917 altered urban development in Russia. From 1924 onwards, the national economy was directed by 5-year plans and urban development was planned according to economic and social needs. Urban policy was aimed at providing equal services to all citizens. During the Soviet period in Russia there were three essential advantages for town-planners. First, all the land and most of the buildings in cities belonged to the state. Secondly, the development of cities was planned according to master plans on the basis of 100 per cent budget financing. Finally, buildings were built in complexes with public services, called "micro-regions".

The "right to housing" was one of social guarantees provided by the state. The Constitution of Russian Federation, 1977; Article 44 states that "The citizens of the USSR have the right to housing". This right was implemented by the urban administration through mass production and distribution of houses. Housing was generally modest but the limited floor area was compensated for by public facilities within walking

distance. The whole system of social infrastructure including schools, shops, and other cultural and service facilities was planned and built along with houses.

However the social goals identified for the country were too ambitious for the economy and in spite of tremendous efforts, they have not been achieved in full. By the mid 1980s the Soviet economy came to a crisis, and needed reforming. On the one hand, it was depressed by administrative management and on the other hand it was damaged by shadow operations. The prices that had not changed in the previous 40 years were being artificially lowered. The economists thought that the prices should be increased 3 or 4 times, but the reforms of 1992 resulted in the complete liberation of prices. They shot up seventy-fold, which led to even more serious consequences for the economy.

In 1990 *Perestroika* altered the national economy for the second time in a century. Only later did the realities of the stagnation of the economy and of urban development become known.

“Liberation of prices led to their growth. The prices rose to levels at which only the richest 25 per cent of the population could afford them. Manufacturers had more profit if they sold 25 per cent of their goods and overcharged them, so there was no point in them keeping the prices affordable for the majority and the sales – at the old level. The low-income population had to cut down their purchases to the minimum. As they had constituted the majority of purchasers before the reforms, the market overflowed with goods. That was naturally followed by the rise of unemployment and decrease in production in all branches of industry. At the present time the gap between the levels of income of the rich and poor is not diminishing, just the opposite – it is widening. This leads to a further deepening of the economic crisis. The 80 per cent of the population with low incomes possesses only 9 per cent of savings. The 20 per cent of the population with high incomes has about 54 per cent of all savings. The least numerous group (0.2 per cent or the «tail» of the curve) has 32 per cent of savings”

(Vasilyeva A and E Chernomazova 1999).

The democratisation of society has brought new approaches to the town-planning development of Moscow and has created essentially new conditions for the planning and management of the city.

After *Perestroika* the private sector received a lot of benefits and many social guarantees became virtual. In the post-Soviet era the low-income category of citizens has the right to housing:

- “1. Each citizens has the right to housing. Nobody can be arbitrarily deprived of housing.
2. Public authorities and the local government bodies are to encourage housing construction, and create the conditions for the realisation of the right to housing.
3. The needy citizens, indicated in the laws relating to housing, will be granted housing free of charge or at accessible costs, by the State, or Municipal or other housing stock, according to statutory norms.” (The Constitution of Russian Federation, 1993; Article 40).

According to the Law on Town Planning (1998), the right to housing is achieved through the ramified system of housing legislation, principally the Housing Code (1998).

According to the Law on Town Planning (1998), and the State Codes on Construction (SNiP) all urban residents have a right to housing and socially guaranteed minimum social services.

The Granted Floor Area Norm is defined by the Subjects of the Russian Federation. The size (number of square meters of floor area) *“can not be less than the average floor area per person in a given area.”*

2. The History of Moscow in the 20th Century

In the 20th century the living conditions of the majority of Muscovites improved. From the mid-1950s, the

construction of apartment buildings on an industrial basis had begun, allowing a sharp increase in the levels of housing facilities. In 1967 the share of industrial housing production was 76 per cent, in 1971 more than 80 per cent and in the early 1980s 93 per cent. The number of square metres of housing per Muscovite was constantly rising: in 1940 it was 6.2m² per capita; in 1961 it was 9.4 m², 13.6 m² in 1971, 16.4 m² in 1981 and 17.8 m² per capita in 1991. The proportion of Muscovites living in separate (detached) flats had grown from 40 per cent in 1961 to 60 per cent in 1971, 79 per cent in 1981 and 85 per cent in 1991.

In the 1960s, 490,000 Muscovites improved their housing conditions annually, in the 1970s 420,000 and by the end of the 1980s only 280,000. By the end of 1990s 80 per cent of children’s tuition fees in day nurseries or kindergarten facilities were paid by the state, and only 20 per cent were paid by parents.

In Moscow the process of centralised urban development was based on authorised master plans. This process can be divided into 4 main periods: 1) 1931-1941; 2) 1945-1950; 3) 1951-1960; 4) 1961-1991. At the end of 1991 the history of a new democratic Russia and a new stage in the town planning history of its capital began. In 10 years a whole new system of legislation was created and put into practice.

The last decade of the 20th century has brought new problems, but hope for the revival of the former glory of Moscow.

3. The Physical City

The urban development of Moscow has been planned and supervised by the Central Research and Design Institute of Master Plans of Moscow since 1993.

Moscow’s area is 1,079.9 km², of which 1,002.6 km² (93 per cent) comprises a territory within the limits of the urban boundaries, 37.2 km² is Zelenograd (a satellite town located in a suburban zone of the capital) and 40.1 km² is composed of other settlements in suburban zones.

Residential areas comprise only 26,000 ha, or 24 per cent of the city territory, a lower proportion than in other cities of the world. The Moscow housing stock represents almost 180 million m² of floor area. More than 80 per cent of the housing stock was constructed in the last 30-40 years.

After World War Two the Moscow economy needed a work force for ambitious projects. The population of the city doubled in several decades and eventually reached 8 million people. In the 1950s and 1960s, during a period of mass production of houses, vast areas in Moscow were turned into neighbourhoods called *Microraiion* (*Microregions*). *Microraiion* is a legal form of city physical planning. The population of the early microraiion was about 5,000 residents. All the public facilities and everyday services were provided

within walking distance from the houses: schools, kindergartens, shops, recreation areas, etc. The task was to provide the new Muscovite families with individual flats, because by that time many of them lived in shared housing: dormitories or "communal flats" with one family per room. To overcome these housing crises a new cheap and modest housing type was invented. It was a 5 storey prefabricated concrete block of flats organised in living sections around staircases. 3-5 or even 10 typical sections made a building of 60-120 or even several hundred meters long. More than 500 prefabricated concrete plants for production of these houses were built across the country, including in Moscow. Prefabricated industrial houses were cheap, easy to build, needed a small team of qualified workers and could be produced as fast as machines on assembly lines. Each flat had all modern conveniences including hot water and central heating.

With time the negative aspects of the modest "functional" approach in architecture of industrial houses of the "First Generation" became evident: thin walls lost too much heat in winter, lack of storage and closet areas in flats made them uncomfortable for families (with children, parents and grandparents). Rooms and premises were very small, sound insulation was poor. Three generations of mass-type houses followed one another from the 1950s until the end of the 1980s. New "advanced" 16-22 story "typical" modern buildings even now hold a strong position in the post-*perestroika* housing market in Moscow.

The growth of residential stock in Moscow occurred mainly in new areas of mass housing development. The realisation of the previous (1971) Moscow Master Plan was complicated by the economic context of country in the 1970s. Due to the stagnation of the national economy the majority of socio-economic parameters of Moscow sharply lagged behind the largest foreign cities (in terms of life expectancy, comfort of moving house and all parameters of the service sphere including transport and roads).

In the newly developed neighbourhood areas (where 75 per cent of the population lived) the construction of cultural and public service buildings had not been executed in full. The proportions of unbuilt services were 70-80 per cent for schools and day nurseries, 50-60 per cent for food shops, 40-50 per cent for polyclinics and so on. Unfortunately, the building patterns of the 1950s did little to give a sense of identity to places and encourage people to care for outdoor greenery and open spaces. As a result most of the outdoor landscape is deteriorated. (Krasheninnikov, 1987).

In the 1970s and 1980s, insufficient attention was also given to financing, construction and reconstruction of the transport infrastructure, and this sector was sharply reduced. In 1998 the development of the new Master Plan for Moscow for 25-30 years was completed and in 1999 the Government of Moscow adopted the

Plan (Kuzmin, 1999).

The new General Moscow Development Plan consists of 3 sections:

- 1) Main Town Planning Development Directions (25 year plan)
- 2) City Zoning (for the next 12-16 years)
- 3) Prime Measures (for the next 4-8 years).

In the "Main Directions" section, city problems are considered at three levels: the Moscow Region, the city, and the city centre.

The essence of new approach to planning is not one of "total design" but rather of preparing and granting information about prohibited kinds of activity, in which what is not forbidden, can be considered to be authorised. The limitations are established in terms of function. For example, in certain areas industry is not permitted but, business centres could be approved. They also use architectural parameters: number of floors, density and building types and balance of residential and public functions. Territorial zoning in Moscow is presently under way. Up to the present only aggregated zoning for city blocks (kvartals) has been produced, but the whole city territory will be covered with zoning ordinances at a more detailed scale.

The hope is that the Zoning Ordinances, as well as income for land use, will help to use the limited urban territory more effectively. The share of physically and morally of out-of-date stock in the total volume of city housing stock of city was 36 per cent in 1998. If the city plans go ahead it will be reduced to 15-20 per cent by 2020.

Plans for the next decade are to increase works on repair and reconstruction of apartment buildings by 200 to 1,500 thousand m² per year.

The complex reconstruction of the territories of the first period of mass industrial construction (2,000 hectares), includes the demolition of deteriorated buildings with a total floor area of 7 million m² (the "amortised residential stock") and the construction of up to 20 million m² of new housing accommodation and renovated stock.

According to the Moscow Central Master Planning Institute, the average living area in flats for the residents of Moscow in 1998 was around 20 m² per person. By 2020 this figure will rise to 35 m² per person (Kuzmin, 2001).

4. Demographics

The main parameters of social and economic development in Moscow in the period up to 2020 were determined during work on the Master Plan of the City to 2020 (Kuzmin 1999). In this document the main issues of social policy were determined as being an "increase in the quality of life of the population, its level of well-being and longevity"

The constant population level for Moscow in 2000 was estimated at around 9 million people, (3.8 million men, 4.7 million women), while the aggregate daytime population is 11-12 million people. The estimated population for the next 20 years is 11.3-12.3 million people (including constant population and migration). That is to say, Moscow's population is not expected to grow considerably. The temporary population level will vary between 2 and 3 millions people. The constant population will be 8-9 million people compared to 8.5 in 1998. In Moscow the proportion of children is expected to be lower and the proportion of people above working age will increase. The average lifespan will increase for men - from 60 in 1998 to 70 in 2020, and for women from 73 to 80 years. (Kuzmin A. V. 1999, page 14).

The social groups identified in Moscow (from Kuzmin AV, 2001) can be summarised as follows:

1. Pensioners (1.9 million in 1997 rising to 2.2 million in 2020).
2. Invalids (0.7 million in 1997, 0.8 million in 2020)
3. Single mothers (66,500 in 1997, 75,000 in 2020)
4. Families of dependent children (34,000 families in 1997, 50,000 in 2020)
5. Students' families (1,100 families in 1997, 5,000 in 2020)
6. Refugees (13,000 in 1997)
7. People with no fixed abode ("BOMji") (60,000 in 1997)
8. Run-away children (6,000 in 1997, 30,000 in 2002)
9. Orphans (5,100 in 1997, 5,000 in 2020)

The large number of visitors living in Moscow without registration are not taken into account by these statistics. The removal of the use of a passport in post-Soviet times has had a negative effect on statistics, and as such the above mentioned data are partial.

Since 1994 the annual level of the immigrant population has steadily increased, reaching a level of 60,700 people in 1999. Moscow still provides a strong attraction for migrants from other regions of the Russian Federation. As such in 1998 internal migration had resulted in a 72 per cent increase in levels of migrants in Moscow.

Since the 1990s Moscow has started to receive new migrants from the ex-republics of the former Soviet Union, the main source being Ukraine (28 per cent), followed by Georgia and Azerbaijan and Armenia.

Another category within the temporary population of city are the refugees. According to data from the Moscow Migration Agency, in the years 1990-1995 the city has received 14,800 new settlers with the status of refugees. Within the totality of newly arrived inhabitants, 76 per cent are refugees and compelled new settlers from Chechnya, 12 per cent are Azerbaijanis, 8 per cent are from Aphasias and 5 per cent from Georgia. However the actual numbers of refugees is significantly

more according to various expert valuations, and might be as high as 50-100,000 people.

One more group within the temporary population category is the *BOMji*. According to published data this group may consist of 10-15,000 people. Presently their number is significantly higher: Expert estimates suggest a figure between 60 and 100,000 people (Romancheva & Gaganjva, 2002).

5. The Urban Economy

Moscow is the largest city in Russia. It concentrates about 6 per cent of the population of the country, 8 per cent of the occupied population, 8 per cent of fixed capital assets, 7 per cent of the management sphere, 20 per cent of the population occupied in finance, credit, insurance and pension maintenance and 35 per cent of those occupied in science. The economy of Moscow provides 16 per cent of Russia's GDP. The per capita GDP of Moscow is more than twice that of Russia as a whole. According to the Master Plan of the City, the city's gross regional product is expected to increase by 4 or 5 times in the next 20 years.

The market economy has brought about huge social stratification, with the incomes of the richest 10 per cent of the population being 44 times that of the poorest 10 per cent (Master Plan of the City 1999, page 14).

The volume of employment in Moscow's industry is roughly 650,000 people and will be the same for the next 20 years. More than 180,000 jobs were vacant by the end of 2001, exceeding the number of the registered unemployed by 5.5 times. However only 15 per cent of vacancies were with average or higher wages.

Moscow is on the way to becoming a significant international tourist centre. In 1998 there were an estimated 1 million tourists.

5.1 Housing Availability

Muscovites mostly live in multi-storey houses of between 5 and 22 stories. According to the Sava Real Estate Agency, the flats in the new "typical" industrial houses rose in price by 0.1 per cent in May 2002 and reached US\$870 per m². In spite of the fact that the real estate market looks balanced, many families could not find appropriate housing. One room flats in industrial buildings of the first series (built 40 years ago) sell for US\$900 per m². That price reflects the good location with well-developed social infrastructure. Muscovites who cannot afford the quality housing in Moscow have a good chance of buying housing in the suburbs of the city. Satellite towns around Moscow offer almost the same type of housing: 5-16 storey industrial or "cast in situ" iron concrete modernised buildings. "The price for industrial housing in construction starts at US\$320 per m². In built houses the price is about US\$500 per m², that is about 30-40 per cent lower than in Moscow city. Satellite towns have good railway and highway connec-

tions to the city and the flats in the towns 3-15 km from the city ring road are a good alternative for those who wish to improve their housing conditions but have not got enough resources" (Zamuravaeva, 2002, p14).

Unfortunately about 40 per cent of 5 storey prefabricated concrete buildings from the first generation of mass construction are close to dilapidation. Engineering systems such as central heating, electricity, hot and cold water, sewage and gas should have been replaced 10 years ago.

The most common structural problems in these houses are: flooding of the cellars and foundations due to the rise of the water table in the neighbourhood and leaks from sewage pipes; bad insulation of walls especially external corners and slab joints; cracks in the ceiling panels with lowering of height in rooms. Other problems include the lack of elevators, premises for the handicapped, low maintenance and vandalistic behaviour by the residents. Many buildings, most of them municipal, are planned to be demolished and people moved to new modern houses built on the same sites or near by. In Moscow a large volume of reconstruction is scheduled.

6. Governance

Moscow is the capital of the Russian Federation. The Moscow area is divided into 10 administrative districts, incorporating 125 local areas called *uprava*. The city has representative, executive and judicial authorities. The legislative public authority - the Duma, consisting of 35 deputies, is elected by Muscovites for a period of 4 years. The executive authority is the Moscow urban administration. The Mayor of Moscow is elected by the citizens, and his duty is to supervise the activity of the Government of Moscow, its structure and human resources. The system of justice includes the general jurisdictional courts and the Moscow Arbitration Court.

The most recent example of Moscow Government policy and activity is a report made by the city's vice mayor, Shantsev. This programme has incorporated measures to support more than 80 short and long-term programs, as well as the Moscow General Development Plan. Financing will be provided according to the law relating to the 2002 Moscow Budget.

The measures and tasks of the Programme for 2002 come from the obligations of the urban authorities to Muscovites and the measures offered by the President of Russia and Government of the Russian Federation on modernising the economy and state management and the development of the social and economic initiatives of the citizens.

The priorities of socio-economic policy of Moscow Government for 2002 can be summarised as follows:

- Modernising the economy, support for the production of competitive goods and services, effective scien-

tific development and technology.

- Conditioning the growth of the population's real incomes, facilitating consumption and reducing the number of families in which average per person income is lower than the poverty line.
- Maintenance of the quality and availability of health, education and other base social services.
- Reform of the economic relations in the housing sector of the city economy, with the aim of a gradual reduction of budget subsidies and a concentration on addressing the support of families with low incomes.
- Creation of a favourable economic environment for private enterprise, maintenance of equal conditions and competitiveness in the economy.
- Elimination of the constraints for development of small and middle sized businesses.
- Escalating the scope of reconstruction of housing stock and the extension of construction of housing accommodation using the personal savings of the citizens. A transfer, for these purposes, of industrial enterprises from sites in the central city to vacant territories outside the city with the provision of a modern industrial base.
- Complex development of a road and transport infrastructure, retail trade and hotel networks in the city.
- Development of social and economic partnerships, promotion of grassroots initiatives among the citizens. Support for a budget/financial system for local self-government.
- Transition to exchequer performance of the urban budget, strengthening of payment and spending discipline of budgetary funds.
- Improvement of the ecology, strengthening of safety and order.

(Source: Moscow in 2002, The Programme of the Government of Moscow for 2002)

II. DILAPIDATED HOUSES AND POVERTY

B. DIFFERENT TYPES OF SLUMS IN THE CITY

'Slum' is not the relevant word for the housing problems in Moscow. There are no self-built shelters in Moscow, although there are several types of deterio-

rated housing. Among these are: squatter flats, shabby and dilapidated buildings, shared flats and outdated first generation industrial housing.

- Squatter flats are the result of an incorrect usage of housing stock by owners or tenants who practice illegal subletting.
- Shabby and dilapidated houses result from inadequate maintenance.
- Communal flats were conceived of as temporary measures to accommodate important human resources.
- Primitive first generation industrial houses are a legacy of the Soviet period that nowadays looks outdated and falls short of modern building codes for housing.

Due to 70 years of socialist regulation and because of the state's special registration policy, working people were provided with housing and non-Muscovites were moved out of the city. Those who did not work in Moscow usually could not get Moscow registration (*propiska*) with a share in the city's common housing stock. In the period of rapid industrialisation a whole family could be settled in one room in shared or communal flats with other rooms occupied by other families. To overcome the shortage of housing the mass production of houses was introduced at the end of 1950s. Since *perestroika*, in the 1990s, people have been able to buy a house or flat in Moscow and thus become Muscovites. At that time the city authorities had no experience in dealing with poor immigrants from the former Soviet republics. As a result refugees and homeless beggars crowded railway stations, airports and subways. These people found temporary insecure tenure, usually without registration, in squatter flats.

Another type of deteriorated housing in Moscow is the municipal and corporate housing built as temporary shelters, dormitories or barracks for workers. These barracks and *obschag* are still occupied by poor residents who could find no resources to move out. Barracks are one or two storey wooden or brick structures sometimes with primitive engineering systems, and are very rare now in Moscow. Dormitories for workers are usually four or five storey brick-walled buildings. Their original residents were listed several times for housing improvements, and usually moved out, giving room to newer generations of inhabitants. Residents have normally changed several times moving to better places. The present day residents are partly illegal, and they pay very little for their accommodation, if anything.

Abandoned houses are houses that have temporarily lost their investors, original residents and formal owners. Dilapidated first generation industrial houses constitute a well-known problem for the Moscow Government.

The above-mentioned types of dilapidated housing in Moscow are summarised in **Table 1**

C. OFFICIAL DEFINITION OF SLUMS IN MOSCOW

1. Communal flats, called *communalky* in Russian, are flats used by two or more families, sharing communal kitchens and other premises. This standard of living is now appropriate only for short residence, in hotels, hostels and dormitories.

2. Shabby and dilapidated buildings, *vethi* and *avariyni* in Russian are buildings recognised as being unsuitable for constant residence, usually because they are damaged constructions that are not safe. People registered as inhabitants of such housing have a right to ask for free housing. They are listed in a line of required home residents or *ocheredniki* in a queue for housing improvement. The queue moves slowly according to available municipal housing stock.

3. Morally outdated and deteriorated buildings are usually prefabricated concrete 5 storey houses from the first generation of mass construction. They were built with very modest standards both in spatial parameters and constructions. The standards used are outdated compared with modern standards for housing (Russian Construction Code for Housing – SniP2.08.01-89).

4. Bomji are people without permanent addresses.

The resettlement of people from shabby and dilapidated housing stock aims to provide them with housing accommodation adequate for modern standards.

D. UNOFFICIAL DEFINITIONS OF SLUMS

'Hrushebi is a vulgar nickname for modest industrial houses of the first generation built in Hruschev's time (after N. Hruschev, Soviet leader from 1956-1962).

Baraks are primitive houses built usually for construction workers for the period of construction. They are commonly viewed as being the lowest possible form of civilised houses.

People without permanent shelters - *BOMji* – use abandoned and ruined buildings as temporary shelters. These types of structures are not mentioned in official reports and could not be found in the maps. However they can survive and be used for several years before demolition occurs.

E. OFFICIAL DEFINITIONS OF POVERTY

Low-income citizens are defined using cost of living criteria, representing a minimum consumption of the material goods and services necessary for the preser-

Table 1. Dilapidated Housing in Moscow

Types of dilapidated housing	Location	Age and origin	Population characteristics
<i>Squatter flats</i> result from a misuse of once good municipal houses.	Municipal or privatised – former municipal houses with lowest possible rent	Lease or sublease by owners or tenants (incorrect use). Due to low maintenance and vandalism “alien” houses degraded much faster than the houses with permanent residents	Illegal immigrants, refugees, seasonal workers, small market traders carpetbaggers.
“Abandoned” houses	Houses that are abandoned or look like they are abandoned can be found occasionally in and around the Central Administrative District of Moscow.	Old buildings especially in central districts of the city, outdated buildings that are bound to be replaced by new constructions but still standing, waiting for investments.	When the old shabby buildings are marked for demolition, people are given new flats. Sometimes abandoned houses stand for years and new generations of residents move in. Regular inhabitants of “abandoned” buildings are shadow communities of homeless people (less than 0.1 per cent of the total population). If the engineering is still functioning the premises could be used for artistic studios, community groups and sometimes are illegally leased to families, workshops, even offices. People take advantage of available shelter.
<i>Shabby houses, old dormitories and “barracks”</i>	Temporary shelters and dormitories were built in and around industrial zones in the middle belt of the city. In Moscow there are more than 70 industrial zones comprising about 15 thousand ha, or 16 per cent of the Moscow area.	Built generally after the World War 2, when the shortage of houses was especially acute. The industrial zones remain most ineffective in land use, irregularly built up and ecologically dilapidated territories of city. While average height of building of industrial zones is 1-2 floors, the efficiency of use of their territory in 2-3 times lower than recommended by zoning	People living in a shabby dormitories and former barracks are really poor. They do not own the flat and could not privatise it. They are usually “internal immigrants” who came to Moscow and refuse to leave the city. Most of them do not have permanent registration and are struggling to be included in the Moscow queue for housing improvements. In Moscow now there are 696 dormitories. 68 of them are private property. Not all of them are in bad conditions but almost everywhere marginal population have lived in them for a long time. Very often outlaw refugees and immigrants take the place of the former residents who had improved their living conditions with the help of the state.
“Communal flats”, shared housing	Historic part of the city. Houses built in 1930s-1940s were designed to suit both family per room and family per flat ratios of residence. Some houses were built 100 or more years ago and now occupy the most expensive land.	Some of the houses are architectural masterpieces, built before the 1917 Revolution for the rich and well to do people. After 1917 shared flats were the means of “just distribution” of available housing stock. Another generation of houses with shared flats appeared in Soviet times before the period of mass construction of houses.	“Communal flats” in Russian “communalky” are flats uses by two or more families with common kitchens and other premises. 151,000 shared flats in Moscow are still occupied by more than 318,000 families
<i>Outdated first generation industrial housing</i>	“New” areas of the city built up after the World War Two during the time of mass housing construction beyond the boundaries formed by the Moscow Circular Rail-road. Now forming the internal mid-zone belt of the city between the central and peripheral districts.	During the first generation of mass construction (1955- 1970) new technology for production of houses was used. Some miscalculations led to engineering and construction faults in K-7, 1553 and other ‘typical’ houses	5 storey typical building series make up about 36 per cent of aggregated housing stock of the city 40 per cent of them are physically amortised and morally out-of-date. Those are generally the buildings of first generation of mass construction - prefabricated concrete buildings made of thin slabs. Several city programmes are now being implemented in practice accumulating stocks from public and private resources to resettle people from these houses.

vation of health and the maintenance of the people’s ability to live.

Social support is provided for citizens with actual per capita incomes lower than the cost of living in the city. Social support is also granted to families with children below a certain age, students and youths, veterans of Great Patriotic War, older citizens and invalids.

People in need of housing have the right to apply for housing improvements at the expense of the city. The

conditions constituting being “in housing need” are determined in the Russian Federation Housing Code. For example people in Moscow are considered to be in housing need if they have less than 9 m² of floor area per person. That is one of the reasons why people do not hurry to leave deteriorated buildings and squatter housing – they are waiting in a queue for housing improvements.

The poor are defined as people with incomes that are

lower than the cost of living. Today poverty is one of the sharpest problems in Russian society. This was confirmed through the results of an analytical survey completed in the first quarter of 2002 (GolovachevTrud, 2002). The data is preliminary, but the tendencies are visible quite distinctly.

From the table it is clear that poverty is gradually receding. In the first quarter of 2002 year the number of people in urgent need was down on the same period of 2000 by 16 million, and in comparison with the first quarter of 2001 was down by 9 million (source, Golovachev, 2002)

Table 2. The Population of Russia with Incomes Lower than the Cost of Living

Millions	2000	2001	2002 (Expert evaluation)
Population (living in poverty)	59.9	52.9	44

F. UNOFFICIAL DEFINITIONS OF POVERTY

The official definition of the cost of living of an average person in Moscow is \$75 (2,385 roubles) per month for a non-working citizen and \$85 (2,662 roubles) for a working citizen. However, the Minister for Economic Development and Trade has suggested that the real cost of living in the capital is \$200-250, or 2 - 3 times higher.

According to information from the Institute of the Social and Economic Problems of the Population (Russian Academy of Sciences) 3 to 4 per cent of the families in Russia are prosperous, ie with a monthly per capita income over \$1,500. Over 60 per cent of families have a monthly income of less than \$100 per capita and are living in poverty.

About 31-33 per cent of the Russian population has an average monthly income of between \$150 and \$1,500 per capita, and comprise the middle class. 15 per cent of the population with a per capita income of between \$150 and \$400 form the lower level of the middle class. According to world standards people can be called middle class if they spend less than one third of their monthly income on food, while representatives of the Russian lower middle class spend about 40 per cent of their budget on food. They can only be categorised as middle class by a considerable stretch, (information from Vasilyeva A & Chernomazova E, 1999).

1. The Poor's Perception of their Own Poverty

Poverty is something more than just a lack of material

resources. As it turns out, living in chronic need develops special sets, values and stable behaviour patterns which are passed on as an inheritance and which in their turn promote intergenerational poverty. As a result of "market" reforms in Russia, many people have suddenly fallen into acute poverty. Since formerly these people had a rather high social standing the sociological and economic publications began to refer to them as the "new poor" in contrast to the "old poor", ie those who were poor before the economic transformations. At least at first there could be no question of the "new poor" belonging to the "culture of poverty". In their case poverty meant only lack of money, the need to reduce consumption and to limit themselves in every way. During the last seven years some of those "new poor" have managed to improve their living standards. However, many were unable to break out of their poverty. What does it mean for them now? Is it only a question of extremely limited material resources or we can already start talking about the "culture of poverty" among the "new poor"? During the final stages of "stagnant socialism" the only real criterion of social standing was educational status, although the living standards of those who had a higher education and that of less educated people did not differ much. Sociological surveys conducted among school-children traditionally showed that the attitude of teenagers to various kinds of deviant behaviour, their ability to adapt to school and plans for the future depended to a great extent on the educational level of the mother (the father's education and occupation played a less significant role).

The family's material wellbeing had a significant influence on the above parameters only in those cases when poverty was a direct consequence of family problems (low-skilled parents, alcohol abuse and parasitism). As recently as several years ago when society had already undergone the process of considerable economic differentiation it was found that parents' income did not have a sharp impact on the socialisation of children. As market relations develop and strengthen in present-day Russian society the family's economic conditions begin to exert a considerable influence on children. To illustrate, a study conducted by the sociologist Mogun has shown that in making their life plans teenagers tend to take into account the support which the family can render them. The higher the parents' income the more help is expected and accordingly the greater are the children's aspirations. At the same time the mother's educational status continues to play a very important role in the socialisation of children. We conducted a study among ninth form pupils in Moscow and Ivanovo. 500 schoolchildren participated in the study (250 from each city) whom we divided into four groups. The first group included children from poor families whose mothers had no higher education. We called this group the "old poor". Certainly this term is arbitrary – in actual fact families of those children

became poor only recently. The second group consisted of teenagers from low-income households whose mothers had higher education. This group was called the “new poor”. (Irina Shurygina, 1999).

G. ORIGINS OF THE TYPES OF SLUM HOUSING IDENTIFIED

1. The Forces that have Formed Slum Housing

Squatter flats are the result of illegal immigration and illegal subleasing of municipal and privatised housing. New people strive to find their home in the capital. Sergey Smidovich, the chairman of the Committee on Migration of the Government of Moscow, indicated that every year the urban businesses create about 50,000 jobs for foreigners. And hundreds of thousands migrants live in the capital illegally. According to a preliminary estimate, in Moscow there are more than 150,000 illegal immigrants from China, although only 200 figure on the tax accounts. Of 200,000 Ukrainian immigrants, taxes are paid only by 800. According to official data only 0.4 per cent of arriving immigrants are employed in Moscow. The large majority of the foreigners work illegally, and live in squatter housing (Romancheva I & Gaganjva A, 2002).

Abandoned and deteriorated buildings are the result of property speculation. An example from a newspaper: “In a newly developed neighbourhood of 16-storey houses the “ruins” of a former factory club for workers have survived. The ruins have continued to exist for the last five or six years. Now the building has completely lost its roof. Partially damaged walls of dark red brick have gradually acquired natural damp. The gloomy neighbourhood frankly does not please the local inhabitants. They have hoped for a long time for the disappearance of this terrible structure from under their windows. It was found that the unlucky building had changed the ownership several times. Probably the gloomy ruins still spoil area and induce horror. Ghosts of the past do not disappear so simply.” (Pravda, no. 357, 30 March 2002).

Shabby houses, old dormitories and barracks were built for the temporary use of construction workers or new workers in industrial facilities. If the building is officially recognised as ‘dilapidated’, it is necessary by law to grant the inhabitants a room or apartment. And as municipal housing is not sufficient, the queue for housing improvement is very long, and employers do not hasten to invest in repair and maintenance of buildings, people continue to live in a deteriorated environment.

Communal housing is the result of the tremendous

growth of the Moscow population (from 2 to 6 million people in 30 years) caused by the industrialisation of the country and of the shortage of housing. According to the ideology of that period it was appropriate to use of flats with many rooms designed and built before the October revolution (1917) for rich families to house those in housing need. New housing in Moscow built between 1920 and 1955 (before the mass production of houses) was designed both for communal and private use according to the model of ‘one family in one room’.

Outdated industrial housing of the first generation is a result of an urban policy aimed at building ‘more houses for less money’ and the extensive urban development of the 1950s. The industrial production of houses was developed to deal with the housing problem. However, due to the extension of the construction they produced a problem of their own. The mass construction of modest apartment buildings has resulted in a monotone, architecturally deprived type of building, associated with a rapid moral and physical deterioration of the housing stock and residential environment. A new generation of buildings (1970-1980) offered better flats but with increasing levels the psychological and microclimatic characteristics of the new residential areas deteriorated. “During the last decade about 1 million m² of shabby housing was demolished or reconstructed every year. Average per capita floor space has increased from 17.7 m² in 1990 to 21.3 m² in 2000. But alongside the sharp contrast in real housing possession, the queue for housing improvements is getting longer. A tentative estimate is that more than 200,000 Moscow families, or about 600,000 people are in the queue for improving their housing conditions, and the waiting list is 10 years or more. Annually only 10 – 20 per cent of the people in the queue are able to improve their living standards with the help of the city authorities.” (Town-planning of Moscow: the 90-s’ years XX centuries – 2001 Despite all the efforts to make up the shortfall, there is still a housing shortage in Moscow.

2. The Social, Political and Economic Advantages of the Dilapidated Housing to the City

Housing supply was considered to be one of the most painful social problems of the last century. Modest housing was politically approved of and cultivated. Presently the proportion of physically and morally out of date housing stock in the city is 36 per cent. This housing stock plays a number of roles:

- Shabby houses provide shelter for illegal migrants from CIC countries and abroad
- Abandoned houses are the playground for alternative communities
- Shared flats provide a way to house new workers for

socially important jobs

- Outdated houses are the possessions of poor people that they have received from Soviet times
- Newcomers are important for the city economy

According to Committee on Migration of the Government of Moscow, the number of illegal workers in Moscow exceeds 1 million people. But a popular internet site "Outlaws in Moscow" declares that the number of those living in the capital without registration is almost 3 million. Federal officers are sure, that at any one time about 5 million outlaws work in Moscow. About 2 million people constantly live in Moscow without registration. Foreign workers come to work in Moscow because of the poor living standards in their native towns. Even salaries of less than \$100 (2,500-3,000 roubles), which seem ridiculous to Muscovites are acceptable to workers from Bielorrussia, Moldavia and far away regions of Russia. The \$200-300 per month paid to builders is decent money for migrants from CIS. Migrants from Vietnam, China and citizens of some African countries are much better off in Moscow than at home. They live in Moscow, but can only afford shabby and deteriorated housing with their low incomes.

"We are interested in workers - foreigners - who come to Moscow. But they have to come legally. If you want to work in capital then please register yourself officially, and live, work and pay the taxes. ...Unfortunately many firms ignore that legal order. They prefer to employ outlaws, to pay them miserable salaries, and house 10-15 people in one room apartments. And the owner in the meantime receives the excess profit and evades taxes" (S.Orlov, Deputy of Moscow City Duma, in an interview with Romancheva I & Gaganjva A, 2002).

H. DATA ON THE CITY'S DETERIORATED BUILDING

There has been no growth and spread of dilapidated houses over time, but about 5 per cent of housing stock is in a unsatisfactory state. Almost all the buildings that can be considered "deteriorated housing" are equipped with sanitation, sewage, solid waste collection, electricity, public transportation and road access, but their inhabitants have no money to improve their living conditions, and they wait for the city to solve their problems. All through the Moscow area people have access to health care, to education and to primary schools.

Available census data on different types of dilapidated buildings:

- Squatter flats – no data

- Abandoned houses – no data
- Shabby and dilapidated buildings, abandoned houses - no aggregated data
- Communal (shared) flats are listed and residents are included in a queue for housing improvements. According to the Russian Federation State Committee of Statistics (1997) "In 151,000 flats there are still more than 318,000 families". These families are all in the list for housing improvements The queue for housing improvements still includes more than 500,000 people, and continues to grow with the addition of new migrants. About 100,700 m² of floor area in shabby and deteriorated housing makes up 1 per cent of all the housing stock in the city.
- Outdated first generation industrial housing. The low estimated parameters include practically all typical (industrial housing) built 30-40 years ago. Among these the lowest quality is found in 5-storey buildings from the first period of industrial housing production. A list of shabby and deteriorated buildings to be demolished by the city year by year is published in the newspaper Moscow Pravda #16, 2002.

I. Available Data on Poverty in the City

In the first quarter of 2001 the cost of living in Moscow was estimated at 2,067 roubles (US\$65) per month. The proportion of the population with incomes lower than the cost of living is 29.6 per cent of the population of Moscow and 36.6 per cent of the population of Russia. The proportion of the population with per capita income of more than 4,000 roubles per month (US\$130), is 12 per cent in Russia as a whole, and 44.5 per cent in Moscow (Government of Moscow Committee on Telecommunications and Mass Media 2002). The poverty line for residents of Moscow has been established at \$75 a month for non-working and \$85 a month for working citizens.

Because people with incomes below the poverty line compose about one third of the population of Moscow, the census data for poor people more or less reflect the Moscow average (Statistics of the Moscow Population. Master Plan Analyses. In: "Town-planning of Moscow: the 90-s' years XX centuries "-2001).

III. DETERIORATED BUILDINGS: THE PEOPLE

J. THE RESIDENTS OF THE DETERIORATED BUILDINGS

1. Short Histories and Key Events in the Lives of Typical Households

Story 1. The dormitory building in Krasnaya Presnia Street will not stand for long. The tenants are afraid to come back home from work, as at any moment instead of a building they may find a heap of bricks and garbage. The building was constructed almost 100 years ago in 1905. In 1974 it was leased by a food warehouse, which placed the non-resident workers here in small rooms divided by cardboard walls, with two gas cookers for 30 people. In due course everyone was promised separate housing accommodation. But the company ceased to exist, all promises vanished, and the building continues to collapse. In the cellar the water is knee deep, the walls are overgrown, the ceilings are propped up to prevent collapse.

"We were simply used" the tenants say. *"All of us have had to leave our homes, and have arrived in the capital. The women worked the loaders. At 5 in the morning they went to unload fruits from the planes. Muscovites do not work in jobs like this. And then the work finished. The former management has forgotten about us, and in the Uprava (local authority) they said "it is not pleasant here. Return to where you belong". Where? We have lived and have studied in Moscow for 25 years, our children were born here, and there is nowhere for us to go back to"*.

The urban interdepartmental commission on use of residential stock of Moscow recognised the housing emergency in 1998, but the Prefecture (the administrative region authority) has not yet issued the appropriate decree. And there are bureaucratic delays. If the building is recognised as being 'dilapidated', it is necessary to grant to the people a room or apartment. And the municipal housing is not sufficient, even for the Muscovites. In Moscow there are 696 workers' dormitories. 68 of them are the private property of businesses. The employers do not invest in repair and maintenance of buildings. In a similarly deadlocked situation there are also 301 dormitories (hostels) with a corridor plan in which the kitchen and bathrooms are common for all the inhabitants of a floor. The Government of Moscow decree NB 976 in 1994, according to which hostel residents should be resettled, applies only to buildings with room plans. This means that almost 50,000 people have no hope of their own housing in the near future.

"It may sounds heartless" says the assistant to the chairman of a Moscow City Duma commission on hous-

ing policy, Emelianova V, "but the Government of Moscow can not help the hostel tenants. First of all they need to demand that their former employers carry out their obligations, by going to court if necessary. Moscow's legislation offers the right to apply for housing accommodation to people who live in Moscow and who have been registered for more than 10 years" Galina Metelitsa, 2002.

Story 2. The building on Khoroshevsky Highway is due for demolition, but one family refuses to leave. These people live in empty building where the gas and water supplies are constantly being disconnected. The owner of the flat, Olga Raeva, an artist and teacher told her story: *"I have two sons, they study at the English and Music Schools which are close by. I wrote a letter asking for a new flat close to the place where I live now, I have a right to it... Why should we throw away good schools and move to God knows where?" Her neighbours meanwhile have moved for better or for worse. Some people were resettled in the building that Olga had aimed for. "We have a privatised apartment, so the state should either purchase it, or to give us an alternative which is not worse..."* In five months of struggle this woman has learnt the Housing Code. *"I do not ask for something extra" - the voice of Raeva sounds broken - "I just want my sons to live in normal conditions. And my mother is an invalid. Why should I should make the life of these people worse?"* (Interview by Lobanova Z, 2002).

2. Aspirations, Plans and Barriers to their Fulfilment

Interviews with families impoverished as a result of housing reforms have revealed several typical defence mechanisms which enable people to adapt to poverty: humility; poverty as a norm; self-isolation. These adaptation strategies to poverty were studied by Irina Shurygina, (1999).

Humility

Many respondents say that both they and their children are prepared to do with little:

- *"I have already got used to difficulties, that is why I find the way out of any situation. And my children are like me, they do not demand anything. They are satisfied with what they have."*

- *"My children are used to everything, to all these shortages. That is, to all these conditions."*

The idea that their children have got used to difficulties gives my women respondents a great relief: *"My children, thank God, do not ask me for anything"*, says one of them. The other echoes: *"I am very grateful to my children that they do not pester me all the time with their requests. They never say 'Give-give-give, buy-buy-buy'.* On the contrary, I myself sometimes urge my daughter:

'Let's buy you something' and she will reply: 'No, mummy, I don't need anything.'

What helps people to put up with poverty is the belief that money (or lack of it) is not the most important thing in life, which could bring much greater hardships: "The most important thing is to avoid war, then with time things will begin to look up." However, more often people express the conviction that family values are much more important than material well-being. In this case money and family are looked upon as antipodes and the choice is made in favour of family which is considered to be of the greatest value: "Life is not easy, but I always say – we are a close-knit family, we help each other and I have good children" or "My wealth is my children. I have never been after big money."

Poverty as a Norm

It is very difficult to think of oneself as a social outsider, as a failure. Yet, if one believes that other people do not live any better, then poverty begins to look not like a failure but as a norm of life.

"All the teachers, not only ourselves, are in the same position. We are not alone. Probably, every other person lives like that." Another respondent says: "Everybody lives like that." And "All the intelligentsia are having a hard time these days."

One more way to avoid the constant feeling of humiliation and injured pride is not to acknowledge one's poverty. In the long run there are always those who are still poorer: "We have an average income. We had it before, we have it now. We eat normally and dress modestly." "Old women go begging. So far I have not had to do it."

"We are not poor, we have an average income."

Self-isolation

As it is impossible to close one's eyes to the process of rapid stratification of the society the respondents try to avoid situations which can destroy their belief that "everybody lives like that". "I try, maybe subconsciously, to have fewer contacts with people who are richer than we are. Mostly because of my daughter. It seems to me that at her age children react very strongly to the fact that their parents cannot buy something or to go somewhere..."

To some extent all these attempts at psychological defence make people's lives easier. However, they are nothing but methods of adaptation to poverty which as a result starts to be perceived as a normal and inevitable way of life.

"This is what I think: this is how we live – not knowing how to steal, how to scheme, how to dodge – and that's how our children will live. They will be doomed to the same way of life if no improvements take place in our country, if there is no call for honest workers and society has no need for decent, hard-working people. At the

moment there is a negative attitude to working people. The diligent man lives in need while dishonest people prosper. If nothing changes, not only we but our children will drag out a miserable existence".

The above is a good illustration of the fact that use of psychological defence methods (the conviction that "the society has no need for honest workers", that only those who "steal, scheme and dodge" can avoid poverty) inevitably entails the conclusion that the respondents' children are doomed to a "miserable existence". Which mother would wish her children to become dishonourable, dishonest idlers?

The conclusion we have arrived at is unfortunately far from being optimistic. The poverty of the "new poor" is not a temporary lack of money but a psychological condition which has a serious impact on the socialisation of children: it makes them lower the level of their aspirations, conditions them to accept their fate and be content with little, impedes adaptation to school. Already at this stage it is clear that in most cases children from poor families are doomed to defeat in their competition with their well-to-do peers.

The mothers' high educational level slows down the process of the children falling into "the culture of poverty" rather than prevents it. A very thin line separates present-day Russian society from the situation when many people would join the ranks of chronically, hopelessly poor with their own subculture. Actually it is just a question of time.'- Shurygina I, (1999).

K. HOUSEHOLD INDICATORS FOR THE TYPES OF SLUM IDENTIFIED

Of 1,000 Muscovites, 860 live in a separate apartment, 102 in common (shared) flats, 33 in dormitories, 1 in individual houses, 1 in part of an individual house, 3 lease a residential premise. In terms of total floor area in Moscow 5-storey buildings occupy 24 per cent of residential floor area (information from "Town-planning of Moscow: the 90-s' years XX centuries "-2001)

Moscow provides financial help to families with per/capita incomes lower than 8500 roubles (\$275) (from: Moscow in 2002). People with incomes of US\$300 or more per month can improve their housing conditions with the help of credit, mortgages, loans, etc.

Households with a floor area of less than 5-9 m² per person have the right to free housing (or to join a queue for improving their housing conditions).

"By the beginning of 1999 the housing stock in Moscow had reached 179.2 million m² of floor area, or 3.49 million apartments. The average size of the Moscow apartment was 53 m².

Average figures for Moscow for the end of 1990s:

- floor area for one resident, 20.5 m²
- number of inhabitants per room, 1.29

- number of rooms per apartment, 2.2

The ratio between the number of household members and the number of rooms in an apartment in Moscow is comparable to similar ratios in Middle Eastern and Far Eastern countries."

(Town-planning of Moscow: the 90-s' years XX centuries ,2001)

Birth/Fertility Rates

People living in deteriorated houses are average Muscovites. Birth/fertility rates reflect the trends for natu-

Table 3. Household Types in Percentages

Type of residence	Estimated percentage of household type
Squatter flats	No data
Abandoned houses	Less than 100 buildings
Shabby and dilapidated buildings	About 5% of total housing stock of the city
Communal housing	About 10% of total housing stock of the city
Outdated Industrial housing of the first generation	24% of total housing stock of the city

Source: State Committee of Russian Federation on Statistics, (1997)

Table 4. Income by Quintile and Household Type

Type of residence	Estimated average monthly income
Squatter flats	1,500 rub (\$50-100 per capita)
Abandoned houses	- no formal households-
Shabby and dilapidated buildings	3000-4000 rub (\$100-200 per capita)
Communal housing	Up to 6000 rub (\$100-250 per capita)
Outdated Industrial housing of the first generation	9000 rub (\$300 per family)

Source: personal survey and occasional interviews

Table 5. Household Size

Type of residence	Estimated average household size
Squatter flats	30-45 m ²
Abandoned houses	30-70 m ²
Shabby and dilapidated buildings	20-30 m ²
Communal housing	30-40 m ²
Outdated Industrial housing of the first generation	40-60 m ² per family of 3

Source: personal survey and occasional interviews

Table 6 Types of Tenure and House Ownership

Type of residence	Expected ownership
Squatter flats	Illegal use of municipal housing (subletting)
Abandoned houses	Illegal use of "no-one' s" property
Shabby and dilapidated buildings	Industry, company, institutional ownership (rent)
Communal housing	Municipal housing stock, privatised rooms
Outdated Industrial housing of the first generation	Municipal housing stock, privatised flats

Source: personal survey and occasional interviews

Table 7 Occupancy Ratios

Type of residence	Floor area per person in m ²	Number of people per household
Squatter flats	3-5	Up to 15 to a room
Abandoned houses	Free occupancy	5-10 people in unformed groups
Shabby and dilapidated buildings	5-10	1-3 to a room in shared flat
Communal housing	10- 15	2-3 for 2 rooms
Outdated Industrial housing of the first generation	12- 17	3-4 for 3 room flat

Source: personal survey and occasional interviews

Table 8 Length of Household Residency in Slum

Type of residence	Estimated length of household residency
Squatter flats	2-5 weeks
Shabby and dilapidated buildings	2-5 years
Communal housing	15-20 years
Outdated Industrial housing of the first generation	30-40 years

Source: personal survey and occasional interviews

ral gain/loss of population: of 1,000 people, 8.5 were born and 15.2 died in the 1990s (Town-planning of Moscow: the 90-s' years XX centuries "-2001).

Of 1,000 Muscovites 675 live in a flat belonging to the state, 325 live in privatised residential stock (Town-planning of Moscow: the 90-s' years XX centuries 2001).

Literacy Rates by Age Group, Sex and other Relevant Variables

There is universal free education in Moscow. Literacy is around 100 per cent. Many of the "new poor" have higher educational and scientific degrees.

"The number of apartments in Moscow since 1996 has exceeded the number of families, but this has not reduced the queue for municipal housing accommodation. People have lived in deteriorated buildings for 20 years or more." (Town-planning of Moscow: the 90-s' years XX centuries "-2001)

L. THE COST OF LIVING IN DILAPIDATED BUILDINGS

There is no special research on people living in deteriorated buildings because they are the same as average Muscovites. They are even not always poor people.

In general it can be suggested that people who are not poor remain in shabby buildings for several reasons:

- They were promised a better place to live at the city's expense when their turn in the queue comes.
- They have not got enough money to buy a new flat.

Urban Slums Reports: The case of Moscow, Russia

- They could not borrow money because they have low salaries and no collateral.
- They are old or handicapped and afraid to lose their only "property".
- They want better housing than that offered by the city.
- They let their flat to other tenants and live somewhere better, but still are considered as residents.

1. Commuting to Work

Moscow has an advanced and cheap system of public transportation that covers the whole city. A monthly ticket for all types of public transportation underground, bus and trolley-bus costs 360 roubles (\$12).

2. Availability of Housing Finance

Formal mortgages or credits are not available for poor people in municipal houses, as they have no collateral. Short-term credits with high interest rates are not affordable for low-income people with low wages. The Moscow Government accumulates funds for social housing and has a Department for Out of Budget Financing that controls housing investments.

"In 1995 public production of houses in Moscow was 92 per cent funded from the "out of budget" sources, city and federal budgets added 4 per cent. "Out of budget" investments came from the 1995 sale of housing (78 per cent), sale of objects from uncompleted construction (4 per cent), sale of the rights of ground lease (10 per cent) and shares in enterprises and organisations (8 per cent)" (Moscow - 2002)

Table 9 Prices of Water and Other Services

Type of residence	Price of water, electricity and other services
Squatter flats and abandoned houses	No payment
Abandoned houses	No payment or less than US\$10 per household
Shabby and dilapidated buildings	No payment or less than US\$5 per household
Communal housing	About US\$5-10 per household
Outdated Industrial housing of the first generation	About US\$15 for a 2 room household. Usually with subsidies people pay about US\$10 a month per household both for services and rent.

Source: personal survey and occasional interviews

Table 10 Rental Rates

Type of residence	Expected rental rates for household per month	Informal sub-rent per month
Squatter flats and abandoned houses	-	US\$100 for a room in a shared flat with services
Abandoned houses	No payment	No payment or US\$300 for a flat with services
Shabby and dilapidated buildings	No payment or US\$5 per month	US\$50 for a room
Communal housing	About US\$12 for 1 room	US\$150- 200 a month for a room
Outdated Industrial housing of the first generation	About US\$15 for a 2 room flat	US\$200-300 for a flat of 45 m².

Source: personal survey and occasional interviews

3. Discrimination in Employment and Education

Public services and job opportunities are open to people with correct registration.

M. ASSETS AVAILABLE TO SLUM DWELLERS

1. Social Capital

Poor people use the same social premises as other Muscovites. There are a large number of civic and community organisations in Moscow, some of which relate to particular social groups, including religious and cultural organisations, but very few of them deal with issues of particular interest to specific neighbourhoods. Housing was traditionally a state prerogative. Now the situation has changed.

The first experiments in collective groups with people linked together at district levels stumbled because of an absence of effective financial instruments (like low-level mortgages, virtual ownership of “private” flats in semi-private buildings on city-owned land) and the inefficiency of the Uprava bureaucracy (see the Fili-Davidcovj case study on page 20 of this report).

People with different incomes see the improvements of their housing in different wayS. However people

living together for a long time or with a strong mutual interests can form effective small associations of residents called “home committees” with branches in every section of the building. These organisations play an important role in the public control and maintenance of houses. In old neighbourhoods a yard-based structure or “yard-committees” prevail. In the buildings where most of the flats are privatised, the housing committees can hire additional services like a concierge, keep and maintain public the entrance and stairs and decorate the halls and corridors with paintings and flowers. This would seem to be the best model for the near future.

2. Financial Capital

Poor people try not to invest money in housing because they consider it an obligation of the state to improve their housing condition. Poor people generally rely on state support: subsidies, privileges, pensions, obligations to provide them with free housing, and other services.

3. Human Capital

The Moscow population is getting older, so newcomers are very important for the city economy. In Soviet times there were construction-oriented public organisations for young people called MJK – Youth-Housing-Complexes. MJK used the human capital of those wishing to invest their personal time in the construction of their own houses. The land, project documentation, infrastructure and building materials were provided (often in a credit form) by the local administration and supervised by political organisations like Comsomol and CPSU. Volunteers (young people) worked on the construction site in their free time and during their vacations. Such a form of utilising human capital could speed up the long waiting times in the queues for housing improvements. The negative side of this approach was the low quality of buildings made by unskilled labour.

Nowadays the MJK are not in practice because they were organised and partly sponsored by the local “Comsomol” (“Youth Communist Union”) that ceased to exist after perestroika. No NGO has taken over this activity in the city. It is felt that modern buildings in a city should be built by professionals.

4. Physical Capital

The only property poor people can turn into capital is their privatised flats. Old people usually are scared to do business with it and sometimes they want to return their flats to the city ownership. There are several groups of people who are interested in returning the ownership of their flats to the municipality, for example, those people who had privileges (veterans of war and labour, invalids, families with many children and so on) but lost them when they became the owners of their apartments, people who had a right to housing

Table 11 : Financial Expenditures for a Typical “Slum Household” (US\$ per month)

Type of residence	Housing	Food	Transport
Squatter flats and abandoned houses	-	About US\$50 (per person) (below the poverty line)	-
Abandoned houses	No payment	No data	No data
Shabby and dilapidated buildings	About US\$10 for 1 room flat	About US\$80 (for household) (near the poverty line)	US\$10
Communal housing	About US\$20 for 1 room	US\$120 (for 1 person in household)	US\$15
Outdated Industrial housing of the first generation	About US\$25 for a 2 room flat (45 m2)	US\$150-200 (per household)	US\$20

Source: personal survey and occasional interviews

improvement, but lost it after privatisation, old people who fear pressure from relatives or swindlers trying to get hold of their valuable property. They are waiting for a chance to de-privatise their homes.

5. Supportive Public Policy

The development of social and economic partnerships, the promotion of grassroots initiatives of the citizens, supporting a budget-financial system of local self-government are understood to be the main directions of the Moscow Governments programmes (Moscow, 2002).

Moscow provides financial help in a form of rent and service deduction to families with per capita incomes lower than 8,500 roubles (US\$275). If housing payments exceed 13 per cent of the family budget support will be provided through payment of the budget grants to organisations such as suppliers of services or personally to residents.

IV. DILAPIDATED HOUSES AND POVERTY: THE POLICIES

N. THE POLICIES AND ACTIONS TAKEN TO IMPROVE DILAPIDATED HOUSES AND ALLEVIATE POVERTY

1. Federal Programmes

The government of the Russian Federation has accepted the decree entitled "A Federal Purpose-Oriented Programme - Housing for the Years 2002-2010". The main purpose of the programme is to make a transition to sustainable development in the housing sphere, ensuring availability of housing accommodation to citizens in a safe and comfortable urban environment. The mechanism for realising and financing the programme includes the development of two subprogrammes: "Reforming and Modernising Municipal Housing in the Russian Federation" and "Resettlement of the Citizens of the Russian Federation Living in Shabby and Dilapidated Housing Stock".

The plan is to eliminate existing dilapidated housing stock by the year 2010, (by the beginning of 2000 the scope of the project was estimated at 8.2 million m²). To realise these measures, the federal budget has allocated 5.7 million roubles (US\$186.1 million). The housing grants (subsidies) for the payment of municipal services at a rate of 332 billion roubles (US\$10,709 million) will be financed from all of the budgets.

Among the programme measures are normative and legal documents ensuring the realisation of the programme goals, such as the necessary changes and additions to the Civil and Tax Codes of the Russian

Federation, and to various federal laws.

With regard to the refugee population, within the framework of the subprogram "Providing Housing Accommodation to Refugees and People Changing their Settlement in the Russian Federation" 7,998 million roubles (US\$258 million) from the federal budget will be allocated. Providing housing accommodation for certain categories of citizens as an obligation of as an obligation of the state will be continued with a budget of 4,396.2 million roubles (US\$142 million) (source: Housing for 2002-2010 years (2002)).

2. The Moscow City Master Plan: Socio-Economic Targeting of Housing Development

The struggle to overcome the problem of deteriorated buildings and to improve housing conditions for Muscovites is clearly seen in as one of the main directions for the Moscow Master Plan (1999-2020). With the help of the accumulated resources of the public and private sectors and according to the Moscow Master Plan Law, the following changes in housing construction and development will take place in the next 20 years:

- The practical liquidation of shared flats and increase of housing space to 26-28 m²/person. An Increase in the total scope of housing stock from 176 to 220-230 million m². This figure includes new development programmes - 12-13 million m² and the reconstruction of residential stock - 25-31 million m², as well as new housing construction on former industrial and other territories - 7-10 million m².
- The reduction and stabilisation of the total share of physically amortised and morally of out-of-date residential stock from 36 to 15 per cent by means of the demolition and substitution of typical first generation apartment houses, and by an increase in the annual scope of reconstruction, with from 0.2-0.3 and up to 1.4 million m² per year.
- The improvement of maintenance and operating performances of residential buildings through an increase in high quality housing stock and a decrease in low quality residential stock.
- The improvement of the urban environment, concentrating on socio-psychological and ecological comfort, architectural expressiveness and functional sufficiency of residential areas, complex accomplishment of residential areas in the last years of construction.
- An increase in the efficiency of use of urban territories with mixed-use developments from 6,000 to 11,000 hectares, an increase in density of the resi

dential and mixed residential buildings in urban activity zones to 15-20,000 m²/hectare and the creation of high quality structures of residential stock appropriate to the town-planning potential of residential areas. (Oleg Baevski, 1999, page 26).

3. Non-Governmental Interventions: Community-Based and NGO-Based Programmes to Improve Dilapidated Houses and to Alleviate/Eradicate Poverty

Low wages for people employed in social services, education, administration and other "state jobs" is a well-known social problem that does not allow well-educated working people to improve their housing. The state (municipal government) has an obligation to provide people qualified as being in housing need with better housing, and it does so, but unfortunately, rather slowly. In order to accelerate the process certain measures have been planned or undertaken by the Moscow Government:

- Increases in wages for people engaged in public institutions, thereby extending the number of families able to improve their housing using their personal savings.
- Reforms to the economic relations of the housing sector of the city economy, with the aim of gradually reducing budget subsidies for services with a change towards supporting families with low incomes.
- Escalating the scope of reconstruction of housing stock and extension of construction of housing accommodation using "out of budget" funds accumulated through development contracts with private developers and selling city share in new buildings.
- Escalating the scope of reconstruction of housing stock and extension of construction of housing accommodation using "out of budget" funds accumulated through development contracts with private developers and selling city share in new buildings.
- Escalating the scope of reconstruction of housing stock and extension of construction of housing accommodation using "out of budget" funds accumulated through development contracts with private developers and selling city share in new buildings.
- Development of social and economic partnerships is seen as a strong instrument for supervising building and environment maintenance. Unfortunately this instrument has not been well developed, because attention was traditionally paid principally

to the macro-economy. Social workers who work with housing committees are still rare. That is why the promotion of grassroots initiatives is a very important item for the city government.

- Moscow is a very big city and the activity of the Moscow Government should be implemented together with the local Upravas. Until now the Uprava have had very few resources, authority and experience, and though they are headed by elected public officials, local people get very little feedback because no real initiatives can be undertaken by this structure. It is very important to increase the abilities and enablement of the Upravas. That is why central government is planning to increase support for a budget-financial system of local self-government.
- Fund-raising is almost impossible for community-based and NGO-based organisations in Moscow. That is one of the reasons why NGOs are not very successful in dealing with the housing problem: public opinion and public resources are already aimed at the housing problem. Private capital is channelled to private housing. In almost every private development the city government has a share or receives a lump sum for the right to use the land. Those funds are accumulated for investment in municipal housing developments. In this way almost every new construction represents a partnership between public and private capital.

O. IMPACTS OF THESE EFFORTS

1. Moscow Government

- The 2001 housing programme was carried out completely. The construction of 3.5 million m² of housing in 2001 offered 64,700 families a chance to improve their housing conditions, that is, 6,700 more families than in 2000.
- New houses with a total of 1.3 million m² of floor area were assigned in 2001 to be granted to people in the queue housing improvements and for resettlements. As a result 27,300 families have improved their housing conditions, out of which more than 9,000 families in priority categories have received separate apartments with a total floor area of 470,200 m².
- In 2001 self-contained apartments were given to 1,488 families of invalids and veterans of the Great Patriotic War.
- The city has granted about 5,000 m² of housing to 98 families in housing need after the Chernobyl

Power Station disaster.

- Restoration of 5-storey shabby and dilapidated buildings was carried out. As a result 15,500 families from 250 residential structures with a floor area of 670,200 m² were resettled.
- About 650 million roubles (US\$21 million) were allocated in the 2001 Moscow City budget for free grants for construction or purchase of housing. As a result, 1,649 Moscow families have acquired 99,400 m² of floor area, adding 473.7million roubles (US\$15 million) of their own savings.
- The free transfer of housing to private ownership (privatisation) continues on the basis of federal law
- The programme of reconstruction of 5-storey and shabby housing stock in Moscow has become one of the main social problems of the city. The scope of resettled and demolished houses constantly increases. If in 1998 117 buildings were demolished, in a 2000 it was 169, in 2001, 250, that is, more than twice the 1998 level.
- In 2002 more than 13,000 families of Muscovites from 195 deteriorated buildings will improve their housing conditions.

(Source: *Implementation of Moscow Government Programs, 2001*).

Fily Davidkovo Housing Area – a History of Successes and Failures 1994-2002

Fily Davidkovo, a housing area of about 150 hectares was mostly developed between 1960 and 1970, and now mostly consists of 5 storey buildings in poor conditions. The idea of reconstruction was brought to life by the residents' group. The aim of the project was to improve living conditions for more than 25,000 local inhabitants without major governmental investments. It was estimated that the new housing stock for resettlement should exceed the demolished housing stock by 1.3 times in order to meet modern standards of settlement. The assumption was that all the financial resources for the social programme could be gained through selling new commercial housing that would be built in the same area.

1994 Plans

During the conceptual planning phase, the region was divided into three main zones with different urban strategies:

- *Regeneration* - demolition of old and construction of new housing with increased density

- *Reconstruction* - modernisation of the old buildings and landscape
- *Renovation* - environmental improvements

Old prefabricated houses on 50 hectares of land would be replaced by modern 16-22 storey buildings. That would meet the demands of the local population and provide vacant sites for the construction of commercial housing and public and business centres.

The modernisation of the old concrete houses had several objectives: refitting the flats, improvement of wall insulation, increasing the amount of useable space using the roof area and spaces between the buildings.

The reconstruction of 42 hectares of the old neighbourhood was based on the social studies of people's analysis of real land use. Outdoor areas between the high-rise municipal housing were to provide a place for social activities for young and elderly residents.

The local government supported the activity but could not sponsor it. A private investment construction company "CONTY" offered its help and paid for the project documentation.

The plan was established in the West Moscow Planning Bureau and adopted by the Municipal Council of Moscow in 1994. According to city decree #610 the status quo was to remain: all the houses were to remain in municipal property (no privatisation allowed). The private development company CONTY started carrying out the project on a contract with the prefecture. The initial balance of public/private housing stock was 50/50.

1996 Findings

In two years three houses were demolished and about 100,000 m² of floor area were built. The economic crisis of 1996 altered the previous plans. The development company found that in the new economic environment they could not meet the financial balance of reconstruction if they built the same type of houses for social and commercial purposes. So it was decided to build panel-wall houses for the local residents and brick wall houses for sale. Even with the use of this segregated system the ratio of municipal/commercial housing in the scheme would have to be 30/70 and not 50/50. The project faced a deficit of sites for commercial housing. The re-housing coefficient (the relation of new flat sizes to the old ones) in practice was reduced from 1.3 to 1.8-2. People wanted to gain more from the demolition of their flats. The result was that there was no room for re-housing in the same area.

1997, Three Alternative Strategies

In 1997 three alternative strategies were studied (Krashennikov, 1997)

1. The Moscow Government would undertake the

project and assign US\$71 million to carrying on the programme. There were not sufficient resources for that.

2. The private development company could meet the minimum required profits if there were enough land for new constructions or they received a subsidy of not less than US\$10 million.

3. The Local Housing Association (NGO) could generate about US\$5million (in accumulated rent), about ½ of what was needed. So they would require either a US\$5million subsidy or a reduction in the plans. With a strong credit line of \$5 million the area could be renovated: part of the old houses would be retained and reconstructed later. The new urban design project would incorporate a private/public partnership between the development company and the housing association.

Another financial crisis in 1998 brought an end to plans for public interventions. No Housing Association was formed, and even private companies could hardly get credit at that time.

2002: Lessons Learned

The private development company had to build commercial houses in the available area and the reconstruction of the housing continues very slowly. After 7 years of reconstruction the programme has received no subsidy and local residents have received only 15-20% of the planned new housing.

If the idea of the Housing Association was supported and certain social work was undertaken, an NGO could control the development. That would also mean strong budget allocations at least for the NGO activity, a municipal subsidy for credit allowance and a lot of privileges for the public development in order to make it compatible with private development company.

The programme could be fulfilled with people's investment (mortgage credit) if housing rents were to rise by 10 times. Such an approach is unsuitable now for social reasons, because rents cannot be higher than 20 per cent of the annual income of the family.

The income of Muscovites is gradually increasing. The Moscow Duma is working on advanced legislation. With time more and more Muscovites will be able to improve their housing with personal resources, but there will still be about 20 per cent of low-income citizens who will need public support and municipal housing even in 20 years. By that time housing will be the burden of the city government.

Reasons for Successes and Failures

One of the general reasons for housing crises is a shift in the national economy. During the transitional period the housing sector did not receive enough resources. "Throughout the country shabby and dilapidated housing stock constitutes about 50 million m². Reconstruction and resettlement of residents would

cost about 160 billion roubles (US\$5,161 million) over the next 10 years" (Strategy of Realisation of Federal programme Housing 2000-2020).

"The state of crisis of the housing complex is based on its dependence on subsidies and unsatisfactory financing, expensive maintenance and absence of economic incentives for reduction of costs of municipal services, lack of a competitive environment and, as a consequence, high percentage of wear of fixed capital assets, ineffective operation of the enterprises, large-scale loss of energy, water and other resources"

That self-critical passage is taken from the Strategy for the Realisation of a Federal Housing Programme 2000-2020

The main reasons for housing crises in general are as follows:

- high presence of social housing with under-funded underpaid services
- poor organisation of residents in their efforts to maintain a good environment
- high bureaucratisation of municipal government and unfriendly attitude of numerous local officers making it difficult to enable grass root activity of community-based organisations and NGOs
- housing maintenance subsidies go not to residents but to municipal services with no economic incentives to improve their work.

Alternative means to escape from the housing crisis are understood as follows:

- privatisation of housing, giving more rights to owners and easing the burden of the state
 - organisation of residents in community based organisations, as a means to improve public control of maintenance and effective use of government subsidies
 - state and municipal housing subsidies should go directly to the recipients and not to agencies, which could increase the competition between public and private maintenance agencies
 - municipal support for NGO activity could accumulate additional resources for poor people
- "The share of private housing stock in Russia as a whole in 2000 was more than 63 per cent in comparison with 33 per cent in 1990, and the share of state and municipal housing stock was reduced from 67 to 35 per cent". (Strategy of realisation of Federal programme Housing 2000-2020). Naturally private flats can be

placed in a real estate market and the owners have a chance to improve their housing conditions with the help of state or private loans. Unfortunately this approach is only available to well to do groups who have an official income of more than US\$300 per family per month.

“It is expected, that the incomes of the population (1997-2020) will rise 3 times. Together with the efforts of the Moscow Government, this will allow a reduction in the acuteness of the housing problem in city and will provide access for all Muscovites to quality services - both paid, and free of charge.” (Master plan of the city 1999 page 14).

Lessons Learned

In the new economic conditions in our country, the search for the optimum balance between private and municipal capital in the realisation of the town-planning programme has not come to an end.

The financial risk of long-term town-planning programmes, inevitable in a market economy, should support the idea that such initiatives should be based on private (individual) investments, and the share participation of the state should be limited to the development of conditions, town-planning programmes and systems of cost-benefits stimulating development in a selected direction. On the other hand until most of the population has access to financial resources (credit,

subsidies, grants and so on) – the obligation of local government is to supervise social housing.

The search for the means of financing of urgent town-planning measures in residential housing brings us to the practice of public-private contracts that allow commercial activity in stipulated territories whilst incurring obligations of solving social problems, in particular ensuring that the population has housing. However, in practice it means a double tax on commercial activity (the first being value-added tax and second the free transfer to municipal bodies of parts of new residential funds, making such programmes feasible only in the central city districts where the prices of land are very high.

In the new socio-economic conditions, in which the financial resources of the municipal economy are rather limited, the role of the state is to stimulate and support the realisation of town-planning programmes. With time it should become more a catalyst than the moving force in town-planning transformations. Developments would generally go through private sector with only 10-20 per cent of people being personally affected by subsidies and protected by municipal programmes and NGOs.

At present the transition from a planned to a market economy has caused a fundamental change in social policy and, unfortunately, has led to a fast decrease in the social protection of the population. The new government has faced a complex problem - to create a new system of social protection of the population and to

Table 12 Lessons Learned

<p>Importance of context (political, social, economic, cultural, legal)</p>	<p>Promotion of market development has allowed the growth of budget income and investment in social housing. But even in Moscow that gives only 1/10th of the necessary resources. The public sector could solve the housing problem with the investments of private capital and peoples' input. Unfortunately the obstacles to this approach are poor self-organisation of people, "experimental" legislation and a general disbelief in the possibility of fair bargaining with the bureaucratic system. Occasional Home Committees (a kind of NGO) are found and work well especially in the buildings that were built with people's money in the form of co-operatives. Co-operatives were a form of private investment in housing in Soviet times. A state agency provided credit and members of the co-operative paid it off in 10-12 years. At first flats were not private but jointly owned.</p>
<p>Importance of leadership</p>	<p>The social activity of residents is very important for their housing improvement. Needy tenants should demand the fulfilment of the obligations of their former employers, and the city government, even through court. Moscow legislation gives the right to apply for housing accommodation for people who have lived in Moscow with proper registration for more than 10 years.</p>
<p>Importance of various types of capital</p>	<p>Private investment in real estate development provides shares in new housing for the city. That process accelerates housing development, especially on expensive sites.</p>
<p>Importance of correct targeting</p>	<p>Existing practices have confirmed that the most effective form of performance by the state for its obligations to provide citizens with housing is granting budget grants for the purchase of housing with the use of the mechanism of the state housing certificates. Most consistently this approach is realised in a federal task-oriented programme "The State Housing Certificates", authorised by a decree of Government of the Russian Federation since January 20, 1998. N 71.</p>

Table 13: Moscow Government Plans for 2002

Total scope of new housing including	4.2 million m ²
- Urban budget	236,700 m ²
- Investment contracts	194,000 m ²
- By means of special housing-investment stock	40,000 m ²
Construction of housing for resettlement of the citizens in the programme of reconstruction 5-storey and shabby housing:	900,000 m ²
- Urban budget	200,000 m ²
- Investment contracts	700,000 m ²
Submission of the free grants to the citizens on construction or purchase of housing	\$36.12 (1,120 million roubles)
For granting to young families	Not less than 100,000 m ² from the total volume of input of housing accommodation

Source: The Moscow Government Programme for 2002.

Table 14: Social Support Measures for Low-Income Muscovites

Main measures	Population receiving help (thousands)	Total costs in million Roubles/ million US\$
Address compensatory payments for children from the urban budget	200.9	250.2 (US\$8.07)
Free power supply, indemnification of power supply to school-children	989.6	1912.5 (US\$61.7)
Material help for veterans, invalids and participants in the Great Patriotic War	218	48.3 (US\$1.5)
Monthly supplements to pensions from the urban budget	1,991	12,576.5 (US\$405.7)
Free and preferential medical assistance	1,823	3,340 (US\$107.7)
Social help and measures in the rehabilitation of invalids	185	275 (US\$8.87)

Source: Moscow in 2002, page 6

save to the maximum its social infrastructure base. The situation was complicated by the fact that the transformation of the system of social bonuses occurred against a background of recession in production and the living standards of the population.

One of the new financing and organisational mechanisms used by the Moscow Government to gain resources for municipal housing is the Investment Contract for Site Development. By means of this mechanism, a lump sum can be paid in the form of shares in the future development. In that way almost every housing development in Moscow is organised as a Public-Private Partnership in which the city's capital contribution is introduced in the form of leasehold interest. In return for this contribution the city receives 30-40 per cent of built housing.

Moscow has concentrated a high economic potential for modern development. First of all, it has qualified labour and a central position in the economic system and infrastructure of country. Use of these factors and the orientation of the Moscow Government, as well as the administration of a number of leading regions in Russia, on the stimulation of inflow of the investments has given a chance to social programmes. The support of large and small businesses and active industrial and investment policies have allowed the growth of budget incomes. Deductions from 'out of budget' funds ensure high levels of financing of investments in the social sphere. As a result the structure of the city economy has acquired a market orientation that has sped up its development, as expressed in the numerous social programmes and construction activity.

P. COMMITMENT TO REGULAR MONITORING, FEEDBACK AND ADJUSTMENTS OF POLICIES AND PROGRAMMES

The commitment of the Federal Government to housing policy and programme monitoring is seen in a constantly improving legal base for housing policy in order to adjust budget commitments.

Among programme measures normative and legal documents ensuring the realisation of programme aims have been developed, ensuring a uniform basis for the recognition of the citizens' rights for housing accommodation or improvement of the housing conditions with the assistance of public authorities and local government.

Ensuring the completion of the transition to direct financial support for citizens requiring housing or improvements to housing conditions by granting personal grants for the purchase of housing, and establishing a precise regulation of procedures on the distribution of grants with the uniform methodical approach

of definition of sizes of the grants and control of their distribution and use. (Federal Housing Programme, 2000-2020).

In its plans for 2002 the following measures are proposed by the Moscow City Government for the social support of the population with the low incomes:

- To save the programmes of social support established by the urban authorities for the low-income population.
- To develop a new legal project for the transition to granting of social support in accordance with actual per capita incomes and cost of living.
- To carry out measures to increase the social support to low-income people and families with dependent children, to improve preventive measures against social orphans (children who prefer to leave their family), adaptation of housing and urban infrastructure for the handicapped.
- On the basis of a comprehensive programme of measures of social protection for the inhabitants of Moscow for 2002, to develop similar programmes in administrative districts and to provide finance measures, with drafts of target budget development funds for administrative districts and areas.
- To set up social support for families with young children, help students and youth, support veterans of the Great Patriotic War and elderly citizens, and give material support for the rehabilitation of invalids." (Moscow in 2002, P. 6)

"Among other measures taken are the development of two complex centres for social services, 4 centres for social help to families and children, 65 special acting centres, 2 social shelters for children and teenagers, and medical block on the territory of a special boarding school for children without families.

356 million roubles (US\$11.48 million) were allocated for the purchase of 160 hectares of land in the Moscow Region and the development of an infrastructure for the accommodation of a collective garden for preferential categories of residents.

For the realisation of measures stipulated by the urban medical programme, the necessary allowance from the city budget is planned, (Moscow in 2002,p. 7)

1. Policy Commitments

According to federal legislation 57,000 families in Moscow, or 30 per cent of the total population waiting housing improvements have various privileges in terms of granting of residential floor area. The volume of housing created for free granting allows the annual

provision of housing to between 8 and 8,500 families. Every year it is necessary to make a difficult choice between 16 and 17,000 families out of the 57,000 with housing privileges. This problem is decided by the priorities for grants. The law is directed at granting housing to orphans, invalids, badly-ill citizens, veterans of war and work, families with dependent children and others urgently requiring housing. Other aspects of the city's social policy can be found on the following web-site: www.mos.ru

2. Commitment of NGOs to Monitoring Slum Conditions

The privatisation of housing and the transition to a market economy has not been supported by the necessary legislation, financial and organisational measures so far. That is why the professional activity of such Non-Governmental Organisations as the Union of Architects of Russia and the Union of Moscow Architects is essential in the promotion of better legislation and mechanisms for people's involvement in the planning and practice of housing construction. An important research and co-ordinating role in that activity is taken by the Russian Academy of Architecture and Building Sciences.

Other NGOs such as The Society of Mothers with Many Children, The Soviet of Veterans and The Society of Invalids monitor the social aid and provision of housing accommodation to the appropriate population groups.

The city government takes the main responsibility for programme monitoring, feedback and adjustment.

3. Commitment of International Technical Co-operation Agencies

Financial allocations for dealing with international investment projects and international financial organisations are planned in the city budget.

ACRONYMS

MJK Youth Housing Complexes

GLOSSARY

Microraiion	Microregion
Uprava	Local Administrative Areas
Propiska	Moscow Residency Registration
Obschag	Temporary Barracks for Workers
Communalky	Communal Flats
Vethi	Shabby Buildings
Avariyni	Dilapidated Buildings
Ocheredniki	Required Home Residents (prerequisite for housing queues)
BOMji	People without Permanent Addresses
Hrushebi	Nickname for Industrial Housing
Baraks	Primitive Housing Built for Construction Workers

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Moscow State Department of Statistics (1990) *Moscow in Numbers 1990*, a Statistical Yearbook. Moscow State Department of Statistics, Moscow

The Totals of distribution of residential floor area in Moscow for 1996 " 73 , 1997.

" *Town-planning of Moscow: the 90-s' years XX centuries* " Ed. by Chief architect of Moscow - Kuzmin A.V. Joint-stock company " the Moscow textbooks and Kartolitographia " ?., 2001

'*Housing for 2002-2010 years*'. Federal purpose-oriented programme. Published in " Assembly of the legislation of Russian Federation ", " The Russian Newspaper " from September 26, 2001, No 187 (2799). © " The Russian newspaper ", 1998-2002 (Http: // www.rg.ru/oficial/doc/postan _ rf/FCP.shtml)

" *Stategy of realisation of federal programme Housing 2000-2020* http://www.gvozdik.ru/analit/article0058C/default.asp

Baevski O. Strategy of Moscow Urban Development in XXI century. " *Architecture, Construction, Design* " 4 (14) 1999. pages 18 –33

Constitution of Russian Federation, 1993

Estate news. *Theme attachment to "Izvestia" newspaper*, 10 June 10, 2002. Page 15

Glushkov V.G. " *A Social portrait of Moscow on a threshold XXI centuries* " ? , "Misl", 1999, page 129

Golovachev V. (2002) *Poverty reseeds but slowly*. Trud, 24 April 2002 page 2.

Gorbachev's coming to power. [Http://petsu.karelia.ru/international/courses/history/topic10_1.htm](http://petsu.karelia.ru/international/courses/history/topic10_1.htm). -2002.

Implementation of Moscow Government programmes on 2001. Committee on telecommunications and mass media of Government of Moscow. Information - analytical issue "government - city-people", N 3 (152) 2002. <http://mos.ru/progr/prog>

Korotaev V. From the history of development and realisation of Moscow urban development plans until the 90th. " *Architecture, Construction, Design* " ? 4 (14) 1999. pages 8-11.

Krasheninnikov A. V. - *Housing development programme for Fili-Davidkovo, Moscow*. Final report for workshop: Inner City Development in Transitional Economies". Institute for housing and urban development studies, Report code 2452, Rotterdam, 1997.- 26 pages.

Krasheninnikov A. V. -*Residential Blocks: Reconstruction and Modernisation of Buildings and Complexes*. Moscow, Vysshaya Shkola, 1988. - 87 p., ill.

Kuzmin A. V. *The Draft of New Maser Plan of Moscow development on the period until 2020: special features, methods, principles*. " *Architecture, Construction, Design* " ? 4 (14) 1999. pages 12-17.

Law of Moscow on Developing a Master plan (1997).

Law on Development in Natural Complexes (Landscapes) of Moscow (1998),

Law on Muster plan of Urban Development of Moscow till the 2020, (1999)

Law on Protection of Rights of citizens in a course of urban development,

Law on Public Participation on discussions of Urban Development plans" 1998,

Law on Urban Zoning of Moscow.(1998).

Lobanova Z. (2002) 'Who blocked the traffic on Khoroshevka?'. "Komsomolskay Pravda", #20 May, 2002 page 3

Master plan for reconstruction and development of Moscow, 1971. " *Architecture, Construction, Design* " ? 4 (14) 1999. Pages 84-85.

Metelitsa G., "There is no way out from the dormitory". Aif Moscow, #18-19, 2002 page 9.(Photo by Usoev G.)

Moscow And All Russia In Figures. The material presented by "Committee on telecommunications and mass media of Government of Moscow". Information - analytical issue "Government - City- People" N 1 (150) 2002. <http://mos.ru/progr/>. 25 May 2002

Moscow in 2002. *THE programme of GOVERNMENT And BUDGET of Moscow*". The material presented by "Committee on telecommunications and mass media of Government of Moscow". Information - Analytical Issue "Government - City- People" N 1 (150) 2002. [Http://mos.ru/progr/](http://mos.ru/progr/). 25 May 2002.

Portnov B. *Rational use of territory in town reconstruction* (methods town-planning and regulation). Stroyisdat, Krasnoyarsk, 1990?. -266 pages.

Romancheva I., Gaganjva A.(2002) "We say welcome for guests, not for illegals" in "Aif Moscow", #18-19 page.

Ruins and darkness. Moscow Pravda, # 357, 30 March 2002

Shurygina I.(1999). ' *Poverty Is Not Just Lack Of Money*'. In "Woman plus". #1, 1999

<http://www.owl.ru/eng/womplus/1999/bedn-e.htm> (20 April 2002)

State Committee of Russian Federation on statistics. " *The housing Conditions of the population of Moscow*. On data of population census of 1994 " ? 98 ?, 1996

The Housing Code of RSFSR. (in edition from March 28, 1998).

The Law on Moscow as a Capital of RF. 1996.

The Town-Planning Codex of Russian Federation (RF).- 2001.

Zamuraeva I. *The Last Autumn-real Estate market in Moscow is expecting shifts*. *The Gazeta*, 20 June 2002, pg 14