

Opportunities and limitations of Russian national public policy in the field of spatial development of cities

Introduction

The Russian government run a national project "Housing and the Urban Environment" in 2018, which is a sign of a new stage of a national urban policy in Russia. Russian cities are facing challenges in creating an affordable housing market and renovating urban centers. Nevertheless, two main aims of Russian government and the President are:

- 1) high-rise mass housing development (industry growth by one and a half time by 2028);
- 2) urban centers redevelopment with mass housing based on private developers and ignoring public housing programs. Overcoming of these challenges is restricted by national economic stagnation and low households' incomes. The implementation of this national project will take place under the conditions of massive governmental financial and regulatory interventions.

I consider the national project "Housing and the Urban Environment" a new milestone of urban governance in Russia, although it is evident that the Russian government has been implementing urban courses of national urban policy since 1990th as regulation of urban zoning policy or housing policy. For achieving two main aims, the Russian Government transforms these courses. Although Russian cities have faced numerous challenges for the last 30 years like many post-socialist cities in Central and Eastern Europe, I proposed that the new phase of national urban policy does not intend to solve the main problems of Russian cities.

This research aims at evaluation of implementation of national public policy in the field of spatial development of cities – with the help of what mechanisms, what governance models and in what ratio such policy is realizing. **The research problem** is within the framework of modern theories of meta-governance and network governance.

Therefore, I put forward **two main research hypotheses**:

- 1) The achievement of the goals of national public policy in the field of spatial development of cities is possible with the balanced implementation of various governance models – hierarchical (command), market and network;
- 2) The public policy in the field of spatial development of cities is aimed at improving the physical condition of cities, and not at solving social problems.

For analysis of Russian urban policy design, we should define a set of institutions and bureaucratic procedures, which is a toolkit of implementation of national urban policy in Russia. There are some tools:

- 1) A program-target method and a project method in urban planning and urban governance;
- 2) Sub-national authorities' power frames for establishing rules in urban governance and spatial development for their municipalities;
- 3) Redistribution of resources among Russian regions, cities and developmental state corporations like DOM.RF, VEB.RF etc.;
- 4) System of motivations of local and regional civil servants who are responsible for urban governance and planning;
- 5) Establishing key indicators and aims for urban development in governmental and local programs such as strategies, general plans, and national projects.

This research is based on an analysis of the federal urban planning legislation, as well as some cases of Russian cities, whose experience formed the basis of the national urban policy. The research includes official statistics from the Federal State Statistic Service, Russian Government, and local authorities, development programs, comprehensive plans of cities, federal and regional legislation.

Literature Review

The national policy in the field of spatial development of cities in modern Russia has become important, both in the media field and in governance. It includes the regulation and resolution of issues in the field of urban planning, spatial planning, urban zoning, spatial strategizing (the so-called master planning), landscaping, urban environment (the concept of "comfortable urban environment" has been developed in Russia), housing policy, transport policy and land use. In Europe and North America, such issues are part of urban policy or urban policy (Couch et al., 2011; Levy, 2016).

Public authorities in Russia carry out spatial planning in cities and regulation in the field of housing policy, public transit, housing and communal services and other sectors of the urban economy. They [normatively] determine the order and scope of providing public goods to citizens. However, often private firms build up and develop territories, build new housing, build schools and kindergartens in some regions, transport citizens in public transport, produce heat and other utilities. The structure of actors involved in the implementation of national policy in relation to cities is not hierarchical, but rather has a network character, even in the conditions of managerial rigidity which is inherent in modern Russia, and which is "characterized by tendencies of administrative centralization and unification of administrative governance mechanisms" (Barabashev and Klimenko, 2017, p. 7).

The public policy in Russia in the field of spatial development of cities is a synthetic comprehensive policy in relation to cities. It is a set of programs, projects, strategies, courses, practices united by a common subject of impact – the city and urban issues that have a spatial dimension. Consequently, such diversity requires coordination and consistency of both the setting of goals and indicators, if the responsible performers set themselves the goal of achieving efficiency. Its implementation in Russia has two significant limitations or features: firstly, it is aimed at providing citizens with local public goods; secondly, the provision of local public goods is largely entrusted to private firms operating in local markets. The combination of these two features creates a variety and uniqueness of the forms of provision of these public goods, which depend on many factors, conditions and actors. At the same time, Russia's public policy in the field of spatial urban development should contribute to achieving the goals of sustainable development, equity and diversity, and not serve as a basis for the creation and development of extractive and inefficient institutions. That is, it must comply with the principles of effective governance (Rothstein, 2012)¹.

Those involved in determining the parameters of state policy are extremely diverse: the president of the country, members of the State Council, public authorities – ministries and departments, state development corporations (VEB.RF and DOM.RF), industry lobbyists make up the first group of actors. They can both set the parameters of the policy being implemented and participate in its direct implementation. The second group of actors are regional and municipal authorities, which regulate the branches of the city's economy at the local level within the framework of interaction with private firms,

¹ Thus, modern reforms in the urban planning sphere and the construction industry are aimed at reducing the time for issuing construction permits, speeding up the processes of making changes to urban planning documentation, weakening regulatory procedures (the so-called "regulatory guillotine"), developing self-regulation in the industry, improving the cadastral assessment system, developing participatory design, including on the basis of electronic platforms, and other examples that can be described as effective, side by side with the degradation of the principles of territorial planning, urban zoning (Trutnev, 2019), the participation of citizens in the planning system as a whole, not to mention the undemocratic nature of local self-government as a whole.

they make up the third group of actors. The fourth group includes civil society and city residents who are involved in city governance within the framework of participatory design and other participatory practices. Thus, the achievement of public policy goals is possible only with the interaction of all four groups of actors. Thus, in modern Western societies, there is a transition to hybrid governance mechanisms, that is, the combination of vertical and horizontal methods of coordination (Jessop, p. 330).

The network nature of the interaction of public policy actors, as well as the complexity of the governance object – the spatial development of Russian cities, "require" a transition to meta-governance by the federal center. Although it may seem that at the current stage public policy is characterized by a process of centralization and transition to hierarchical governance, in fact, at the same time other forms of governance are being introduced into practice – network and market. At the same time, at the previous stage, until 2018, the policy of managing the spatial development of cities was rather characterized by fragmentation, lack of coordination at the state level and regulation in some sectors of the city's economy. That is, centralized governance is being implemented where the provision of public services was not previously regulated or carried out through market exchange. The transition to meta-governance can be a way out of the failures of different types of governance: hierarchical, market and network.

The appeal to the theory of network governance and the New Public Governance paradigm (hereinafter referred to as NPG) is due to the fact that NPG is " both a product of and a response to the increasingly complex, plural and fragmented nature of public policy implementation and service delivery in the twenty-first century " (Osborne, 2010, p.9). Modern urban development is a rather complex process that cannot be managed in any one way; therefore, methods are becoming more complicated and new tools for managing cities are emerging, including such as meta-governance (Pierre, 2011, p. 61). The paradigm of public-public administration considers the state not as a set of functions, but as an administrative part of network governance, which includes other actors (Barabashev, 2016, p. 178). However, Bo Rothstein points out the limited possibilities of applying the concept of public administration in specific institutional conditions (Rothstein, 2012, pp. 149-152) inherent in modern Russia.

The network nature of the policy on managing the spatial development of cities is also explained by the fact that public authorities can shift the functions of providing local public goods to the private sector. In this case, the governance vertical will not be effective since coordination will be required to achieve collective goals. The governance of such a network structure is carried out using metagovernance, which can be described as "the construction and governance of a mixture of hierarchical, market and network governance methods" (Meuleman, 2008, p.72). Based on the analysis of 79 articles devoted to meta-governance, the following definition of meta-governance is proposed in the literature: "the practice (mainly) of public authorities involving the coordination of one or more governance regimes using various tools, methods and strategies to overcome governance failures" (Gjaltema et al., 2020, p. 1759). Through networks, "the state sets an institutional matrix for the political process on how to solve specific problems through governance" (Jessop, 2019, p. 319), thus it relies on networks as a form of governance in order to maintain efficiency due to the "growing complexity of society" (Jessop, 2019, p. 329).

Meta-governance is carried out through collibration, that is, "changing the weight of individual governance methods so that the total set of governance structures at a higher or more comprehensive level of social organization is better adapted to coordinate complex social relations in accordance with the strategic objectives of this form of third-order meta-governance" (Jessop, p. 324). There are other types of meta-governance, but they are more focused on network governance than on finding a balance between different types of governance (Gjaltema et al., 2020, pp. 1771-1775).

An example of meta-governance and the transition to the principle of "best practices" on Russian material is the Moscow renovation program. The introduction of the "capital practice" technology into governance practice, which is the continuation of the use of the principle of

implementing "best practices" at the federal level since the beginning of the 2010s. coincided with the strengthening of the centralization trend in the country's governance. This technology is new and is a reaction to economic constraints and the need for interaction with regional authorities, civil society and business, which are necessary for the implementation of state programs and the achievement of set goals. The policy is developed in the center, and the execution and organization is transferred to the Russian regions (Zupan et al 2020).

Russian National Urban Policy

The Context

The current stage of the national urban policy in Russia, which began in 2018, has not canceled the previous development, and is a logical continuation of the established course. The federal authorities have been implementing a whole range of directions related to cities over the past 30 years:

- Functioning of local self-government.
- Budgetary policy and inter-budgetary relations.
- Implementation of housing policy.
- Modernization of the housing and utilities.
- Implementation of urban planning policy.
- Provision of territorial planning.
- Ensuring strategic planning.
- Spatial development of cities.
- Regulation of urban public transit.

In fact, all these areas and entire branches of the urban economy were created by the state from scratch. In fact, post-socialist transit is not a simple adaptation of the urban sector of the economy to market and capitalist conditions. In the Soviet Union there was no housing policy, housing market, there was no urban planning legislation, local self-government also did not exist. The emergence of a relatively developed mortgage lending market took 30 years.

The period from 1991 to 2018 can be considered as a stage of creation and evolution of basic institutions of planning and governance of urban development. Since 2018, the influence of federal public authorities has increased, as has the degree of interference in the processes of spatial governance of urban development. Although earlier the development of individual cities was determined by major federal projects: the APEC summit in Vladivostok, the Winter Olympics in Sochi, the World Cup – a group of cities, other mega-sporting events, anniversaries of cities. After 2018, there was a transition from institutional construction to a project-based approach to spatial development governance.

Many authors associate urban development in Russia with the quality of public administration, and the improvement of administrative institutions and governance procedures is considered as the only possible way out of the current situation. Leonid Smirnyagin identifies the following challenges facing Russian cities: market development, globalization, transition to the post-economic era, depopulation, centralization. As if anticipating the current stage of public policy towards cities, the famous geographer writes that the federal authorities will have to coordinate the development of the Russian urban system, that cities need strict zoning, and the strategy of socio-economic development and the general plan of the city should coexist together (Smirnyagin 2007). Experts of the Institute of the City Foundation point out that housing and urban planning policies should be coordinated with each other, the only way to improve the quality of the urban environment (Kosareva et al. 2015b, p. 284). Olga Vendina also notes that it is impossible to replace the development of the city (social, human, cultural capital) with economic growth, since economic growth is possible without the development of the city (Vendina 2010). At the same time, experts note that the following trend is observed today: in the 2010s, the quality of strategies for socio-economic development of cities has fallen, expert support is used less, the number of social flagship projects has decreased, although there has been an expansion of the project approach in city governance (Zhikharevich and Pribyshin 2019).

Ensuring the economic growth of Russian cities is impossible without the redistribution of powers to the lower levels of government. In conditions of centralization of city governance, it is possible to pursue policies aimed at increasing the contribution and role of cities in economic growth. It is possible to provide federal transfers to cities and agglomerations identified as growth points in strategic planning documents at the national level. The largest cities and agglomerations need to regain powers in the field of urban planning and related areas (Popov et al. 2018, pp. 12-14). In connection with the turn to agglomerations, other problems arise in the governance of the development of urbanized territories: it is necessary to improve the quality of state and municipal statistics, scientific and official justification of the allocation of agglomerations is necessary, information on the distribution and concentration of all budget investments in the context of territories is needed (Kuznetsova 2019).

The fact that the Russian state is trying to manage the development of cities through agglomerations can be seen as a positive sign. Schragger writes that economic competition between cities for limited resources, finances, etc. is inefficient, that is, the governance of agglomerations can reduce inefficiency. The task of local authorities is to provide public goods, and not to compete in the market with each other, since the link between the effective provision of public goods and economic growth is not obvious. However, he also notes in his work that it is difficult, if not impossible, to manage the economic and geographical structure of the urban network (Schragger 2016).

Although at the level of the country's spatial development strategy it is noted that cities and agglomerations are the engine of Russia's economic growth, the situation is different. The contribution of cities to the Russian economy in 2000-2015 only decreased, primarily due to the raw nature of the national economy, and new modern branches of the economy did not appear in cities that would become the basis for advanced development. Cities and agglomerations are not the locomotives of the Russian economy. There is a big differentiation between agglomerations according to the level of economic development (Kosareva et al. 2018). Polycentric development of the country is possible with the decentralization of the governance system. It can be said that the economic crisis of the long lost decade of the 2010s contributes to the preservation of negative trends in urban development. (Zubarevich, Safronov 2019). That is, a possible way out of the current economic crisis will not improve the socio-economic situation in Russian cities.

The economies of cities do not make a significant contribution to the economic development of Russia. In the future, growth is possible only in those cities where there is a comfortable urban environment, there are conditions for the development of business, science, and education (Kosareva and Polidi 2017). But the creation of such conditions is limited by a number of problems: for example, the presence of "institutional barriers of budgetary policy for the development of large cities", the uncompetitiveness of Russian millionaire cities compared to Moscow and St. Petersburg (Zubarevich 2019b, p.68), the dominance of big business and the monopolism of the Russian economy (Zubarevich 2019a). The problem of budget security of the largest Russian cities was only growing (Gorodnichev et al. 2021). Natalia Zubarevich points out that the influence of the state on spatial inequality in the country is contradictory: firstly, "Highlighting the priority of large agglomerations in the Spatial Development Strategy. If implemented, it will lead to an increase in intraregional inequalities" (Zubarevich 2019b, p.68); secondly, too many agglomerations are allocated in the spatial development strategy, 40 is an excess, since not all the city centers in the strategy are potential leaders and generally have potential (Zubarevich 2019a). The conscious policy of the state to support individual cities, "designated locomotives of growth", leads to an increase in inequality between cities. Due to the fact that at the beginning of the 2010s there were no formulated goals of urban policy in Russia, cities were differentiated by the quality of the urban environment (Golubchikov and Makhrova 2013, pp. 57-59), urban space degraded in not very successful cities, and social segregation was not considered as a problem (Makhrova and Golubchikov, pp. 28-30).

Being in a transit state in the 1990s and in the first half of the 2000s, the Russian planning system was in crisis, only by 2004 it stabilized. Compared with the socialist times, urban planning has a legislative status and a legal justification. Today, the problem of the Russian urban planning system is in

the relationship between old and new institutions (Golubchikov 2004, p. 244), which are layered on top of each other (Borushkina and Gorodnichev 2021). Eduard Trutnev believes that the transit from the post-socialist system of urban regulation to the modern one has been delayed: firstly, the system of point-administrative urban planning is being reproduced instead of the development of the institute of urban zoning, and secondly, the institute of territorial planning contains contradictions within itself, which sooner or later will have to be eliminated (Trutnev 2019). In fact, we can talk about the replacement of institutions of urban regulation with substitutes for regulating urban development activities. Urban planning activity in accordance with the law consists of territorial planning and urban zoning.

Goals and directions of the new national urban policy in Russia

The new national urban policy in Russia is implemented using a project approach, the best world practices, and an agglomeration approach. We are witnessing a departure from the traditional program-oriented approach in the system of public administration. All public and local programs and projects should be linked to national projects. National projects affect almost all spheres of the national economy and public administration. The key project for the urban issues is the national project "Housing and Urban Environment". This national project consists of the following federal projects:

- Housing
- Mortgage
- Ensuring sustainable reduction of uninhabitable housing stock (slum clearance)
- Formation of a comfortable urban environment
- Clean water

Federal projects such as "Modernization of passenger transport in urban agglomerations", "Regional and local Roads" and the departmental project of the Ministry of Construction "Smart City" also address issues of urban development.

I have written out the areas of work that are of interest to the participants of the last seminar of the State Council. The analysis of these directions shows that the federal public authorities are focused on deregulation of the construction industry, simplification of administrative procedures, stimulation of economic and investment activity, implementation of PPP projects, modernization of the public administration system through their digitalization and technologization, development of agglomerations, and not only individual cities.

- Spatial development, agglomerations and growth points (identification of growth points and the creation of a balance of supply and demand, certain issues of inter-budgetary relations, labor resources, national spatial data system);
- Provision of improved housing conditions for at least five million families annually and the commissioning of at least 120 million square meters of housing per year (development of urban potential, governance of urban development projects, integrated development of the territory, emergency housing and fulfillment of state obligations (waiting lists), attracting investors);
- Development of the individual housing construction market (mortgage and housing, supply promotion, technological connection, investment programs, gasification, simplification of the procedure for granting land plots);
- Mobile city (requirements for the transport system of the municipality, for the organization of parking space);
- Comfortable and convenient living environment (the main tools of infrastructure development of territories);
- Reduction of the investment and construction cycle, digitalization of the construction industry;

- Improving the professionalism of government customers (capital investment governance, flexibility of "transfers", centralization of customers and pricing).

Institutional players

As part of the traditional approach for Russia, Deputy Prime Minister of the Russian government Marat Khusnullin oversees the main directions of the new national urban policy in Russia, he also coordinates the activities of the Ministry of Construction and Housing and Communal Services, which is headed by Irek Fayzullin. Coordination of the main directions is carried out through meetings of the sectoral commissions of the State Council, including with the participation of the President. So, at a meeting of the Council for Strategic Development and National Projects, he said on July 13, 2020, that "we have a historic chance in the foreseeable future, absolutely understandable, maybe for the first time in the history of Russia to solve, radically solve the housing issue." In this sense, urban policy is in the optics of the country's leader.

The Ministry of Construction and Housing and Communal Services is the main executor and responsible agent for the implementation of urban policy, the Ministry of Transport also oversees part of the "urban" areas, the Ministry of Construction interacts with the Ministry of Finance to implement its federal project. An important part of urban policy is the Ministry of Economic Development, which is responsible for state policy in the field of strategic and territorial planning of cities, including single-industry towns and special economic zones and special territories. However, in the modern structure of the executors of national policy, not only state authorities participate in it, which is logical, but the presence of other institutional players – state corporations that act not only as executors, but also active actors with their own agenda and interests.

The key state development corporation is VEB.RF, in fact, is a development bank and a distributor of public investments. This state corporation invests both in national-scale projects (about 1.8 trillion rubles) and in urban projects – 1 trillion rubles in 50 cities of Russia. VEB.RF has developed its own index of "Quality of Life" in Russian cities for the implementation investment projects.

Another special corporation is DOM.RF, a joint-stock company DOM.RF, a financial institution for development in the housing sector. First, DOM.RF is responsible for mortgage lending, support of commercial banks that issue mortgage loans. But also, DOM.RF is responsible for improving the comfort of the urban environment. The director board of DOM.RF expressed a desire to create a state manufacturer of elevators (to limit import foreign manufacturers), to create a new public developer who will build housing in Russian regions with low activity of construction firms. The Housing and Communal Services Fund is responsible for the resettlement of dilapidated and dilapidated housing.

Agglomeration turn / agglomeration approach to area development

The transition to managing the development of urbanized territories with the help of metropolitan institutions is a long-standing idea in Russian public administration. A group of experts was developing a federal bill on urban agglomerations, but the State Duma did not consider it. In general terms, public administrators consider agglomerations as an administrative way of uniting municipalities into a single system and an administrative way of establishing cooperation between them, usually within the same region. Experts, in particular the former Finance Minister of Russia Alexei Kudrin, propose the unification in the agglomeration of a group of the largest cities of Russia, located hundreds of kilometers apart from each other.

One way or another at the legislative level (in the form of a federal law!) there is no definition of agglomeration, criteria for their identification, and governance methods, but this does not prevent the Russian public authorities from putting into practice agglomeration governance of the development of urbanized territories. "The spatial development strategy of Russia for the period up to 2025" states that the economic and scientific development of the country will be carried out through the development of urban agglomerations. The authors of the strategy identify 40 agglomerations in which half of the country's population lives. The strategy directly speaks of the need to develop metro governance institutions and municipal cooperation.

It is worth paying attention to the next point of this strategy – "to improve the quality and comfort of the urban environment ... through joint planning of the development of transport infrastructure, traffic and transport services to the population by municipalities that are part of large urban agglomerations and the largest urban agglomerations; ... by expanding the radii within 2-hour transport accessibility to large cities of large urban agglomerations and the largest urban agglomerations through the construction of highways, high-speed non-public transport lines, high-speed suburban transport." The implementation of these points of the Strategy is carried out through the development of regional transport strategies and transport planning schemes overseen by regional authorities. Regional authorities are developing transport planning schemes not for the entire region, but for individual agglomerations within their regions.

Another example that also concerns transport infrastructure is the federal project "Modernization of Passenger Transport in Urban Agglomerations", which supports the initiatives of agglomerations, not individual cities. Although applications are submitted by individual cities together with regional authorities. The third example of an agglomeration turn is the development and special competitions for the creation of master plans for the development of individual agglomerations (Borushkina and Gorodnichev 2021), for example Russian South cities like Derbent or Astrakhan.

The following two examples so far represent intentions to introduce an agglomeration tool for development by territories. The so-called strategy of aggressive infrastructure development (frontal strategy) of Mishustin-Khusnullin is aimed at developing the country through agglomerations until 2030 with the help of an active state investment policy. The establishing of new cities near the largest economic centers is the case of Vladivostok and its potential satellite city, which should form a new urban agglomeration.

Mechanisms and procedures for implementation and implementation. Public policy instruments

As already mentioned, modern urban policy in Russia is implemented using a project approach. Each ministry is responsible for one or another national and federal project. Accordingly, project supervisors face problems of governance, execution, coordination, and reporting. To achieve the set political goals, the main actors use a variety of approaches, tools, models of public administration (see Appendix).

Urban policy in Russia is characterized by the widespread introduction of indicative indicators and an indicative approach in general. At the same time, institutional players are holders of indicators and they are often the managers of financial resources.

The theory of meta-governance distinguishes three governance models – command, market, and network. Each model assumes its own performance indicators, motivation of performers and methods of control.

So the indicative approach is characteristic of the market model, when the performer is evaluated by achieving the KPI. Giving infrastructure budget loans to the most efficient regions is also an example of a market model. The most effective performers receive resources and support, but not the neediest. VEB.RF distributes investments using its own index. It is worth noting that the Ministry of Construction owns two indexes, VEB.RF owns one index, which allows the state corporation to be relatively autonomous from other institutional players.

The network governance model includes retraining programs, education of other actors, involvement of citizens in decision-making processes through electronic services. The indicator of citizen engagement is one of the goals of the national project. The development and governance of territories and cities through agglomerations can also serve as an example of network governance, but under certain conditions. This approach excludes market elements of competition between municipalities but requires equality between governance participants - municipalities and regional authorities.

The command (administrative) model is a traditional bureaucratic example of public administration. In our case, the federal government distributed indicators for achieving the goals of

national projects by regions, approved growth centers, defined the boundaries of agglomerations, that is, assigned roles to performers directly, and not through competition or contractual procedure.

Discussion

I have developed a scheme describing modern urban policy in Russia, based on the approach of Atkinson and Moon (Atkinson and Moon 1994). This approach allows us to describe the current stage in general and concisely. The result of this analysis is presented in Table 1. In the future, I will have to develop a method for evaluating the ratio of governance models.

The analysis has shown that the key limitation of state policy is the predominance of a market model aimed at competition between performers for limited resources. The indicative approach, subject to manipulation by performers, has certain limitations.

It is still difficult to say whether the presence of a group of state corporations operating independently from public authorities is a limitation. Their powers and resources have increased, they have begun to have their own goals that go beyond the state interest. The agglomeration approach in urban development governance is quite controversial, as it primarily solves managerial problems of power imbalance, and does not use the positive effects of agglomeration.

The advantages lie in the complexity, complexity of the policies and their diversity. Although they focus mainly on the physical aspects of urban development. The proposed solutions concern technologies, but not the basics of public administration. This state policy does not imply the strengthening and autonomy of local authorities and urban communities.

The opportunities that the new stage of state policy opens lie in the field of problematization, coordination, and interaction of different actors. Public investments and elements of public entrepreneurship bear the risks of the "investment for investment's sake" practice.

Table 1. National Urban Policy in Russia from 2018 to the present

National Urban Policy in Russia from 2018 to the present (with the inclusion of earlier stages of urban policy)	
Conception of urban	Construction approach to urban development: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - emphasis on the physical component of the city, infrastructure - attention to landscaping and its physical parameters - the concept of public "space" is narrowed down to a physical understanding - moral and physical obsolescence of residential areas of mass industrial housing construction - the economy of the city is a derivative of the urban comfortable environment
Theoretical approach	State interventions, public-private partnerships, urban development through megaprojects, "neoliberalism", the concept of "comfortable urban environment"
Nature of problem	Degradation and obsolescence of the physical environment of cities
Explanation	The presence of unnecessary administrative restrictions for construction; Lack of "urban vision" in local and regional authorities; Lack of investment in the urban economy.
Aim of policy	Overcoming the housing problem/ solving the housing issue Creating a comfortable urban environment
Mechanisms	Strengthening State Development Corporations (VEB.RF, DOM.RF), state

	corporations' interventions in the economy and industry; public-private partnership; deregulation of the construction industry; the important role of the private sector - developers and developers; public entrepreneurship; grants to cities and regions; development and implementation of urban environment standards; multilevel governance
Resourcing	Subsidizing industry factors (state support of the mortgage program), putting into circulation conditionally free land for construction, budget investments
Governance	Through national projects - project approach; cooperation with lower levels of government; New Public Governance.
Political support	Since 2018, in the person of the President of the country; achieving the figure of 120 million square meters of housing per year is a personal political goal of the president. Support in the person of the heads of federal factors (V. Mutko, M. Khusnullin, I. Shuvalov)
Legislation	Amendments to the Urban Planning Code (2004), the Federal Law on "Local self-government" (2003) and other regulations; changes in standards, including the creation of new "urban" "standards"
Monitoring	Ignoring social aspects of politics; monitoring in the regional context; great attention to indicators and indicators of physical variables.
Beneficiary	Construction industry and firms; local elites which distribute resources and land plots for construction

Conclusion

As this study shows, the Russian federal government uses a variety of governance tools to achieve policy goals. It also implements a variety of governance models. Although we can fix the predominance of the hierarchical model, since the main executors of state policy are regional and local authorities, stimulation, involvement, and evaluation are carried out through market models and tools. At the same time, institutional actors recognize the network model as important, so they organize the retraining of city governance teams from all Russia, the involvement of citizens in governance processes.

With all the variety of governance models and tools, institutional actors influence mainly the physical component of the urban environment. Reforms in the field of urban development do not affect the foundations of urban governance, stakeholder interactions, local democracy, social justice, and equality. Reforms change technologies, improve the environment, but not the established status quo. Although the development of Russian cities in the socio-economic context and nationwide is limited by institutional barriers, the state of the national economy, the quality of governance, then the spatial development of cities directly is also associated with the low quality of administrative institutions that regulate urban development.

The key difference between the current stage of the national urban policy and the previous one is the active involvement of state development corporations in the policy implementation. Today their importance and role have grown. They are agents of public investment and government support for business, primarily construction firms and corporations. Institutional actors incorporate the private housing construction market through a system of financial support and stimulation of supply and demand in this market.

Traditional actors like ministries rather develop strategies, whereas state corporations implement strategies. The role of private consulting agencies has also increased due to the development of norms and standards, training of specialists, dissemination, and popularization of the implementation

of the best world practices. The project approach in governance of urban development has become dominant. Thus, modern Russian urban policy can be characterized as an amazing mixture of state capitalism and neoliberal practices.

References

- Atkinson R., Moon G. (1994). *Urban policy in Britain: The city, the state and the market.* – Macmillan International Higher Education, 1994.
- Barabashev, A. G., Klimenko, A.V. *The state and directions of reforms of Russian public administration / A. G. Barabashev, A.V. Klimenko : WP8 preprint/2017/03 /.* – Moscow : Publishing House of the Higher School of Economics, 2017– – (WP8 series "Public and Municipal Administration"). - 88 p. (In Russian).
- Barabashev, A.G. (2016). *Crisis of State Governance and its Influence on Basic Administrative Paradigms of State and Bureaucracy.* *Public Administration Issues*, n. 3, pp. 163–194 (in Russian).
- Borushkina S., Gorodnichev A. *Layering, Embedding or Ignoring: Interaction of Master Planning With Existing Urban Planning System In Russia*, in: *Urbanism Research Across the World: a PhD Seminar.* Leuven : The International Center of Urbanism, 2021. P. 43-49.
- Couch C., Sykes O., Börstinghaus W. (2011). *Thirty years of urban regeneration in Britain, Germany and France: The importance of context and path dependency*, *Progress in Planning*, Volume 75, Issue 1, 2011, Pages 1-52
- Gjaltema Jonna, Biesbroek Robbert & Termeer Katrien (2020) *From government to governance...to meta-governance: a systematic literature review*, *Public Management Review*, 22:12, 1760-1780, DOI: 10.1080/14719037.2019.1648697
- Golubchikov O. (2004). *Urban Planning in Russia: Towards the Market / European Planning Studies.* – Vol. 12. – No 2. – pp. 229-247
- Golubchikov O. Yu., Makhrova A. G. *Factors of uneven development of Russian cities.* *Bulletin of the Moscow University. Series 5: Geography.* 2013. No. 2. pp. 54-60. (In Russian).
- Gorodnichev A.V., Kulakova T.V., Moiseeva M.A. *Dynamics of Russian Cities Budget Autonomy in the Transition to Multi-Level Governance.* *Financial Journal*, 2021, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 39–57 (In Russ.). DOI: 10.31107/2075-1990-2021-1-39-57.
- Jessop B. *The State: Past, Present and future / Bob Jessop ; translated from the English by S. Moiseev; edited by D. Karasev.* - Moscow : Delo, 2019. - 501 p. (In Russian).
- Kosareva N. B., Polidi T. D., Puzanov A. S. *Housing policy and economy in Russia: results and development strategy.* Moscow: HSE, 2015. - 387 p. (In Russian).
- Kosareva N. B., Polidi T. D., Puzanov A. S. *The main trends of the housing economy of Russian cities // Urban research and practice.* 2015. No. 1. pp. 33-54. (In Russian).
- Kosareva N., Polidi T. *Assessment of the gross urban product in Russian cities and its contribution to Russia's GDP in 2000-2015 //Economic issues.* - 2017. - No. 7. - pp. 5-23. (In Russian).
- Kosareva Nadezhda Borisovna. *Economic urbanization / N.B. Kosareva, T.D. Polidi, A.S. Puzanov - Moscow : Foundation "Institute of Urban Economics", 2018 — 418 p. (In Russian).*
- Kuznetsova O.V. *Problems of Elaboration of Spatial Development Strategy of the Russian Federation.* *Prostranstvennaya Ekonomika = Spatial Economics*, 2019, vol. 15, no. 4, pp. 107–125. <https://dx.doi.org/10.14530/se.2019.4.107-125>. (In Russian).

Levy, J. M. (2016). *Contemporary urban planning*. Taylor & Francis.

Makhrova A. G., Golubchikov O. Yu. Russian city in conditions of capitalism: social transformation of inner-city space // *Bulletin of the Moscow University. Series 5: Geography*. 2012. No. 2. pp. 26-31. (In Russian).

Meuleman L. (2008). Public management and the metagovernance of hierarchies, networks and markets: The feasibility of designing and managing governance style combinations. – Springer Science & Business Media, P.399.

Osborne, S. P. (2010). Introduction The (New) Public Governance: a suitable case for treatment?. In *The new public governance?* (pp. 17-32). Routledge.

Pierre, J. (2011). *The politics of urban governance*. Macmillan International Higher Education.

Popov R. A., Puzanov A. S., Polidi T. D. Contours of a new state policy in relation to cities and urban agglomerations of Russia // *ECO*. 2018. No. 8. pp. 7-22. (In Russian).

Rothstein Bo (2012). *Good Governance*. / *The Oxford handbook of Governance*. / ed. by David Levi-Faur. – Oxford University Press, pp. 143-154.

Schragger, R. (2016). *City power: Urban governance in a global age*. Oxford University Press. 322 P.

Smirnyagin L. V. The difficult future of Russian cities // *Pro et Contra*. 2007. No. 1. pp. 56-71. (In Russian).

Trutnev E.K. Town regulation : Legal support of town-planning activity: alternative models of legislation and a program for correcting its mistakes E.K. Trutnev. - Moscow : Institute of Urban Economics, 2019. - 682 p. (In Russian).

Zhikharevich B.S., Pribyshin T.K. *Urban Development Strategy: Russian Practice 2014–2019*. *Prostranstvennaya Ekonomika = Spatial Economics*, 2019, vol. 15, no. 4, pp. 184–204. <https://dx.doi.org/10.14530/se.2019.4.184-204>. (In Russian).

Zubarevich N. V. Inequality of regions and large cities of Russia: what has changed in the 2010s? // *Social Sciences and modernity*. 2019. No. 4. pp. 57-70. (In Russian).

Zubarevich N. V. Spatial development strategy: priorities and tools // *Questions of Economics*. 2019. No. 1. pp. 135-145. (In Russian).

Zubarevich N., Safronov S. The development of large cities in Russia in the 2010s // *Regional studies*. 2019. No. 1. pp. 39-51. (In Russian).

Zupan D., Smirnova V., Zadorian A. Governing through stolichnaya praktika: Housing renovation from Moscow to the regions // *Geoforum*. 2021. Vol. 120. P. 155-164

