

Government Classification of Residential Real Estate. Managerial Approach

Anatoly A. Likhtin*, Almira N. Muftakhova

Russian Presidential Academy of National Economy and Public Administration (North-West Institute of Management of RANEPA), Saint Petersburg, Russian Federation; *likhtin-aa@ranepa.ru

ABSTRACT

The classification of residential real estate occupied by the citizens of the country has been raised more than once both by the scientific community and by the state. Based on the managerial approach, the article reveals the main methods of differentiation of places of residence and class of housing, used by government department at the federal and regional levels. On the example of the modern megapolis — St. Petersburg — the dynamics of the development of the housing sector, its important social character is shown. Based on historical, sociological and normative methods, the material on specific cases illustrates the heterogeneity of people living in various types of modern housing. It is concluded that it is necessary to take into account the entire system of factors that determine the classification of residential real estate in order to more accurately predict the development of social processes in the housing sector, and effective public administration at the regional level.

Keywords: habitation, inequality, realty, housing conditions, city, megapolis, St. Petersburg, city administration, public administration; municipal administration, managerial approach

For citing: Likhtin A. A., Muftakhova A. N. Government classification of residential real estate. Managerial approach // Administrative consulting. 2022. N 3. P. 80–86.

Государственная классификация жилой недвижимости. Управленческий подход

Лихтин А. А. *, Муфтахова А. Н.

Российская академия народного хозяйства и государственной службы при Президенте Российской Федерации (Северо-Западный институт управления РАНХиГС), Санкт-Петербург, Российская Федерация; *likhtin-aa@ranepa.ru

РЕФЕРАТ

Вопросы классификации жилой недвижимости, занимаемой гражданами страны, не раз поднимались как со стороны научного сообщества, так и со стороны государства. В статье на основе управленческого подхода раскрываются основные способы дифференциации мест проживания и классовости жилья, применяемые органами государственного управления на федеральном и региональном уровне. На примере современного мегаполиса — Санкт-Петербурга — показана динамика развития жилищной сферы, ее важный общественный характер. В материале с опорой на исторический, социологический и нормативный методы, на конкретных кейсах проиллюстрирована неоднородность проживающих в различных типах современного жилья. Сделан вывод о необходимости учёта всей системы факторов, обуславливающих классификацию жилой недвижимости, в целях более точных прогнозов развития социальных процессов в жилищной сфере, и эффективного государственного управления на уровне региона.

Ключевые слова: жилье, неравенство, недвижимость, жилищные условия, город, мегаполис, Санкт-Петербург, управление городом, государственное управление, муниципальное управление, управленческий подход

Для цитирования: Likhtin A. A., Muftakhova A. N. Government classification of residential real estate. Managerial approach // Управленческое консультирование. 2022. № 3. С. 80–86.

The problem of social inequality and the division of society into strata does not lose its relevance and is of particular interest for study. In modern sociological science, ideas about the stratification models that have developed in society are quite diverse and complex: multilayered (polyhottomic), multidimensional (carried out on several axes) and varied (allow the coexistence of many stratification models): qualifications, quotas, certification, determination of status, ranks, benefits, privileges, other preferences. Similar stratification models are also characteristic of housing relations, which is manifested in the inequality of housing conditions for the population.

Housing, as a high-value and inaccessible social value, has always been characterized by a disproportion in provision. And unresolved issues of inequality in housing have been given significant attention. The study of housing stratification can be found in the classical works of F. Engels "On the Housing Question" [1, p. 16] and A. Weber "The growth of cities in the 19th century" [9] and others. The problem of housing space has been studied by sociologists at the Chicago School. Within the framework of this scientific direction, J. Rex and R. Moore proposed the theory of "housing classes", from the point of view of which, the population differentiates depending on the availability and size of housing property of representatives of each social housing group segregated in the city space¹. V.V. Radaev and O.I. Shkaratan lead the position of P. Saunders, who believes that the importance of differences in ownership of housing property forms an independent basis for differentiating the life opportunities of groups through the accumulation of wealth in the face of an outstripping growth in housing prices [5, p. 26].

Among the works of contemporary Russian authors, it is worth noting the studies of E.Yu. Karavaeva and T.Yu. Cherkashina [2, p. 119], N.R. Korneva [3, p. 77–84], M.G. Meerovich [4, p. 14], M.M. Starikova [8, p. 74], R.M. Khaziev [6, p. 12], T. Shmankevich [7, p. 301]. The generalized conclusion of these works is the following quote: "The stratification factor of housing involves the differentiation of people's living conditions depending on their income and social status" [6, p. 17].

To confirm this thesis, it seems interesting to study housing inequality in St. Petersburg, in the urban development of which social stratification of housing of various types was reflected.

Since the time of the "Peter's House", which opposed itself to the Nyenschanz fortress, the city of St. Petersburg, in its own way, as it should be the capital of the Russian Empire, divided and ruled over his subjects. Already in the names of the streets of the capital under construction there was a fragmentation according to statuses and classes: Bolshaya (Big) and Malaya (Little) German Streets, 1st and 2nd Pushkarskaya (Artillery) Streets. The ranks of religious customs were reflected too: Blagoveshchenskaya, Nikolskaya, Preobrazhenskaya, Trinity; professional ranks: Marine, Horse Guards, Officer, Joiner; geographical signs: Kremenchug, Mirgorod, Poltava, Romny Streets.

The division into classes took place according to the type of house.

"Lord-houses" — noble or merchant houses.

Various in their characteristics, separate buildings, were owned by one homeowner or family. Facades of houses differed in architectural refinements from classicism to eclecticism. The houses differed in the number of stairs, passages and floors, depending on the wealth of the owner. Almost the entire center of St. Petersburg is built up with them.

"Philistine" — outbuildings, courtyard extensions, low-rise buildings in the depth of the quarter for the poor nobles and the wealthy bourgeois. Such buildings were rarely owned, more often the house or staircase was divided into several families. It seemed unpretentious and without frills, surprisingly turned out to be very tenacious in the struggle against time, revolutions and wars. They are widespread, as among architectural

¹ Big sociological dictionary [Electronic resource]. URL: www.вокабула.рф/словари/большой-социологический-словарь/жилищный-класс (access date: 05.08.2021) (in Rus).

monuments as faithful companions of the “lord-houses”, and on the outskirts of the historical center — on the Vyborg side. As an example of such a “union” can be the mansion V. I. Astashev at 40 Angliyskaya Naberezhnaya¹, which with its facade refers to the object representing historical, scientific, artistic or other cultural value, but the yard extensions are not remarkable.

“Work houses” — houses that were provided by a large industrial enterprise, factory as permanent or temporary housing for their workers. Such houses differed in convenience and location: more comfortable for engineers, less for everyone else. An example is the residential buildings of the Triangle Partnership of the Russian-American Rubber Manufactory at Staro-Petergofsky Prospect, 26². Nevertheless, such examples are very rare, since not all manufacturers went to provide housing for their workforce. However, this experience was borrowed by the Soviet state, and came into our everyday life as hostels.

“Profitable house” — the most common type of urban development that you can meet in any area of St. Petersburg. As well as the “lord-houses”, at the whim of their owner, these houses could differ in decoration or asceticism, were built and existed for the rental of apartments (apartments) for rent. Profitable house entered the Russian classical literature and was described: these are places with lunch for all guests (the Ivolgins family from the novel “The Idiot” by F. Dostoevsky) or “they don’t hold the table” (P. Aduiev from the work “An Ordinary History” by I. Goncharov). Apartment buildings were divided according to professional criteria: officer apartments of a quartered regiment on the lines of the Moscow part (now the metro station “Technological Institute”), or by the level of solvency, as A. V. Badaeva and M. P. Timofeeva on Gorokhovaya St., 64³.

As a result of the revolutionary events of February–November 1917, private ownership of real estate ceased to exist. At the same time, the right to have housing has ceased to be the prerogative of the powerful, and the population, although declaratively, has acquired a chance to obtain “their own” square meters.

As M. G. Meerovich rightly noted: “During the first Soviet decades, power consciously and purposefully turned the dwelling from the primary element of life human space — the security and intimacy of his personal life — into an effective tool of social engineering” [4, p. 6].

The first, albeit unsuccessful, attempt to appeal to the ideas of the “commune” was the seizure of seized in favor of the proletariat of the “surplus” square meters from the “bourgeois”. That did not eliminate the problem of housing shortages, but became an object of social tension. This issue was decided in its own way by architects D. P. Buryshkin and L. M. Tverskaya, who proposed the construction of a housing estate of 20 houses for textile workers⁴. Architects G. A. Simonov, etc. Katsenelenbogen continued given undertaking built for working factories “Bolshevik”, “Economizer”, “Vienna” housing estate at Rabfakovsky⁵. These attempts can be conditionally called the proletarian avant-

¹ Mansion A. I. Thomsen-Bonnara — Mansion V. I. Astashev (on the English embankment) // Citywalls (Architectural site of St. Petersburg) [Electronic resource]. URL: <https://www.citywalls.ru/house1237.html> (access date: 05.08.2021) (in Rus).

² Residential building of the Russian-American Rubber Manufacturing Partnership «Triangle» // Citywalls (Architectural site of St. Petersburg) [Electronic resource]. URL: <https://www.citywalls.ru/house11898.html> (access date: 05.08.2021) (in Rus).

³ Rasputin’s House (Profitable House of A. V. Badaeva and M. P. Timofeeva) // Citywalls (Architectural Site of St. Petersburg) [Electronic resource]. URL: <https://www.citywalls.ru/house5318.html> (access date: 05.08.2021) (in Rus).

⁴ Residential building of residential textile workers // Citywalls (Architectural site of St. Petersburg) [Electronic resource]. URL: <https://www.citywalls.ru/house14244.html> (access date: 05.08.2021) (in Rus).

⁵ Housing estate for workers on Rabfakovskikh // Citywalls (Architectural site of St. Petersburg) [Electronic resource]. URL: <https://www.citywalls.ru/house13809.html> (access date: 05.08.2021) (in Rus).

garde. However, in connection with the beginning of industrialization, a class of industrial intelligentsia arose — highly skilled workers and office workers who needed even more space for life and the unification of their social needs. So there was a constructive solution to the serial construction of housing, which will subsequently be designated as “nods” (“Kirov-houses”), in honor of S. M. Kirov, who launched this project. The main principles of steel are “constructivism”, rigor, geometry, laconicism of forms and solidity of appearance. The idea was to provide the largest possible housing for those in need, by eliminating the basic needs of the residents. So, the technical and creative intelligentsia proposed to give up kitchens in apartments at the expense of cafes and canteens a step away from the house, where it was recommended to organize “brain storms” together. An example is the object “House-commune of engineers and writers” (on 7 Rubinstein St., architect A. A. Ol, K. A. Ivanov, A. I. Ladinsky, built in 1932)¹. In turn, for workers and the proletariat, the absence of bathtubs and showers in apartments was replaced by a wash in a public bathhouse. The example is the Residential building — House-“Sausage” (61 Babushkina St., architect G. A. Simonov, built in 1932)².

“Stalin-houses”. Constructivism in the construction of the mid-30s and Stalinist neoclassicism of the mid-50s of the last century have become a kind of “strong and solid” compensation for the shortcomings of the first serial houses of Soviet power (“Proletarian housing estates” and “Kirov-houses”).

Having retained spaciousness, the property acquired landscaping in the form of kitchens, bathtubs and additional utility rooms. Houses were built from high-quality materials, which is characteristic of both working types of housing and nomenclature. There was a general decoration of the facades, competing with its solidity with the buildings of the imperial time. If ordinary houses for the working class began to acquire typical features, nomenclature ones (intended for leading workers and their families) had their own peculiarities. So, for the generals, an additional room was proposed for the adjutant (no more than 7 square meters), for scientists — a spacious room with no windows for a library, for senior employees — a huge hall-corridor under the reception. In that era, it was not considered shameful for management to have an au pair in their home, for this, as attribute was provided a room with a separate entrance to the kitchen. Similar types of apartments intended for the Soviet “elites” were located close to the authorities, for example, near Smolny prospect, as well as along Moscovsky prospect with the House of Soviets located on it, which, in accordance with the general plan of the 1930s, preparing the role of the new center of Leningrad.

A separate line should be mentioned built from 1945 to 1952 German prisoners of war two-four-story cottages of the barracks type usually for the needs and at the expense of the restored enterprises. They were located among industrial zones, near the Volkovsky cemetery, on the Southern Highway in Kupchino, near Udelny Park and on the Vyborg side.

Then begins the construction of mass serial housing, equalizing the status of the leader, intellectual and worker.

Decision N 1871 of the Central Committee of the CPSU and the Council of Ministers of the USSR of November 4, 1955 “On eliminating excesses in design and construction” can be considered a “backlog” of the housing “egalitarianism” policy. This document gave rise to “Khrushchev-houses” — bright an example of the antipode of the externally ostentatious side of architecture of the previous period, with Bolshevik enthusiasm,

¹ House-commune of engineers and writers // Citywalls (Architectural site of St. Petersburg) [Electronic resource]. URL: <https://www.citywalls.ru/house2500.html> (access date: 05.08.2021) (in Rus).

² Residential building — House-«Sausage» // Citywalls (Architectural site of St. Petersburg) [Electronic resource]. URL: <https://www.citywalls.ru/house3774.html> (access date: 05.08.2021) (in Rus).

cutting down the dimensions of “Stalin-houses” to a minimum: the area of rooms (up to 14 square meters), the height of ceilings (up to 2.5 square meters) the open space of kitchens (up to 4–5 square meters), separate bathrooms (combined).

“Brezhnev-houses”. The country’s leadership, replaced in the Kremlin, gave rise to construction under the new rules of SNiPs approved in 1963. Now the garbage chute has been returned to residential buildings, elevators in some houses, the size of common areas and rooms has slightly increased. However, the number of storeys remained the same — 5 storeys.

In 1969, the Decree of the Central Committee of the CPSU and the Council of Ministers of the USSR “On Measures to Improve the Quality of Housing and Civil Construction”, set the task of increasing the artistic, aesthetic and operational level of new housing. This document laid the foundation for the construction of the third generation.

“Ship-houses” and their derivative types of houses became a revival of past experience. In planning decisions, borrowing from apartments of the past (corridor-vestibule, a tiny kitchen place).

Despite all its shortcomings, the equalization policy has borne products. Citizens managed to get housing from the state. The stratification factor of housing was leveled — the boss and his subordinate could live on one stairwell, and an intellectual and a worker settled in neighboring entrances.

However, with the end of the country of social equality, housing differentiation began to revive. Gradually the housing market was formed, its class owners and tenants, creating social and economic stratification of the population. The privatization processes that covered the large industrial sector of the state’s economy in the housing sector were manifested by the universal transfer of property rights to housing into the hands of the population living in it. As a result, the immature (wild) housing market in the 1990s was heavily criminalized, crowded with cheap “secondary” apartments. At your own peril and risk, the construction of houses was carried out according to unapproved rules, the old ones no longer worked, and the new market did not have time to form.

By the first decade of the 2000s, having survived more than one crisis, developers are already identifying several segments that allow differentiating the stratification factors of housing offers:

“Economy class”. The most massive and standard housing construction, which is carried out far from the public centers of the city, in the «sleeping” areas, practically outside the city agglomeration. The technology uses cheap materials, foam blocks, although there are panel houses. The apartments are mostly small-sized, studios.

There are no special requirements for the improvement of local territories; hospitals, kindergartens, schools, parks and parking are not provided. It is necessary to distinguish economy-class housing from social housing, since the latter implies the right to live on favorable terms for categories of citizens defined by law (military, pensioners, teachers, etc.).

“Comfort class”. Technologies for the construction of such facilities involve the use of better materials. Requirements for the arrangement of local territories, to public places are increasing. Houses are offered near the metro station, roads, within the metropolitan area. It is important that in such housing construction be not expected to have small-sized studio apartments. It is important that in such housing construction be not expected to have small-sized studio apartments.

It should be noted that these two types of housing (economy class, comfort class) are designed for the mass consumer with low and medium income.

“Business Class”. The requirements for the maintenance of socially useful places in these areas are increasing, parking and security are welcome. Construction is carried out only with quality materials and within the city, closer to the center. Apartments are usually offered with a large squares.

“Elite class”. Such houses are being built only in the historical center according to a special architectural plan, according to the all-inclusive system. All apartments are large-sized with a turnkey finish according to an exclusive design project.

In these two types of housing (business class, elite class), the developer expects to see tenants with extra income as owners.

“Townhouses”. The idea of low-rise construction was supposed to provide those who need housing with cheap square meters, but the prospect of instilling a culture of “one-story America” did not find a mass response from post-Soviet citizens, given their sympathy for atypical individual housing construction.

“Apart-hotels”. Fashion trend, only recently appeared on the domestic housing market. Citizens are invited to purchase, and subsequently rent out rooms or apartments to those who wish. However, according to the form of ownership concluded during the real estate purchase agreement, taking into account Russian tax legislation, such a class of homeowners is unlikely to be created.

As a result of the study, I would like to note that housing stratification has the features of a repeating cycle.

The main types of housing relations, once born, appear in the future. So, work houses were reflected in dormitories, apartment buildings in apartment hotels, “Stalin-houses” into “business class” and “comfort-class” houses, “Kirov-houses” into “economy class”, and the proletarian avant-garde of the 1920s — into timid attempts to develop the housing market in the 1990s.

In this way on the one hand, the previously stated thesis on the differentiation of people’s living conditions depending on their income level and social status that forms the housing stratification was confirmed, on the other hand, despite the cyclical nature that is reflected in the formation of the housing sector in the unstable economic situation in Russia, there is still no clear distinction between “rich” and “poor” residents into formed and differentiated social strata.

Modern housing in the metropolis is characterized by social heterogeneity of residents, which is due to a number of factors, primarily the material security of the owner. As practice shows, this factor weakly correlates with social status. Although it should be noted the well-known social homogeneity of those living in houses of the “elite class” type, and some types of “business class” houses.

In our opinion, when studying the housing stratification of a modern metropolis, it is necessary to study the whole system of differentiation factors (criteria), their dynamics. This will make it possible to more accurately predict social processes in the housing sector.

References

1. Engels F. (2012). On the housing issue / trans. from German. Ed. 2nd. M.: Librocom. M.: Librocom (in Rus).
2. Karavaeva E. Y., Cherkashina T. Y. (2015). Housing relationships, policies and conditions // Public Opinion Monitoring: Economic and Social Change [Monitoring obshchestvennogo mneniya: Ekonomicheskie i sotsial'nye peremeny]. N 6. P. 118–135 (in Rus).
3. Kornev N. R. (2005). Housing stratification in the center of St. Petersburg // Sociological research [Sotsiologicheskie issledovaniya]. N 6. P. 77–84 (in Rus).
4. Meerovich M. G. (2003). Power and housing (housing policy in the USSR in 1917-1940) // Bulletin of Eurasia [Vestnik Evrazii]. N 1. P. 5–66 (in Rus).
5. Radaev V. V., Shkaratan O. I. (1996). Social stratification: Textbook. allowance. 2nd ed. M.: Aspect Press (in Rus).
6. Khaziev R. M. (2012). The living space of the population under reform housing and communal services (regional aspect) : dis. abstract. Kazan: Federal State Autonomous Educational Institution of Higher Professional Education “Kazan (Volga) Federal University” (in Rus).

7. Shmankevich T. (2005). A contracting city — a new segregation // *Baikal Siberia: from what stability is developing* / editorial: V. I. Dyatlov, S. A. Panarin, M. Ya. Rozhansky. M.; Irkutsk: Natalis, P. 295–307 (in Rus).
8. Starikova M. M., Bushkova-Shiklina E. V. (2015). Housing issue in sociological retrospective // *Eurasian Union of Scientists [Evraziiskii soyuz uchenykh]*. N 7 (16). P. 71–74 (in Rus).
9. Weber A. 1903. The growth of cities in the XIX century. SPb.: Edition E. D. Lump (in Rus).

About the authors:

Anatoly A. Likhtin, Dean of the Faculty of State and Municipal Management of North-West Institute of Management of RANEPA (St. Petersburg, Russian Federation), Candidate of Economics sciences, Professor; likhtin-aa@ranepa.ru

Almira N. Muftakhova, Senior lecturer of the Chair of State and Municipal Management of North-West Institute of Management of RANEPA (St. Petersburg, Russian Federation), muftakhova-an@ranepa.ru, msmalmira@yandex.ru

Литература

1. *Энгельс Ф.* К жилищному вопросу / пер. с нем. 2-е изд. М.: Либроком, 2012. 112 с.
2. *Караева Е. Ю., Черкашина Т. Ю.* Жилищные отношения, политика и условия // *Мониторинг общественного мнения: Экономические и социальные перемены*. 2015. № 6. С. 118–135.
3. *Корнев Н. Р.* Жилищная стратификация в центре Санкт-Петербурга // *Социологические исследования*. 2005. № 6. С. 77–84.
4. *Меерович М. Г.* Власть и жилище (жилищная политика в СССР в 1917–1940 годах) // *Вестник Евразии*. 2003. № 1. С. 5–66.
5. *Радаев В. В., Шкаратан О. И.* Социальная стратификация: учеб. пособие. 2-е изд. М.: Аспект Пресс, 1996. 318 с.
6. *Хазиев Р. М.* Жизненное пространство населения в условиях реформирования жилищно-коммунальной сферы (региональный аспект): автореф. дис. ... канд. социол. наук: 22.00.04. Казань: ФГАОУ ВПО «Казанский (Приволжский) федеральный университет», 2012. 28 с.
7. *Шманкевич Т.* Сжимающийся город — новая сегрегация // *Байкальская Сибирь: из чего складывается стабильность* / редкол.: В. И. Дятлов, С. А. Панарин, М. Я. Рожанский. М.; Иркутск : Наталис, 2005. С. 295–307.
8. *Старикова М. М., Бушкова-Шиклина Э. В.* Жилищный вопрос в социологической ретроспективе // *Евразийский союз ученых (ЕСУ)*. 2015. № 7 (16). С. 71–74.
9. *Вебер А.* Рост городов в XIX столетии. СПб.: Издание Е. Д. Кусковой, 1903. 464 с.

Об авторах:

Лихтин Анатолий Алексеевич, декан факультета государственного и муниципального управления, профессор кафедры государственного и муниципального управления Северо-Западного института управления РАНХиГС, кандидат экономических наук, действительный государственный советник Санкт-Петербурга 1 класса (Санкт-Петербург, Российская Федерация); likhtin-aa@ranepa.ru

Муфтахова Альмира Нургулиевна, старший преподаватель кафедры государственного и муниципального управления Северо-Западного института управления РАНХиГС (Санкт-Петербург, Российская Федерация); muftakhova-an@ranepa.ru