Prospects of the public–private partnership on integrated development of areas in regions

Problems of the state, associated with the implementation of projects on integrated development of areas are identified and described in the article. The legislation governing the implementation of projects on integrated development of areas (IDA) is examined. The experience of Russian developers in the implementation of integrated development projects is analyzed. The results of the implementation of a number of integrated development projects in the Russian Federation are analyzed; the extent of involvement of regions in such programmes is identified. Current projects, implemented in the Russian Federation in the field of integrated development of areas, is considered. Given the results of the analysis, the potential classification of projects is developed within the framework of integrated development of areas. The reasons for the need to convert to packaged construction are listed. Factors, that reduce the attractiveness of the mechanism of integrated development of areas in the Russian Federation for developers, are identified. Regional practices of projects implementation were singled out and local peculiarities were considered with regard for local real estate markets. Advantages of integrated area development have been determined for representatives of government authorities, municipalities and end users of residential and nonresidential buildings. The authors also consider the views of major developers on problems and challenges of integrated development of areas. The authors consider models of interaction between the state and the private business community in such foreign countries as the UK, Germany, and the USA as a possible response to these challenges. Common features of models of public private partnerships are emphasized. Peculiarities of the practical application of such models are taken into account; difficulties encountered by developers in the process of work are described. As a result, the authors have identified the main lines for the development of such projects, taking into account public-private partnerships.
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The implementation of the national project “Housing and Urban Environment” is impossible without a drastic increase in the areas of zones of integrated residential development [1]. Even the Land Code of the Russian Federation had provisions about the implementation of projects on integrated development of areas for the purpose of residential construction, which later obtained a comprehensive regulatory foundation[2]. As a result, in early 2021 legislative changes came into force, changing the mechanism once again. The IDA programme is now regulated by Chapter 10 of the Urban Planning Code of the Russian Federation, introduced by the Federal Law of December 30, 2020 No. 494-FZ “On Amendments to the Urban Planning Code of the Russian Federation and some legislative acts of the Russian Federation to ensure integrated development of areas”[3].

The law defines the notion of IDA as “a set of interrelated activities towards the development of an area, construction of infrastructure and (or) capital construction facilities conducted by legal entities, natural persons, public authorities and aimed at the qualitative transformation of built-up and free (undeveloped) urban areas for the purpose of their best and most efficient use, including the social functions ensuring sustainable development of urban areas”.

The procedure for the approval of integrated development projects is established by Decree No. 1184 issued by the Government of the Russian Federation on July 14, 2021 “On approval of rules of decision making by the Government of the Russian Federation about the integrated development of areas and coordination of such decision with the subject of the Russian Federation, within whose boundaries the area, subject to integrated development of territories”.

As of February 21, 2022 the total of 471 agreements on the construction of 1,343 residential facilities were concluded within the framework of the IDA programme.

We propose to classify IDA projects according to the following criteria.

1. **By scale:**
   - federal;
   - regional;
   - local.

2. **By duration (from the date of conclusion of the CDA/IDA/DBA agreement to the planned date of commissioning):**
   - short-term (up to 5 years);
   - medium term (5–15 years);
   - long term (more than 15 years).

3. **According to the method of securing the builder’s obligations:**
   - escrow accounts;
   - without using escrow accounts.

4. **By the number of floors:**
   - low-rise construction (1–3 floors);
   - medium-rise construction (3–5 floors);
   - high-rise construction (6–9 floors);
   - multistory building (10 and more).

The largest share of projects were agreements on development of built-up areas (DBA) — 265 projects. For example, the development of former industrial areas, renovation, programmes for the resettlement of dilapidated and emergency housing. In addition, owners themselves can enter into an agreement on comprehensive development of the area (CDA). At the analyzed moment, 35 such projects were being implemented. The smallest number of projects are implemented at the initiative of the local government; only 13 such agreements have been made. Unfortunately, this fact has proven the low interest of local authorities in the development of their areas and improvement of the comfort of the residential environment (Fig. 1).

Of the total number of projects, 787 houses have already been commissioned, while the remaining 556 houses are under construction (Fig. 2).

The total residential area of the projects that are being implemented exceeds 12 million square meters of housing of various formats and floors (Fig. 3).

Project agreements have been concluded in every federal district of the Russian Federation. The leader in terms of the number of projects is the Central Federal District (CFD), where 153 IDA contracts were concluded. The Volga Federal District (VFD) comes next with 98 projects. It is well known that this federal district is the second largest in terms of population, with IDA projects being implemented in 13 of 14 subjects of the Russian Federation. The missing subject of the Russian Federation is the Republic of
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Mordovia. The Ural Federal District with 63 IDA projects is also among the top three. It is noteworthy that all 6 subjects of the Russian Federation, included in the Ural Federal District, are implementing projects under IDA contracts. None of the federal districts of Russia can boast full involvement anymore. The worst situation is in the North Caucasian Federal District, where the total number of IDA projects is 7 (Table 1).

In an attempt to analyze the breakdown of IDA contracts concluded by constituent entities of the Russian Federation, let us consider the top 10 (Table 2). The leading position with 225 houses under construction and already commissioned buildings is taken by the Moscow Region, followed by the Nizhny Novgorod Region — 126 houses, the Republic of Bashkortostan — 104 houses. At the bottom of the list is the Belgorod Region with 36 houses being sold under agreements on comprehensive development of areas. 19 subjects of the Russian Federation are outsiders in the rating, with not a single IDA contract concluded in these regions. The Jewish AR (Autonomous Region), Chukotka AR and Nenets AR, Kamchatka Krai, Republics of Adygea, Altai, Ingushetia, Komi, and

Fig. 1. Quantitative indicators of involvement of constituent entities of the Russian Federation in the integrated area development programme

Fig. 2. The breakdown of IDA projects by the stage of construction

Fig. 3. The breakdown of IDA projects by the number of floors
Mordovia, Tyva, Karachay-Cherkess Republic, as well as Kostroma, Magadan, Murmansk, Omsk, Pskov, Smolensk, Tambov and Tomsk regions are among them. Escrow accounts introduced by the state, according to the Federal Law of December 30, 2004 No. 214-FZ (ed. of March 14, 2022) “On Participation in Shared Construction of Apartment Buildings and Other Property and on Amendments to Certain Legislative Acts of the Russian Federation”, are designed to facilitate and accelerate the process of buying and selling real estate and reduce risks for both parties making such deals. Therefore, it is noteworthy that of the total number of IDA projects 607 projects against 736 are implemented using escrow accounts (Fig. 4). The unobvious share ratio can be explained by the fact that at the moment, escrow accounts for large projects are not a flexible enough solution accompanied by numerous problems and issues.

Table 1. Involvement of Russian regions in the IDA programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regions not implementing projects under the IDA programme</th>
<th>Federal District</th>
<th>Development of built-up areas</th>
<th>Agreement on comprehensive development of the area</th>
<th>Agreement on comprehensive development of the area at the initiative of local government authorities</th>
<th>Agreement on comprehensive development of the area at the initiative of the owners</th>
<th>For the purpose of construction of economy class housing</th>
<th>Number of projects in total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kostroma, Smolensk, Tambov regions</td>
<td>CFD</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murmansk region, Pskov region, Komi Republic, Nenets AR</td>
<td>NWFD</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republic of Adygeya</td>
<td>SFD</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republic of Ingushetia, Karachay-Cherkess Republic</td>
<td>NCFD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republic of Mordovia</td>
<td>VFD</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–</td>
<td>UFD</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republic of Altai, Republic of Tuva, Omsk region, Tomsk region</td>
<td>SFD</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamchatka Krai, Magadan Region, Jewish AR, Chukotka AR</td>
<td>FEFD</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Breakdown of constituent entities of the Russian Federation by the number of IDA projects being implemented

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject of the Russian Federation</th>
<th>Number of homes built or commissioned under the IDA programme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moscow region</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nizhny Novgorod region</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republic of Bashkortostan</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novosibirsk Region</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sverdlovsk Region</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irkutsk region</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyumen region</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krasnodar Region</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Petersburg</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgorod region</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orenburg region</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altai Krai</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leningrad region</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republic of Sakha (Yakutia)</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryansk region</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republic of Tatarstan (Tatarstan)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khabarovsk Krai</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republic of Buryatia</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelyabinsk region</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 4. Proportion of IDA projects in terms of use of escrow accounts
In practice, developers face a number of problems that have existed since the introduction of the legislative mechanism in question. They still have no solution, although they have a significant impact on the investor’s decision to apply the mechanism of IDA when implementing an investment and construction project, which creates the need to consider the application of a public private partnership (PPP) for the implementation of IDA projects in Russia to improve the management of the programme development period. Having studied the mechanism of public private partnerships in developed economies (USA, UK, France, Germany), the authors identified the following distinctive features of its regulation [2–5]:

- specialized structures dealing with the problems and support of PPPs;
- PPP agreements provide for the distribution of risks between the state and business communities with guarantees for both parties;
- the owner of the infrastructural facility is usually the state, which, in turn, guarantees the conditions for the provision of services and the payment of remuneration to the investor, according to the terms of the contract.

Having developed the concept of rising the investment attractiveness of IDA projects, we conclude that it is advisable to apply the experience accumulated by the foreign countries in the field of PPPs in the course of implementation of IDA projects in Russia. The main trends in the development of the IDA mechanism, taking into account the application of PPPs, may be as follows:

- establishing the possibility of concluding concession agreements or public private (municipal-private) partnership agreements within the framework of IDA contracts for the construction of public utilities, transport and social infrastructure facilities;
- development of model contracts for IDA projects involving PPPs, including a specific set of documentation for the preparation, support and financing of projects to ensure a better understanding of the risks assumed by the parties;
- construction of social infrastructure facilities within the framework of an IDA contract should include their mandatory buy-out by the municipality;
- creation of additional instruments of support for citizens to be resettled from areas that are offered using the bidding procedure;
- within the framework of the IDA, at the initiative of the right-holding municipality should have an opportunity to provide plots, adjacent to the applicant’s plots, for the construction of social facilities.
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ПЕРСПЕКТИВЫ ГОСУДАРСТВЕННО-ЧАСТНОГО ПАРТНЕРСТВА ПО КОМПЛЕКСНОМУ РАЗВИТИЮ ТЕРРИТОРИЙ В РЕГИОНАХ

В данной статье выделяются и описываются проблемы государства, связанные с реализацией проектов комплексного развития территорий. Рассмотрена нормативно-правовая база реализации проектов комплексного развития территорий. Проанализированы опыт российских девелоперов в реализации проектов комплексной застройки территорий. Проанализированы результаты реализации ряда проектов комплексного развития территорий по Российской Федерации, определена активность участия регионов в подобных программах. Рассмотрена база текущих проектов, реализующихся в Российской Федерации в области комплексного развития территорий. По результатам анализа разработана потенциальная классификация проектов в рамках комплексного освоения территорий. Сформированы причины необходимости перехода к комплексному строительству. При этом выделены факторы, снижающие привлекательность механизма комплексного развития территорий для застройщиков в Российской Федерации. Выделены региональные практики реализации проектов и рассмотрены локальные особенности с учетом местного рынка недвижимости.

ОПРЕДЕЛЕНИЯ

Сфера применения государственно-частного партнерства в России
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