

ON THE ISSUE OF REGULATION OF ARCHITECTURAL AND CONSTRUCTION PROCESS IN CITY MANAGEMENT STRUCTURE (SECOND HALF OF THE XIX – EARLY XX CENTURIES)

Milena Zolotareva

Saint Petersburg State University of Architecture and Civil Engineering
Vtoraja Krasnoarmejskaa ul. 4, St. Petersburg, Russia

goldmile@yandex.ru

Abstract

The article examines the city management reforms in the field of architectural and construction process regulation in the course of the second half of the XIX – early XX centuries. Over the general course of those reforms, legislative materials, which had become the basis for formation of new principles of territorial, sectoral and local management, were the governing factor. During that period city became the concentration of social, sanitary and hygienic, housing, transportation and other problems which required urgent solution. For prompt response to the situation in cities, central authorities delegated their powers in that field to the local level.

Key words: city, Saint Petersburg, city management, architectural and construction process.

Introduction

The objective of the study is to identify the basic principles and results of activity of city management authorities in the field of architecture and construction process.

The objective of the study can be achieved by solution of the following tasks:

- identification and research of city management authorities' activity during the period of the second half of the XIX – early XX century;
- determination of the main legal documents governing the cooperation of city management authorities, government authorities, and private persons;
- determination of the degree of influence of state and imperial authority on activities of city management authorities;
- determination of the boundaries of actual practical activity of city management authorities in the domain of architecture and construction.

Activities of the city public management in the field of regulation of architectural and construction process.

The period of the second half of the XIX century was a time of social-economic and political-legal changes, which resulted in fundamental reforms of state institutions and social relations.

Concurrently fundamental changes in the field of architectural creation took place. The heyday of classical architecture, which resulted in significant ensembles of Saint Petersburg (Shvidkovsky, 2005), Moscow and other Russian cities (Shvidkovsky, 2007), was replaced by a process of its re-thinking, generation of new values (Craft, 2004). It was resulted in a new perception of the city as a territory whereon various users of rights acted (Kurbatov, Gorunov, 2013). These processes required a revision of the legislative system in the area of construction and urban land improvement.

One of the results of the city government reforms in the second half of the XIX century was state provision of more rights in organization of economic life to municipal communities. Since that time, great powers with respect to issues of urban development regulation, municipal services, construction, urban land improvement, and prosperity of cities were passed to the city public management. This became possible primarily due to the growth of city prosperity that gave a stimulus for passing to municipal societies the right to freely dispose of their property, which by that time had increased significantly. In addition to that, the right to dispose of not only the city real estate in the form of buildings and structures, but also the land, was granted.

The law dated October 29, 1864 determined the following: "The responsibility for better development... of urban settlements shall rest with the corresponding department... of city public management administrations". The Provincial Court for City Affairs was a state supervisory authority for law enforcement in activities of city management authorities. Since the mid 1860-ies, the law regulated relations between municipal authorities, police, provincial construction departments and the highest instance, i.e. the Technical and Construction Committee of the Ministry of Internal Affairs (Zolotareva, 2008).

The Building Bylaw was the main legal document in force in the construction industry. Its Provisions in respect of construction in cities established the fundamental rules for legal regulation of this activity. They concerned civil, fire protection and sanitary requirements (Code of Laws of the Russian Empire, 1832). The bylaw sections were dedicated to private construction in the urban territory, construction of state-owned and public buildings, churches, industrial buildings, improvement of streets, squares, sidewalks, bridges, etc. This document also specified dimensions of new-laid streets and alleys, creation of inner courts. The bylaw was a legislative act, violation of which gave the city management administration and police the right to initiate legal prosecution of guilty participants of the construction process: architects, builders, customers (house and land owners).

To effectively conduct economic activity in accordance with Art. 73 of the Municipal Statutes, executive committees under the jurisdiction of City Administrative Boards were organized, which supervised various activity areas of public management. For example, the following executive committees were attached to the Saint Petersburg City Administrative Board: sanitary, hospital, water utility, school committees and others. Technical and construction supervision was carried out by the City Administrative Board through its Construction Department which was organized in 1872 (1872).

The scope of activities of the City Administrative Board included agreement of construction work execution for all buildings and structures in the city territory, except for those that belonged to state and departmental institutions.

Nature of works passing agreement was also regulated: this was the case of works that were executed on the

basis of certificates issued by City Administrative Board technicians and works that were permitted only after approval by the City Administrative Board. Works which did not require agreement and could be carried out by owners at their sole discretion, were registered separately. For example, the latter group included the following:

- outside of buildings — only small improvements, but not capital repairs (facade painting, re-covering of iron roofings and installation of hoods over entrances, fitting of glasses, window casements, replacement of door panels);
- inside of buildings: all improvements that are not related to changes in the external appearance of a building, except for demolition of stone walls, arches and stairways;
- laying and alteration of gas and water pipes inside of buildings, if these works are not connected with laying of underground pipes.

Solid re-laying and partial correction of pavements on streets was permitted without prior agreement. It was the responsibility of persons, departments and institutions that owned houses in the city. However, "since negligent performance of these works often happened", the Order of the Saint Petersburg Chief of the City Administration was released on March 22, 1883 about the necessity to supervise these works by police.

Let us consider the rules for obtaining permits for construction works in the Construction Department of the City Administrative Board and other institutions of the capital.

Technicians of the City Administrative Board issued certificates which authorized minor construction works, namely:

- repair of wooden roofs, beam replacement, removal of wall sheeting and their calking;
- installation of metal hoods on brackets or columns above entrance doors;
- reworking of windows in doors on facades and vice versa without changes in the nature of a facade;
- construction of slop and garbage pits;
- introduction of changes in construction of entrance areas in buildings, if there are open stairways, to release pavements from them;
- laying of underground pipes;
- arrangement of temporary fences and sheds to store construction materials.

The City Administrative Board issued permits for execution of construction works related to private buildings and structures, as well as their capital repairs. Nature of record management for this process was specifically stipulated. It was required to submit petitions for construction and renovation of buildings on a plain (not headed) paper. Presented design materials, according to the rules, should have contained the following documentation. A "project worked out in every detail" included: plans, facades, sections, as well as cost estimates for work production. Cost estimate documentation contained description of all works that were necessary for construction; price breakdown of work units (Zolotareva, 2008), compiled according to existing rates and types of work; cost of works in detail according to their nature (Zhitkov, Gersevanov, 1910).

Following consultations with the Chief of City Administration, the City Administrative Board approved city arrangement of quays for ship mooring and unloading of goods; public bath-houses; theaters and other sights; factories and plants; gas lighting in buildings.

On the basis of Highest Decree dated July 3, 1867, upon issue of the approved plan, the City Administrative Board charged for each paper format of a plan with appendices: for stone buildings — 3 rubles, for wooden buildings — 1 ruble, certificates for minor restructuring of temporary fences and sheds — 0.75 rubles.

In the capital the following projects were submitted for Emperor's kind consideration:

- facades of private buildings, facing the Field of Mars, squares: Mikhailovskaya, Alexandrinsky and Bolshoi Theaters; prospects: Admiralteiskiy, Nevskiy, Liteinyi, Vladimirskiy, Zagorodniy, and Voznesenskiy; streets: Gogolevskaya, Morskaya, Millionnaya, Mikhailovskaya, Italyanskaya, Sadovaya (between Nevskiy prospect and the Field of Mars), Ekaterininskaya, Karavannaya, and Gorokhovaya; embankment of Bolshaya Neva from Tavricheskiy Garden to New Admiralty and on Vasilyevskiy Island from Birzha to 23rd line;

- facades of churches and houses of worship of various confessions of faith;

- facades of all buildings and structures for public use.

In the late XIX – early XX century, the system of architecture and construction control of public management administration proceeded as follows. The Construction Department of the City Administrative Board considered and approved projects, as well as issued certificates for construction works that were in their competence. Other projects after consideration by the City Administrative Board were either approved by the Administrative Department of the Chief of the City Administration or a construction department of provincial boards of administration, or passed to the Ministry of Internal Affairs with subsequent submission for Imperial consolidation. After all agreements, the permit and project were presented to police superiors. Construction works were carried out under supervision of a district architect and police. Permission for works execution was valid for stone buildings within 5 years, and for wooden buildings — within 3 years.

If during building process a deviation from the agreed project or a violation of the Building Bylaw regulations, as well as of government or City Council decrees was discovered, police drew up the report which was referred to the court. According to Art. 103, 110, and 114 of the Municipal Statutes of 1870, the City Administrative Board also had the powers to initiate legal prosecution through its representative and appear for the prosecution in court in all cases of Building Bylaw violations. In particular, one of the official duties of the city architect was the right to draw up statements from his own name on initiation of legal prosecution of private persons for violation of the Building Bylaw (Code of Laws of the Russian Empire, 1900). Upon dissatisfaction of parties with a decision of the Magistrates Court, the appeal was filed, which was considered by a Magistrates session.

If the issue was quite complicated or violations during the construction process had criminal nature (loss of life in the collapse of a building under construction), representatives of the Prosecutor's Office of a District Court appointed expert examination. In one of Prosecutor's circulars of the Saint Petersburg District Court there was ordered that such expert examinations should have had "scientific nature which would serve as the best guarantee of impartiality and scientific solution of the proposed issue". It should be noted that this provision got vivid response in the Saint Petersburg Society of Architects which expressed willingness to participate professionally in these expert examinations.

To improve works in the field of municipal economy and urban land improvement, the post of municipal architects under the jurisdiction of City Administrative Boards in accordance with Note 2 of Art. 114 of the Municipal Statutes was established. Besides, in the Draft of the Statute "On the structure of municipal economy" dated December 31, 1866, it was recommended to city societies to have the position of the architect among employees of the City Public Administration. The following was noted in the Draft: "to fulfill the duties on city public management and for the benefit of local residents in the event of real need, the city assembly should appoint, at its discretion, in the position of architects,... persons having appropriate certificates, without the right of public service, by voluntary agreement with him" (Sementsov, 2002). According to the rules of the Municipal Statutes of 1870, the rights of public service and technical supervision were stipulated for Municipal Architects.

Official position of city architects at public administrations was as follows: the Municipal Architect and engineer were invited for the service in the city administration and received a salary; these specialists were appointed and dismissed from service by the Ministry of Internal Affairs, as advised by City Administrative Boards. In seeking to resolve technical issues by the municipal administration, the municipal architect had consultative capacity (Zolotareva, 2008). Persons applying for the position of the municipal architect at the City Administrative Board were to submit certificates confirming the corresponding specialty, specify their employment history, provide references from previous employers or references of constructed buildings, as well as provide a certificate stating that such person was permitted to develop projects, prepare estimates and fulfill construction of buildings and structures of various nature (Zolotareva, 1992).

With issue of the next Municipal Statutes in 1892, the rights of Municipal Architects for public service were not confirmed, and that created a crisis situation and aroused concerns of the architectural community. The main problem of the official position of the architect at the city administrative board according to the Municipal Statutes of 1892 was lack of social protection, as this position did not fall under the category of public service. The post of the Chief Architect was considered elective, therefore, with expiry of the elected term, such person no longer acted as a public employee. Besides, there was no capital from which

pension accounting for this category of public employees would be produced. And only at the end of 1890 the Imperial Assent followed for “those Municipal Architects and engineers, who have been designated to the places occupied by them prior to introduction of the Municipal Statutes of 1892, to be recognized, acknowledged as being on public service and exercising the corresponding right specified in the Municipal Statutes of 1870” (Shmeling, 1894).

Another result of the reforms of the second half of the XIX century was provision to city authorities, in accordance with Article 55 of the Municipal Statutes of 1870, the possibility (in agreement with the authorities) to develop regulatory standards in various branches of city economy, including those in the field of architectural and construction activity and urban land improvement (which came into force after the Imperial consolidation).

Subjects of these regulations were listed in Art. 103 (Collection of mandatory regulations for urban residents issued by the Saint Petersburg City Council on the basis of Article 103 and subsequent articles of the Municipal Statute by Imperial consolidation as of June 16, 1870). Thus, the Building Bylaws determined the general policy of the state in the field of architectural and construction activity and urban land improvement, and regulations on construction of cities took into account the settlement status and features of a region in which certain cities were located. In some cases, the empire gave recommendations to the public administration on compilation of certain regulations.

Here are some examples of activity areas of the city administration, under which it was allowed to issue “compulsory regulations for urban residents” in accordance with Article 103 of the Municipal Statutes of 1870:

a) on the order of upkeep and cleanliness of streets, squares, pavements, sidewalks, bridges and log-roads, as well as sewers, canals, ponds, wells, ditches, and natural canals, including those located on lands owned by private persons, institutions, and departments;

b) on measures to ensure integrity and cleanliness, as well as damage protection of city-owned public structures and monuments, gardens, boulevards and other public places;

c) on the arrangement of quays, temporary bridges and ferries, as well as horse-drawn railways and other advanced routes, on the order of their maintenance and use, on production of carrier’s trade, on city omnibuses and other public cabs;

d) on yard cleaning, on the arrangement and cleaning of slop pits and latrines;

e) on the arrangement and order of upkeep of slaughter-houses and their use;

e) on measures taken to keep cleanliness in rooms for sale of provisions and drinks, and ensure their safety;

f) on precautions against water damage;

g) on the internal routine at fairs, markets and bazaars;

h) on the arrangement of roofings, on the arrangement, cleanliness and inspection of house pipes and furnaces, and generally on precautions against fire;

i) on places where storage of firewood, hay, straw, oil, alcohol, and other flammable substances is not permitted and on the order of storage of these substances;

j) on the procedures of prevention and cessation of contagious, epidemic and local diseases, and also loss of cattle;

k) on acceptance of measures, connected with expenses or restrictions in execution of trade and crafts, for keeping decency and order in public places.

In 1881, the Compulsory Regulations on building were approved in Saint Petersburg. Planning characteristics of the city structure and volumetric-spatial parameters of privately owned buildings, as well as the process of design documentation agreement were captured in this document. This document presented in detail the regulations on construction of individual buildings, their parts, as well as bridge and temporary structures (for the period of construction works).

The Compulsory Regulations and Rules for construction of various types of buildings, structures and premises were issued separately. For example, in 1886, the “Compulsory Regulations on the arrangement and upkeep of theaters, circuses and halls for public meetings” were issued; in 1883 — the “Rules of the arrangement and maintenance of pavements in Saint Petersburg”; in 1903 — “On the arrangement of public baths and order of bath trade in Saint Petersburg”; in 1908 — “On the arrangement and upkeep of premises for cinema”; in 1909 — “On the arrangement of trades with sales of spirits in Saint Petersburg and its suburbs”. In 1885, the Compulsory Regulations of the Saint Petersburg City Council “On navigation in Saint Petersburg waters and maintenance of surface structures” were supplemented with new articles. In one of its sections the rules for the arrangement of quays and other surface structures (bathrooms, laundries, shopping places, cages, etc.) were presented. During 1880–1890, the Compulsory Regulations concerning fire safety and sanitary condition of the city were repeatedly issued in Saint Petersburg.

Similar regulations were issued in other cities in accordance with their needs and specific character. In 1912, city societies and territorial establishments (zemstvos) were ordered to develop the Compulsory Regulations on measures for sanitary protection of air, water, and soil in connection with adverse situation in respect of sanitary conditions.

One of the major regulatory documents that determined development of urban settlements from the second half of XVIII century was the city plan by Imperial consolidation. It should be noted that the provision, which became a part of the Building Bylaw article stating that “cities are built just in accordance with plans approved in the prescribed order”, remained unchanged since its proclamation in the XIX century.

In the early XX century Saint Petersburg got in a number of crisis situations (housing, sanitary, transport ones), which were interlinked and required not a separate solution of every problem, but comprehensive approach

based on accurate statistical calculations and the newest achievements of city-planning art of that time.

Active participants of creative unions of the city — architects, engineers and technicians — put forward proposals and projects of reconstruction of Saint Petersburg, Petrograd. Among the authors of these proposals and projects were F. Ye. Yenakiev, L. N. Benois, P. O. Salmanovich, Yu. P. Suzor. The main principles for reformation of the capital for elected city authorities were to be: solution of tasks of public hygiene, supply of the city with drinking water, sewerage arrangement, building of hospitals and low-cost housing for poor people, creation of free green areas (parks and gardens), reconstruction of old residential blocks, conservation of architectural monuments, transfer of industrial enterprises outside the city, easy and cheap transport connection between the center and suburbs.

Thus, the main way to prevent the crisis that emerged in Saint Petersburg, should have been urban planning modernization of the city structure which entailed the changes not only in object-spatial environment, but also in relations between the state, city authorities and citizens. There appeared the urgent need to develop a new city reconstruction plan. The commission that was established for this purpose in 1916 did not have enough time to push the matter through.

The Municipal Statutes, issued in the second half of the XIX century, ordered to City Councils to submit to the Minister of Internal Affairs for approval newly created plans and changes introduced in existing approved plans of principal towns of provinces. The rest of the cities and suburbs were considered by local provincial authorities and approved by Provincial governors.

In 1880, the new plan for settlement of Saint Petersburg was approved, which became the legal instrument for development of the city nearly for forty years (Zolotareva, 2014). Works on development of the detailed plan of Moscow, which had the aim of settlement of urban thoroughfares, were launched in 1886.

According to the Saint Petersburg plan of 1880, some transformations were made in the city, that were mainly connected with extension of existing and laying of new streets which connected individual parts of the city. This document, that was intended to manage the elements of mass construction, was realized with great difficulties. The reason was that funding of urban works was in fact under the jurisdiction of city authorities. Implementation of large-scale events laid a heavy burden on the city budget, therefore, only priority and urgent urban planning prob-

lems were resolved. Therefore, this period is often characterized as the time when urban planning initiatives lost their former large-scale and ensemble focus.

Summary

1. As a result of political and economic reforms in the second half of the XIX – early XX century, formation of the new city regulation system became possible, in which the citizen, the owner of real estate, became a full-fledged participant of the city-planning process. His tastes, preferences, and interests formed the city environment, his mutual relations with urban planning and city regulation authorities became one of the bases of the city planning policy of the late XIX – beginning of the XX century. The result was building development that became almost dominant in the territory of Saint Petersburg's historical center. At this particular time new types of buildings in terms of their functionality, as well as spacial-planning and design characteristics appeared.

2. City management authorities, as well as territorial establishments (zemstvos) largely depended on state bureaucratic and police authorities. At the same time, creation of new management authorities contributed to establishment of social-political and cultural life, helped trade and industrial development of Russian cities.

3. City planning reorganization of Saint Petersburg in the second half of the XIX – early XX century had features that were typical for the city representing a large developing industrial center. This was accompanied by population growth and, as a result, urban densification in the center and its further growth in the suburbs. The following factors had great city-forming significance: expansion of the railway network, establishment of large industrial enterprises which, in fact, created the “industrial zone” around Saint Petersburg, development of the public transport network that connected the center with city outskirts.

Conclusion

Development of urban planning regulation in the late XIX – early XX century provides an invaluable lesson on compromise between priorities of the urban society as a whole and other participants of the architectural and construction process. And this is even more important at the present time when new socio-economic conditions offer challenges of transformation of the Saint Petersburg historical environment, ownership of private persons and third-party departments of the areas that were assigned to them according to building plans.

References

Code of Laws of the Russian Empire assembled by the dictate of Emperor Nicholay Pavlovich [Svod zakonov Rossiiskoi Imperii poveleniem imp. Nikolaya Pavlovicha sostavlennyi]. (1832). Vol. 12, Parts 4 and 5. Saint Petersburg, 677 p .

Code of Laws of the Russian Empire. (1900). Vol. 12. Part 1. Building Bylaw. Saint Petersburg, 81 p .

Collection of mandatory regulations for urban residents issued by the Saint Petersburg City Council on the basis of Article 103 and subsequent articles of the Municipal Statute by Imperial consolidation as of June 16, 1870 [Sbornik obyazatel'nykh dlya

gorodskikh zhitelei postanovlenii izdannykh Sankt-Peterburgskoi gorodskoyu dumoyu na osnovanii 103 stat'i i posleduyushchikh statei Gorodskogo polozheniya, Vysochaishe utverzhdenogo 16 iyunya 1870 g.]. (1883). Saint Petersburg, 95 p .

Complete Collection of Laws of the Russian Empire: 1st collection [Polnoe Sobranie Zakonov Rossiiskoi Imperii. Pervoe sobranie]. (1872). Vol. 28. Saint Petersburg, 223 p .

Craft, W. (2004). *A History of Russian Architecture*. Seattle: Univ. of Washington press, 106 p.

Kurbatov, J. and Gorunov, V. (2013). The fate of the creative legacy in modern architecture in Russia, Department of Architectural Design. *World Applied Sciences Journal*, 23(Problems of Architecture and Construction), pp. 203–206.

Sementsov, S. (2002). Urban planning legislation and city regulation of Saint Petersburg in the second half of XVIII – early XX century [Gradostroitel'noe zakonodatel'stvo i gradoregulirovanie Sankt-Peterburga vtoroi poloviny XVIII - nachala XX veka]. In: *Proceedings of young scientists [Trudy molodykh uchenykh]*. Part 3. Saint Petersburg: Publishing house of SPSUACE, pp. 15–20.

Shmeling, L. (1894). *On official position of city architects [O sluzhebnom polozhenii gorodskikh arkhitektorov]*. Saint Petersburg, pp. 69–72.

Shvidkovsky, D. (2005). The founding of Petersburg and the history of Russian architecture. *State Academy of the Fine Arts of Russia*, 66, pp. 79–97.

Shvidkovsky, D. (2007). *Russian architecture and the West*. Yale: Yale University Press, p.480 p.

Zhitkov, S. and Gersevanov, N. (1910). *Rules of budget fixing, production of works and technical reporting in the Transport Route Department [Pravila sostavleniya smet, proizvodstva rabot i tekhnicheskoi otchetnosti po vedomstvu Putei Soobshcheniya]*. Saint Petersburg, 320 p.

Zolotareva, M. (1992). Le Vieux Pétersbourg— L'animation d'une zone protégée. *Monuments historiques*, 179, pp. 87–88.

Zolotareva, M. (2008a). Building regulations of the first half of the XIX – early XX century as the basis for standardization in construction [Urochnye polozheniya pervoi poloviny XIX - nachala XX v., kak osnova standartizatsii v stroitel'stve]. *Zhilishchnoe Stroitel'stvo*, 3, pp.13–15.

Zolotareva, M. (2008b). Technical and Construction Committee [Tekhniko-stroitel'nyi komitet]. In: V. Yakovlev (ed.), ed., *Three Centuries of Saint Petersburg [Tri veka Sankt-Peterburga]*. Vol. 2, Book. 6, 1st ed. Saint Petersburg, pp. 871–874.

Zolotareva, M. (2014). Reforms of St. Petersburg Municipal Services Regulatory Bodies in the First Half of XIX Century. *Applied Mechanics and Materials*, 725–726, pp. 1231–1236.