Urban planning and development of the area of Peschanye streets in Moscow: past, present and future
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Abstract. The paper analyses basic approaches which should be implemented for transformation of urban environment to preserve urban heritage values. For case study was chosen Peschanye streets district (Moscow, Russia) as an integral element of the urban environment, as a historical and cultural, experimental city district and as a potentially emergency development site. The article discusses the heritage and cultural landscape-based approach for urban development where the conservation and development are potential partners, affects principles and processes and all together can create increased value for city and citizens.
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1. Introduction

In 2011 the confines of Moscow City were changed: expansion of the Moscow City territories to the south-west due to incorporation of the part of the Moscow region territories. In 2012 International Urban Competition for the elaboration of the Draft Concept of the Moscow City Agglomeration development were held. The competition and its result had made a significant influence on the contemporary urban development of the city – Moscow needs the transformation and rethinking of urban systems and structures. New city development challenges and new goals were announced.

In 2018 International Urban Competition for the development of concepts for experimental renovation sites was held. The competition and its result had made another significant influence on the contemporary urban development of the city: the beginning of vast transformation and redevelopment of residential areas in Moscow. Emergency questions of this transformation are issues related to urban planning heritage and issues related to the desire of citizens to live in familiar urban environment with a high concentration of green spaces. Many emergency issues were ignored, leading to the loss of urban historical heritage and the loss of green areas as “green yards” (an example is the Kuntsevo quarter). The question is how to develop and to save and to preserve urban heritage values in transformation. Which approaches should be implemented as basic?
2. Literature review
Heritage issues are central to the sustainable spatial planning worldwide (Kalman, 2014), especially in the European context [1]. After the Second World War, approaches to preserving the world heritage are systematically becoming more complicated and moving towards greater complexity and integration. H. Kalman considers heritage planning, establishing that the management of change on the prerequisite that conservation and development are potential partners, affects principles and processes. Since 1990 influence of heritage approach (Vecco, 2010 [2]; Schofield & Szymanski, 2011 [3]; Veldpaus, Pereira Rodrigs & Colenbrander, 2013 [4]; Smith, 2014 [5]; Kalman, 2014 [1]; Rzasa, Ogryzek & Kulawiak, 2016 [6]; Janssen, Luiten, Renes & Stegmeijer, 2017 [7] etc) in spatial planning expanded and progressed significantly. J. Smith investigates the application of cultural landscape theory and practice to the urban context and conditions, implementation and suitability of landscape-based approach to urban territories. Thus, to the city structures and urban built environment, for its interpretation and further development the landscape-oriented approach is applied. Cultural landscape-based approach considered as a tool to heritage management and identity protection (Priore, 2009) [8] in dynamic and transformation, in particularly, should be mentioned by the European Landscape Convention (Council of Europe, Florence, 2000 (ELC)). Also, the emergency issues in spatial planning, landscape and heritage management as tangible to the intangible (Vecco, 2010 [2]; Veldpaus, Pereira Rodrigs & Colenbrander, 2013 [4]; Janssen, Luiten, Renes & Stegmeijer, 2017 [7]) should be mentioned. The dual nature (Farinelli, 1991 [9]; Jakob, 2009 [10]; Baldeschi, 2011 [11] etc) of the term landscape (both the object (meaning) and its interpretation (significance) presents both the complexity (Trusiani, Biscotto & D'Astoli, 2013) [12] and integrity of the concept. The natural-ecological characteristics of a landscape, its socio-cultural identity, sense of place (Schofield & Szymanski, 2011) [3] are integral parts to strategic spatial planning (Hersperger, Bürgi, Wende, Bacău & Grădinaru, 2020) [13].

Continuing the ideas of a landscape-oriented approach in heritage spatial planning, an integrated approach was identified (Janssen, Luiten, Renes & Stegmeijer, 2017) [7] that summarizes the experience in heritage management and propose mix approach for spatial heritage planning, based on 3 approaches: sector¹, factor² and vector³ approaches. The vector approach determinates heritage as goal for spatial projects and sustainable territorial development. This 3-based approach indicates the transition to the increasing of layering, interpretation and integration in spatial planning, including politics, programmes, methods, approaches and tools for spatial heritage planning as a combined approach to spatial planning and heritage conservation, enhancement and cultural landscape transformation.

3. Research methodology
The paper analyses heritage and landscape-based prerequisites through the past and present planning of the district regarding: urban structure value; historical transformation of the district; transformation regarding of the post-war period till present-day in relation with urban planning tools and emergency issues; actual issues on transformation of urban environment of Peschaneye streets district (Moscow) regarding cultural, natural heritage in order to identified value-basic approach for further spatial management of the district.

¹ Spatial ‘sector’ preserves heritage by isolating it from spatial development (Janssen, Luiten, Renes & Stegmeijer, 2017).
² Heritage seen as a ‘factor’ in spatial dynamics. Heritage as a basis, an asset and goal to urban and rural regeneration (Janssen, Luiten, Renes & Stegmeijer, 2017).
³ Heritage seen as a ‘vector’ for sustainable territorial development. Heritage determinates the direction of spatial projects and further development (Janssen, Luiten, Renes & Stegmeijer, 2017).
4. Case study
For case study was chosen Peschanye streets district (Moscow) as an integral element of the urban environment, as a historical and cultural, experimental city district.

5. Historical transformation of the district: before experimental post Second World War urban planning
The area of development earlier belonged to the former village of Vsekhsvyatskoe and to the Khodynskoe field. Village Vsekhsvyatskoe (Vsekhsvyatskoye) is within the city of Moscow since 1917. Currently, the territory of the village is occupied by the Moscow districts of Airport and Sokol. The village is known from the XIV-XV centuries. The cultural layer of the Village of Vsekhsvyatsky is a valuable cultural heritage object (site) of regional importance. The village received the name Vsekhsvyatskoe (Vsesvyatskoye, or All Saints) from the Church of All Saints, built in 1683. Currently, on the site of this church there is a new Church of All Saints, built in 1733-1736. In the XVIII century there was a Georgian printing house. Before the opening of the Petrovsky Park, Vsekhsvyatskoe was one of the favourite places for festivities of Muscovites. Fraternal Cemetery of the victims of the First World War was opened near the Village Vsekhsvyatskoe in 1915. In the considered area and around it there are buildings and urban planning projects related to Soviet architectural avant-garde1, postconstructivism2 with art deco elements.

The first residential buildings at the beginning of the district appeared before the war. In the 1920s the first cooperative residential village ‘Sokol’ (avant guard period) appeared here on the periphery of the village Vsekhsvyatskoe in the Bol'shoy Vsekhsvyatskoy roshcha (forest). In honour of village ‘Sokol’ metro station received its name, which was open on September 11, 1938 with its eastern entrance. The authors of the metro station and eastern entrance are K.N. Yakovlev and Yu.N. Yakovlev, engineer N.A. Kabanov, Teslenko, Ushakov. The station was built on an individual project, its design is not typical for the Moscow metro. Initially, the station’s eastern entrance was surrounded by low-rise rural houses, the urban area in the area in the pre-war years was practically absent. On December 21, 1949, the station’s western entrance was opened, located on the opposite side of Leningradsky Prospekt near to the Church of All Saints in Vsekhsvyatskoe. Western entrance designed by architects V.M. Andreev and V.G. Polikarpov [14,15,16,17].

6. Experimental post Second World War urban planning
Peschanye streets (Sandy streets) District in Moscow is an example of the first experimental experience of using standardization methods and the using of partly prefabricated structures post Second World War urban planning and development of residential areas in Moscow so widely (300 ha). The residential constructions in Peschaye district began before war (Leningradsky Prospekt, 69-71, 1938, architect is V.I. Yeramishantsev.). And then after the Second World War in 1951-1953 was constructed the second part, designed by the architects from Leningrad A.F. Khryakov and Z.O. Brod. But the integrated high-speed construction was carried out from 1948 to the end of the 1950s. The design and construction of the area were carried out in several stages. In different periods architects working on this district: V. Andreev, V. Sergeev, Z. Rosenfeld, N. Shvets, A. Bolonov, M. Zilbergleit, M. Posokhin, A. Mndoyants, R. Olikhov; engineers V. Lagutenko and S. Shkolnikov, constructor A. A. Bartoshevich and others [14,15,16,17].

---

1 Fire Station No. 19 constructed 1927-1928 by architect A. Kurovskiy (Leningradskiy avenue, 71 A). Administrative building near metro station Polezhaevskaya constructed late 1920- early 1930 (Khoroshevskoe highway, 86), architect is unknown.

2 1st Moscow Air Force Special School, constructed in 1930s. Now is a part of School № 1249.

---
Peschanye streets district represents the residential area up to 9 floors, the example of one of the most homogeneous city districts in Moscow.

Architects Z.M. Rosenfeld and P.V. Pomasanov designed the urban plan structure for development the area (from village Vsekhsvyatsoke, Leningradskiy avenue to Khoroshevskoe highway). Between Khodyinskoe field and circular railway, river Tarakanovka there were situated the summer military camps. Now on the most part of it located the favourite park of local citizens “Berezovaya roschcha”. The landscape of the developed site was the river landscape of rivers Tarakanovka and Khodynka. On the banks of them near village Vsekhsvyatsoke there were situated for the time of mass construction the holiday villa ges (dacha) for families of officers. By the proposed urban plan, the rivers were hidden under the ground and covered, above them on the most part of them there were planned green areas (parks) of the district, and somewhere above them there were planned streets. Complex geomorphology of relief and landscape can be also seen in the urban structure nowadays: especially on Novopeschanaya Street, it is emphasized by the plan of setting up houses and a combination of their heights.

7. Emergency issues on transformation of urban environment of Peschanye streets district

The modern threats of the urban transformations of the district were defined: the inclusion of structures of non-district significance as transport infrastructure, high density business and residential construction and development, poor quality building renovation. Which potentially destroy the existing homogeneous and united structure of the district. For example, by the existed General plan there were changed the boarders of the Peschanye streets historical district by divided it to 2 different. Which formally allows to design the main streets of city importance (with permitted speed 80-100 km/h; with 4 – 8 lines) within the historical district. The last precedent was created in the autumn of 2019 (3-rd Peschanaya st. could be transformed into the main streets of city importance).

8. Values of urban environment

Pechanye streets district is an integral element of the urban environment, with high values of urban heritage and environment, comfortable scale, which is not common in Moscow, with high presents of parks and green areas. The district designed as a whole structure of the urban environment, the first example of experimental post Second World War urban planning and development of residential areas in Moscow. Complex geomorphology of relief and landscape, cultural layer of the Village of Vsekhsvyatsky (valuable cultural heritage site of regional importance), historical experimental urban structure and its architecture (of various periods) represent both tangible and intangible urban heritage. We argue that the heritage and landscape-based approaches should be implemented as a basic for the further development of the district.

9. Research results

Consider that the conservation and development should be potential partners (Kalman, 2014) for management of change also in this case [1]. If we apply the cultural landscape theory and practice to the urban context (Smith, 2014) [5] and conditions, in our case to the Pechanye streets district, we can change the direction of urban spatial development to the heritage orientated approach, to the ‘vector’ approach (Janssen, Luiten, Renes & Stegmeijer, 2017) [7], in order to implement heritage approach for sustainable territorial development. Which is an advantage in relation to the historically formed urban areas and permits not to lose multi-layering cultural diversity, natural-ecological characteristics of a landscape, socio-cultural identity, sense of place ( Schofield & Szymanski, 2011) [3], especially considering that cultural landscape-based approach is a tool also to identity protection (Priore, 2009) [8], in our case the identity of Moscow should be considered. 3-based approaches (sector, factor and vector approaches) (Janssen, Luiten, Renes & Stegmeijer, 2017) [7] permit to enhance the value of the cities, changes the direction of development to
more integrated heritage spatial planning approach in a direction as a combined approach to spatial planning and heritage conservation, enhancement and cultural landscape transformation.

10. Conclusion
The area of Pechanye streets within the designed borders is a valuable city-forming area. The further spatial management of the district should be based on the historical, cultural and natural heritage, values of the urban environment to identified value-basic approach, should include heritage orientated politics, programmes, methods, approaches and tools in order to enhance urban values in Moscow scale and the quality of life.
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