

# Development of Rural Areas in Zones of Large Cities' Influence

Konstantin Getmantsev

Department of Organization and Planning of Local
Development
Kuban State University
Krasnodar, Russia
E-mail: kot34@mail.ru

Ekaterina Krylova

Department of Organization and Planning of Local
Development
Kuban State University
Krasnodar, Russia

Abstract—The present article studies the issues of evaluating a large city's influence on socio-economic development processes in a rural area and the prospects for its independent development in the urban agglomeration. It analyses the changes in the system of rural settlement affected by the transport factor and circular migration of the local population to nearest cities.

Keywords—rural development; urban agglomeration; agglomeration development processes; urban and rural interaction

### I. INTRODUCTION

One of the acute problems of urban agglomerations' development is the expansion of their influence on rural territories. The traditional boundaries between the city and the village are changing and rural territories gradually integrate into the urban economic space, which cannot but raise the issues of local economy, labor market and transformation of rural residents' lifestyles. These issues frequently pose significant challenges to the existence of rural territories; however, they can serve the purposes of social and economic development as well.

The article is aimed at studying the influence of cities on the development of rural territories and identifying the approach to framing the policy for rural territories development.

### II. THE KRASNODAR URBAN AGGLOMERATION AND RURAL AREAS COMPRISING IT

In recent years, in the media of Krasnodar Krai there has been increased information on the Krasnodar urban agglomeration. Meanwhile, the given data is rather contradictory: the constituent elements of the agglomeration, its population and economy structure, etc. are presented differently. It can be explained by the fact that the concept of

Elena Ilyasova
Department of Organization and Planning of Local
Development
Kuban State University
Krasnodar, Russia

Evgeniya Atamas

Department of State and Municipal Administration
Kuban State University
Krasnodar, Russia
E-mail: eatamas@bk.ru

"the Krasnodar urban agglomeration" has not yet been enshrined in regional legislation. Therefore, it is a matter of priority to define the Krasnodar urban agglomeration, its structure and size.

The structure of the Krasnodar urban agglomeration can be described as follows [2]:

- the city of Krasnodar the nucleus of the agglomeration;
- the Dinskoy District;
- the Krasnoarmeyskiy District;
- the Severskiy District;
- the Ust-Labinskiy District;
- the city of Goryachy Klyuch.

The city of Krasnodar, the nucleus of the agglomeration, is a multifunctional city, characterized by a multi-branch economy, substantial proportion of high-tech industries; considerable socio-cultural, scientific, technical and intellectual potential, and unique functions of national and international significance. [2].

The analysed rural district, the Severskiy District comprises the Krasnodar city agglomeration belt.

According to the official data, the Severskiy District is a medium-sized rural territory of Krasnodar Krai, located to the southwest of the region, on the left bank of the Kuban River, on the northwestern slope of the Greater Caucasus Mountain Range. The territory accounts for about 211 thousand hectares. The area is characterized by the moderately humid climate, with the annual mean rainfall of 700-800 mm. The population of the area amounts to 117833 people [1].



The Severskiy District is closely related to the city my means of massive labour migration flows, business and economic connections, tourist flows, city enterprises location in the region and city residents buying real estate in the region.

Oil, natural gas, non-metallic resources, clay, and mineral water springs are the main natural resources of the region. Being an industrial region, the Severskiy District has a multidimensional capacity. In the structure of the economy, manufacturing represents 90%, 80.4% of which is oil production. What is more, the region produces wall materials (brick), construction non-metallic materials, oil field equipment, the products of the forest and wood industries, and food industry. [2].

Agriculture is also well-developed in the district. The dominating industries include crop farming, especially grain crops production (wheat, buckwheat) and oil crops production (sunflower and rapeseed).

Natural landscapes and attractive recreational spaces are areas of unique interest in the district.

When evaluating the role of the Severskiy District in the Krasnodar urban agglomeration, it is reasonable to assess its transport accessibility first.

The data on the distance and travel time from the settlements in the administrative centres of the Severskiy District to the city of Krasnodar was provided by the portal https://www.rudorogi.ru/ and is presented in "Table I" [7].

Studying the data we can conclude that most settlements of the municipal entities of the district meet the main criterion for the territories comprising the agglomeration - accessibility by transport (travel time within 1.5 hours).

However, due to the rugged landscape of the Severskiy District (flat terrain, piedmont, mountain areas, extending to the Caucasus Mountain Ridge) transport communication between individual settlements and the nucleus of the agglomeration is impeded [8].

TABLE I. DISTANCE AND TRAVEL TIME FROM THE ADMINISTRATIVE CENTRES OF THE SEVERSKIY DISTRICT SETTLEMENTS TO THE ADMINISTRATIVE BORDER OF THE CITY OF KRASNODAR (AT THE AVERAGE SPEED OF 60 KM/H)

Inhabited localities	Distance, km	Average travel time, min	Available means of transport	
Afipskoye urban settlement (Afipskiy urban-type settlement)	29	32	Automobile, bus, railway	
Ilskoye urban settlement (Ilskiy urban- type settlement)	52	58	Automobile, bus, railway	
Chernomorskoye urban settlement (Chernomorskiy urban-type settlement)	67	1 h. 03 min.	Automobile, bus, railway	
Azovskoye rural settlement (Azovskaya stanitsa)	48	57	Automobile, bus	
Grigor'yevskoye rural settlement (Grigor'yevskaya stanitsa)	85	1 h. 52 min.	Automobile, bus	
Kaluzhskoye rural settlement (Kaluzhskaya stanitsa)	54	1 h. 2 min.	Automobile, bus	
L'vovskoye rural settlement (L'vovskoye village)	49	51	Automobile, bus	
Aleksandrovskoye rural settlement (Aleksandrovskiy khutor)	67	1 h. 12 min.	Automobile, bus	
Mikhaylovskoye rural settlement (Mikhailovskiy settlement)	68	1 h. 27 min.	Automobile, bus	
Novodmitriyevskoye rural settlement (Novodmitrievskaya stanitsa)	28	24	Automobile, bus	
Severskoye rural settlement (Severskaya stanitsa)	37	32	Automobile, bus, railway	
Smolenskoye rural settlement (Smolenskaya stanitsa)	32.6	46	Automobile, bus	
Shabanovskoe rural settlement (Shabanovskoe village)	82	1 h. 57 min.	Automobile, bus	

The most remote inhabited settlements include the Plancheskaya Shchel settlement - 112 km (3 hours 17 minutes of travel time); the Tkhamakha village - 148 km (3 hours 47 minutes of travel time); the Mirnyy settlement - 117 km (3 hours 25 minutes of travel time); the Ubinskaya stanitsa - 142 km (3 hours 12 minutes of travel time); the Derbentskaya stanitsa - 157 km (over 4 hours of travel time) ("Table I"). [7].

### III. IDENTIFYING ZONES OF URBAN AGGLOMERATION INFLUENCE ON ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT OF THE RURAL AREA

Taking into account the described conditions, it can hardly be said that the Krasnodar urban agglomeration incorporates the whole Severskiy District and influences it as much as its other constituent elements. Thus, the territories of the region are involved in the agglomeration processes to a greater or lesser extent.



Accordingly, the Severskiy District can be conditionally divided into three zones that experience influence by the urban agglomeration:

The first zone is comprised of the settlements bordering on the city of Krasnodar and the settlements located at the A-146 federal highway (Krasnodar-Novorossiysk). This zone includes the inhabited settlements of the Afipskoye, Ilskoye and Chernomorskoye urban settlements; travel time to the city of Krasnodar there is up to 1 hour.

The second zone is represented by the inhabited settlements of the L'vovskoye, Smolenskoye, Azovskoye and Kaluzhskoye rural settlements. Although they are located up to 80 km away from the Krasnodar-Novorossiysk highway, they are easily accessible by transport from the city. Travel time to Krasnodar is 1-1.5 hours.

The third zone is shaped by the settlements farthest from the Krasnodar-Novorossiysk highway, characterized by considerable travel time, limited transport access and problems with regular public transport. They include the inhabited settlements of Mikhaylovskoye, Grigor'yevskoye and Shabanovskoe rural settlements. Travel time to the city of Krasnodar is over 1.5 hours.

The presence of transport communication and roads connecting the rural areas and the agglomeration nucleus represent another criterion to identify the Severskiy District in the structure of the Krasnodar urban agglomeration. [3].

Nowadays, in the Severskiy District, roads are predominantly present in central plain-like areas. The Chernomorskoye, Afipskoye, Ilskoye urban settlements, the Severskoye, Smolenskoye and Novodmitriyevskoye rural settlements have well-developed networks of roads, transport communication with the city, which has a significant role for passenger and cargo flow direction within the agglomeration [5].

However, for some settlements, such as the Azovskoye, Shabanovskoe and Mikhailovskoye rural settlements transport communication with the agglomeration nucleus is hindered due to the lack of developed road networks.

What is more, some settlements lean towards the neighbouring areas, not the city of Krasnodar. For instance, the Kaluzhskaya stanitsa is more oriented to the city of Goryachy Klyuch, which is within the distance of 18 km; the Sputnik settlement - to the city of Abinsk; the Mikhailovskiy settlement - to the neighbouring city of Slavyansk-na-Kubani, 12 km away [8].

## IV. CHANGES IN THE SETTLEMENT SYSTEM AND DEMOGRAPHIC PROCESSES OF THE RURAL AREA INFLUENCED BY THE AGGLOMERATION

One of the most important outcomes of rural areas being influenced by the agglomeration is changes in their settlement systems.

In a broad sense, a settlement system is the system for locating the population and populated areas across the country (region). The settlement location is always preconditioned by three factors: cores of employment,

habitability of the territory and the opportunities of convenient transportation. [3].

A core of employment is industrial and agricultural production, research and training centres, administration, etc., i.e. a place to concentrate people for the production of material and nonmaterial values, management, personal contacts and communication. The population is the main productive force of society, while its settlement is the arrangement of productive forces across territories. Nevertheless, for productive forces to function effectively, the space has to be specially organized. Therefore, it is exactly the settlement system, which has a regulatory role in the territorial structure of productive forces [3].

As a part of the Krasnodar urban agglomeration, the Severskiy District, is inevitably faced with changes in the settlement system. Table 2 provides an overview of these changes [32]. In order to illustrate them more clearly, the data is presented in three periods over the past 20 years.

Some of the trends require special attention.

First, there is a positive dynamics in the number of large inhabited settlements in general and in the administrative centres of rural and urban settlements of the Severskiy District in particular. Most of the rural centres increased their population over the past 20 years. The largest population growth was recorded in the Afipskiy urban-type settlement, the Ilskiy urban-type settlement and the Severskaya stanitsa. The negative trend is characteristic only of the Alexandrovskiy khutor. 15 people - is the official number of its residents, which reduced to 8 people in 2018 [6].

Simultaneously, the population decrease is observed in small inhabited settlements, especially in villages in the periphery.

The population is also declining in the Tkhamakha village, the Naumenkov khutor, the Oasis khutor, the Shuvayev khutor, the Anan'yevskiy khutor, the Peschanyy khutor, the Novoivanovskiy khutor, the Krasnyy khutor, the Chibiy settlement, the Stavropol'skaya stanitsa, the Kipyachiy khutor, and the Kosharskiy khutor. These inhabited settlements used to be workers' settlements, thus the termination of operations or reduced volumes of work resulted in the population decrease. For instance, when logging enterprises were closed in Chibiy in 1998, the settlement lost 97% of its population. Today, the official population there amounts to 30 people, with only 4 residents living in the settlement permanently [4] ("Table II").



TABLE II. CHANGES IN THE SETTLEMENT SYSTEM OF THE SEVERSKIY DISTRICT

Inhabited localities	Years			
	1996	2006	2016	
	0.1	e urban settlement		
Afipskiy urban-type settlement	18412	19324	20114	
Vodokachka khutor	287	227	129	
Vostochnyy khutor	517	449	340	
Kovalenko khutor	387 78	412 22	641	
Kosharskiy khutor Neftekachka settlement	114	82	56	
Netteractika settlement		urban settlement	30	
Ilskiy urban-type settlement	16805	18715	24944	
Derbentskoye village	1022	712	634	
	Chernomors	koye urban settlement	1 22	
Chernomorskiy settlement	6265	6912	7205	
Oktyabrskiy settlement	914	1372	1857	
Karskiy khutor	218	243	214	
Novopetrovskiy settlement	1026	815	419	
Vesolyy khutor	508	412	316	
Kipyachiy khutor	318	257	127	
Sputnik settlement	128	522	712	
		e rural settlement	2074	
Azovskaya stanitsa	2308	2714	3874	
Ubinskaya stanitsa	307	511	452	
Crigorly avalence atomitae	963	koye rural settlement 1087	1247	
Grigor'yevskaya stanitsa Stavropol'skaya stanitsa	1352	1105	815	
Staviopoi skaya staiitsa	I .	ye rural settlement	813	
Kaluzhskaya stanitsa	1678	1815	1925	
Chibiy settlement	214	52	30	
Cinory sectrement		ve rural settlement	30	
L'vovskoye village	4247	4732	5171	
Krasnyy khutor	255	211	179	
Novoivanovskiy khutor	289	265	210	
Peschanyy khutor	315	187	65	
Stefanovskiy khutor	285	244	236	
		skoye rural settlement		
Mikhailovskoye village	2057	1862	1775	
Alexandrovskiy khutor	87	34	15	
Anan'yevskiy khutor	627	415	325	
N. I. S. I. S. I.		vskoye rural settlement	5510	
Novodmitrievskaya stanitsa	4283	5472	5718	
Shuvayev khutor	1072	825	512	
Oasis khutor Novyy khutor	612 286	583 207	487	
Novyy knutor		ve rural settlement	377	
Severskay stanitsa	21568	22085	24812	
Bonchkovskiy khutor	638	758	816	
Bondarenko khutor	415	388	311	
Volikov khutor	127	95	87	
Naumenkov khutor	392	312	247	
Novoalekseevskiy khutor	128	214	319	
Svobodnyy khutor	94	107	112	
8 March settlement	393	358	415	
Predgornyy khutor	316	385	317	
		ye rural settlement	•	
Krepostnaya stanitsa	3107	3248	3057	
Smolenskaya stanitsa	3987	3875	4218	
Mirnyy settlement	482	468	412	
Plancheskaya Shchel settlement	312	344	328	
		koe rural settlement		
Shabanovskoe village	422	458	412	
Tkhamakha village	397	355	308	

The following settlements located along the A-146 federal highway demonstrate a positive trend: the Oktyabrskiy settlement, the Chernomorskiy settlement, the

Ilskiy urban-type settlement, the Severskaya stanitsa, the Afipskiy urban-type settlement, the 8 Marta settlement, the



Svobodnyy khutor, the Vodokachka khutor and the Vostochnyy khutor [4].

Another significant trend is as follows: the closer to Krasnodar the settlement is located, the more positive the dynamics of its population is. The trend is demonstrated by the Afipskiy urban-type settlement, the Vodokachka khutor, the Vostochnyy khutor, and the Novodmitrievskaya stanitsa.

Most settlement of the mountainous areas, including the Shabanovskoye village, the Tkhamakha village, the Mirnyy settlement, the Plancheskaya Shchel settlement and the Chibiy settlement, with the exception of the Azovskaya stanitsa and the Ubinskaya stanitsa, gradually lose their population.

It should be mentioned that all the changes in the settlement system of the Severskiy District prove a wellknown fact: the rural population moves from the periphery to the centre and from the centre to the cities. However, this process is only partially characteristic of the Severskiy District: the population do not move to the Severskaya stanitsa, but directly to several large settlements located on the Krasnodar-Novorossiysk federal highway. Meanwhile, the settlements that are geographically closer to the city of Krasnodar grow to a greater extent. This shows that the population does not leave the Severskiy District, but relocates to those settlements more convenient for living and closer to the city, thus shaping "rural" residential areas of the city of Krasnodar.

Another trend is a positive net migration. According to the data of the Severskiy District administration, the population of the district has been growing, including due to the influx of new residents into the district (See "Table III"). [4].

TABLE III. POPULATION DYNAMICS IN THE SEVERSKIY DISTRICT

Indicator	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Standard residential population, pers.	113094	114394	115149	116261	117073	117833
Natural population growth (+)/ decline (-), pers.	-278	-314	-87	-104	-117	-218
Migration gain (+)/ loss (-) of the population, pers.	+827	+986	+668	+1008	+695	+542

The comparison of the figures of natural and migration population growth demonstrates that the 2% growth is predominantly due to migration influx of the population rather than to its natural increase.

Unfortunately, the data on migrants was not available; however, as far as the authors are concerned, most of them are concentrated in three inhabited settlements of the region: the Afipskiy urban-type settlement, the Ilskiy urban-type settlement and the Severskaya station.

It can also be assumed that urban residents themselves contribute to migration flows at least in two possible ways. The first way is connected with the practice of downshifting, when urban residents, tired of hectic city life move to quieter and cheaper areas. The second way is related to making a conscious choice in favour of a village life, mostly for economic reasons.

#### V. CONCLUSION

To conclude, it can be emphasized that the territories of the Severskiy District respond differently to the proximity of Krasnodar and are engaged into the activity of the agglomeration to varying degrees. Therefore, some territories integrate into the agglomeration's life and find new development opportunities in being involved into the city's zone of influence, while others fail sustain their capacity for development and maintain their population and economies. In a part of the areas, the population is on the verge of vanishing, which cannot be helped even by their location in proximity to large cities. Moreover, all processes take place randomly, influenced by external factors and are practically uncontrolled by local administrations.

#### REFERENCES

- Krasnodar. Wikipedia free encyclopaedia. Available at: https://ru.wikipedia.org/wiki/krdn
- [2] Lavrova T.G. Urban agglomeration of Krasnodar: development and management // The contours of global transformations: Politics, Economics, Law. 2015. No. 5. Pp. 80-89.
- [3] Leksin V.N. Urban agglomerations and the settlement system: hopes and fears. Moscow. Infra-M. 2011. 267 p.
- [4] Migration in the Severskiy District of Krasnodar Krai. Materials of the migration centre of the Severskiy district of Krasnodar Krai. Available at: http://www.sevadm.ru/2013/10/29/migracija.html.
- [5] The website of the Severskiy District of Krasnodar Krai. Available at: http://www.sevadm.ru/.
- [6] Districts and cities of Krasnodar Krai. Statistical Compendium. Krasnodar. Rosstat. 2018. 311 p.
- [7] Calculating the distance between cities. "RUdorogi". Available at: https://www.rudorogi.ru/
- [8] Severskiy District. Wikipedia free encyclopaedia Available at: https://ru.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D0%A1%D0%B5%D0%B2%D0%B5 %D1%80%D1%81%D0%BA%D0%B8%D0%B9\_%D1%80%D0%B 0%D0%B9%D0%BE%D0%BD