PIOTR LORENS

Gdańsk University of Technology

CONTEMPORARY ISSUES IN PRODUCTION AND UTILISATION OF THE COMMON URBAN AREAS

Abstract: This paper deals with issues in production and utilization of common urban areas within contemporary cities. Therefore, the main focus of it was put on the analysis of the possible models of development of spaces in the context of changing socio-economic environment of cities and evolution of their structure. This issue is discussed also in light of the changing definition of the contemporary public space, which no longer resembles the examples known from a few decades ago. In conclusion, it is argued that the value of contemporary public spaces is associated with their influence on site attractiveness – both in physical, social and economic meanings

Keywords: Contemporary cities, public spaces, perception of space.

1. The importance of public spaces. Contemporary definition, identity and perception of public space

In every city there are places and spaces which inspire pride and others that are cause for shame. Most frequently, the place that is the object of particular interest, and thus receives the most attention and care from authorities and citizens alike, is the center – the community and cultural heart, a meeting place, a symbol of the city's prime and prosperity or of its decline [Szczepański 2003]. At the same time, the places we find ourselves in on a daily basis and those we visit as tourists elicit reflection, arouse emotions, and comprised a mosaic rather than a uniform image of our world [Jałowiecki 2003]. A particularly important role here is played by urban public spaces. They become the characteristic "urban genetic code" according to which they can be regenerated following degradation or destruction.

244

Its primary conveyor is indeed culture, which strengthens the shape of these spaces [Bielecki 1996].

Many places that have been given varied and rich significance by subsequent generations include historic city centers and their principle public concepts. These are singular, unique places with firmly-grounded identities. Despite this, the buildings that are most meaningful to us are those of a symbolic character such as city halls or important townhouses; the power of their impact, that which influences the aesthetic experience of being in these spaces, stems from the cohesion of a given work of architecture and its context, thus not just from a building but from its surroundings as well [Staniszkis 1995]. Such ties are particularly strong with regard to the communities inhabiting a given city. Cultural uniformity and the proximity of the architecture that surrounds residents impart them with a sense of continuity, integration, and membership in the social group to which they belong. Occasionally, in large metropolises, architectural forms permit finding one's own ethnic, religious, or cultural identity. Examples of this are the ethnic neighborhoods in various cities of the world; Chinatown in San Francisco is probably the best known [Wallis 1977].

Historic and contemporary public spaces are both presently undergoing processes of rapid changes, the consequences of which are often worrying. These spaces are significant elements of every city structure, as it is within their confines that the variety of activity and the model of the community life of its residents are manifested most strongly. They also represent the specifics of the city as a creation of culture and spatial frames within which culture originates and develops [Kochanowski 2002a]. They are, thus, areas that are most strongly associated with conducting an urban lifestyle, which, it follows, stems from the particular scheme of interdependencies between the size and density of the city structure as well as the intensity, variety, and permanence of its utilization [Hassenpflug 2003]. Public spaces are, thus, that structural element of the city which, in the opinion of Walter Benjamin[1], embodies the potential of both "conformity and utopia, the world of material choice, and the world of dreams" [Zukin 1993]. The beauty of a place, which is often perceived subjectively, is also not without significance as it has become an objective economic category. Currently, this designates the price of space and the market price of locations [Kochanowski 2002a].

Contemporary interest in the issues surrounding urban public space was not as evident in the era of modernism. This was so despite awareness of its significance and the multifaceted functions it performed. Although a modern-

---

[1] In the author's description of the late nineteenth century city.

245

ist paradigm for shaping the structure of the city was implemented, public space remained a place for meetings and exchanges (trade and services) and, finally, of transportation [Gehl, Gemzoe 2001][2]. The contemporary trend[3], which is based on transforming space that is alive into cities devoid of life and residential areas, has meant that cities have become increasingly dull and monotonous. Thus, another social need has been pushed to the forefront – the need for stimulation. This is related to the need for contact with other people. In contrast to looking at buildings, being among people offers a rich variety of sensory experiences. This is also why such importance is assigned currently to public space; it stems from attempts to enliven cities and render them more attractive. Lively cities are those which stimulate multifaceted interactions among people. It follows that "its inconsequential how colorful and diversified the buildings are; if they cannot offer the opportunity for human interaction, they remain boring and monotonous" [Gehl 2001].

2. The contemporary definition of urban public space

In the opinion of Diane Ghirardo, public space was defined in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries too optimistically as community space, with the understanding that it belonged neither to a given group nor class, but to the human community as a whole. Discussions of this issue also include the contemporary debate on the topic of the public sphere as public space is where it is realized [Ghirardo 1999]. According to Jürgen Habermas, the public sphere is the place where citizens join and participate in political events. It is, thus, related to places with a time-honored tradition of various activities including political ones. Its value lies in the fact that it is accessible to everyone regardless of financial status or origin [Amin, Thrift 2002].

The character of contemporary public space is not similar to that presented in the literature of the nineteenth century, and it has lost the universal character that permitted identifying it with the public domain. The contemporary city has become a mixed collection of loosely connected elements, includ-

---

[2] These functions developed to varying degrees in different cities. One example is the categorization by Jan Gehl into "traditional" (in which space is used equally for meetingplace, marketplace, and traffic), "invaded" (whose structure is dominated by automobile transportation), "abandoned" (in which space and public life are dying), and "reconquered" (where steps are being taken to return equilibrium to the uses of space for meetingplace, marketplace, and traffic purposes).

[3] This is particular to the industrialization process, segregating various urban functions and the dependence on the automobile.

246

ing public spaces of diverse characters. The "traditional" city, which is usually the historic center of a contemporary metropolis, has become just one of a wide range of components that comprise the contemporary urban body. In addition, we can identify a wide array of specialized spaces for production, consumption (including housing), authorities, exchanges, and, finally, those with symbolic significance [Jałowiecki, Szczepański 2002]. It thus becomes necessary to differentiate between urban "space" (including public space) and "place", which is rich in meaning, memories, cultural connotations, etc. Such "places", in the opinion of Auge, are characterized by a particular identity, social relationships, and history, while "non-places" lack identity and are difficult to define in social or historical categories. Since they are of a private character and lack authenticity, they are often subjected to theming [Auge 1995].

In the present day, public space is that which attains a certain level of autonomy and complex compositional and functional relationships with the structures that form this space and is, at once, a significant element of the city structure as well as one that integrates the urban fabric [Zuziak 2002]. In practice, the concept of public space is often disfigured as its public dimension disappears and is replaced by an alternative form of its utilization. Currently, the "publicness" of space lies not in the formal characteristics of questions of ownership or the way it is shaped. What is significant, rather, is that it affords different social groups, including those with different lifestyles or from different cultural circles, the opportunity of making contact [Hołub 2002]. At the same time, these are the only areas where membership in a given social group does not exclude people from mixing freely, and this means that we can meet them [Zukin 1995].

Currently, traditional public space is being replaced by substitutes, which are referred to by Chmielewski as "private spaces with public access". This includes, among others, shopping centers, supermarkets, and entertainment centers. A characteristic trait of these places is their closed architectural concept that consciously limits the use of exterior space in favor of creating a seemingly multi-functional interior that imitates the exterior space[4]. This is why many of these places, in the opinion of Diane Ghirardo, should be described rather as social spaces than public ones. She also observes that contemporary public space is sometimes interpreted in two ways that differ fundamentally from the nineteenth century concept, which is "as space dedicated to consumption and as space where visitors are subjected to a very specific type of segregation – they are observed and monitored" [Ghirardo 1999,

---

[4] For more on this topic see, among others: [Safdie 1997].

247

p. 43]. This occurs when the users of public space are seeking such qualities as comfort, convenience, a relaxing time, various ways to participate in all that is happening, new experiences, etc. [Carmona *et al.* 2003]. Often, only such "private spaces with public access" can realize this in a safe manner. This is also why we can speak of these spaces in terms of defined cultural identity as well as physical safety [Zukin 1995].

The realization of the requirements listed above is becoming increasingly important for contemporary society. This stems from the huge development in many forms of indirect communication coupled with fully controlled access to some urban spaces which eliminates a range of groups and individuals who are not desirable to the owners or who lack authorization to be in these spaces. However, one of the keenest social needs is that of being in direct contact; thus, the development of these forms of immensely attractive communication has effectively eliminated the possibility of direct interaction between the individual and the surroundings. The information society has thus given new meaning and range to the city as a meeting place [Gehl, Gemzoe 2001]. Significantly, the ownership structure and management of these spaces is no longer important; what is key is the possibility of realizing in these spaces a wide range of social needs.

Based on the preceding discussion, it is possible to define the contemporary concept of public space and to describe its traits in social, ownership, and formal categories. According to these, public space is a fragment of urban space that, through the manner in which it is managed and its location within the urban structure, is dedicated to the needs of realizing **direct contact among the members of the community** as well as fulfilling other social needs of this community. Simultaneously, this space must remain **physically accessible to all interested parties.** Physical accessibility can be limited temporarily in the interest of safety or if the utilization of the space requires it.

Accepting such a definition carries with it a range of consequences. The most significant characteristic of public space remains its publicness, not in terms of ownership, but in the possibility it affords of making direct interpersonal contacts, including those between people who were previously strangers. In light of this and the question of ownership and management, it is possible to describe a privately held space as public. With respect to formal aspects (including the architectural forms that are associated with this), there are also an entire array of possibilities ranging from historic spaces to concepts realized today, including those related to a given theme.

248

Shaping contemporary public space is, therefore, a complex and multi-faceted task. Three fundamental types of activities can be identified: modernizing and supplementing the existing urban fabric, creating new spaces from scratch that are integrated with existing old town structures, and locating significant consumer-oriented investment projects outside of the city limits [Kochanowska 2002]. Simultaneously, with regard to the type of area, it is possible to discuss activities undertaken to transform existing public spaces in the city center, and in residential and recreational areas, as well as a variety of post-industrial spaces [Paszkowski 2003].

3. The perception of public space

Urban public spaces are perceived variously by those who use them. The impression made is determined by many different factors, the foremost being the degree to which social needs can be met. Naturally, issues such as its physical form, including the type and character of detail, are not without significance [Hall 2003]. These spaces determine the cityscape and the legibility of its structure, and thus the harmony between function and form [Staniszkis 1995][5].

In every instance, it is necessary for this space to be defined culturally. This leads to the continuous production of meaning, the creation of spheres of interest, and topics [Hajer, Reijndorp 2001]. However, every culture has its own way of organizing space; this is expressed in the specific limits of personal space, the way people behave in public space, etc. There is no universal model of ideal space, which is different in every culture. Copying patterns from other cultures creates the impression, whether intentional or not, of foreignness. This stems from the connection between spatial forms and specific social content. For example, the size of buildings, their decoration, and their state of repair provide information regarding the social status of the residents. However, street space can also be viewed as an image of encoded history of the space as architecture expresses the evolution of changes in styles, tastes, or fashion, and as such communicates the history and culture of a given space [Jałowiecki, Szczepański 2002].

Public culture develops primarily in public space. Sharon Zukin suggests that these areas are even "windows to the soul of the city", and as such are an important in determining the vision of community life in a city [Zukin 1995]. Therefore, we can assume that the way public space is shaped reflects

---

[5] According to Magdalena Staniszkis, this includes landscapes of various characters – generally urban, local, or elite.

249

the characteristics of a given stage in the development of a city. What is important here are the types of formal space as well as the way in which they function in social and economic life. Consequently, public space is one of the more important determinants of the cultural form of the city [Zuziak 2002].

Urban spaces are organized, connected, and situated within the city structure in accordance with a particular social logic. This also reflects the logic of political and economic leaders, and the structure of the system of spatial connections often becomes the principal means for emphasizing the particular system of that leadership [Harvey 1985]. For example, the quality of medieval cities stems from the fact that they were shaped by their users and not designers working on behalf of one or another magnate or powerful investor. This is why so few spaces realized in later times are characterized by a similar quality [Gehl 2001]. However, the combination of all these historical processes led to a certain shift in the atmosphere of the street and how it is perceived by both its residents and visitors. Transformations in the functional sphere were accompanied by shifts in architectural decoration[6].

The public spaces in city centers or downtown areas are of key significance in designating the cultural landscape of the city. According to Roland Barthes, since its inception, western culture has valued the meaning of the central point of the city. This is also why the most important structures and institutions in our civilization are grouped in these areas. The contemporary concept of the city center not only designated by the spatial expression of the urban community, but also through the concentration here of the economic leadership as well as tourist attractions, entertainment and conspicuous consumption. Nevertheless, the most important function of the city center is its role as the symbolic catalyst for the integration of the members of the urban community, which, thanks to the city center, identifies with the city as a whole [Jałowiecki, Szczepański 2002]. Aleksander Wallis presents a slightly different definition of the city center; he believes that "the center is a relatively small part of the city, which, in comparison to others, is spatially distinct in terms of institutional infrastructure, urban planning composition, and architectural values. It is the most accessible area of the city and is of fundamental significance to the functioning of the urban community and the wider region. Finally, it is also identified by the community as the place in which the most important processes of public life occur" [Wallis 1979, p. 19].

How the public space in the city center is shaped is of key significance to how the city is perceived as a whole. Concurrently, certain coded signals can

---

[6] For more on this topic see: [Chojnacki 2002].

steer the behavior of those who use the space. This occurs when our activities in a given space depend on the image of it and the limitations this imposes as well as those of our own minds. The perception of space is not, therefore, a mechanical reaction as was observed during the modernist period. Above all else, it must be considered to be a cultural process in which the individual interprets their surroundings in accordance with their own culture [Drzewiecki 2003]. This means that the synthesization of experiences is crucial to human discovery. In the opinion of Hall, "…in people, seeing is learning, while what is learned impacts what is seen". Works of art or architecture are interpreted within the categories of contemporary scenery despite incomplete knowledge of the experiences and culture of our ancestors. Thus, "…the most serious reservation regarding numerous attempts made to interpret the human past is that the structure of the contemporary visual world is projected onto the visual word of the past" [Hall 2003, pp. 88-107]. This principle is also applied in the ways the contemporary world is presented in photography, for example. This is why the image of the city is a joint creation of the exits and the viewer, which means that the image of the city is as varied as the people who inhabit it[7].

The discussion of the perception process and the repeated synthesis of the image of the city explains the phenomenon of the development of new social behavioral patterns at the moment a specified type of public space is created[8]. This process also occurs contemporarily. Sharon Zukin mentions the Disney theme parks, which, according to her, are among the most significant examples of public space. They are meant to combine ethnic, class, and regional identity in order to offer a national public culture based on the aestheticization of differences and controlled fears [Zukin 1995].

4. The conditions and development of contemporary public space. Models of shaping and utilisation of the common urban areas

As an element of the city structure, public space is subject to the same laws and processes that rule transformations in urban forms and patterns of urban life. Public space is, however, the most sensitive of the city elements to

---

[7] See also: [Miles 2003].

[8] One example is the rebuilding of Paris by G. Hausmann in the 1853-1869 period which led directly to the creation of a new kind of public space. Similar results were achieved with the plans by I. Cerda for Barcelona or H. Hobrecht for Berlin and Szczecin. The movement and din of these cities motivated the emerging middle class to conduct their lives intensively outside of the home and also provided new opportunities for making interpersonal contacts. For more on this topic see, among others: [Chmielewski 2004].

these cultural phenomena that alter life and spatial forms. This means that we can refer to public space as cultural space. These phenomena include, among others, transformations in civilization and interactions between the space it-self and the surrounding urban fabric [Zuziak 2002]. This is also why the character of our public space is increasingly influenced by the shift in empha-sis from local to global cultural icons, from public to private institutions, and even from ethnic and racial homogeneity to multiculturalism [Zukin 1995]. The character of these relations is, however, twofold since the way the city is built, including its public space, determines the type and quality of ization ears.iod.e occur y ied social logik life and the activities that take place outside of its buildings [Gehl 2001].

The wide variety of human activity possible in public spaces should be borne in mind. Jan Gehl refers to these elements as necessary activities (functional)[9], possible activities (recreational)[10], and social activities[11]. It is generally believed that the character of social activities is widely varied and depends on the context in which they happen. Social activity is often spon-taneous as an immediate consequence of people moving and existing in the same space. This means that the occurrence of such activity depends largely on the degree to which public space is adapted to these various activities. Gehl reminds us also of the various forms of contact that exist between peo-ple, which range from passive relationships to close friendships. In his opin-ion, public space encourages making the most passive type of contact. This does not preclude the possibility of establishing other forms of contact, only that this requires more initiative from the interested parties themselves [Gehl 2001].

Regardless of the impact social needs have on the form of public space, other factors also have a great influence; foremost is the development of mo-torization and the spread of individual automobile transportation. Thanks to the automobile, it has been possible to create numerous service complexes that are separated from the traditional multifunctional systems of urban space and connected to them only through various transportation systems [Kocha-nowska 2002]. Changes in the form and role of the individual elements of the system of public space were heavily impacted by the division of various

---

[9] For example, the journey to work or school; this group includes most daily activities.

[10] These include activities that are undertaken when there is a desire to do so and the time and place to do them, for example taking a walk, tanning, *etc.*

[11] These are activities that depend on the presence of others in public space, for example children playing, meeting with friends, etc. These can also be referred to as "resultant activities".

252

functions, which is also accompanied by an increasing awareness of a lack of safety [Hołub 2002]. Changes in lifestyle that stem from the development of multimedia technology, political climate, and the growing complexity of cities as well as changes in socio-demographic and employment structures must be mentioned at this point. The reaction to these phenomena is the development of many new types of public space or that which is described as public, including themed space[12].

A single, dominant pattern for public space is also disappearing. This occurs even within the confines of one cultural circle when people of different histories, races, ages, class membership, *etc*. have different ideas regarding public space. Often they create their "own" kind of public space with the aim of reinforcing their identity as individuals and citizens. In effect, spaces that have different purposes, functions, meanings, and connotations are created within the city. Each plays a specific role and has its own clientele, which is sometimes of a fairly varied character. Depending on the situation, we require spaces where we can experience otherness or similarity [Borden 2003].

One of the crucial elements in the shaping of public space is the necessity of providing a safe environment for its users. The problem of safety in the public space of highly-developed countries stems from the fact that since the 1970s they began to be the domain of the homeless, beggars, and other social outcasts. At present the control of violence and crime is one of the key issues in the expansion and transformation of cities. This is due to the fact that personal safety, which can also be interpreted within the social dimension as public safety, is seen as an extremely significant parameter of the quality of life [Czarnecki, Siemiński 2004]. Traditional urban spaces cannot guarantee safety due to growing social exclusion, narcotics abuse, and other social pathologies.

Difficulty in providing safety for the users of public space leads them to abandon it. The problem of safety in public spaces is closely related to the evolution of how trade is conducted; according to Gehl traditional street life is limited drastically as small shops and services are pushed out by increasingly larger competitors [Gehl 2001]. This has dramatic consequences for the vivacity of these spaces since the effect of the consolidation of retail and services is to limit the diversity of their forms, and this impacts the functional richness of the street space.

The void of community life in public spaces was quickly filled by a myriad of alternative social activities, including criminal activity. It was this

---

[12] For more on this topic see: [Loukaitou-Sideris, Banerjee 1998]. See also: [Grochowska 2004].

253

fear of criminals that contributed to the development of private police forces, gated communities, and the movement to design public spaces that permits maintaining maximum control over them. The threat to safety that occurs in public spaces thoroughly destroys the principle of open access. This results in either the community being severely penalized or the privatization and militarization of public space, which renders streets, squares, and stores safer but less open. Alternatively, spaces such as malls or theme parks are created, but these only appear to be public spaces since so many people use them for their daily errands. The ever increasing need of people for a variety of contacts and social activities contributes to the popularity of these places since one of the biggest attractions of public space is the possibility it provides of seeing, hearing, and meeting others.

5. Models of development in new forms of public space

Public spaces are subjected to continuous transformations that change their character, and sometimes they even lose or regain their public significance[13]. The crisis of the traditional public space might stem from adapting its character to the paradigm of the industrial city. In wider terms this refers to its more modern genesis, which must undergo change in the day of postmodernism.

The postindustrial turning-point has thus sparked interest in traditional spaces as a specific type of accepted patterns, at the same time extorting, through such phenomena as globalization or new ways and meanings of consumption, new methods for creating them, locating them within the urban structure, and different purposes. Many critics refer to these spaces as substitutes for traditional structures[14]. Yet these are creations of a new epoch; they fulfill its needs and employ its "technology" for the organization of space. It

---

[13] This thesis is confirmed by J. M. Chmielewski, who wrote "… industrialized production was accompanied by spontaneous processes of urbanization which led to the revaluation of commonly used space and a significant portion of it lost its original, social character and was transformed into generally accessible public space that was regulated by state law (…) Public space, in accordance with its contemporary understanding, clearly stands apart as the industrial city takes shape. The urban community is enhanced at this time by the middle class, which reinforces both social and cultural life. To meet their needs, public spaces that reflect urban culture (the urban lifestyle) are created. A relict of the first phase of industrialization is the traditional "downtown" where the most valuable spaces are located. The street, square, or park belong to the most characteristic of these forms and they have become patterns for their contemporary replicas". Cited in: [Chmielewski 2004, pp. 13-14].

[14] The work of D. Ghirardo, S. Sassen and S. Zukin must be mentioned here as well as that of E. Rewers.

254

is indeed true, however, that they are often formally patterned on traditional, sometimes even historical, space. They recall the public utility buildings of the late nineteenth century in which modern construction, technology, and contemporary function went hand-in-hand with historicizing forms. In effect, the available palette of ways to shape public space has grown substantially, and this refers to both the type of urban program as well as to the way urban planning development strategy is built [Lang 2005].

This contemporary new space, which is really new-old in the formal sense, is often prepared from the fabric of the city and satisfies the more or less common needs of the contemporary urban community. These are characterized by a particular spatial organization that is its own kind of replica of urban space (also referred to as quasi-public space). Nothing in these spaces is accidental. They are "programmed" to inspire a definite, desired consumer reaction, and the peak of development is achieved when the space is a value in and of itself. Usually, this is connected with a particular spectacle that is played out within its confines that is designed to attract the attention of customers and consumers. This is when the creation of the city as a spectacle is fully realized. The observation of the development of "city entertainment" may lead, however, to disturbances in the relationships between public and private spaces in the city of the future [Hannigan 1998].

Building new forms of public space is based on three fundamental principles: theming, concentration, and strictly connected spaces [Hołub 2002]. First and foremost, these promote the development of tourism, retail, and other forms of consumption. At the same time, this leads to the rapid gentrification[15] of chosen urban spaces and to the alienation of the poor [Roschelle, Wright 2003]. Already, a full range of typology can be defined that includes the modernization of existing complexes and designs, the realization of new structures in various types of undeveloped urban space or even new building, and the recreation of historic plans [Załuski 2002]. Polish cities, due to the observed atrophy of their historic centers, are particularly susceptible to the development of these new forms of public space. This atrophy results from retarded urban development that originated in the nineteenth century when many cities were unable to concentrate significant groups of functions in the center. This void was not filled during communist times either, and, in effect, the predominant function of Polish city centers until the 1990s remained residential. Changes in this have only become apparent in the last few years [Jałowiecki, Szczepański

---

[15] This process refers to the rehabilitation of a given area that increases its attractiveness to a group, such as the middle class, that is wealthier than the long-term residents.

2002]. However, a new type of shopping center – the mall generally located in the suburbs-began to appear in the early 1990s. They are often a substitute for the city center; actually they are a kind of "anti-center" as they are devoid of the cultural or symbolic content typical of the traditional city.

The numerous examples of newly created public spaces can be separated into two fundamentally different groups: "closed" spaces which are entered by crossing a border into a building or possibly by purchasing a ticket, and "open" spaces that are of a formal, traditional, urban character. The creation of the latter is specifically (although not always) connected with measures taken to rebuild the historic city centers destroyed during WWII.

Conclusions

Contemporary urban public spaces have undergone a significant transformation whose genesis can be found in the phenomenon of globalization, the development of the consumer society, and new types of co-operation between the public and private sectors. In effect, it is necessary to redefine the concept of public space itself. The definition of it as a traditional area under public rule such as openly accessible streets or squares that usually fulfills a variety of social and economic functions is losing sway. The new definition of public space accents an understanding of the public role of the space as a place where various interpersonal contacts can be made, regardless of its ownership structure, control, or spatial organization. This is also why both "open" (those which recall the traditional urban structure) and "closed" (enclosed within a cohesive structure) solutions must be considered as contemporary public urban space. This type of space (understood in the material sense) can also be separated from the public domain (which can be located in virtual space).

The general accessibility to public spaces such as these will no longer be a measure of attractiveness; this will be defined by visual and functional desirability as well of the level of safety offered. This means that if they maintain these conditions, such spaces will attain a measure of autonomy and will often be eliminated from the city structure. However, the traditional city spaces are forced to compete with new complexes often on unequal terms. This is related to the weakness of the public sector and the inability of city officials to recognize the cultural significance of these traditional spaces. As the needs of various social groups crop up, so too will spaces dedicated to particular groups; at the same time, traditional (in every meaning of the word) "public" space that is open to all will disappear.

256

It can be postulated that in the future the quality of the public domain will not be measured by accessibility or the character of space, but by the answers to the following questions: To what extent does it impact the shaping of the surroundings of particular places? Does is create an attractive urban environment? Is it possible to realize social needs in it? Is it significant what the space looks like or who the owner is?

References

Amin A., Thrift N., 2002, *Cities. Reimagining the Urban.* Polity Press, Cambridge, UK.

Auge M., 1995, *Non-Places: Introduction to an Anthropology of Supermodernity.* Verso.

Bielecki Cz., 1996, *Gra w miasto.* Fundacja Dom Dostępny, Warszawa.

Borden I., 2003, *What is Radical Architecture*?, [in:] *Urban Futures*, M. Miles, T. Hall (Eds.). Routledge, London.

Carmona M., Heath T., Oc T., Tiesdell S., 2003, *Public Places – Urban Spaces.* Architectural Press, Oxford.

Chmielewski J. M., 2004, *Rola miejskich przestrzeni publicznych."*Urbanista", Nr 4. Urbanista sp. z o.o., Warszawa.

Chojnacki M., 2002, *Trwałość i zmienność struktur przestrzennych miasta historycznego na przykładzie Głównego Miasta w Gdańsku*, [in:] *Miasto historyczne w dialogu ze współczesnością*, J. Bogdanowski (Ed.). Nadbałtyckie Centrum Kultury, Wydział Architektury Politechniki Gdańskiej, Gdańsk.

Czarnecki B., Siemiński W., 2004, *Kształtowanie bezpiecznej przestrzeni publicznej.* Wyd. Difin, Warszawa.

Drzewiecki H., 2003, *Ruch nowoczesny a teoria obrazu miasta w pracach Wejchera, Lyncha i Norberga-Schultza.* „Urbanistyka" – Międzyuczelniane Zeszyty Naukowe Rok VII. Wyd. Akapit-DTP, Warszawa.

Gehl J., 2001, *Life Between Buildings.* The Danish Architectural Press, Copenhagen.

Gehl J., Gemzoe L., 2001, *New City Spaces.* The Danish Architectural Press, Copenhagen.

Ghirardo D., 1999, *Architektura po Modernizmie.* Wyd. VIA, Toruń.

Grochowska E., 2004, *Negatywne przekształcenia placów warszawskich.* „Urbanista", Nr 4/2004. Urbanista sp. z o.o., Warszawa.

Hajer M., Reijndorp A., 2001, *In Search of New Public Domain.* NAi Publishers, Rotterdam.

Hall E. T., 2003, *Ukryty wymiar.* Warszawskie Wyd. Literackie Muza SA, Warszawa.

Hannigan J., 1998, *Fantasy City.* Routledge, London.

Harvey D., 1985, *The Urban Experience.* The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore.

257

Hassenpflug D., 2003, *City and Consumption*, [in:] *Consumption and the Post-Industrial City*, P. Lang, F. Eckard, D. Hassenpflug (Eds.) Frankfurt am Main.

Hołub A., 2002, *Współczesna przestrzeń publiczna. Terapia patologii czy rozwój nowych terenów – poszukiwanie przesłanek projektowych*, [in:] *Przestrzeń publiczna miasta postindustrialnego*, M. Kochanowski (red.) Wyd. Politechniki Gdańskiej, Gdańsk.

Jałowiecki B., 2003, *Tożsamość ludzi, tożsamość miejsc*, [in:] *Tożsamość miejsca i ludzi*, M. Dymnicka, Z. Opacki (Eds.). Oficyna Naukowa, Warszawa.

Jałowiecki B., Szczepański M. S., 2002, *Miasto i przestrzeń w perspektywie socjologicznej.* Wyd. Naukowe SCHOLAR, Warszawa.

Kłosiewicz L., 2004, *Umeblowanie ulicy.* „Urbanista", Nr 4/2004. Urbanista sp. z o.o., Warszawa.

Kochanowska D., 2002, Śródmiejskie przestrzenie publiczne – współczesne przekształcenia, [in:] *Przestrzeń publiczna miasta postindustrialnego*, M. Kochanowski (Ed.). Wyd. Politechniki Gdańskiej, Gdańsk.

Kochanowski M., 2002a, *Niepokoje i pytania*, [in:] *Przestrzeń publiczna…*, op. cit.

Kochanowski M., 2002b, *Wnioski poznawcze i aplikacyjne*, [in:] *Przestrzeń publiczna…*, op. cit.

Kwiatkowska A., 2003, *Współczesne strategie kompozycji architektonicznej.* „Urbanistyka" – Międzyuczelniane Zeszyty Naukowe Rok VII. Wyd. Akapit-DTP, Warszawa.

Lang J., 2005, *Urban Design. A Typology of Procedures and Products.* Architectural Press, Oxford.

Lees L., 1998, *Urban Renaissance and the Street. Spaces of Control and Congestion*, [in:] *Images of the Street. Planning, Identity and Control in Public Space*, N. R. Fyfe (Ed.). Routledge, London.

Loukaitou-Sideris A., Banerjee T., 1998, *Urban Design Downtown. Poetics and Politics of Form.* University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles CA.

Miles M., 2003b, *Strange Days*, [in:] *Urban Futures*, M. Miles, T. Hall (red.). Routledge, London.

Nyka L., 2003, *W kierunku zmiennej metafory miasta – miejsca, zdarzenia, krajobrazy.* „Urbanistyka" – Międzyuczelniane Zeszyty Naukowe Rok VII. Wyd. Akapit-DTP, Warszawa.

Pachowski J., 2002, *Atrium. Przestrzeń społeczna w budynku wielofunkcyjnym.* PPiP, Izabelin.

Paszkowski Z., 2003, *Transformacja przestrzeni śródmiejskich na przykładach wybranych miast europejskich.* Walkowska Wyd., Szczecin.

Roschelle A., Wright T., 2003, *Gentrification and Social Exclusion: Spatial Policing and Homeless Activist Responses in the San Francisco Bay Area*, [in:] *Urban Futures…*, op. cit.

Safdie M., 1997, *The City After the Automobile.* Westview Press, Boulder.

258

Staniszkis M., 1995, *Planowanie krajobrazu Warszawy w XXI wieku*. Miasto Stołeczne Warszawa, Warszawa.

Szczepański M. S., 2003, *Podróże po mniejszym niebie. Ojczyzna prywatna w oglądzie socjologicznym*, [in:] *Tożsamość miejsca i ludzi, op. cit.*

Wallis A., 1971, *Socjologia i kształtowanie przestrzeni*. PIW, Warszawa.

Wallis A., 1977, *Miasto i przestrzeń*. PWN, Warszawa.

Wallis A., 1979, *Informacja i gwar*. PIW, Warszawa.

Załuski D., 2002, *Tendencje kształtowania przestrzeni publicznych końca XX wieku*, [in:] *Przestrzeń publiczna..., op. cit.*

Zukin S., 1993, *Landscapes of Power*. University of California Press, Berkeley CA.

Zukin S., 1995, *The Cultures of Cities*. Blackwell Publishing, Malden MA.

Zuziak Z. K., 2002, *Nowe przestrzenie podróży. Przestrzenie publiczne węzłów transportu*, [in:] *Przestrzeń publiczna..., op. cit.*