# BENCHES IN THE COMMON SPACE. STATEMENT OF THE ISSUES OF RURAL AND URBAN PUBLIC SPACE FURNISHING

*Maja Skibińska[1], Mariusz Wieczorek[2]*
[1]*Warsaw University of Life Sciences,* [2]*University of Warsaw*

## Abstract

The aim of this article is to formulate guidelines for locating benches in rural public spaces. It is a summary of the results of a qualitative research involving 67 users of urban benches, conducted with the application of individual in-depth interviews, and the results of a literature review on the manner in which rural public spaces are equipped. The obtained results pertain to the use of benches in rural public spaces in the context of their integration and semantic potential (symbolic values). The conclusions are presented in the form of general guidelines. Public consultation should be an important element in deciding how to equip rural common space with benches. Local communities ought to be included in the decision-making process, from the stage of the assumptions of the design concepts to the stage of realization. It is advisable to adjust the form of benches, their number, orientation and location to the nature of public space and expectations of their future users. At the same time, the overall structure of public space and its main functions should be taken into account. Properly selected and placed benches can support the process of community structuring and may be a part of the equipment of public space which integrates the local community. Locating benches opposite each other or in the shape of the letter L or C promotes integration. Designing space according to the safe space standards can be a solution for sites conducive to drinking alcohol. Locating benches in the vicinity of streets, at the fence bypass, is a traditional

way. Benches with atypical forms or functions located in common areas may contribute to the extraction or strengthening of the local identity.

**Keywords***: benches, village revitalization, village renewal, rural public space, participation

## INTRODUCTION

Public space is a general use area constituting public good in which people stay, meet and establish contacts (Chart of Public Space 2009, Lorens 2010, Porębski 2007, Regulation…2003). The form and function of public space determine the identity of a settlement unit (Królikowski 2011, Lorens 2010, Madurowicz 2006). Publications on the role, structure, and development of public spaces are primarily concerned with urban areas. These are publications in the fields of architecture, urban planning, landscape architecture, psychology, ethnology and sociology. A certain novelty, related to the socio-economic changes taking place in Poland after 1989, is to investigate rural space in these categories (Górka 2012, Soszyński *et al*. 2012). In his report Wilczyński (2014) describes a shortage and low quality of rural public spaces, impairment or spatial degeneration of village centers, ignoring the possibility of relaxation and finally not emphasizing the character of the place (simplicity and country symbolism). As a remedy, the report's authors suggest „shaping and improving central parts of rural centers, from the improvement of rural equipment by adding elements deciding on the quality of life (concentration of services, facilities and public spaces)" (Sepioł *et al*. 2014, p. 176).

One of the simplest ways to improve the quality of public space is, among other things, the arrangement of seats (Gehl 2009). The role of the bench as an element of equipment enhancing social integration and enabling the extraction or highlighting of the identity of a place is appreciated by researchers describing urban public space (Gehl 2009, Kościńska 2012, Main and Hannah 2010, Wallis 1977, van Uffelen 2010, Moughtin *et al*. 1999).

The literature review below discusses the issue of benches located in the rural public space in the following three aspects: 1. Co-deciding on the equipment of space to build the sense of community 2. Location of benches in space and their integration potential 3. Benches as a symbolic element referring to the local identity.

Numerous authors underline the significance of the way of arranging rural public spaces – places of social contact. Among other elements of social and recreational infrastructure, a square with benches is included in the basic equipment that is required to meet the fundamental needs of life – their absence is a visible manifestation of the disappearance of the community (Wilczyński 2015). An

important element of publications concerning the Rural Development Program, Rural Renewal Programs, Revitalization Programs or simply the guidelines for the development of common spaces in rural areas is highlighting the importance of the empowerment of the local community, its inclusion in the decision-making process, thus strengthening the sense of well-being, building the community and integrating it (Górka 2012, Sepioł *et al.* 2014, Skiba 2009, Staniewska 2015, Wilczyński 2003, Wilczyński 2009). The manner in which common spaces are equipped is important for their users. The local community may act as a part of a structured initiative, as in the case of the Batory Foundation's Operational Program „You have the voice, you have the choice" within which, in 2013, the inhabitants of the village Sulkowice arranged the common space at the water source of Saint Kinga. During design workshops they chose „child-friendly and adult-friendly benches" and proposed their form and location (Masz głos, masz wybór 2013). The local community can also act completely independently, as in the case of the inhabitants of a settlement in Krasne village who equipped their common space with benches and are now happy to use them (Soszyński *et al*. 2012). Patrycja Mikołajczyk (2015) in her doctoral thesis discusses the issue of seating tailored precisely to the needs and integrating the inhabitants of Cicha Góra in the municipality of Nowa Tomyśl. The author proposes a multifunctional set of wooden self-assembly components that can serve as seats, couches, tables, playground elements and children's toys in the common space (http://mimaristudio.pl/works/przestrzen-wspolna-na-wsi).

Anna Górka (2012) in her publication distinguishes and evaluates the equipment of new common spaces. Describing playgrounds the author indicates that they are most often a copy of the urban pattern, destructively affecting the child's natural creativity and spontaneous forms of play. They often lack benches, which translates into the low comfort of use for caregivers and is not conducive to their integration. The freedom of use is typical for countryside meadows, which are sometimes equipped with single benches and form an informal meeting place. Greater investment in such places eliminates the spontaneity and freedom of use, expresses the function and discourages users from a peaceful rest.

Another type of rural public spaces described by Górka (2012) are squares and streets. Due to the subsidies received by villages in the recent years, squares are often too saturated with elements of spatial development, including seats. There are also cases where squares are completely empty, without benches, which does not contribute to integration. As far as streets are concerned, a hardship for the interpersonal relationships is frequently too intense traffic (Górka 2012, Soszyński *et al*. 2012). In the studied areas, benches that are customarily placed next to the fence of one's own yard and used to observe the „theater of public life" and meet neighbors, are becoming a thing of the past. The results of the research conducted by Soszyński *et al*. (2012) show that in all the studied villages the important public spaces (squares, car parks or fragments of side-

walks in front of the grocery store, square in front of the church, space in front of the chapel, sports and recreation areas) lack places to sit, therefore, the need to include benches in common spaces is one of the conclusions of the study. Only private shops have gardens, but the researchers point to their purely commercial character devoid of the merits of being a „public place". The problem in this case are „alcohol group meetings" that discourage other residents from using the place (Sulima 2000, Soszyński *et al*. 2012). Nowadays, benches located in street spaces at the bypass fence are often discarded. This is due to the social changes taking place in the countryside. These benches have a great social bonding potential and constitute a traditional feature of the common space (Soszyński *et al*. 2012), additionally facilitating the movement of the elderly.

Identification with a given area and the sense of belonging to a local community may be supported by the use of symbolic elements. The issue of attachment to the place of birth or residence, was already referred to by Ossowski (1984) who named it „a small homeland".

Marta Skiba (2009) emphasizes the significance of elements – symbols that reinforce the sense of identification with a place of residence, symbols that should be localized in the meeting place of the local community. The use of elements – symbols is one of the components which create the image of thematic villages (Idziak 2008). At this point, it is worth stressing the dangers stemming from the mindless use of urban spatial patterns in the countryside (Górka 2012, Wilczyński 2014) and subordinating the way of the development of public space solely to its tourist potential (Górka 2012).

Benches located in rural public spaces play an important role in the process of people-to-people integration and identification of the local community with the place of residence.

The purpose of the article is to formulate recommendations for places to sit in rural public spaces. Moreover, it is intended to supplement the available literature with detailed guidance on the use of benches in rural public spaces in the context of their integration and semantic potential (symbolic values).

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

Our research can be divided into three stages. The first stage, described in the chapter *Results,* concerned the study of Warsaw city benches carried out by a group of ten students under the care of the authors of this article within the framework of the Voluntary Research Program of the University Volunteer Center. During the study, 67 individual in-depth interviews were performed in fifteen extracted research fields – urban squares, local squares and fragments of streets, with an aim to get to know the opinions and attitudes of the interviewees as well as to determine expectations about benches in the public space. The

second stage**,** discussed in the chapter *Introduction*, included a literature review of benches in rural public spaces, with particular emphasis on their appearance, location and symbolic meaning. The stage in question was supported by self-observation studies in which emphasis was placed on the researchers' own reflections on the studied phenomenon taking broader socio-cultural meanings into consideration. The third stage, described in the chapter *Discussion*, is a compilation of both urban and rural perspectives, a discussion of the results that aims to isolate information concerning forms, location and symbolic benchmarks that may be useful for shaping rural public spaces.

## RESULTS

Below are excerpts of the interviews along with a comment on the users' expectations regarding the form, location and symbolic meaning of benches. Each respondent was assigned the code according to the following scheme: (WD-1) where the lettering (WD) is an acronym for the location of the interview (here J.H. Dąbrowski square), and the number (1) at the abbreviation stands for the subsequent (here: first) interview with a person at a given location. The following abbreviations were used with respect to individual locations: WD – J. H. Dąbrowski square, WI – Inwalidów square, WM – Mirowski square, WS – gen. P. Szembek square, WŻ – Company AK "Żniwiarz" square, WP – Square in front of the Museum of the History of Polish Jews POLIN, WO – Opolski square, KB – Bankowy square, KN – Narutowicza square, KS – Reduty Kaliskiej square, SH – surroundings of Hala Banacha.

### Location of benches in space and their integration potential

It was very important for the respondents to be able to decide whether to equip the space in accordance with the reported needs, taking into account the demands of the local residents and users. This is related both to the possibility of travelling from home to retail outlets or service points and the specific needs of specific user groups such as mothers with young children, seniors, people with temporary or permanent mobility limitations and people with disabilities (including their guardians). Co-deciding with regard to these numerous issues is seen as part of the wider action of building the sense of community. Most respondents admitted that city benches could serve as a social bonding place: „The most basic function of a bench is social creativity, that is creating a gathering of people" (WP-4). The respondents also valued privacy – most of the people advocated for placing benches in a quiet place so that they could feel comfortable and relaxed during the interview: „Benches farther from the main road, not along the sidewalk, off the beaten track" (WD-4). „Bench is a space that I value as private"

(WI-3). It is worth noting, however, that the need for rest alone was indicated by those who had previously attributed the potential of integration to benches.

Most respondents emphasized the advantages of choosing the location of a bench, such as the choice of the corner of the world (and square) that the bench user can be facing. As far as the way in which benches are located is concerned, the respondents did not show any clear preference – some would like to sit opposite each other or next to each other (linear setting), and still others preferred, for example, rounded benches or benches in the L-shape. „Experience shows that two face-to-face benches are most often chosen by one person, or even by two people – since people like to look at each other, and not to bend over and look to their side. Benches that are round or allow for better interaction are worth considering" (WŻ-4). „The best option would be two benches facing each other, interspaced or placed perpendicularly to each other" (KN-3). „The best location would be next to each other but not opposite since then people would meet, thus causing some discomfort" (WD-5). The conducted interviews showed the need for a barrier between the bench and the street: „It would be good to have a lot of greenery around or even be hidden in a corner surrounded by some shrubs" (WO-1).

The view from the bench was also of great importance to the respondents, often influencing the decision to choose a place to sit. The view of greenery, characteristic buildings, aesthetic fragments of the surroundings or places full of people (allowing observation) were preferable.

Respondents emphasized that there were more benches in the past, especially in the courtyards between blocks of flats, but they were discarded because of noisy night parties by people consuming alcohol. The majority of the respondents did not comment on this matter in an equally unambiguous manner. They emphasized the importance of benches in the daily functioning of, for example, elderly people, indicating that in their opinion they are definitely not sufficient: „[benches] are occupied by different strange people at night, but it is not the reason for taking away something that is important both to mothers with children and for the elderly" (SH-6).

### Benches as a symbolic element referring to the local identity

Many respondents spoke positively about atypical benches, emphasizing their identification, integration (they may provoke conversation) and educational potential. „Benches with music, like those in the Old Town, would bring out the potential of this place. Something original like that would be useful here" (WS-6). Unusual benches „would be great. Because there is nothing interesting here, and on such benches you could sit and talk even about the weather" (WS-1). One of the respondents (KB-4) suggested placement of information boards about the square: „This is some kind of an educational element. For example, I visit this

square every day, there is Ratusz Arsenał located here and actually, there is no information concerning the occupation of Ratusz Arsenał during the war". A male (KS-4) would like to „make the bench extraordinary, designed by a young Polish artist. A female (KS-2) also proposed movable seats – portable benches or movable chairs, just like in the Luxembourg Garden in Paris". A young mom asked for any expected changes on Mirowski Square replied: „Maybe I would add some elements for children to the bench. To have more fun" (WS-7).

## DISCUSSION

In the light of the interviews as well as in view of the literature review (Górka 2012, Soszyński *et al*. 2012, Wilczyński 2015), benches are fundamental equipment of public space and their presence in public areas supports the process of building and maintaining the community. The social bond potential in the case of rural areas is based on the deepening of people-to-people contacts in small communities in which almost everyone knows each other. This is a completely different situation from that in the city. In the research conducted in Warsaw many people mentioned the integration potential of the bench as another possibility of establishing contacts between strangers. There is a clear convergence in terms of the diversity of expectations of urban users regarding the location and surroundings of benches and the specificities of different types of rural public spaces (Górka 2012, Soszyński *et al*. 2012). The varied structure of the public space layout, its variegated forms and functions influence the expected degree of saturation of a given space with benches and the preferred form, location and orientation in space. As in urban areas, there should be places enabling spending time together sitting on a bench (e.g. a central village square, front yard, chapel surroundings, playground, sports grounds) as well as places to sit in small groups or alone (urban meadows, street space at the fence). The degree of investment and the type and manner of equipment should be agreed on with the users within the framework of public consultation.

The variety of seating arrangements preferred by the respondents (in the sun – in the shade, with a view – with no view, etc.) may apply in the case of central rural areas equipment.

Placing benches against each other as an element affecting integration was emphasized by the Warsaw respondents. In the case of benches in the countryside, their linear setting is commonly observed, which does not favor sitting together and talking. Setting benches opposite each other or in the shape of the letter L or C as well as round benches were deemed by the respondents as most desirable. These settings are conducive to deepening contacts between people who know each other, which may be of particular interest to familiar, often small rural communities. The urban respondents referred to the examples of mobile

seats from Paris as an interesting solution. Taking the study by Patrycja Mikołaj-czyk (2015) into account, it can be stated that mobile multifunctional seats which enable freedom of arrangement could also work well in the village.

For the respondents taking part in the study of urban benches, isolation of the view, for example, from busy streets as well as the view of the attractive parts of the landscape were of great significance. In the case of the village, the possibility to observe the surroundings from the bench is extremely important. The vicinity of a busy street might be an exception here (Soszyński *et al*. 2012). The great advantage of locating benches in rural public spaces are far-sighted views, landscapes of fields, meadows and woods surrounding the place. This is in line with the concept of Jay Appleton (1975) who based his research on evolutionary psychology and came to the conclusion that people feel comfortable in places located on the periphery of a given area with a good view of the surroundings as well as with the theory of Janusz Skalski (2007) pertaining to the „comfort of distant view". Benches deemed as a place of seclusion, in quiet cozy locations, have a wider application in the urban space where people complain about haste, excessive traffic and noise. In the rural space, however, such benches may be of more contemplative nature serving, for instance, as landscape observation spots.

A controversial issue both in the countryside and the city are „alcohol group meetings" (Sulima 2002, Soszyński *et al*. 2012), which are the reason for the removal of benches. These problems relate to secluded places and housing areas of the city as well as to squares in front of shops in the countryside. In most cases, removal of benches is only a temporary solution to the problem, at the same time effectively eliminating the integration potential of a given space for its users. Attention is also paid to the commercialization of squares in front of shops (Soszyński *et al*. 2012), their appropriation by private companies sponsoring benches, tables and umbrellas. This issue was not addressed during the interviews conducted in the city, but it is an important topic in the light of the landscape, local, aesthetic and social values of the public space (Błazy 2013, Gruba 2012). Locating benches of symbolic value in common places (Skiba 2009) can positively influence the process of people's identification with space. References to history, landscape, former inhabitants and interesting events may be applied in this case. It is necessary to agree with Górka (2012) and Wilczyński (2014) that the thoughtless copying of urban patterns into rural areas has a deleterious effect, both in terms of the form and function of benches. The research conducted in Warsaw itself showed diverse expectations not only in different districts but also within the same squares. Social consultations are necessary in this case. They are required both by urban respondents and the authors dealing with public space in the countryside. The ability to co-decide on the way of planning and equipping public spaces builds the sense of well-being, strengthens the sense of identification with the place as well as integrates the local community. The role of social

participation, the desirability of involving the local community in as many stages of design and realization as possible, must not be underestimated.

The tourist potential described by Górka (2012) as a dominant and destructive way of thinking about rural landscape is a typical problem in rural areas, whereas in cities the tourist attractiveness of benches was deemed by the respondents as an advantage.

The issue of forms that appeal to children was of particular interest in the case of both rural and urban areas. The benches suggested by the respondents as attractive elements for children could be an interesting idea in the light of the assessment of rural common spaces (Górka 2012).

## CONCLUSIONS

An important conclusion is the need to consult the form, location and meaning of symbolic benches with the local community.

In the case of central rural squares, the variety of bench locations is desirable, providing the user with the possibility of choice (in the sun – in the shade, with a view – without a view, alone – in groups).

Benches as components with social bonding potential should be set up in different configurations, depending on the specificity of the place. It is worthwhile to implement settings other than linear, such as location of benches in front of each other or in the shape of the letter L or C. Exceptions are places in front of shops – alcoholic space – since setting benches in front of each other will encourage spending time together. In the case of benches placed in the vicinity of bustling streets, view isolation is desirable, whereas in other cases the comfort of seeing distant landscape constitutes the greatest advantage.

Benches located in public spaces should be positioned in the manner that does not encourage consumption of alcohol. In this case, it is very important to evaluate the space in terms of safety and make possible changes in the way the area is used (according to the art of safe space design).

As far as street spaces are concerned, it is preferable to set benches at entrances to properties (of course, with the consent of the owners) in line with the traditional spatial model of great integration potential.

Benches located in common places might be a way to extract or emphasize the local identity. An unusual form of the bench, distinguished by the shape, color, material, texture, inscription, pictogram or ornament, supports identification with the place and building the local identity. An interesting solution for central rural squares is the location of interactive multimedia benches, which also promotes development of tourism. In order to avoid the danger of tourism development taking precedence over the well-being of the inhabitants described by Górka (2012), it is worth including inhabitants in the design process of atypi-

cal, symbolic seats. Owing to that, a piece of equipment that is important for the inhabitants and interesting for the visitors can be created.

Unusual forms of benches could include elements attractive to children (games, mobile details, interactivity, creative forms enabling freedom of action) which would encourage young and adult residents to stay in the common space and would provide an alternative to the typical „big city" playgrounds often built in the countryside.

## SUMMARY

This article is a contribution to the discussion on the equipment of rural public spaces. Benches are the basis for the social and psychological phenomena that occur between the inhabitants of a city. Thanks to them public space in the countryside can function as a meeting place. They may fit in the character of the place, refer to the local characteristics and tradition of the place, and yet some of them may become a symbol and identifier of the local identity.

## REFERENCES

Appleton J. (1975). *The experience of landscape*. London. John Wiley and Sons.

Błazy R. (2013). *Komercjalizacja przestrzeni publicznych*. Architektura v perspectivě: architektura a urbanismus 2. poloviny 20. Století, Vysoká škola báňská – Teachnická univerzita Ostrava. p. 27-31.

Czapiewska G. (2011). *Odnowa wsi szansą na rozwój peryferyjnych obszarów wiejskich Pomorza*. Barometr Regionalny nr 3(25) 2011, p. 85-94.

Górka A. (2012). Krajobraz przestrzeni publicznej wsi: zagadnienia planowania i projektowania ruralistycznego. Wydawnictwo Politechniki Gdańskiej. ISBN 8373484361, 9788373484368.

Gruba M. (2012). Sztuka uliczna jako narzędzie kontestacji w przestrzeni publicznej metropolii. *Social Space Scientific Journal* 1/2012 (3). p. 177-196.

Idziak W. (2008). *Wymyślić wieś od nowa. Wioski tematyczne*. Alta Press. Koszalin.

Karta Przestrzeni Publicznej (2009). [*Chart of Public Space*]. III Kongres Urbanistyki Polskiej, 4-5 września 2009, Poznań. Towarzystwo Urbanistów Polskich.

Kościńska M., (2012). *Mała architektura – element spajający strukturę miejską Szczecina*. Tożsamość Krajobrazu Miasta (red. H. Petrshyn, E. Sochacka-Sutkowska). Szczecin. Zachodniopomorski Uniwersytet Technologiczny w Szczecinie, p. 329-333.

Królikowski J.T. (2011). *Genius loci jako źródło tożsamości miasta*. Zeszyty Naukowe Politechniki Poznańskiej. Architektura i Urbanistyka Wydawnictwo Politechniki Poznańskiej, p. 5-11.

Lorens P. (2010). *Definiowanie współczesnej przestrzeni publicznej*. Problemy kształtowania przestrzeni publicznych (red. Lorens P., Martyniuk-Pęczek J.). Wydawnictwo Urbanista. Gdańsk., p.6-20.

Madurowicz M. (2006). *Miejska przestrzeń tożsamości Warszawy*. Warszawa. Wydawnictwo UW.

Main B., Hannah G. G. (2010). *Site Furnishings: A Complete Guide to the Planning, Selection and Use of Landscape Furniture and Amenities*. New Jersey. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Masz głos, masz wybór (2013). Prawdziwa wspólna przestrzeń. http://www.maszglos. pl/wpcontent/uploads/    2011/12/Prawdziwa-wspolna-przestrzen-w-Sulkowicach.pdf (access 10/03/2017).

Mikołajczyk P. (2005). Przestrzeń integracyjna na wsi. PhD dissertation, promoter Rogulski M. Uniwersytet Artystyczny w Poznaniu.

Moughtin C., Oc T., Tiesdell S. (1999). *Urban design ornament and decoration*. Architectural Press.

Ossowski S. (1984). *O ojczyźnie i narodzie*. PWN. Warszawa.

Porębski J. (2007). *Miasto od nowa, miasto odnowa*. Goźlińska K. (red.) Biblioteka wizerunku miasta część 3. Meble miejskie. Wydawca AMS SA.

Regulation (2003). Act on Spatial Planning and Management 2003.

Sepioł *et al.* (2014). *Rekomendacje dotyczące rozwoju obszarów wiejskich*. Raport Przestrzeń życia Polaków. Red. B. Gadomska. Stowarzyszenie Architektów Polskich SARP. Warszawa.

Skalski J. (2007). *Analiza percepcyjna krajobrazu jako działalność twórcza, inicjująca proces projektowania*. Wydawnictwo SGGW. Warszawa.

Skiba M. (2009). *Mała ojczyzna – w poszukiwaniu wspólnoty i odrębności na przykładzie gminy Świebodzin w województwie lubuskim*. Polskie krajobrazy wiejskie dawne i współczesne. Prace Komisji Krajobrazu Kulturowego Nr 12. Komisja Krajobrazu Kulturowego PTG. Sosnowiec, p. 109-116.

Soszyński D. *et al.* (2012). *Problemy funkcjonowania i kształtowania wiejskich przestrzeni publicznych na przykładzie wybranych wsi gminy Uścimów na Polesiu Zachodnim*. Acta Scientiarum Polonorum. Administratio Locorum 11/3, p. 227-237.

Staniewska A. (2015). *Krajobraz żyjący – wstępny program partycypacji społecznej w odnowie wsi historycznej*. Przestrzeń i FORMA 24/2 2015, p. 192-210.

Sulima R. (2000). *Antropologia codzienności*. Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego. Kraków.

Ustawa o planowaniu i zagospodarowaniu przestrzennym z dnia 23 marca 2003 roku [*Act on Spatial Planning and Management*] (Dz.U. 2003 Nr 80 poz. 717).

van Uffelen Ch. (2010). *Street Furniture*. Braun Publishing Ag.

Wallis A. (1977). *Miasto i przestrzeń*. PWN. Warszawa.

Wilczyński R. (2003). *Odnowa wsi perspektywą rozwoju obszarów wiejskich w Polsce*. Fundacja Fundusz Współpracy – Program Agro-Info. Poznań. Krajowe Centrum Doradztwa Rozwoju Rolnictwa i Obszarów Wiejskich.

Wilczyński R. (2009). Jak rozwijać obszary wiejskie, aby przeciwdziałać kryzysowi zagospodarowania przestrzennego? Polskie krajobrazy wiejskie dawne i współczesne. Prace Komisji Krajobrazu Kulturowego Nr 12. Komisja Krajobrazu Kulturowego PTG. Sosnowiec, p. 193-197.

Wilczyński R. (2014). *Przestrzeń wiejska*. Raport Przestrzeń życia Polaków. Red. B. Gadomska. Stowarzyszenie Architektów Polskich SARP. Warszawa.

Wilczyński R. (2015). *Przestrzeń życia Polaków na obszarach wiejskich*. www.prezydent. pl/download/gfx/prezydent/pl/.../2297/39/1/03_wilczynski.pdf (access 10/03/2017)

http://mimaristudio.pl/works/przestrzen-wspolna-na-wsi/ (access 10/03/2016)

Corresponding author: Maja Skibińska, PhD
Warsaw University of Life Sciences
Faculty of Horticulture, Biotechnology and Landscape Architecture
Department of Landscape Art
Nowoursynowska 166 ST. 02-787 Warsaw
Phone: +48660711851
E-mail: Skibinska_maja@wp.pl

Mariusz Wieczorek MA
University of Warsaw