COMMON GOOD IN THE URBAN CONTEXT – INSIGHTS FROM THEORETICAL FRAMEWORKS

Joanna Maria Koszewska[✉]

Laboratory Mediations, Faculty of Arts and Humanities, Sorbonne University, Paris, France
Institute of Civil Engineering, Warsaw University of Life Sciences – SGGW, Warsaw, Poland

ABSTRACT

The objective of the study is to analyse the role of the concept of *common good* in the contemporary field of urban studies. Through an interdisciplinary literature review, the basic explanation of the concept or *common good* is presented with a focus on *common good* in the urban environment. This work examines how *urban commons* became significant in scientific and public debates, translatable into tangible projects. The research results prove the academic and policy discussions focus on *urban commons* both in theoretical and engaged implementation of experiments in local urban governance. The notion of *common good* in the urban context, applied in territorial governance practices as *commons*, has an expanded international geographical reach, popularised within theoretical and more empirical approaches. The findings reveal a correlation between the discourse on *urban commons* and the proliferation of thematic debates and models; grassroot projects, demonstrating varied impacts by local social, cultural and policy contexts. In conclusion to the study of consecutive contemporary theories, the need to provide accurate elaboration on an *urban commoning* framework can be stated. This is a gap to bridge for enabling practical sustainable applications.

Keywords: *urban commons*, *common good*, territorial *commons*, spatial justice, *commoning*, theoretical framework

INTRODUCTION

General concepts

Urban commons, encompassing specific collectively shared resources (e.g., community gardens and other recreational, often re-adapted spaces), are essential to the social and environmental framework of city life. Over the last century, the perception and function of these *common goods* have undergone significant transformations. Once considered utilitarian elements of urban space landscape, included in everyday planning practices, these spaces are recognised as crucial for enhancing urban liveability and sustainability. This shift, driven by an increasing appreciation for community engagement and environmental sustainability, highlights how *urban commons* are integral to fostering social interactions, providing ecological benefits, and enhancing the overall quality of life in densely populated areas.

In the context of the urban (r)evolution, influenced by historical changes such as industrialisation, urban migration and economic transformations have redefined cities' organisation and governance. The significant

Joanna Maria Koszewska https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8585-6881
[✉] joanna.koszewska@insead.edu

increase in urbanisation during the 19th and 20th centuries made the management of common spaces crucial. In the post-industrial era, challenges like urban growth and environmental degradation prompted cities worldwide to repurpose industrial sites and integrate green spaces. However, the rise of neoliberal policies (Rodotà, 2011) towards the end of the century led to increased privatisation (Dellenbaugh-Losse, Zimmermann & de Vries, 2020) and reduced public expenditures, often resulting in the neglect and decreased accessibility of public spaces and semi-public ones, as well as reduced accessibility to other public goods (Dembinski & Huot, Eds, 2017). *Commons* (being also a subject of interest for lawyers and activists of property rights) and *urban commons* are concepts of intersectional appliance.

The relevance of the study is derived from the need to provide a complex and exhaustive framework for 21st century planning. Today, the interdisciplinary approach to the study of *urban commons* is more relevant than ever as cities confront issues like climate change, social inequality, and spatial exclusion. There is the recognised need for adaptive re-use of spaces (European Commission [EC], 2020). The theoretical frameworks developed in response to these challenges provide a historical perspective, guiding contemporary efforts for future urban planning development (Lennon, 2022) by indicating possible directions to pave (Stavrides, 2016). This literature review traces these developments, examining the evolution of thought and the dynamic adaptations of *urban commons* theories in response to new urban realities (Czornik, 2020).

Aim of the review

The aim of this literature review is to explain the theoretical frameworks that have shaped our understanding of *common goods* in urban contexts, by examining pivotal inputs from the 20th and 21st centuries. The contributors to this thematic pool of knowledge represent very diverse environments – from philosophers (Maritain, 1966), sociologists (Mika, 2017), representatives of the legal community, economists (Polko, Czornik & Ochojski, 2021) and geographers (Heffner et al., 2022) to civil engineers, designers and other specialists (Moroni, 2024). By presenting the reviewed works first chronologically and then thematically, this study highlights the progression and interconnectivity of concepts, synthesising key contributions to the field of *urban commons* studies.

Methodology

In this study, the qualitative literature review methodology was employed, suitable for an in-depth analysis of complex theoretical constructs and their evolution over time. The literature has been selected based on its significance to the field, focusing on key works by leading scholars and seminal publications having shaped *urban commons* theories. The literature is organised chronologically to link subsequent historical developments and shifts in thinking from the 20th to the 21st century, followed by a thematic grouping of notions, providing deeper insights, and connecting various approaches. As the presented thematic field is undergoing current development, the indicated milestones help in orientation within different currents of thought within the field of *urban commons* studies.

Structure of the review

The review is divided into parts. The "Introduction" presents the research approach, aim, and method. The "Theoretical framework and state of the art" section ("Theoretical framework – types of ownership" subsection introduces the explanatory lexical basis, while the "State of the art – theatre of *the commons*" subsection explores early theories and contributions) refers to outcomes of studies in the 20th century. The "Contemporary development on the concept of *common good*" section focuses on recent advancements and shifts (with subsections on the frameworks' specificities, rules and principles) in the first quarter of the 21st century. The last part in "Results" contains precisions (regarding the positioning of *commons* in regard to other ownership regimes as well as study fields) and research outcomes ("*Urban common*

good – a question of citizens' rights" subsection lexically reframes expressions present in the literature) to envelop *commons* in their complexity of meanings (with subsections on challenges and a toolbox to reframe the research and empirical *apparatus*). This divided approach not only chronicles the historical progression of ideas but also introduces the material to elucidate themes and patterns, offering a comprehensive, engaging overview of the panorama of *urban commons* studies. The closing reflection, "Critiques and threats to *urban commons*", summarises the impact of the engaged debate on *commons*. "Discussion" paves the way towards indicating the possible next research steps and further actions. The "Conclusions" section reframes the provided results, being a classifying section for the enumerated approaches, to link with other current contributions to the field and enable further future studies.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND STATE OF THE ART

Theoretical framework – types of ownership

In the division of goods according to the type of ownership, private goods are distinguished on the scale of limiting the availability and use of the resource (usually the most restricted), then club goods (also known as group goods, the use of which is conditioned by belonging to a community that has the right to use the given resource, i.e. the so-called club), *common goods* (also called *common pool resources* – CPR), and finally public goods (which do not allow for restriction of access), not competitive in their nature (of the access to the resource, such as *commons*) (Koszewska, 2020).

Types of goods classified by ownership and access limitations

Table 1 shows the general classification of goods (Cornu, Orsi & Rotchfeld, 2017) according to their availability: competitiveness and exclusivity for users.

Table 1. Typology of goods based on the criterion of excludability and rivalry

Accessibility criteria		Rivalry	
		yes	**no**
Excludability	**yes**	private goods	***common goods***
	no	club goods (group)	public goods

Note: After the CPRI notion is introduced later in this document, the division of goods by ownership is actualised and precisely described in a detailed manner in Tables 2 and 3.

Source: Koszewska (2020) based on Cornu et al. (2017, p. 75).

Table 1 shows that *common goods* are classified as non-excludable and non-rival by their accessibility features.

Use of urban commons

The urban planning professionals and citizens involved in participatory planning practices, as well as agents contributing to the elaboration and evaluation of public spatial policies, have acknowledged the existence of emerging modes of exercising collective urban action for several decades. Researchers focused on social practices, legal and institutional regulations, and their dynamics approach *commoning* as a stated, already-mature field of examination (Bollier, 2014, 2016). Table 2 illustrates the characteristics of urban territorial goods by their access.

Table 2. Explanatory typology of goods based on the criterion of excludability and rivalry

	urban public goods urban landscape, streets, parks, street infrastructure (street lighting, urban monitoring, free mapping services (*open access*, or provided by municipalities), etc.)	**urban common-pool resources** courtyards, parking spaces, community gardens, etc.
Low excludability		
	urban common goods commonly governed terrains and goods (ex. shared gardens, working spaces, etc.)	
High excludability	**urban club goods (group)** gated communities, non-public sport areas tennis courts (exclusive group ownership and management)	**urban private goods** private houses, private apartments, office buildings
Criterion	low rivalry	high rivalry

Note: *Urban common goods*, understood typically as commonly governed terrains and goods (ex. shared gardens, working spaces, etc.), would be classified in the intersection of "low excludability" and "low rivalry" sectors, (exceptionally in "high rivalry").

Source: own elaboration based on Polko et al. (2021, p. 16) and Ostrom, Gardner and Walker (1994, p. 7).

Table 2 shows that *common goods* are classified as non-excludable and non-rival by their accessibility features. It describes if citizens are easily excludable from the access to them, meaning also that users may experience a range of rivalry to access the good.

Importance and utility for urban planning actors

Precision in explaining the meaning of *common good* in the urban context is valuable for designers, policymakers (and activists), policy analysts and researchers in urban planning and geography (Eisenschitz, 2022). Elements considered as *common good* in the urban space may translate into specific ways of managing the city space and its design. This is the work of architects, planners, and other industry designers in the field of spatial management. Spatial planning is often in the hands of local government employees, as planning and urban work often require cooperation in teams. For this reason, it may be useful to review the paradigm of exercising power and activities in the field of urban space management. In local authorities' governance, numerous decisions are made, requiring answers to fundamental questions. In situations of conflicting actions (democratisation, dialogue, participation…), determining their consistency with the spirit of the *common good* might improve such actions' contribution to the improvement of urban planning processes. Reflection on this concept equips actors of collective action with a lens focused on the cohesion of collective territorial governance actions, including in the rural dimension. It may seem that elaborate theories in human science are distant from lessons from praxis, though these two intertwine in many approaches.

State of art – theatre of *commons*

The international transdisciplinary scene of scientific and scholarly debate represents different currents and tendencies in observing and evaluating the dynamics of *commons* (as resources) and *commoning* (as activities). *Tragedy* and *comedy* (and the *tragicomedy*) reveal the *commons* characteristics in theme literature. Thus, it can be referenced as a dialogue, separated into acts.

"Tragedy of the Commons" (Hardin, 1968)

In reference to the growing global urban community, pessimism on resources has become an integral element of the reasoning, though the referential works on *commons* in the 20th century (Hardin, 1968) were based on a descriptive qualitative study of natural resources viewed as *commons*. The radiating theoretical exploration of *commons* can be assigned to Garrett Hardin's 1968 essay, "The Tragedy of the Commons" (Hardin, 1968), where he argued that individual self-interest in unregulated *commons* leads to resource

depletion. The situation of over-exploitation led to the elaboration of the process, i.e., *the tragedy of the commons*, through the practical access to the use of a non-restrained community of users. The dysregulated access to the resource (e.g., pasture) implicated the functioning of *free riders*, tempted to exploit the natural resource by privatising the profits derived from them. The reflection touches on the concept of overuse. Hardin's solution was either government intervention or private ownership as a means to manage resources sustainably. His pessimistic approach may be linked to the energy crisis of his epoch, and the – little examined and commented – zoological foundations of his research workshop, leading to generalised assumptions about human behaviour at the social scale (Koszewska, 2020).

In the 21st century, this situation has gained a new label in planning, used for the urban environment: "Not in my backyard" – NIMBY – referring to people's lack of communal reference (Domaradzka, 2018).

"Comedy of the Commons" (Rose, 1986)

Later, Hardin's observation was countered by the opposing statement, which led to work on "Comedy of the Commons" (Rose, 1986). She examines infrastructural resources such as roads and waterways, where the maintenance cost is publicly shared (recreational spaces such as the beach ball playgrounds, following the principle of recreational use: "the more, the merrier", and the commerce that offers social benefits). The law scientist wrote a reflection on public property use and the users' convictions: "When things are left open to the public, they are thought to be wasted by overuse or underuse. No one wishes to invest in something that may be taken from him tomorrow, and no one knows whom to approach to make exchanges. (…) All resort to snatching up what is available for 'capture' today, leaving behind a wasteland. From this perspective, 'public property' is an oxymoron: things left open to the public are not property at all, but rather its antithesis. (…) The Romans, whose legal thinking greatly influenced later European law, were sufficiently interested in 'public property' to separate it into at least four categories". In reference to the Northern American understanding on the benefits and challenges of private property, Rose wrote: "some kinds of property should not be held exclusively in private hands, but should be open to the public or at least subject to what Roman law called the 'jus publicum': the 'public right' (…), service to commerce was a central factor in defining as 'public' such properties as roads and waterways. Used in commerce, some property had qualities akin to infinite 'returns to scale'. Thus here, the commons was not tragic, but comedic, in the classical sense of a story with a happy outcome." This may "suggest that commerce might be thought a 'comedy of the commons' not only because it may infinitely expand our wealth, but also, at least in part, because it has been thought to enhance the sociability of the members of an otherwise atomised society" (Rose, 1986, p. 728). Ending the discourse on commons' comedy, the author wrote: "I conclude by suggesting that in the twentieth century there may be other versions of the comedy of the commons, and other practices that share with commerce the power to enhance our sociability. We might even think that properties devoted to such non-commercial uses as recreation or speech could achieve their highest value when they are accessible to the public at large" (Rose, 1986, p. 728).

"Tragicomedy of the Commons" (Daniels, 2014)

To describe intermediating features of *commons*, the term *tragicomedy* – a post-modernist label of classics – is also being employed: "One strand is plagued with challenges, most of which can be traced back to the internal characteristics of the commons – the nature of the resource, the traits of its users, the way the commons is governed, and the value placed on the commons resource. The second strand is one of hope – that through governance we can overcome these internal challenges and this inertia" (Daniels, 2014). The author overarched the two opposing narratives of *commons*: the pessimistic tragedy of Garret Hardin, and the optimistic comedy by Carol Rose. The joint presentation resulted in the term 'tragicomedy', which represents the binding tension between the opposing scenarios. In the conclusion the author weights the two presented approaches: "However, hope in this context is fragile. It depends on not only guarding against the push toward tragedy but

also assuring that the way we govern the commons changes to both consider surprises and shifts in the way we value the commons. Fortunately, (…) the end of each commons story is ours to write".

To summarise this part, interestingly, the diversity of authors and opposing trends in the interpretation of values of *commons* is not dominating the hope of these authors and actors of collective action to elaborate commonly (jointly, collectively) a new way of cooperating, responding to changing needs of society and their territorial reign. As an alternative to popular existing models of governance, communing is also called the third way (Bollier, 2014; Hudson, Rosenbloom & Cole, Eds, 2019).

Contemporary developments of the concept of *common good*

Hardin's perspective was defeated by Elinor Ostrom, who, in her seminal work: "Governing the Commons" (1990), provided empirical study cases of communities successfully managing common resources through collective action and self-governance (CPRs).

Functionally described use – Ostrom's institutional framework (1990)

Although the trans-locality of these actions is apparent, their copy-paste adaptability is limited (to the size of the operation – Ostrom, local conditions and traditions). This approach is described in a further part of the article, describing contemporary development on *commons*. Elinor Ostrom has established a long--standing common pool resources examination (Ostrom et al., 1994; Ostrom 2008, 2013), being translated into diverse languages and integrated within different disciplines. The approach has been developed and continued by followers. Her contribution was granted a Nobel Prize in 2009 for its analysis of economic aspects of governance, especially by communities, which widely popularised her research.

Design principles for sustainability of commoning

The eight design principles (Ostrom, 1990) for managing commons are defined as follows (described subsequently): (1) The group boundaries and spatial resource limits must be clearly defined (This condition refers to the implemented exclusion of non-entitled and non-involved parties). (2) The rules of governing and appropriating the *common good resource* (limiting the time, place, and number of involved participants of the CPR) and the rules of contributing to the resource (through the input of time, work, materials, financial allocations) by participating entities must be aligned with the local environment needs and local conditions of its governance structure. (3) The possibility of modifying collectively the binding rules by all the parties affected by their functioning (regarding the use, management, and contribution to the maintenance of the resource) needs to be precisely defined. (4) It is necessary to monitor the use of the *common good* by internal means or the responsibility should be transferred to external socially trusted actors (It is also required for the external governors and authorities to respect the elaboration and outcomes of internal regulations established within the CPR. The monitoring from outside reinforces the common structure). (5) The cross passing of established rules of functioning must be possible to effectively punish with sanctions to exclude violating behaviours. (6) The conflict resolution mechanisms should be effective and accessible to apply. (7) Community self--organisation and recognition of this management by higher-level administration (e.g., through state regulations). (8) For larger common resources: organisation of use in the form of enterprises for the common good of resources being nested tiers of a larger interconnected multi-level system.

Complementary rules to Ostrom's work – commons in the city (Foster & Iaione, 2015)

To develop and precisely define the framework of Elinor Ostrom (1990), five key design rules were defined for the *urban commons* by Sheila R. Foster and Christian Iaione (Hudson et al., 2019): (1) collective (multistakeholder) governance, (2) enabling state representatives (i.e. local authorities in cities), (3) social and economic pooling (presence of autonomous participatory institutions), (4) experimentalism (in adaptive

iterative place-based design), (5) technological justice (co-ownership of infrastructure and data). According to the authors, elaboration of the five enumerated principles serves the emergence, development, and sustainability of *urban commons*, enabling the local community to co-create in ways adapted to 21st century dynamics (and power games).

RESULTS

Challenges of studying a diverse property regime's features

Conducting research on the categories of management and ownership requires constant updating of knowledge, followed by the capturing of records within contemporary phenomena; the traditional criterion of property ownership should be supplemented with the aspect related to the actual management of a given property (as shown in Table 3). It is not only private (which can entail the multitude of entities under the brand of a legal person, such as a joint venture or a corporate company) and public ownership that are the main typology elements, but a growing diversity of shared ownership and management in different frameworks is also expanding (Cornu et al., 2017). A simplified array of types of ownership and management (establishment of rules & change elaboration, responsibility for access control) is presented further.

Table 3. Typology of goods based on the criterion of ownership and management

Category	Private ownership	State ownership	Common ownership	"Free access"
Entity keeping the title to the ownership	private entity joint ventures holdings housing communities	**State** political and administrative entities of central, regional, and local (local actors)	**Common Pool Resource Institutions (CPRI) members** (ex. trade unions, guilds of professional chambers, cooperatives, associations, co-inheritance)	**nobody**
Exclusion of non-owning entities	**yes**	**no** (optionally: foreigners and entities exempted from taxation)	**yes** (non-members of the club)	**no**
Entities responsible for access control	**entities holding the right to ownership** (guaranteed by the state)	**State**	**CPRI members**	**nobody**
Entities participating in the management process (taking decisions)	**entities holding the right to ownership**	**political and administrative entities** (actors)	**CPRI members**	**nobody**

Source: Koszewska (2020) based on Cornu et al. (2017, p. 76).

Table 3 shows the general division of goods based on the ownership criterion using the *common pool resources institution* (CPRI) category, i.e., organisations and institutions established for managing common property. It distinguishes individual, and typical contemporary forms of organisation management, such as companies, housing communities, etc., and four basic types of ownership of goods: private, state, common, and "free access" (ownership – indefinite or unlimited).

Additional criteria considered are the organisational form of ownership, actors responsible for access control (exclusive control for the possessors or exclusive control not only for the possessors – owners – but the possibility of excluding an also-given good from general use: controlled access) and actors participating in the decision-making and management process.

Table 3 presents the typology of goods based on the criterion of ownership and management. The common ownership via CPRIs excludes from ownership entities not belonging to the club. Entities partake in CPRI functioning through the membership access control.

Building on Ostrom's framework, recent scholarship has expanded the understanding of *commons* to include not only environmental resources but also social, cultural, and digital *commons*. Scholars have explored the way *commons* encompass a broad range of resources, including knowledge, culture, and urban spaces. The focus has shifted towards understanding *urban commons* as complex socio-spatial phenomena (Foster, 2011) that embody environmental, economic, and social dimensions (Foster & Iaione, 2015, 2019).

The *commons* movement has expanded specifically around chosen current problems of space ownership in Italy – particularly around buildings in Rome (Rodotà, 2011) and natural resources in Naples (Vittoria, Ragozino & Esposito De Vita, 2023), in France within human sciences examinations, such as philosophy (Dardot & Laval 2015) and economics (Festa, 2016) and in Greece (Stavrides, 2016) and other countries (ex. USA, UK, Belgium…).

Since Elinor Ostrom's work (Ostrom, 1990), the debate on *commons* and *commoning* (Stavrides, 2016) has been present in disciplines such as economics and law (Rodotà, 2011), philosophy, and sociology (Dardot & Laval, 2015). Though it is necessary to refer to the complex heritage of science in this area (Piechowiak, 2012; Hudson et al., 2019). The reflection on the community regulations dates from the ancient times of mankind (Coriat, Ed., 2015). Even in in-depth monographs devoted to the notion of *common good*, there is an apparent difficulty in clearly defining the subject (Dardot & Laval, 2015). This background motivated the author of this research to mobilise the cognitive apparatus to undertake this cross-disciplinary analysis, explaining the phenomenon of established and emerging *commoning* practices, which influence existing territorial planning procedures by their actions, changing the local landscape. In some cases, the propagating tendency of temporary territorial *commoning* occupations reaches is permanent impact, shaping local spatial planning laws (Czornik, 2020).

Urban common good – a question of citizens' rights

In the urban studies framework, the notion of justice is connected to the "just city" idea (Fainstein, 2010), where planners explore how common spaces beyond public or private status regulate inequalities of contemporary societies. Even though the question of justice has been of interest within political philosophy and science for several centuries, behavioural researchers were cautious with regulatory definitions. However, critical left-wing-oriented scholars developed this in the late 1960s through 1970s. The western literature accommodated moral questions within the description of social phenomena, but justice in the urban realm remained undefined (Fainstein, 2014). The influential work of Lefebvre contributed to the field by attributing to the space the characteristics of social construction, to which everybody should have a right (Lefebvre, 1967). By the end of the 20th century, the spatial dimension of justice mobilised researchers to be more descriptive, in the context of the neo-liberalised experience of shaping the city. The communicative rationality and spatial justice approaches focused on democracy and equity, process and outcome of the expression and place of diversified participants of urbanised areas. The governance principles: democracy, diversity, and equity, are also contradictory, according to Fainstein. The author stated that structural changes were harder to imply than rhetoric of urban justice. Urban policies are prone to be adapted to residents' need to improve their quality of life by introducing to the public discourse the criteria of the "just city" concept while focusing less on competitiveness (a key factor at the municipal level of strategic planning and policy elaboration).

In urban studies, common spaces beyond public or private status regulate inequalities of contemporary societies and how societal challenges and movements (Kubicki, 2020) can be expressed within this part of public life, which is apparent in public spaces in the city (Harvey, 2012, 2013).

There is the conceptual link between the right to the city (Lefebvre, 1967), considering that negative effects of urbanisation should be opposed by the 'Right to the city' movement, lobbying for new

methods of urban management; the concept of fighting in the name of the revendication of access to the city space (Lefebvre, 1967; Harvey, 1968, 2012).

As *common* spaces are meant to be, but do not always appear to be explicitly just spaces, it is challenging to reconnect ethical tensions of commonalities and justice. Despite the conceptual link between spatial justice and *commoning*, it needs to be clarified in a comprehensive theoretical framework to avoid the misunderstandings. This concept used in the fight for the just city generates scepticism on the rules within the community of commoners' practices of commoning, the process' permeability to the newly involved and the disadvantaged. The relations of power within common forms of governance, economic resources sustaining such processes, and the dynamics between *communities of commoners* and public institutions deserve to be observed to verify the regulations of these dynamics.

Within the contemporary discussion as presented in the previous chapter, we can observe the rising paradigm of *urban commons* as a way to express the community's collective action and a shift from theoretical concepts of *commons* towards practical applications in diverse intersectional contexts. This shows that *urban commons* are an applied field of study, which is closely following and deeply rooted in the developments of a changing world. Although the contemporary debate on regulations of *commons* started in the 20th century, it was in the 21st century that the accumulated research brought precisions on their efficiency and sustainability.

Many works on the *common good* postulate the need to conduct further research on these issues to assist procedures in the city space for balancing the *spatial justice*, in a place where a large and diverse community lives.

Classification of thematic and disciplinary approaches in *commons* studies

Table 4 illustrates the interdisciplinarity of studies on the idea of *common good* and the diversity of study approaches and orientations, suitable for each discipline and its subject of examination with an adjusted methodology. It provides a schematised disciplinary classification and interpretation of methodological examinations and an attributed focus on the study aims.

Table 4. Interdisciplinarity of studies on the idea of *common good*, grouped by field frameworks

Field of science	Approach to the study of *commons* & *common good*	Scientific discipline
Humanities	ethical cultural	philosophy, cultural and religious studies
Theological sciences	ontological transcendental	theological sciences
Social sciences	social – materialistic	sociological sciences social economic geography social communication sciences
	economic – managerial	economics and finance political and administrative sciences
	institutional – economic	management sciences law spatial management
Engineering and technical sciences	materialistic – ecological	environmental engineering civil engineering
	economic – institutional (design-oriented)	architecture and urban planning, civil engineering

Note: the authors' classification is based on the Polish qualification of scientific disciplines (Rozporządzenie Ministra Nauki i Szkolnictwa Wyższego z dnia 20 września 2018 r. w sprawie dziedzin nauki i dyscyplin naukowych oraz dyscyplin artystycznych. Dz.U. 2018 poz. 1818), the latest based on the international classification of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD).

Source: Koszewska (2020).

As seen in the synthesised critical choice and interpretation of the general trends and methodologies (Table 4), these approaches complete themselves by the description of different aspects of the *commons* thematic field. The described research procedures (e.g., economy) are suitable to disciplinary positioning and diversified approaches of the applied methodologies. In the thematic literature, we can observe both the highly theoretical angle of study (e.g., philosophy, theology, law), in parallel to others, elaborated on the choice of local territorial *commoning* case studies (economy, geography, sociology, ethnology, urban planning and architecture…), (Mika, 2017; Koszewska, 2020).

DISCUSSION

Critiques and threats to *urban commons*

While *urban commons* are praised for their potential to foster community engagement and democratise public space, they also face significant challenges. Although the described hereby classical dispute between tragedy (Hardin, 1968) and comedy (Rose, 1986), commented as tragicomedy (Daniels, 2014) and completed by the comprehensive use proposal (Ostrom, 1990) defines the opportunities and dangers of *commoning* as a way of governing the resource, new observations arise, suitable to new local collective experiences and problems (often in response to spatial conflicts). The side effects include secondary exclusivity (hidden, not-officially expressed preferences of limiting the access to the use of the resource), privatisation, and unexpected commercialisation of the *commoning* spaces (such as externalities – ex. pollution).

Weaknesses. Although spatial justice and *commoning* are semantically related, this needs to be further clarified in a comprehensive theoretical framework to avoid misinterpretations. The critical question to be asked is: who profits directly from the *commoning* activity and who contributes to its resource?

As demonstrated, the study of the *commons* leads to a proposal of a way of functioning differently from the typical division into public and private property. Thus, the chances of elaborating and testing new models of collective action seem promisingly inexhaustible. The facilitated international cooperation in the globalised era of new digital *commons* and results of open access scholarly works facilitate the exchange of thoughts, local and disciplinary perspectives, research results, and testing experiences. The presence of international programmes and documents encourages cross-pollination of practices, both in empirical experimentation and theoretical frameworks testing.

Urban common good concept potential

At the end of the presented discourse, it is essential to evaluate the opportunities of *commoning* as a practice included in spatial, and particularly, urban planning procedures. Planning processes and *commoning* seem to guide this field into innovative participatory actions, though the balance between idealised communal participation and the pragmatic realities of managing common resources in urban settings is worth discussing.

Strengths. *Commoning* has, amongst other characteristics, the strong capacity of demonstrating pedagogies of the societal drive towards equality and justice in the cityscape. This agency can engage its actors, users or target groups of people invited to take part in the *urban commoning* activity, touching upon participation and inclusion.

CONCLUSIONS

The presented literature research addresses gaps in the body of scholarly material in the domain of architecture and territorial planning, in particular, in the urban realm. The mentions of the *common good* concept, particularly in the technical literature, tend to flatten the richness of possible interpretations and trans-disciplinary complexity of study into *commons*. On the other hand, emerging authors tend not to exhaust

the topic of *urban commons*, linked to methodological deficiencies, which are still evolving and being developed across the globe (Koszewska, 2020).

The concept of the quest for spatial justice applies to the urban *commoning* activity in a direct way. It deserves theoretical and practical reflection and explanations through in-depth analysis to support the *commoning* movement.

Toolbox for reading the theories and conceptualising *commons* practicalities

The article contributes to the establishment of actualised knowledge construction, enables academic and civic discussion by providing (by the author's own elaboration and quotation) the basic disciplinary vocabulary. The author's presentation makes it possible to join the ongoing international debate on the new efficient modes and models of possible joint and just social territorial action and intervention with the goal of establishing a sustainable environment. This review proves the evoked diversity of disciplinary approaches, intertwined in applied *commoning* practices. By establishing foundations for further works, it is paving the way for following in-depth profiled theoretical and empirical case studies on the detailed classification of just roles of *commons* actors.

Within the summarised research, the author has examined and presented the existing theories and methods to establish the framework, enabling further theoretical, but also empirical interdisciplinary studies, with an emphasis towards civil engineering (architecture, urban planning, sustainability in the built environment). The methodology used was profiled to achieve a broad understanding of the complex phenomenon of common ownership, governance, and use.

This study of theories illustrates the transformative power of urban commons, reinforcing civic democratic dialogue in action for elaborating models and urban policies in mixed dynamics of social representatives with local authorities.

Acknowledgements

REFERENCES

Bollier, D. (2014). *The Commons. Dobro wspólne dla każdego.* Zielonka: Faktoria.

Bollier, D. (2016). *Commoning as a Transformative Social Paradigm.* Retrieved from: https://thenextsystem.org/ node/187 [accessed: 23.02.2022].

Coriat, B. (Ed.), (2015). *Le retour des communs.* Mayenne: Éditions Les Liens qui Libèrent.

Cornu, M., Orsi, F. & Rotchfeld, J. (2017). *Dictionnaire du biens communs.* Paris: PUF. Retrieved from: http://www. documentation.ird.fr/hor/fdi:010070767 [accessed: 30.04.2024].

Czornik, M. (2020). Collective Benefits as Impulse for Urban Development. *Studia Miejskie*, *37*, 3952. https://doi. org/10.25167/sm.1922

Daniels, B. (2014). The Tragicomedy of the Commons. *Brigham Young University Law Review*, *6*, 1347–1372. Retrieved from: http://digitalcommons.law.byu.edu/lawreview/vol2014/iss6/7 [accessed: 30.04.2024].

Dardot, P. & Laval, C. (2015). *Commun: essai sur la révolution au XXIe siècle.* Paris: La Découverte.

Dellenbaugh-Losse, M., Zimmermann, N. E. & Vries, N. de (2020). *The Urban Commons Cookbook: Strategies and Insights for Creating and Maintaining Urban Commons.* Urban Coomons Cookbook.

Dembinski, P. H. & Huot, J-C. (Eds), (2017). *Le bien commun par-delà les impasses*. Saint Maurice: Éditions Saint-Augustin.

Domaradzka, A. (2018). Urban social movements and the right to the city: An introduction to the special issue on urban mobilization. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary & Nonprofit Organizations*, *29* (4), 607–620. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11266-018-0030-y

Eisenschitz, A. (2022). A Geography for the Common Good. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, *46* (4), 523–530. https://doi.org/10.1080/03098265.2022.2045574

European Commission [EC], (2020). *New Leipzig Charter: The transformative power of cities for the common good*. Retrieved from: https://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/en/information/publications/brochures/2020/new-leipzig-charter-the-transformative-power-of-cities-for-the-common-good [accessed: 30.04.2024].

Fainstein, S. (2010). *The Just City*. Ithaca–London: Cornell University Press.

Fainstein, S. (2014). The just city. *International Journal of Urban Sciences*, *18* (1), 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1080/12265934.2013.834643

Festa, D. (2016). Les communs urbains. L'invention du commun. *Tracés*, *6*, 233–256.

Foster, S. R. (2011). Collective Action and the Urban Commons. *Notre Dame Law Review*, *87* (1), 57–133.

Foster, S. R. & Iaione, C. (2015). The City as a Commons. *Yale Law & Policy Review*, *34* (2), 281.

Hardin, G. (1968). The Tragedy of the Commons. *Science*, *162* (3859), 1243–1248.

Harvey, D. (2012). Tworzenie miejskich dóbr wspólnych. In *Bunt miast: Prawa do miasta i miejska rewolucja* (pp. 102–129). Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Bęc Zmiana.

Harvey, D. (2013). *Rebel Cities. From the Right to the City to the Urban Revolution*. London–New York: Verso.

Heffner, K., Gasidło, K., Klasik, A., Majorek, A., Polko, A., Noworól, A., Janik, M., Klemens, B., Wyrzykowska, A., Stankiewicz, B., Zuzańska-Żyśko, E., Rykała, P., Bartoszek, A., Runge, J., Twardoch, A., Harat, Ł., Komornicki, T., Markowski, T., …, Wrana, K. (2022). *Miasta w procesie przemian. W kierunku nowego stylu zarządzania miejskiego* [*Cities in Transition. Towards a New Style of Urban Governance*]. Warszawa: Polska Akademia Nauk Komitet Przestrzennego Zagospodarowania Kraju.

Hudson, B., Rosenbloom, J. & Cole, D. (Eds), (2019). *Routledge Handbook of the Study of the Commons*. New York––London: Routledge, Abingdon, Oxon: Taylor & Francis.

Koszewska, J. (2020). *The common good in urban space – Comparative analysis in Poland and in France on the example of chosen districts of Warsaw and Paris* (doctoral dissertation). Politechnika Warszawska, Warszawa / Sorbonne Université, Paris [unpublished].

Kubicki, P. (2020). Miasto jako dobro wspólne czy suma prywatnych własności? O polskiej kwestii miejskiej w kontekście działalności ruchów miejskich. *Przegląd Kulturoznawczy*, *4* (46), 477–492. https://doi.org/10.4467/20843860PK.20.041.12845

Lefebvre, H. (1967). Le Droit à la Ville. *L'Homme et la Société*, *6* (1), 29–35.

Lennon, M. (2022). *Planning for the Common Good*. New York: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003155515

Maritain, J. (1966). *The Person and the Common Good*. Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press [original work published 1947].

Mika, B. (2017). Dobro wspólne okiem socjologa – kilka uwag porządkujących. *Kultura i Społeczeństwo*, *61* (4), 49–63. https://doi.org/10.35757/KiS.2017.61.4.3

Moroni, S. (2024). *Untangling the commons: three different forms of commonality*. Springer Science and Business Media. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11138-024-00639-1

Ostrom, E. (1990). *Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action*. Oxford–New York: Cambridge University Press.

Ostrom, E. (2008). The Challenge of Common-pool Resources. *Environment, Science and Policy for Sustainable Development*, *50* (4), 8–21.

Ostrom, E. (2013). *Dysponowanie wspólnymi zasobami*. Warszawa: Wolters Kluwer Polska.

Ostrom, E., Gardner, R. & Walker, J. (1994). *Rules, Games & Common-Pool Resources*. The University of Michigan Press.

Piechowiak, M. (2012). *Dobro wspólne jako fundament polskiego porządku konstytucyjnego*. Warszawa: Biuro Trybunału Konstytucyjnego.

Polko, A., Czornik, M. & Ochojski, A. (2021). *Understanding the urban commons: Economics and governance*. Poznań: Bogucki Wydawnictwo Naukowe.

Rodotà, S. (2011). Beni comuni e categorie giuridiche: una rivisitazione necessaria. *Questione Giustizia*, *5*, 237–247.

Rose, C. (1986). The Comedy of the Commons: Custom, Commerce, and Inherently Public Property. *The University of Chicago Law Review*, *53* (3). Retrieved from: https://chicagounbound.uchicago.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=4473&context=uclrev [accessed: 30.04.2024].

Rozporządzenie Ministra Nauki i Szkolnictwa Wyższego z dnia 20 września 2018 r. w sprawie dziedzin nauki i dyscyplin naukowych oraz dyscyplin artystycznych (Dz.U. 2018 poz.1818).

Stavrides, S. (2016). *Common space: the city as commons*. London: Zed Books.

Vittoria, M. P., Ragozino, S. & Esposito De Vita, G. (2023). Urban commons between Ostrom's and neo-materialist approaches: The case of Lido Pola in Naples, Southern Italy. *Land*, *12* (3), 524. https://doi.org/10.3390/land12030524

DOBRO WSPÓLNE W KONTEKŚCIE MIEJSKIM – PRZEGLĄD POJĘĆ I TEORII

STRESZCZENIE

Celem prezentowanego studium jest analiza koncepcji dobra wspólnego we współczesnej urbanistyce. W interdyscyplinarnym przeglądzie literatury przedmiotu przedstawiono podstawy badań na temat pojęcia dobra wspólnego ze szczególnym uwzględnieniem miejskiego dobra wspólnego. W ślad za rosnącym zainteresowaniem badaniami nad miejskimi dobrami wspólnymi podążają eksperymentalne praktyki w lokalnym planowaniu i zarządzaniu przestrzennym. Wyniki badań świadczą o rosnącym zainteresowaniu akademickim i w publicznej dyskusji o polityce przestrzennej. Niniejsza praca przedstawia przełożenie teoretycznej koncepcji miejskich dóbr wspólnych z debaty naukowej na możliwość wdrażania projektów społecznych w zurbanizowanym środowisku. Podsumowując, pojęcie dobra wspólnego w kontekście miejskim, stosowane w zarządzaniu terytorialnym jako *urban commons*, ma międzynarodowy zasięg geograficzny, dzięki popularyzowaniu w ramach badań naukowych nad jego zastosowaniem. Wyniki ujawniają relację między dyskursem na temat miejskich dóbr wspólnych a rozprzestrzenianiem się modeli projektów, zróżnicowanych pod względem lokalnych uwarunkowań kulturowych i politycznych.

Słowa kluczowe: miejskie dobra wspólne, dobro wspólne, terytorialne dobro wspólne, sprawiedliwość przestrzenna, procesy uwspólniania, podstawy teoretyczne