EUROPA XXI
Vol. 46, 2024, pp. xx-xx
https://doi.org/10.7163/Eu21.2024.46.7

Institute of Geography and Spatial Organization
Polish Academy of Sciences

OPPORTUNITIES AND BARRIERS RELATED TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE RIGHT TO THE CITY CONCEPT IN THE BRAZILIAN AND POLISH URBAN PLANNING SYSTEM. A COMPARATIVE STUDY

Maciej J. Nowak[1], **Roberto Rocco**[2]

[1] West Pomeranian University of Technology in Szczecin, Faculty of Economics, Department of Real Estate
Żołnierska 47, 71-210 Szczecin: Poland
macnowak@zut.edu.pl

[2] Technische Universiteit Delft (TU Delft), Department of Urbanism
Julianalaan 134 2628BL Delft: The Netherlands
r.c.rocco@tudelft.nl

Abstract. This article identifies the key factors either supporting or blocking the implementation of the Right to the City concept in the urban planning systems of Brazil and Poland. Poland and Brazil, despite some differences, can be compared from the perspective of selected features of spatial planning systems. A characterisation of the spatial planning systems of both countries, including their legal and socio-political conditions, is made. The article identifies these institutional challenges and barriers in both national spatial planning systems, which can be linked to a discussion of the Right to the City concept. It then analyses how elements of the Right to the City concept are implemented in each system and what constitutes the main barrier. Those elements of the Right to the City concept that can be more universally compared were identified. The commonalities and discrepancies found in the two systems are then discussed. In Brazil, the Right to the City concept is much more strongly framed in formal and legal terms, but market and social inequalities are a barrier to its implementation. In Poland, on the other hand, there is a broader institutional inertia in the implementation of the concept. In both countries, there are serious (different) barriers related to the implementation of the Right to the City concept in the urban planning system.

Keywords: governance, planning cultures, Right to the City, spatial planning, urban planning.

Introduction

The use of the Right to the City concept continues to be very useful in discussing barriers and opportunities for urban development. The questions it raises about the optimal directions of urban development, the expansion of social and environmental protections and the nature of urban resilience, have become even more relevant. These issues can be considered from multiple perspectives. One of the key perspectives is the analysis of the possibilities afforded by national spatial planning systems and spatial policy instruments. We find that a very good benchmark to help accurately assess the capacity of different systems to respond to the emerging challenges of climate extreme events, growing inequality and democratic deficit in the governance of urban affairs

is the concept of the Right to the City. This concept involves both the distributive aspects of spatial planning and its procedural framework.

With these ideas in mind, this article addresses how the concept of the Right to the City has influenced National Urban Policies in two, at first sight, diametrically different countries: Brazil and Poland. We observe, however, that both countries have striking similarities in how they have emerged from protracted undemocratic regimes shaped by the Cold War at roughly the same time (Brazil in 1986, Poland in 1989), in diametrically opposing sides of the conflict, and how they have then gone on to enact vigorously democratic National Urban Policies shaped. In the case of Brazil, by grassroots movements that had organized under the former military regime with the help of Basic Ecclesial Communities influenced by the Liberation Theology, a progressive and insurgent theological approach that emphasized the liberation of the oppressed.

Both countries had strong labour movements pushing for democratisation, with *Partido dos Trabalhadores* (the Worker's Party) in Brazil and *Solidarność* (Solidarity) in Poland, that had a broad civil constituency articulating for reform. For a long time, both countries struggled to implement functioning democratic systems, but Poland's democratic fate changed dramatically with its accession to the European Union on May 1st, 2004. Meanwhile, Brazil has implemented social policies aimed at reducing its vast social disparities with moderate success. These efforts are part of a broader strategy to integrate its citizens into democratic life and strengthen democracy, despite the challenges posed by entrenched and reactionary social structures. Brazil notably embarked on a populist experience with the election of Jair Bolsonaro as President in 2018. Bolsonaro is often characterized as a far-right populist leader. Brazil's political system has faced significant challenges under Bolsonaro's administration, including political polarisation and controversies surrounding policies and governance. The election of President Lula in 2022 for an unprecedented third term seems to have given the country some respite from right-wing populism, but Bolsonarismo is still a very strong political force in the country. Poland has also seen a rise in right-wing politics, particularly with the Law and Justice Party (PiS) coming to power in 2015. The party is known for its conservative and nationalist stance. Poland's democratic institutions have been under strain, with concerns raised by the EU and other international bodies regarding the rule of law, judicial independence, and media freedom, but it can be speculated that the EU has acted as a safeguard for Polish democracy. Poland's accession to the EU required the country to meet certain democratic standards and adhere to the principles of the Copenhagen criteria, which include the stability of institutions guaranteeing democracy, the rule of law, human rights, and respect for and protection of minorities. EU membership has provided a framework for democratic governance and legal standards, which can act as a safeguard against authoritarian tendencies. The EU has mechanisms to monitor and address concerns related to democratic backsliding among its member states. For example, the European Commission has initiated proceedings under Article 7 of the Treaty on the European Union, a process that can potentially lead to sanctions against a member state for breaching EU values. Most importantly, EU membership comes with economic benefits, including access to the single market and funding opportunities. These incentives can encourage member states like Poland to maintain alignment with EU standards and values. In October 2023, Poland's opposition parties won enough seats to take power from the Law and Justice (PiS) party, with the Civic Coalition led by former Prime Minster and European Council President Donald Tusk, pledgeding to form a coalition government to oust PiS from power. The authors once again emphasise their awareness of the numerous (also historical) differences between the two countries being compared. This differentiation also applies to historical events. Nevertheless, according to the authors, the analogies in the history of the two countries outlined

above are relevant, especially from the perspective of the discussion of the Right to the City concept. Common to both countries is the need to implement democratic principles (of course, in different ways both at the end of the 20th century and today). This translates into the sphere of urban planning, public participation and the way the role of the market is perceived.

The systemic and political polarisation and turmoil faced by both countries partly translate into a discussion on spatial planning and the approach to property rights. Both countries diagnose serious problems in meeting the challenges and objectives of spatial planning. We believe this exploration is relevant in order to assert how the concept of the Right to the City has been integrated into policymaking and the factors leading to this integration in different contexts, including the specific trajectories of democratization and the ensuing democratic models in both countries. Furthermore, we wish to understand how the Right to the City has been instrumentalized into policy tools and concepts, and how it could be further explored in future policymaking that addresses the distributive and procedural dimensions of spatial planning.

The aim of this article is to identify the key factors supporting and blocking the implementation of the Right to the City concept in the spatial planning systems of Brazil and Poland. The following specific objectives were set:

- to identify and compare the key barriers associated with the use of spatial planning instruments (in particular – spatial plans) in both countries;
- to identify in both cases those features of spatial planning systems that can be linked to the implementation of the Right to the City concept.

The authors are aware of the differences between the two countries but believe there are enough factors in their paths to democratisation that justify a comparison. In the next part of the article, we point out differences and commonalities. Then, on the basis of the literature review, we clarify which elements of the Right to the City concept are the subject of comparison. The following part of the article describes the socio-political and legal conditions in both countries and, on this basis, defines the conditions for implementing the Right to the City concept in Brazil and Poland. A broader comparison of these factors is then made. The questions we wish to answer are: 'How were elements of the Right to the City concept incorporated into the legal spatial planning systems of two emerging democracies, Poland, and Brazil, diametrically opposed on the ideological spectrum of the Cold War?'; 'What are the factors influencing integration of the concept of the Right to the City into urban planning?'. The issues concerning the Right to the City concept are very broad and diverse. The paper focuses on selected aspects of the concept, which can be directly translated into the sphere of application of spatial planning instruments (primarily spatial plans). The sphere concerning spatial planning, protection of spatial values, including the realisation of the public interest in planning are very important conditions for the implementation of the Right to the City concept. However, in order to credibly clarify the Right to the City concept-related aspect of spatial planning in both countries, the article proposes the following objectives:

- to indicate (based on the literature review) how the Right to the City concept is taken into account in the discussion of spatial planning challenges;
- to indicate the socio-political context of development in both countries;
- to identify key features of the spatial planning system of both countries;
- to identify and compare in both countries those spatial planning issues that are translated into the Right to the City discussion.

The article has the character of an academic essay. A broader presentation of the historical and political conditions of the development of the two countries was considered to provide the necessary basis for the comparisons made.

Poland and Brazil, two emerging democracies at the opposite ends of the Cold War

The issue of adapting spatial planning systems to social, environmental and climate challenges is particularly relevant in countries that are still in the process of defining their democratic values. These countries are, on the one hand, aware of the emerging challenges but, on the other hand, have serious barriers in providing a rapid response to these challenges. Two countries from opposite ends of the former Cold War meet the present criteria: Brazil and Poland. In many respects, they are comparable, but they also have important differences.

The similarities include:

- Both countries are young democracies, where the democratic order has been taking shape now for over thirty years. The 1980s saw the end of authoritarian regimes in both Brazil and Poland. Since then, both countries have been trying to shape democratic orders, which, however, involves different problems (manifested, for example, by current populist governments in both countries);
- Attitudes to redistributive spatial policies in planning and huge attachment to the right of property ownership, stemming from historical reasons, which is reflected in the understanding of the role of planning, the role of the State and the market and of property owners in their respective spatial planning systems;
- Numerous challenges and barriers related to the functioning of national spatial planning systems (including the implementation of their objectives).

The main difference is the implementation of the Right to the City concept in the national legal order. While this is the case in Brazil to a larger extent, the Right to the City and related issues are not reflected in the Polish legal order. We try to explore the reasons for this difference by:

- defining the key directions of the relationship between the Right to the City concept and the objectives of spatial planning dominating in the current literature;
- presenting the societal models of the development of Brazil and Poland;
- presenting the legal framework of spatial planning in Brazil and Poland (in the context of real and potential links with Right to the City);
- comparing the degree of implementation of key issues from the perspective of Right to the City in the national spatial planning systems of both countries, to define discrepancies and on this basis to define broader theoretical conclusions.

We follow Nadin and Stead (2013) in comparing different national urban planning systems. In this article, however, the key point of reference is the concept of the Right to the City, for its importance in face of the distributive and procedural challenges of spatial planning and the challenges of democratization in both countries. In this context, we consider it crucial to refer (within the framework indicated above), first of all to the objectives of spatial planning systems and the administrative and legal environment of these systems. Then, in assessing the implementation of the Right to the City concept, the topics of the attributes of governance and the main tools at the disposal of planners will be considered.

Literature review

The concept of Right to the City is defined and understood in different ways by scholars and policymakers, and addresses diverse issues. For example, in 2021 alone, authors have addressed its broader social context (Hsu, 2021; Meshkini et al., 2021), housing (Bonfert, 2021), children's rights), the rights of the elderly (Heidari et al., 2021), refugee rights (Tsavdaroglou& Kaika, 2021), and the development of urban gardens (Apostolopoulou & Kotsila, 2021). There are also attempts to organize the indicated concept a EU perspective (de Franz, 2021). Nevertheless, also in the most recent approaches, attention is drawn to the fact that the concept of the Right to the City is gaining relevance within the framework of contemporary urban conflicts and political struggles, which manifests themselves to a large extent in urban planning (Castro Seixas, 2021). Reference can be made to the claims of Lefebvre (Leary-Owhin & McCarthy, 2020) and Harvey (2008) linking the Right to the City with the right to change the city and precisely to shape the process of urbanization. Again, this view continues to point out that urban policy making is a key area of negotiation about how urban stakeholders distribute burdens, benefits, and opportunities in cities (Eshtiaghi & Sharepour, 2021).

The adaptation of the concept of the Right to the City to national spatial policy systems is a key element in its implementation. A point of reference there is the juxtaposition of two actions:

- making the shaping of the urban space available to its inhabitants.
- understating property in its social context (Karlsson, 2020).

The preference for the first option as a priority in urban policy is related to the concept of spatial justice (McRobert, 2013; Venturini, 2019; Binandeh et al., 2020; Tsavdaroglu 2020). There is no doubt in the literature that a cross-cutting classification of national spatial planning systems is very difficult. In addition to the diverse legal frameworks, there are also diverse planning practices (Nadin & Stead, 2013; Reimer et al., 2014; Nadin et al., 2018;, Nowak et al., 2024; Zimmermann & Feiertag, 2024). However, this does not block the possibility of making comparisons of specific solutions and the degree of implementation of specific concepts.

The concept of Right to the City can be a point of reference in the evaluation of National Urban Plans, as it is advanced as a 'new paradigm for urban development that seeks to address the major challenges in cities and human settlements of rapid urbanization, poverty reduction, social exclusion, and environmental risk that call for decisive actions and new policy priorities by national, regional, and local governments' (UN-Habitat, 2017, p. 24). The fact that it is possible (and sometimes necessary) to verify how much the Right to the City concept is currently considered in urban planning is confirmed by various authors (Cesar & Almeida, 2017). In the present context, two key issues are pointed out:

- relationship between public interest and private interest in spatial planning;
- the scope of public participation in spatial planning.

The first issue involves determining how much the national spatial planning system underscores the rights of owners and investors and, consequently, how much private investors are able to influence urban space. Correspondingly, it also involves identifying and evaluating the planning tools in place to mediate this relationship, including tools like zoning, land value capture, progressive taxation and more. Thorpe (2017) points out that there are very significant tensions between protecting the interests of property owners and extending social and economic justice within urban space. Therefore, it is important for national urban policies to take into account the notion of 'public interest', equated with the interests of the wider community. It may mean taking into account social considerations in spatial policy, as well as protecting the environment,

nature and cultural heritage. The extent to which the public interest is taken into account in a given system is most easily determined when observing the direction of spatial conflict resolution (Baker et al., 2013; Saporito, 2013, Wirawan et al., 2019; Novotny et al., 2023). Thorpe (2017) considers spatial conflicts as allowing to better clarify the interests and priorities of different stakeholders. Silva (2017) specifically highlights here the role of urban public space. Manzi et al. (2018) identify conflicts as a beginning, enabling the definition of cooperation within the Right to the City. However, the problem remains when the direction of conflict resolution is not linked to the protection of the public interest. Public participation in urban planning is supposed to prevent such cases (Bailey, 2019). Thorpe (2017) cautions that an insufficient basis will be the reliance of participants in the process on narrow self-interest. Also at risk is apparent participation, amounting to consultation of spatial decisions already informally made by authorities. One condition that broadens the possibilities will be the developed level of urban movements (Bacque & Gauthier 2017). The effect of participatory meetings contributing to the creation of new values and perspectives is also important (Tsavdaroglou, 2020; Woods, 2023).

Social and political context of Polish development. Determinants of spatial planning system formation

Two issues need to be distinguished in this subsection. The first is the socio-political context of Poland's democratic development and the second is its impact on the spatial planning system. Until 1989, Poland was part of the communist bloc. The degree of restrictiveness of the authorities in Poland, especially since 1956, was much lower than in the Soviet Union. This does not change the fact that, after 1989, it was necessary to introduce and define democratic principles in Poland practically from scratch. Especially in the first years it was considered that a broad economic liberalism was the key answer (Kowalewski & Nowak 2018). The Constitution adopted in 1997 was a consequence of a compromise between leftist and centrist political circles. As the years passed, the new reality was contested in various ways. The paradigm of economic liberalism was criticised not only by left-wing formations, but also by right-wing populist ones (which took full power in the country in 2015).

The spatial planning system was to some extent developed during the communist era. Also during this period, zoning plans (especially at the local level) were envisaged, as well as urban planning standards, i.e. guidelines on the distance of residential development from specific types of services. However, these regulations were:

- strongly inconsistent, inconsistent and imprecise and consequently often not implemented;
- too detailed (in many cases);
- combined with communist social and economic planning, and consequently impossible to implement.

For these reasons, among others, after 1989, spatial planning was perceived as sphere forming part of the communist economy, with all its negative connotations (Markowski, 2015; Nowak, 2021). Therefore, especially in the 1990s, it was perceived very negatively. This translated into legal regulations extending various development possibilities and promoting private property. This was also reflected in court decisions. It was in this context, a kind of rebirth after communism, that the role of property owners and investors in spatial planning was strengthened. It was also reflected in social attitudes, including the attitude to development. The right to develop

began to be treated as an obvious element of the property right. There was also another problem inherited from communism. The legal regulations on spatial planning remained very imprecise. The lack of precision in various situations deprived investors of certainty as to what they could build (Śleszyński et al., 2018). As a result, sometimes against the will of the legislator, a belief was established that spatial planning was an unnecessary, illogical barrier. This belief can still be found today. There are also attempts in the Polish literature to capture the Right to the City concept. These range from the perspective of the city or locality in question (Kaczmarek, 2022; Matyja, 2022; Śleszyński, 2022), the relationship to spatial justice (Churski, 2022), and partial diagnoses related to spatial planning (Hausner, 2022; Izdebski, 2022, Markowski & Nowak, 2022).

The spatial planning system in Poland. Legal dimension

Poland is a democracy with a decentralised system. In addition to the central government, there are three levels of local government: voivodeships (which, however, have a limited scope of competence), poviats and communes. The Constitution of the Republic of Poland does not refer directly to the spatial planning system. However, its selected regulations may be referred to. Article 2 indicates that the principles of social justice are implemented in the country, and Article 5 refers to the principle of sustainable development (in the context of environmental protection). In turn, Article 20 refers to the social market economy based on 'freedom of economic activity, private property, solidarity and dialogue'. Article 21 indicates that the Republic protects property and the right of inheritance. The possibility of restricting both property and economic activity was linked to public considerations. Article 64 (3) indicates that property may be restricted only by law and only to the extent that the law does not infringe the right to property.

The above is translated into the Act on spatial planning and development which has been in force since March 2003. Pursuant to Article 6 Section 2 of the Act, everyone has the right to develop their own land and to protect their legal interest in the development of land belonging to other parties. The framework for possible development is shaped by spatial policy instruments, primarily local spatial development plans. At the same time, the legislator considered spatial order and sustainable development to be the key values in spatial planning. He also referred to the public interest. Each of these concepts has been very generally (excessively generally) defined.

From the planning perspective, the local, municipality level is crucial. Higher-level authorities (especially national ones) may interfere with the local spatial policy, but only in selected parts. This applies to several issues in particular: environmental and nature protection, cultural heritage, national defence and security, and the implementation of extraordinary, key investments for the country (primarily infrastructural ones).

National authorities have limited influence on spatial planning: it really comes down to the enactment of laws (this includes the Spatial Planning Act itself, as well as laws on specific types of infrastructure investment or protected areas). Regional authorities determine the location of key public purpose investments. Municipalities have planning autonomy. This means that they can plan space to an extent not restricted by other authorities. There has been a major reform of the spatial planning law in 2023, but it will take about two years for new instruments to be introduced. In the current state of the law at the local level, the key instruments are:

- local spatial plans – legal acts that specify the purpose of a given area and the rules for its development. Consequently, such plans have been adopted for less than 40% of the country's area (Śleszyński et al., 2020);

- decisions on building conditions – issued at the request of the investor for the areas for which no local spatial development plans apply. These are administrative decisions, detached from the entire national spatial order. In order to obtain a positive decision, it is necessary to prove that the planned development fits the function of the land, has access to a public road and utility infrastructure.

Right to the City in the Polish spatial planning system

The Polish spatial planning system is the subject of numerous critical analyses (Zachariasz, 2014; Parysek, 2018; Śleszyński et al., 2018; Śleszyński & Nowak, 2023). Both the current legal solutions and the planning practice are assessed very negatively, from the perspective of various stakeholders and disciplines. Negative assessment very often concerns the role of investors/property owners in the system. The following factors can be distinguished here:

- weakness of spatial policy tools at local level;
- approach to property in society.

There are especially problems with the local spatial plans (Nowak et al., 2023). As already indicated, municipalities are not obliged to adopt them. It depends on their discretion. In many cases, therefore, municipalities do not adopt plans for areas which require restrictions. From the perspective of these municipalities it is better to have peace and quiet. Moreover, in the Polish system, the adoption of spatial development plans has financial consequences (Śleszyński et al., 2021). If the enacted zoning plan lowers the value of a property, the owner of such property may demand from the municipality compensation for the loss incurred. This is another deterrent to more ambitious spatial planning policies. Even if a plan is adopted for a given area – it will often allow for very chaotic development.

The most problematic, however, is the situation where no zoning plan has been adopted for a given area (Nowak et al., 2022). Then, an investor wishing to commence operations must obtain an administrative decision from the municipality: a decision on land development conditions. The grounds for issuing such a decision are very subjective. The requirement that the planned development must comply with the function of the neighbouring land is very often abused. Firstly, such compatibility is too often found. Secondly, even if such compatibility does not result from the urban planning analysis, the area under consideration is enlarged – in order to ensure such compatibility and, consequently, to obtain a positive decision.

Investors take advantage of all the opportunities identified above. As indicated above, spatial planning regulations are interpreted differently (and subjectively). Therefore, there also appear situations in which investors may have problems with pushing through their investment concepts. This, however, does not result from the overall planning framework, but from a random interpretation in a given situation. In general, however, the effect of the tendencies described above is an excess of uncontrolled development in Poland. Consequently, since spatial planning is dominated by the vision imposed by private investors – there is a lack of broader consideration of public interest . The above is related to the attitude of society, which prefers a far-reaching protection of property owners' interests. This is a manifestation of a still visible reaction after communism era. In Polish society – both in the national and local sphere – the introduction of broader spatial restrictions is perceived very reluctantly. This is also reflected in the interpretation of the courts in matters related to spatial planning. The prevailing principle in court rulings is that doubts in the assessment of spatial planning regulations should be resolved in favour of the property owners/investors.

This is all the more so because of very weak public participation procedures. It really comes down to:

- the possibility for any interested party to submit non-binding applications and comments to the drafts of studies of spatial development conditions and directions and local spatial development plans under consideration;
- participation, as parties, of owners of neighbouring properties in proceedings to issue decisions on development conditions.

This is therefore a very limited scope (sometimes extended as a result of bottom-up initiatives of the municipal authorities). In the case of the aforementioned motions and comments, it is enough that the municipal authorities briefly refuse them – and the procedure is closed. On the other hand, the role of the parties to administrative proceedings is more important – on the basis of it, it is possible to submit motions in the entire matter, as well as appeal against the issued decision. However, in this case the access to such participation is limited. It applies only to those property owners who may be directly affected by the planned investment. In practice, therefore, a controversial development may often be implemented without the broader knowledge of the local community concerned.

In the Polish system of spatial planning we can see issues related to the concept of Right to the City. However, they can hardly be linked to the authorities' conscious implementation of the elements of this concept. This is rather a confirmation of the thesis that taking into account the Right to the City concept (or values related to it) is very important for the national spatial policy systems. And omissions lead to serious, noticeable negative consequences.

Too much freedom for private investors also fits in with the tendency of more profit-oriented urban policies. Of course, this does not have to mean total disregard for the position of other city inhabitants. Nevertheless, the spatial planning system with its weaknesses, such as the Polish one, makes it difficult to adjust space to the interests of diverse communities. The discourse on spatial justice also becomes more difficult on this scale (as theses that are right from this perspective may be rebuffed by a dry interpretation of the law that favours the interests of investors). A serious weakness of the Polish spatial planning system is its very general concept of public interest. From a legal perspective, the extensive understanding of public interest, even with weak spatial policy tools, may provide justification for specific spatial measures (e.g. limiting the scope of investment opportunities). This should translate into various spheres: social, environmental, or cultural. In each of them, the need for such justifications occurs. However, the practice of specific decisions lacks an important axiological point of reference to which the courts could refer. Right to the City could be just such a reference.

Social and political context of Brazilian development. Determinants of spatial planning system formation

Brazil is a former colony which acquired independence in the first half of the 19th century but where colonial relationships, social structures and modes of production have subsisted much longer. The history of democratisation in Brazil is a complex and evolving journey marked by periods of authoritarian rule and democratic governance. Following centuries of colonial rule, Brazil gained independence from Portugal in 1822. Initially, it was a monarchy under Emperor Pedro I and then Pedro II. In 1889, a military coup established the First Brazilian Republic, which was characterised

by oligarchic rule and limited democracy. The 1930 Revolution brought Getúlio Vargas to power, leading to a period of populism and authoritarianism, culminating in the Estado Novo dictatorship from 1937 to 1945. Post-World War II, Brazil experienced a brief period of democratic rule with the Second Brazilian Republic (1946-1964), marked by the adoption of a new constitution and competitive elections. However, in 1964, a military *coup d'état* led to a 21-year military dictatorship, characterised by censorship, political repression, and human rights abuses. Democratisation began in the late 1970s with the *abertura* (opening) policy, leading to the gradual restoration of political freedoms and civil liberties. The military regime ended in 1985, and the country transitioned to the current democratic period with the adoption of the 1988 Constitution, establishing the Federative Republic of Brazil. Since then, Brazil has experienced ups and downs in its democratic journey, including political corruption, economic challenges, and social unrest, but it has maintained a democratic system with regular elections and a multiparty system. Several key socio-political conditions appear to be relevant to our analysis. In Brazil, one finds ever-increasing social inequalities, as well as a progressive deregulation of the labour market.

Unemployment in Brazil has historically been relatively high compared to OECD countries. Brazil's unemployment rate has often exceeded the average rates observed in OECD member countries, particularly during economic downturns or periods of political and economic instability. But the huge scale of informal employment seems to be one of the main challenges. As of 2019, 41.6% of the Brazilian workforce was informally employed (Campos, 2020). The above trends are reflected in urban spaces, especially in terms of the increasing number of 'abnormal agglomerations', such as slums or houses on stilts (Canzian, 2021). On the other hand, the explosive growth of the formal real estate market should be highlighted, with particular reference to activity in the construction sector and the level of height growth rates (Guedes, 2021). The opposing dynamics of the two processes indicated above seem to define planning practice in Brazil. The development of the real estate market determines the investment pressures on specific urban areas. This strongly influences the urban planning framework, regardless of the legal and institutional arrangements. On the other hand, it remains a very serious challenge to relate institutional spatial planning to areas of informal settlement.

Urban planners are confronted with the challenge of addressing the needs of both sectors. This involves not only managing the growth and expansion of formal real estate markets but also integrating informal settlements into the urban fabric. Strategies may include regularisation and upgrading of informal settlements, provision of affordable housing, and ensuring equitable access to services and infrastructure. All these measures exist in practice but remain insufficient to address the scale of the issue. The coexistence of informal and formal sectors highlights the disparities in access to housing, employment, and urban amenities.

Characteristics of the basic formal frameworks of spatial planning in Brazil. They are related to the 'Romanesque' family of European spatial planning systems , as demonstrated by the link between the Brazilian legal code and the Napoleonic civil code of 1804. The formal sector is regulated mainly through zoning and tools connected to floor area building rates, setbacks, height and other formal constraints. However, it is important to highlight the existence of a serious gap between the normative dimension and planning practice. The procedures, regulations and even values contained in the law are not always applied in practice. In addition to the informality of planning in numerous areas, nepotism and corruption are blocking factors. Against this background, however, the problem of informal urbanisation, associated with the informal appropriation of space, stands out in particular. From the perspective of the discussion on the specifics of urban development in Brazil, the analyses conducted by Milton Santos (2017) are crucial. The author

pointed out that in underdeveloped countries, the urban economy cannot be viewed in a homogeneous way. He distinguished two 'circuits' in cities: an upper and a lower circuit, subject to different socio-economic conditions. It is also possible to distinguish contemporaneous publications on the various aspects of the development of the Right to the City concept in Brazil (Friendly, 2017; Rodrigues, 2022). However, there is a lack of publications containing an in-depth reference of the concept to Brazilian urban planning systems.

The spatial planning system in Brazil. Legal dimension

From the perspective of the characterisation of the legal determinants of spatial planning in Brazil, it is first important to note its federal nature. There are three levels of governance, with autonomous authorities: Union, Federal States and Municipalities. It is important to highlight the serious material and population disparities that exist both between states and between municipalities. It can also be noted that some discrepancies exist in terms of the formal capacities of the individual municipalities in the sphere of spatial planning.

The key spatial planning competencies of the national government are:

- the designation and management of indigenous reserves;
- creation and management of national parks, ecological reserves and other protected areas;
- building and managing strategic major infrastructure;
- assigning special status to cities/regions where strategic infrastructure is built, with special planning regulations and tax exemptions.

The key spatial planning remit of the federal government is to promote the strategic decentralisation of production and consumption and to facilitate industrial export activities and water resource management. Planning for major regional infrastructure is also an important direction. The role of metropolitan areas deserves special emphasis. They are diverse in volume, encompassing both areas made up of contiguous municipalities (integrating public functions, especially regarding sewerage and mobility issues) and individual large urban municipalities.

The 1988 Federal Constitution of Brazil included an entire chapter on urban areas. This translated into the adoption of the City Statute in 2001. Brazilian law emphasises both that property is guaranteed and that it should also have a social function. One can also point to the progressive taxation of land, which is also reflected in the legislator's assumption that taxes must fulfil the social function of property. A consequence of the above-mentioned assumptions is the possibility of specifying in municipal spatial plans: 1. grounds for carrying out compulsory parcelling or construction, 2. progressive tax rates on real estate and on urban land, 3. to carry out expropriation with appropriate payment/compensation.

The literature indicates that the Municipal Statute encompasses urban development in a holistic manner, integrating thematic planes related to, inter alia, spatial planning, urban governance, tax regulation, coverage of the scope of property rights (including informal planning), as well as issues of public participation and public-private partnerships (Maricato, 2010). Urban planning instruments in Brazilian cities are diverse. One example of the way they are applied can be found in the city of Petolas, which has two types of spatial plans: general plans and detailed plans. General plans define zones and forest use restrictions (including maximum building heights). At the same time, they attempt to define social, cultural and environmental interest areas. However, within the detailed approaches, local spatial planning regulations vary, depending on the specific location.

Right to the City in the Brazilian spatial planning system

As indicated earlier, the concept of Right to the City is included in the Brazilian planning system to a much greater extent than in the Polish system. Nevertheless, it is also worth attempting here an in-depth analysis of the dilemmas related to the implementation of this concept in Brazilian urban planning, both legally and in terms of planning practice.

The leading instrument that incorporates guidelines related to the concept of Right to the City in the context of urban planning is the (aforementioned) *Estatuto da Cidade* (Statute of the City). Four important aspects related to its application can be identified . The first concerns the recognition and emphasis on the social function of property rights and the prejudgement that its value is the result of collective endeavours. The separation of property rights from usufruct rights is also a manifestation of the above. The second aspect relates to the fact that the Municipal Statute was written from the perspective of the majority, urban poor. It is for them that both the clarification in the law of the social function of property rights and the approach to land taxes are intended to serve. The third aspect concerns the guidelines for the development of urban policies solely on the basis of popular participation. This is supposed to determine the active participation of diverse community representatives (on the formal legal side, the provisions putting these guidelines into practice are the requirement for the approval of draft spatial plans by neighbourhood councils). Fourthly, the City Statute offers the enforcement of the social function of the property/city in a number of alternative ways. In particular, it encourages local administrations to implement especially smaller, neighbourhood-based projects (instead of large-scale planning). It thus differs from earlier, comprehensive but more homogeneous legislation.

Some other problems and challenges can be identified. For example, the development of public participation practices, which also allow for public influence on the content of spatial plans, is to be commended. In practice, however, the basis for public participation has not proved sufficient to change the culture of planning institutions and, as a consequence, spatial planning has retained many elements of technocratic rigidity of solutions. In addition, the problem and barriers associated with informal settlements still need to be highlighted. An example is the problem concerning the procedure for correcting the status of a plot of land with an irregular legal status. The procedure has to be considered complicated (and therefore a potential barrier for residents of informal settlement areas). A partial answer is the support of the municipal authorities provided to residents in such procedures.

Comparison of the implementation of elements of the Right to the City concept in the Brazilian and Polish spatial planning systems

In both countries, major barriers and problems are found regarding the implementation of spatial planning goals and objectives. Already at the stage of formal-legal analysis, significant differences can be found. In the Brazilian system, there is a very strong emphasis on the social dimension of property rights and the need for public participation at different levels of planning (an example of which is the requirement to approve spatial planning concepts also at the neighbourhood level). Yet, there is a major difference in the Polish system in this respect. Both the Constitution

and lower-level legislation emphasise the social role of property rights much less strongly than is the case in the Brazilian system. Elements of social participation are present in the Polish system, but also to a much weaker extent. In terms of formal and legal conditions, the Polish spatial planning system performs much weaker: it addresses issues that can be linked to the concept of Right to the City to a much lesser extent. Notwithstanding the above, serious problems can be found in both systems with regard to the way in which individual spatial planning instruments are legally constructed in both countries (of which the Polish decision on building conditions is the best example).

At the same time, the case studies of both countries show that, regardless of the legal regulations, the key influence on the implementation of the Right to the City concept is planning practice. The way in which planning practice is shaped is, to a significant extent, a consequence of the socio-political conditions in the respective countries. Two distinct trends can be distinguished in the countries studied. In Brazil, the determination of public authorities at different levels to take into account (develop) the protection of the public interest in spatial planning and to broaden public participation is noticeable. The barriers to these actions are mainly social problems, including the 'clash' between rapid real estate developments on the one hand and unemployment and informal settlements on the other, as described above. It is the problems indicated that are the primary factor blocking the wider implementation of the elements of Right to the City. The problems of Polish planning practice are different. There is no problem of informal settlements in Poland. There is, however, a problem of spatial chaos resulting from high (difficult to overcome) urban pressures. In this case, public authorities have very limited determination both to protect the public interest (and valuable space values) and to deepen participatory practices.

As indicated in the first sections of the article, Brazil and Poland have both several features in common, as well as quite a few differences and their own specificities. In the authors' opinion, the indicated features make the comparison between the two countries more interesting and important from the perspective of a more universal discussion. In particular, the spatial planning issues identified show what barriers may be involved in implementing the Right to the City concept. The implementation of spatial planning objectives looks different in different countries. This includes differing political, cultural, geographical and social conditions. However, if we are looking for common ground for universal discussion, then concepts similar to Right to the City can provide a significant basis. Of particular relevance in the case under analysis is the right of city dwellers to (differentiated) use of urban space declared within this concept. It seems crucial to identify what (from a spatial planning perspective) hinders the realisation of this objective. The common thematic levels for the Brazilian and Polish case concern:

- the systemic approach to property rights in spatial planning (including the scope of property rights and the legal basis for allowing restrictions on the rights of private property owners in relation to the realisation of the public interest);
- the effectiveness of spatial planning instruments (including barriers limiting their effectiveness);
- the quality of public participation.

Expressing an awareness of the broader complexity of the Right to the City concept, the authors, on the basis of the considerations carried out, consider that, in the context of the link with spatial planning, these are key thematic areas.

Table 1. Factors facilitating and impeding the implementation of Right to the City elements in Polish and Brazilian planning practice

Thematic area	Brazil	Poland
The role of property rights in the spatial planning system	Emphasising the social function of property. Separation the right to own property from the right to collect possessions.	Very strong position of property owners. Doctrine of freedom of construction (limited only in exceptional cases).
Effectiveness of spatial planning instruments	Limited, due to difficulties associated with the implementation of spatial policies on selected parts of cities (e.g. subject to informal settlements).	Limited, due to the overly powerful position of property owners. Difficult for local authorities to implement bolder spatial settlements.
The role and scope of public participation in spatial planning	Serious, enabling participation of a diverse range of stakeholders, including allowing a serious influence on the content of spatial documents.	Limited, often facade.

Despite some similarities between the two countries, how the Right to the City concept is implemented in urban planning looks quite different (Table 1). The barriers and supporting factors in the two case studies differ. Obviously, to a significant extent, this is derived from political traditions and specificities related to the economic level of the two countries. As the above examples show, there may be different approaches to legal solutions. Undoubtedly, in the case of Brazil, legal solutions are the result of socio-economic problems (which simultaneously constitute a certain barrier to the implementation of the Right to the City concept). In Poland, the lack of adequate legal solutions results from the widespread social attachment to private property that emerged after the fall of communism.

The paper identifies common ground for discussion of a broader, universal implementation of the Right to the City concept in urban planning. A broader context including historical and socio-economic similarities and differences between the two countries is deliberately presented. Also in the context of these differences, it is important to identify common ground for discussion. In the present case, according to the authors, there are three key aspects, identified in Table 1. The way they are addressed (not only in the Brazilian and Polish systems) can guide the discussion on the implementation of the Right to the City concept into spatial planning systems. This can be considered a starting point for the discussion on how and to what extent to implement rights to the city in a given country. Equally important is the analysis of the socio-political and legal conditions. There is no doubt that such a focused analysis should start a broader national reflection on the specific needs and challenges of implementing Right to the City.

Conclusions

The juxtaposition of constraints related to the implementation of elements of the Right to the City concept in two different countries (which nevertheless have some similar characteristics) leads to several conclusions. First and foremost, it can be pointed out that there are diverse barriers to the implementation of the indicated concept. These can be of a socio-political, legal nature as well as relating to national specificities of planning practices. The authors are, of course, aware of the diverse conditions of the countries studied, which translates into different ways of implementing the Right to the City concept. However, the above article provides evidence that there is scope for a universal debate on the facilitating and limiting factors in the implementation

of the Right to the City concept. In relation to spatial planning systems, this of course requires taking into account the specificities (and differences) of individual national spatial planning systems.

The topic addressed needs to be continued. The authors suggest the relevance of conducting similar analyses on other national spatial planning systems. Such analyses should be primarily qualitative and start from the definition of the political and social conditions and the legal framework. The indicated comparative analyses may have an important practical value: to provide some inspiration for changes in national spatial planning systems, as well as to contribute to the clarification of specific national needs related to the understanding of the Right to the City concept.

References

Apostolopoulou, E., & Kotsila, P. (2022). Community gardening in Hellinikon as a resistance struggle against neoliberal urbanism: Spatial autogestion and the Right to the City in post-crisis Athens, Greece. *Urban Geography*, *43*(2), 293–319. https://doi.org/10.1080/02723638.2020.1863621

Bacqué, M.-H., & Gauthier, M. (2017). Participation, urban planning, and urban studies: Four decades of debates and experiments since SR Arnstein's "A ladder of citizen participation". *Dialogues in Urban and Regional Planning*, *6*, 49–79. https://doi.org/10.1177/0095399720957606

Bailey, N. (2019). The Right to the City: Evaluating the changing role of community participation in urban planning in England. In M. E., Leary-Owhin & J. P., McCarthy (Eds.). *The Routledge Handbook of Henri Lefebvre. The City and Urban Society* (pp. 422–431). London: Routledge.

Baker, D., Marston, G., & McClure, L. (2013). Synergies and goal conflicts for climate change policy and spatial planning. *Proceedings REAL CORP 2013 Tagungsband*, 871–877.

Binandeh, M., Mahmoodi, J., & Sanaee, A. (2020). Urban Spatial Policies and the Right to the City: Institutional Ethnography of subalterns Urban Neighborhoods (Case study: Old neighborhoods of Aghazman, Qatarchian, Jurabad and Korabad in Sanandaj). *Sociology of Culture and Art*, *2*(3), 48–26. https://doi.org/10.34785/j016.2021.592

Bonfert, B. (2021). 'The real power must be in the base' – Decentralised collective intellectual leadership in the European Action Coalition for the Right to Housing and to the City. *Capital & Class*, *45*(4), 523–542. https://doi.org/10.1177/0309816821997117

Campos, A. C. (2020, November 12). IBGE: Informalidade atinge 41, 6% dos trabalhadores no país em 2019. Agência Brasil. Retrieved from https://agenciabrasil.ebc.com.br/economia/noticia/2020-11/ibge-informalidade-atinge-416-dos-trabalhadores-no-pais-em-2019

Canzian, F. (2021). Total de favelas dobra no Brasil em dez anos e 20 milhões estão passando fome. Folha de S. Paulo. Retrieved from https://www1.folha.uol.com.br/mercado/2021/10/total-de-favelas-dobra-no-brasil-em-dez-anos-e-20-milhoes-estao-passando-fome.shtml

Castro Seixas, E. (2021). Urban (digital) play and Right to the City: A critical perspective. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *12*, 636111. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.636111

Cesar, P. S. M., & Almeida, G. H. M. D. (2017). Reflexões sobre o planejamento urbano sustentável e o direito à cidade em Bento Rodrigues/Brasil e em Kiruna/Suécia [Reflections about sustainable urban planning and the right to the city in Bento Rodrigues/Brazil and Kiruna/Sweden]. *Revista De Direito Da Cidade*, *9*(3), 893–911. https://doi.org/10.12957/rdc.2017.27957

Churski, P. (2022). Miasto a sprawiedliwość społeczna w ujęciu terytorialnym. In M., Nowak (Ed.). *Prawo do miasta a wyzwania polityki miejskiej w Polsce* (pp. 129–177). Warsaw: Scholar.

de Frantz, M. (2022). The Politics of the EU Urban Agenda: Mobilising the 'Right to the City' for European Governance? *Urban Research & Practice*, *15*(5), 655–678. https://doi.org/10.1080/17535069.2021.1896029

Eshtiaghi, M., & Sharepour, M. (2021). In Research of a Conceptual Model of the Idea of the Right to the City in Urban Policy. *Journal of Sustainable Urban & Regional Development Studies*, *1*(2), 67–84.

Friendly, A. (2017). Urban Policy, Social Movements, and the Right to the City in Brazil. *Latin American Perspectives*, *44*(2), 132–148. https://doi.org/10.1177/0094582X16675572

Guedes, M. (2021). Mercado imobiliário prevê alta de mais de R$ 11 bilhões em vendas no Brasil neste ano. CNN Brasil. Retrieved from https://www.cnnbrasil.com.br/business/mercado-imobiliario-preve-alta-de-mais-de-11-bilhoes-em-todo-brasil/

Harvey, D. (2008) The right to the city. *New Left Review*, *53*, 23–40.

Hausner, J. (2022). Podsumowanie. Prawo do miasta – Między neutralizacją zagrożeń i pobudzaniem rozwoju. In M., Nowak (Ed.). *Prawo do miasta a wyzwania polityki miejskiej w Polsce* (pp. 240). Warsaw: Scholar.

Heidari, M. T., Mohamadi, S., & Rahmani, M. (2021). Monitoring the Theory of the Right to the City in Reproducing Age-Friendly Space of the City (Case study: Worn-Out Texture of Central District of Zanjan). *Human Geography Research*, *53*(1), 195–212. https://doi.org/10.22059/jhgr.2019.278353.1007891

Hsu, A. (2021). The Right to the City: San Francisco's Chinatown Before and after the 1906 Earthquake. Scripps Senior Theses, 1606. Retrieved from https://scholarship.claremont.edu/scripps_theses/1606/

Izdebski, H. (2022). Prawo do miasta – kontekst prawny. In M., Nowak (Ed.). *Prawo do miasta a wyzwania polityki miejskiej w Polsce* (pp. 32–53). Warsaw: Scholar.

Kaczmarek, T. (2022). Prawo do miasta – perspektywa metropolitalna. In M., Nowak (Ed.). *Prawo do miasta a wyzwania polityki miejskiej w Polsce* (pp. 105–128). Warsaw: Scholar.

Karlsson, F. (2020). P as in People; An exploration of how the Right to the City can take spatial form by the redesign of a parking garage. Master's Thesis, Chalmers School of Architecture, Göteborg. Retrieved from: https://odr.chalmers.se/items/d8342d03-90d8-4ca1-93df-15571eacaf94

Kowalewski, A., & Nowak, M. J. (2018). Chaos przestrzenny i prawo: Uwarunkowania, procesy, skutki, rekomendacje. Warsaw: Komitet Przestrzennego Zagospodarowania Kraju PAN.

Leary-Owhin, M. E., & McCarthy, J. P. (Eds.) (2020). *The Routledge Handbook of Henri Lefebvre, The City and Urban Society.* London: Routledge.

Manzi, M., Figueiredo, G. C. D. S., Mourad, L. N., & Rebouças, T. D. M. (2018). Neighbourhood planning and the Right to the City: Confronting neoliberal state urban practices in Salvador, Brazil. *International Journal of Urban Sustainable Development*, *10*(1), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1080/19463138.2018.1433677

Maricato, E. (2010). The Statute of the Peripheral City. In *The City Statute of Brazil: A commentary* (pp. 5–22). São Paulo: Cities Alliance and Ministry of Cities.

Markowski, T., & Nowak, M. (2022). Koncepcja prawa do miasta w polskim systemie planowania przestrzennego. Wymiar ekonomiczny, prawny i polityczny. In M., Nowak (Ed.). *Prawo do miasta a wyzwania polityki miejskiej w Polsce* (pp. 9–31). Warsaw: Scholar.

Matyja, R. (2022). Prawo do miasta widziane z prowincji. In M., Nowak (Ed.). *Prawo do miasta a wyzwania polityki miejskiej w Polsce* (pp. 178–201). Warsaw: Scholar.

McRobert, M. H. (2013). Practice Resurrection: Urban Planning, the Right to the City, and Transformative Social Justice. Master's Thesis, The University of New Mexico, Albuquerque.

Meshkini, A., Zarghamfard, M., & Kahaki, F. (2021). A comparative study of the Right to the City in Iran. *GeoJournal*, *87*, 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10708-021-10421-6

Nadin, V., & Stead, D. (2013). Opening up the compendium: An evaluation of international comparative planning research methodologies. *European Planning Studies*, *21*(10), 1542–1561. https://doi.org/10.1080/09654313.2012.722958

Nadin, V., Fernández Maldonado, A. M., Zonneveld, W., Stead, D., Dąbrowski, M., Piskorek, K., Sarkar, A., Schmitt, P., Smas, L., & Cotella, G. (2018). COMPASS – Comparative Analysis of Territorial Governance and Spatial Planning Systems in Europe: Applied Research 2016-2018. ESPON EGTC.

Novotný, L., Kulla, M., Nestorová Dická, J., & Pregi, L. (2023). Three decades of economic changes of rural Slovakia. *Europa XXI*, *44*. https://doi.org/10.7163/Eu21.2023.44.7

Nowak, M. (2021). The Spatial Management System in Poland: The Categorisation of the Problem from the Perspective of the Literature on the Subject. *Zarządzanie Publiczne*, *1*(55), 23–34. https://doi.org/10.15678/ZP.2021.55.1.03

Nowak, M. J., Dühr, S., Peña, S., Batsuuri, B., Fast, V., Fidélis, T., Gagakuma, D., He, Z., Khavarian-Garmsir, A. R., Legutko-Kobus, P., De Marchi Moyano, B., Sugar, M., Peres, O. M., & Blaszke, M. (2024). An international comparison of the scope and instruments of local spatial planning. *Town Planning Review*, *95*(2), 197–217. https://doi.org/10.3828/tpr.2023.40

Nowak, M. J., Hołuj, A., & Blaszke, M. (2023). Law as a factor generating weakness in the spatial planning system: The case of Poland. *disP – The Planning Review*, *59*(2), 76–87. https://doi.org/10.1080/02513625.2023.2257489

Nowak, M. J., Śleszyński, P., & Legutko-Kobus, P. (2022). *Spatial planning in Poland: Law, property market and planning practice*. Cham: Springer.

Parysek, J. J. (2018). Rozwój społeczno-gospodarczy oraz czynniki i uwarunkowania rozwoju. In P., Churski (Ed.). Teoretyczne i aplikacyjne wyzwania współczesnej geografii społeczno-ekonomicznej (pp. 37–56). Warsaw: Komitet Przestrzennego Zagospodarowania Kraju PAN.

Reimer, M., Getimis, P., & Blotevogel, H. (2014). *Spatial planning systems and practices in Europe: A comparative perspective on continuity and changes*. London: Routledge.

Rodrigues, A. M. (2022). The Right to the City and the Housing in Brazilian Cities. In R. C., Lois González & M. A., Mitidiero Junior (Eds.). *Brazilian Geography* (pp. 233–253). Singapore: Springer Nature Singapore. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-19-3704-0_15

Santos, M. (2017). *The Shared Space: The Two Circuits of the Urban Economy in Underdeveloped Countries* (1st Ed.). London: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315103105

Saporito, E. (2013). *Consensus Building Versus Irreconcilable Conflicts: Reframing Pluralistic Spatial Planning*. Cham: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-30829-6

Silva, K. (2017). A distribuição dos espaços públicos em Belo Horizonte: uma análise sob a ótica do direito à cidade e do planejamento urbano [The distribution of public spaces in Belo Horizonte: an analysis from the perspective of the right to the city and urban planning]. *Revista De Direito Da Cidade*, *9*(4), 1586–1606. https://doi.org/10.12957/rdc.2017.29263

Śleszyński, P. (2022). Prawo do miasta z perspektywy geograficznej. In M., Nowak (Ed.). *Prawo do miasta a wyzwania polityki miejskiej w Polsce* (pp. 72–88). Warsaw: Scholar.

Śleszyński, P., & Nowak, M. (2023). Directions of change in the spatial policies of Polish border municipalities during the first year of war in Ukraine, 2022. *Europa XXI*, *45*. https://doi.org/10.7163/Eu21.2023.45.5

Śleszyński, P., Kowalewski, A. T., & Markowski, T. (2018). *Synteza: Uwarunkowania, skutki i propozycje naprawy chaosu przestrzennego*. Warsaw: Komitet Przestrzennego Zagospodarowania Kraju PAN.

Śleszyński, P., Kowalewski, A., Markowski, T., Legutko-Kobus, P., & Nowak, M. (2020). The Contemporary Economic Costs of Spatial Chaos: Evidence from Poland. *Land*, *9*(7), 214. https://doi.org/10.3390/land9070214

Śleszyński, P., Nowak, M., Sudra, P., Załęczna, M., & Blaszke, M. (2021). Economic Consequences of Adopting Local Spatial Development Plans for the Spatial Management System: The Case of Poland. *Land*, *10*(2), 112. https://doi.org/10.3390/land10020112

Thorpe, A. (2017). Between rights in the city and the Right to the City: Heritage, character and public participation in urban planning. In A., Durbach & L., Lixinski (Eds.). *Heritage, Culture and Rights: Challenging Legal Discourses* (pp. 121–147). London: Bloomsbury.

Tsavdaroglou, C. (2020). The refugees' right to the center of the city and spatial justice: Gentrification vs commoning practices in Tarlabaşı-Istanbul. *Urban Planning*, *5*(3), 230–240. https://doi.org/10.17645/up.v5i3.3098

Tsavdaroglou, C., & Kaika, M. (2022). The refugees' right to the centre of the city: City branding versus city commoning in Athens. *Urban Studies*, *59*(6), 1130–1147. https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098021997009

UN-Habitat (2017). The Right to the City and Cities for All. UN-Habitat. Retrieved from https://habitat3.org/wp-content/uploads/Habitat%20III%20Policy%20Paper%201.pdf

Venturini, F. (2019). Reconceptualising the Right to the City and spatial justice through social ecology. In F., Venturini, E., Değirmenci & I., Morales-Bernardos (Eds.). *Social Ecology and the Right to the City: Towards Ecological and Democratic Cities* (pp. 86-100). Montreal: Black Rose Books.

Wirawan, B., Utama, S., Suratno, I. R., Tambunan, J. R., Muthadir, A., Mulyana, W., Setiono, I., Wicaksono, A., & Afiff, S. A. (2019). *Spatial Planning, Land Tenure, and Increasing Conflicts Over Land Claims in Sumatera and Kalimantan: Economic Development, Policy Dynamics, and the Pace of Investment*. Jakarta: Conflict Resolution Unit.

Woods, M. (2023). Rural-Urban Inequalities and Spatial Justice in Europe. *Europa XXI*, *44*. https://doi.org/10.7163/Eu21.2023.44.8

Zachariasz, A. (2014). Parks, green areas and landscape in view of new concepts related to the shaping of structure and form of a city. *Czasopismo Techniczne. Architektura*, *111*(2-A), 327–359.

Zimmermann, K., & Feiertag, P. (2024). Regional Planning in France and Germany: Towards convergence? *Europa XXI*, *46*. https://doi.org/10.7163/Eu21.2024.46.1