

- the ongoing assistance of international partners throughout the research project in interpreting the results and undertaking the comparative analysis
- the different perspectives brought to the research by the international partners.

A key task was the identification of cities that could provide examples of good practice in the management of urban open space, and the identification of expert partners who were knowledgeable about urban open space management in the selected cities. An expert steering group was put together to guide the research, and from this, city and international expert nominations were gathered. From these initial nominations, a rolling and expanding network of international experts was soon created as initial contacts suggested other cities and other experts. Using this rolling and expanding network, eleven cities were eventually chosen for the research as those that most consistently came up in discussions amongst the network. They were:

- 1 Århus , Denmark
- 2 Curitiba, Brazil
- 3 Groningen, Netherlands
- 4 Hannover, Germany
- 5 Malmö, Sweden
- 6 Melbourne, Australia
- 7 Minneapolis, USA
- 8 Paris, France
- 9 Tokyo, Japan
- 10 Wellington, New Zealand
- 11 Zürich, Switzerland.

Suitable experts were eventually identified and commissioned for each city.¹ The remaining sections in this chapter examine how the eleven cities deal with the first two themes of the analytical framework regarding the context for open space management in the cities. They look at how open spaces are understood and how policy aspirations are formulated. Chapter 8 then goes on to look at the remaining four, focusing on questions of management practice. Both chapters conclude with an overview of the general lessons that come from the eleven cities. Interspersed with the text are insets that focus on the individual cases and on aspects of open space management practice in the cities.

Understanding the types of public open space and their needs

The process of public open space management should logically begin by understanding the nature of that space (i.e. what spaces exist, of what types, what conditions they are in, what pressures and opportunities they are subject to, and how open space is currently used and managed). Different types of public open space will inevitably be subject to different pressures, and to different aspirations and management regimes. Therefore it is important to know what types of public open space exist in what places and to be able to categorise them.

Open space typologies

The types of public open space for which city managers are responsible varies considerably from large expanses of open land, to the smallest green squares. Many of the cities were actively involved in managing large areas of natural or semi-natural landscape that have been incorporated into the city because of topographical constraints, by historical accident, or sometimes by design. These are now highly prized and valued parts of the cityscape.

Nearly all the cities use public space typologies as part of their approach to public open space management, most often classifying spaces by size and function, but variously also by:

- location according to their position in the city (i.e. Wellington's city open spaces, suburban open spaces, inner green belt, the bays, outer green belt);
- environmental criteria and natural value/protection;
- potential uses as well as existing uses;
- ownership;
- relative protection from development;
- heritage value;
- management responsibility;
- professional responsibility (i.e. gardeners or foresters);
- required maintenance approaches and tasks;
- special equipment requirements.

In Malmö and Tokyo, the classifications also have a long-term planning function, as a tool to try and ensure an even distribution of open spaces by function across the two cities.

The exceptions were Paris and Minneapolis. In the former, there is no official typology of urban open space for management purposes, and