example, every local community has all the powers they require to manage or change public open space, but no statutory duty to do so. The city of Malmö is only required by law to ensure that parks do not pose a health and safety risk to the public. The fact that these cities still maintain their public open spaces to a high standard is testimony to the political priority given to public open space in each city.

At the level of localised, day-to-day management of open spaces, a range of powers exist in the eleven cities in addition to the broader powers described above. The responsibilities for enacting these powers vary between cities, as do the range of problems and their solutions.

The prime responsibility for detailed regulation of public open spaces in all the cities falls on the municipal authorities. Typically local byelaws form the basis for regulations dealing with such matters as litter and control on dogs, often as a complement to national legislation. Thus in Wellington, operational regulation of activities within open spaces is governed by reserve management plans prepared under national legislation to regulate public uses in each reserve, whilst the Wellington Consolidated Byelaw contains standard rules and provisions for all the city's open spaces.

ENFORCEMENT

Enforcement of local byelaws is also often a municipal responsibility. In Hannover, for example, the city's Environment and Green Spaces Department (FUS) is responsible for enforcing open spaces regulations. These are initiated variously by the city council and district councils, or are the result of higher level legislation. In Curitiba, the regulatory basis for the management of public spaces is almost exclusively municipal, and the responsibility for enforcing it falls with the Municipal Secretariat of the Environment (SMMA) and the municipal guard.

In Zürich, the city has clearly defined park and open spaces regulations for its territory and conducts a communication campaign to explain to park users what is and is not allowed, helped by a permanent, visible presence of maintenance staff in all key public open spaces. However, enforcement of regulations is the responsibility of the police. Indeed, the police have an important role to play in most of the eleven cities, and generally the relationship between city authority and police is viewed as an important partnership, with clearly prescribed roles for each party.

Common across the eleven cities was the use of parks keepers or managers in an enforcement role. The Department of Parks and Gardens in Paris is responsible for enforcing open space regulations throughout the city. Every park has at least one park keeper whose daily reports form the basis for the department's actions to tackle vandalism, safety issues, or, in the worst cases, to make structural changes in park layout (Box 8.3).

In Hannover, park managers within FUS are also responsible for ensuring that regulations are complied with. However, their role is more to observe and advise than to punish, and they operate closely with the police, social services and the youth services (particularly relevant in the case of anti-social behaviour).

In Wellington, a safe city programme for the city centre has included uniformed officers providing a visible and approachable patrolling presence in all public spaces. These services are contracted out to a local security firm. Volunteer rangers also assist fully paid rangers with patrolling and inspecting open spaces in the larger 'natural' areas, whilst in the most visible open spaces in Paris, park keepers are helped by municipal security. Although in many respects akin to the police, municipal security officers do not bear arms and are limited to patrolling the city's open spaces.

In Melbourne, Parks Victoria is responsible for administration and enforcement of a wide range of legislation. There, only authorised officers who are properly trained, including on how to use their discretion on whether to inform, educate, issue a warning, a penalty notice or pursue prosecution can conduct enforcement activities. Education and interpretation programmes are also used as an initial approach to achieve compliance with the regulations.

Only Minneapolis had the advantage of a dedicated force to police the city's parks. Parks regulations are enforced by the resident park keepers and by the city's Park Police Department whose role is to protect park users and park property. Park police officers are professionally trained police officers of the State of Minnesota and are responsible for visitor and resource protection, emergency services, maintenance of good order in parks, law enforcement, and information and public service.

RECURRING PROBLEMS

Three issues seemed to create the greatest range of enforcement problems across the eleven cities: anti-social behaviour, vandalism and dog-related problems. Significantly, however, they were never described as major problems, and instead were usually kept under control by efficient enforcement mechanisms and/or programmes of repair. Such problems are nevertheless most apparent in central areas because of the intensity of their use, corresponding with the fact that these areas are also the highest maintenance priority.

Anti-social behaviour is considered a problem particularly in Paris, Malmö and Zürich. In Zürich, however, negotiation rather than outright enforcement has been adopted by the city's Social Services as a means to resolve conflicts between different social groups and their use of parks. The approach has led to the 'Sip züri' initiative, a programme to encourage the coexistence of different groups in public space that relies on regular