

- themed public space – aims to create ambience and stimulate activity in order to attract more people to public spaces and thereby encourage their self-policing.
- 6 In terms of their adaptability in use – Franck and Stevens (2007: 23) argue ‘The looseness and tightness of space are related conditions, emerging from a nexus of the physical and the social features of a space’. Thus loose space is adaptable, unrestricted and used for a variety of functions, ad-hoc as well as planned. Tight space, by contrast is fixed, physically constrained or controlled in terms of the types of activities that can occur there. For them, although these qualities are adjustable and relative, existing along a continuum from tight to loose, the new types of space that have emerged are often more restrictive in nature than they have been in the past and actively discourage the kinds of unplanned activities that lead to looseness.
- 7 Through their exclusionary strategies – Flusty (1997: 48–49) distinguishes between five types of space, each designed to exclude to different degrees:
- ‘stealthy space’, which is camouflaged or obscured by level changes or intervening objects, and which therefore cannot be changed;
 - ‘slippery space’, which is difficult to reach because of contorted, protracted means of access or missing paths;
 - ‘crusty space’ to which access is denied due to obstructions such as walls, gates and checkpoints;
 - ‘prickly space’ which is difficult and uncomfortable to occupy, for example seats designed to be uncomfortable and discourage lingering, or ledges that are sloped and can not be sat upon;
 - ‘jittery space’ that is actively monitored and which cannot be used without being observed.
- 8 Reflecting degrees of inclusion – Malone (2002: 158) adapts Sibley’s (1995) notion of open and closed spaces to define spaces according to their acceptance of difference and diversity. Thus open spaces have weakly defined boundaries and are characterised by social mixing and diversity (e.g. carnivals, festivals, public parks), whilst closed spaces have strongly defined boundaries and actively exclude objects, people and activities that do not conform (e.g. churches, some shopping malls, schools). The latter are also strongly preoccupied with boundary maintenance and definition.
- 9 By their clientele – Burgers (1999) classifies space as a series of landscapes that form the domains of various social sectors or interest groups:
- erected public space – landscapes of fast-rising economic and government potential;
 - displayed space – landscapes of temptation and seduction;
 - exalted space – landscapes of excitement and ecstasy;
 - exposed space – landscapes of reflection and idolisation;
 - coloured space – landscapes of immigrants and minorities;
 - marginalised space – landscapes of deviance and deprivation.
- 10 In terms of how users engage with space – Dines and Cattell (2006: 26–31) use social engagement with space and perception of it as a means to identify five categories, although these are not necessarily mutually exclusive:
- everyday places – the range of non-descript neighbourhood spaces that make up much of the public realm and the everyday venues for interaction;
 - places of meaning – that differ from person to person and that relate to particular associations and meanings attached to particular spaces, both positive and negative;
 - social environments – that through their design and uses actively encourage social encounters between users, both fleeting and more meaningful;
 - places of retreat – that offer a chance for people to be alone with their thoughts or to socialise in small groups of friends;
 - negative spaces – where some experience aspects of antisocial behaviour, including racism and disruptive activities that are often perceived as threatening.
- 11 Through their physical / morphological character – from Sitte’s (1889) deep and broad squares, to Zucker’s (1959) closed, dominated, nuclear, grouped and amorphous squares, to the Krier brothers attempts at more sophisticated typological classifications for urban space (see Papadakis and Watson 1990).
- 12 And, by function – for example Gehl and Gemzøe (2000: 87) classify 39 ‘new’ city spaces into five types: main city square, recreational square, promenade, traffic square, monumental square, whilst Carr *et al.* (1992: 79) identify eleven types of space:
- 1 public parks
 - 2 square and plazas
 - 3 memorials
 - 4 markets
 - 5 streets
 - 6 playgrounds
 - 7 community open spaces
 - 8 greenways and parkways
 - 9 atrium/indoor marketplaces
 - 10 found spaces/everyday spaces
 - 11 waterfronts.