| | State-centred
Public service ethos, accountability, separation provision-use, separation public-private | Market-centred
Delegation, value for money and profitability, contract relationship, overlap provision-use, separation client-contractor, overlap public and private, | Community-centred
Delegation, civic spirit, co-production of services, overlap provision-use, overlap public-community, overlap client-contractor |
|---|---|---|---|
| Coordination | • Hierarchies
• Organisational restructuring
• Consultation and user feedback | • Contract specification
• Partnership design | • 'Compact', agreement and partnership design
• Contract specification
• Stakeholder engagement |
| Regulation | • Legislation and enforcement
• Performance management | • Contract enforcement
• Partnership performance management | • Contract enforcement
• Partnership design
• Institutional support
• Capacity building |
| Maintenance | • Separation delivery-use
• Technical expertise
• Standards setting
• Consultation and user feedback | • Overlap delivery-use
• Separation client -contractor
• Contract drafting
• Outcome specification | • Contract drafting
• Standards setting
• Institutional support
• Local x general standards |
| Investment | • Budget allocation
• Rationalisation and efficiency gains | • Alternative sources
• Value for money and competition
• Stakeholder identification and involvement
• Vested interests | • Alternative sources
• Stakeholder identification and involvement
• Commitment
• Local knowledge
• Capacity building |

4.2 The three models of public space management

on the nature of the management challenges at hand. However, each of these approaches has its own dynamic and its own implications, and it is important to look at each in more detail (Figure 4.2).

The state-centred model

The first model centres on the state-centred provision of public space management, which was the dominant form of public space services in most countries for most of the twentieth century. It relies on public-sector institutions to plan and deliver the array of services that make up public space management, with minimum use of external input from either private contractors or the voluntary sector. Its key characteristics are:

• hierarchical structures of planning and delivery;
• clear vertical lines of accountability both upwards to policy makers – the politicians who set up public space policy whether explicit or implicit – and downwards to service users;
• clear separation between service and use;
• a public-service ethos based on the impartiality of officers and a commitment to the public interest.

In some cases this model can be regarded as inertial, a mere continuation of public space management practices and cultures developed over decades. This carries on despite the challenges posed by contemporary demands on public space and its quality and despite the sort of problems widely associated with this model, including: service specialisation caused by strong departmental cultures and professionalisation; clear separation of policy conception and service delivery leading to a fragmentation of

the different components of public space management; rigidity in dealing with varying contexts, including the ability to deliver fine-tuned variation of basic services; a disjuncture between, people's perception of issues and those of specialised service deliverers; issues of costs and cut-backs; and a lack of responsiveness to changing needs and demands (Audit Commission 2002a, ODPM 2004). It was precisely the growing realisation of those negative consequences of the traditional model of public space management that raised the need to re-think management systems.

However, this model can encompass attempts to tackle those negative aspects of traditional practice in ways that still retain the positive elements of state-controlled public service delivery with its public-service ethos and democratically accountable system. Indeed, the main strength of this model is that it is based on visible and widely acceptable lines of accountability, as service planning and delivery are directly subject to established mechanisms of elected local democracy. Moreover, it maintains clear lines of demarcation between the public and private spheres and therefore sets a clear, easily understood framework of responsibilities, of property rights, ownership, and of public rights and duties. Also, as discussed in Chapters 7 and 8, in many other countries the pressures to reform public services management and delivery have not been as intense as in the UK, local services funding has not been so eroded and the costs of this traditional model have not as yet offset its benefits to the point of demanding radical change.