

makers and users in designing maintenance routines, while at the same time maintaining the separation between service delivery and use. Chapters 6 and 8 illustrate some of the ways in which public space users have been involved in the definition of, for example, cleansing or tree pruning routines, on the basis of the general aspirations they have about their public space. This is incorporated into the technical deployment of those routines; into more general policy instruments regulating public space quality; and, importantly, into budgetary considerations.

INVESTMENT

Finally, in this state-centred model, the fourth dimension of public space management, investment, is primarily about capturing an appropriate slice of public-sector budgets for public space services. This can in turn pay for the skills and equipment necessary for the delivery of the desired levels of public space quality. As resources come exclusively from within public sector service budgets, increases in the quantity or quality of public space services are linked to one of two processes.

On the one hand, increases are possible if budgetary allocations to public space services grow, because either the total budget grows, or those services manage to capture a larger slice of the total public-sector budget. The latter is a product of policy shifts in a context in which public space quality is valued more highly in relation to other public service goods, and can be instigated by pressure from public space lobbying groups, shifts in public appreciation of public space, shifts in central government policy, and so forth. On the other hand, those increases can be the result of rationalisation, for example through better use of existing human, technical and financial resources, introduction of new technologies in maintenance routines, reduction of duplication in activities through organisational restructuring, and so forth.

In recent times, given the growing importance of public space quality for securing a range of urban policy objectives, both of these processes have been at play. For example, increased budgets for park maintenance were documented in England as park quality became a key indicator of local service delivery within the new 'liveability' agenda (MORI 2002). At the same time, the re-organisation of local authority structures, with the merging of previously separate public space services, has created the potential for increased coordination and, by pooling budgets and reducing duplication, for more resources for service delivery (ODPM 2004, ODPM 2006). Therefore, within this model the issue of resourcing centres around the role of public space management vis-à-vis other public services and how budgets are shared among them, and on how service delivery can be rationalised so that existing resources can be used more productively.

Devolved models

The other two emerging models share the common characteristic that they imply the transfer of responsibilities for provision and management of public space away from the state and towards other social agents. More than a rearrangement of responsibilities, they suggest a redefinition of what public space is or should be, and how its public character should be kept. This is part of what are referred to in the literature as process of privatisation of public space (see Chapter 3). In practice it comprises widely differing practices that go from the provision and management of public space by corporate organisations as part of the process of securing control upon externalities that might affect the performance of their business, to the take over of public spaces by community organisations or interest groups, whose own interests become equated with the 'public interest'.

This retreat of the state from its responsibilities over public space should not be confused with, or restricted to, the transfer of ownership of public spaces, although it is certainly linked to it. The real issue for public space management is how 'devolved' public spaces are managed and maintained, which also has a bearing on how 'publicness' is defined. Thus spaces owned and maintained by the embodied representation of the public interest (i.e. the elected state machinery) are intuitively 'public' and belong to all citizens, whereas spaces owned by private agents and managed by them will have their public status secured through contracts, legal instruments and regulated practices and might feel (and actually be) less 'public', even exclusionary. These devolved models imply a definition of property rights over public space management, separate from the issue of ownership of such space.

Therefore, what characterises these models is not necessarily the transfer of ownership of public spaces such as those produced through private property development in the UK or the US (see Kayden 2000). It is rather the transfer of management responsibilities (i.e. those of coordination, regulation, maintenance and investment) to others away from the public sector; to a variety of collaborative arrangements with other social agents with a shared interest in their outcomes. These arrangements will vary from contracts, to partnerships, to looser networks. As such, the models embrace the process of collaboration between the state, private agents and communities in the delivery of public services, or co-production of services (Sullivan and Skelcher 2002).

The market-centred model

The first and more common model of the devolved type is the transfer of management responsibilities over public spaces, whether publicly or privately owned, to private entities. This involves the transfer of rights and