REGULATION

The regulation dimension in this model also relies on the law-making and policing roles of the state to deal with conflicts of uses in public space and patterns of usage, often in support of a less formal policing role played by the community itself. Contract enforcement mechanisms are also relevant to regulate devolved service provision, but less so than in the market-centred model.

Voluntary organisations are not necessarily in competition with one another for the same service, especially the more localised community groups, and the effectiveness of contractual sanctions is less clear. A more established voluntary-sector organisation delivering public space management services in a variety of locations, with assets to back their liabilities will react differently to contractual sanctions compared to a small, local friends group, which might simply dissolve under pressure. In the same vein, performance measurement systems setting clear targets for public space management are important to secure standards in a devolved approach, but are less useful as an enforcement tool for the same reasons. Moreover, they need to be linked to capacity building measures and thus to resourcing policies to secure that targets can really be met.

MAINTENANCE

As regards maintenance, the appropriate definition of routines, techniques and procedures is still the core of this management dimension. As with the market-centred model, there is a separation between the definition of standards and routines and their deployment; the first, the responsibility of the local authority, the second of the organisation undertaking the management task. This is especially so where contractual relationships are employed, and in these cases contract specifications are an important part of management; as they were in the previous model.

However, the gap between the definition and deployment of maintenance routines is not so clear when standards of public space and maintenance are agreed through partnership work and deployed by community partners. The key issues here are about setting standards of public space maintenance that are compatible with the capacity of the partnership or the community organisation to deliver. This may very well involve the provision of technical and institutional support to those organisations by the public sector so that the desired standards can be achieved.

Locally defined standards and maintenance routines are more likely to reflect local aspirations, be more responsive to local context, and benefit from a sense of ownership by local communities. However, they are likely to lead to differences in standards or maintenance across areas within the same local authority, as inevitably communities will have different aspirations as regards public space quality, and varying capacities to deliver them. In this model, therefore, the acceptability or otherwise of local difference, and the understanding by all parties of its implications are key issues in the maintenance of public space.

INVESTMENT

As with the previous model, resourcing is not primarily about securing a slice of the public sector budget for public space management but is instead about drawing resources from outside the public sector. In this case, this may not involve finding alternative sources of money or technical expertise, although that can be important, but instead involves drawing local knowledge into public space management by harnessing the active commitment that can be provided by public space users. Again this implies identifying who are the social actors with a stake in the fortunes of a public space, what resources they can add to its management, how these resources can be combined with those already available, and how those actors can be engaged in public space management.

However, even when contractual relationships are in place setting up rights and responsibilities, the nature of community involvement is such that those resources of knowledge, mobilisation and commitment can only be released if the right structures are established to make this possible. Therefore, in this model public space management resourcing is also concerned with building community capacity to act collectively, developing skills to form and manage partnerships, and about creating and fostering relations of trust; all of which create and sustain the basic conditions for those resources to be released. Indeed, experiences reported in this book suggest that releasing the kinds of resources communities can offer to the management of public space requires in turn a sustained effort to maintain commitment and a sense of purpose.

Conclusions

In this chapter three models of managing public space have been put forward which have emerged as a response to perceived problems of the more traditional approach. From the discussion it should be clear that although there are clearly identifiable rationales underpinning each model, in practice they do not constitute entirely separate approaches to public space management. The next chapters will show how public space management strategies use elements of these different models to tackle