specific challenges and contexts, sometimes harmoniously, sometimes with contradictions. How they combine these models is determined by the nature of public space issues, political contexts, local social and economic factors, and so forth.

There is no moral or practical superiority of one model over the others. In both theory and practice approaches centred on state action, or on private sector effort, or in direct community participation, can all provide solutions to particular public space challenges in the particular contexts in which they are applied. These models have their own intrinsic advantages, from the clear accountability or the public interest ethos of the state-centred model; to the ability to draw resources from a much wider constituency and more sensitivity and responsiveness to changes in demand in the market-centred model; to the sensitivity to user needs and the commitment of the community-centred approach.

They also have their own potential disadvantages too, from the potential bureaucracy and insensitivity of the state-centred model, to the very real risk of exclusion and commodification of the market-led approach, to the fragmentation, lack of strategic perspective and inequality of a community-centred model. These issues and how they have played out in practice will be returned to in the chapters that follow in Part Two of the book.