The birth of public space privatization: How entrepreneurialism, convivial urbanism and stakeholder interactions made the Martim Moniz square, in Lisbon, 'privatization-ready'

Pedro S Gomes

▶ To cite this version:

The birth of public space privatization: how entrepreneurialism, convivial urbanism and stakeholder interactions made the Martim Moniz square, in Lisbon, 'privatization-ready'

Pedro Gomes, pedro.gomes@gmail.com

Introducing the *Mercado de Fusão*

In June 2012, Lisbon's deputy mayor for public space was 'very happy'(Lusa, 2012) with the upcoming inauguration of arguably the city's first privately managed public space, the *Mercado de Fusão* (Fusion Market in Portuguese) on Martim Moniz square. The deputy mayor hoped the *Mercado* would finally reveal how 'great' a place Martim Moniz was.

When it opened, the *Mercado* included ten kiosks serving food and beverages, each with its own terrasse; an urban market every weekend selling 'urban handicraft' and goods from nearby stores; and a program of cultural events including music, film screenings and festivals. Most of its activities resonate with the initiative's multicultural concept (hence 'fusion' in the *Mercado*'s name): world food, world/urban music, etc. Through the *Mercado*, two thirds of the publicly owned square of 13,000 m² are under the management of NCS for a period of 16 years, a private company of the entertainment and audiovisual sector. NCS's responsibilities include cleaning and security, besides

the operation of the kiosks, terrasses and the weekend market and around 5,000 € of monthly rent[1]. The inauguration of the square was announced in the local and real estate sections of national daily and weekly newspapers, without reference to any form of opposition. Some activist blogs criticized the initiative in the broader context of Mouraria's rehabilitation, but no public debate emerged from it. The Mercado's implementation did not meet any visible resistance.

Far from uncommon in many cities throughout the globe, this is the first management scheme of its kind in Lisbon. Yet, the *Mercado de Fusão* appears at a time when the municipality of Lisbon is massively investing (public) money in the redevelopment of public spaces, without any major changes in governance or in their everyday management. The private management of *Mercado de Fusão* does not emerge, then, from a broader context of widespread privatization of Lisbon's public spaces or of a general retreat of public authorities from public space provision. Why, then, did the *Mercado de Fusão* come to be? Parochial as it may seem, this question explores an overlooked angle in the abundant literature on the privatization of public spaces: the contingencies of making a space 'privatization ready', to paraphrase Ward's (2006) research on BIDs – the political, organizational and discursive work that goes into such a process.

Through the case study of the *Mercado*, this article argues that privatization of public space might not be the sign of a general movement towards private governance. It is rather a component of complex and diverse public space governance arrangements in a city (de Magalhães and Freire Trigo, 2017), reflecting local contexts and policies (van Melik and Lawton, 2011). The next section goes through the literature on the privatization of public spaces and argues for a process-based approach. The main sections of the article show how the Martim Moniz square became ready to be transformed into the *Mercado de Fusão*. I will first describe Lisbon's city hall's take on an entrepreneurial turn and the role public spaces play in such a political strategy. Afterwards, I will present how such a policy translates into a set of recurring public space design and management techniques – a Lisboan version of 'convivial urbanism'. Then, I present the discursive work which legitimized the privatization of the square. A final section discusses the substantive implications of the *Mercado*, considering more recent developments in Lisboan public space governance.

The privatization of public space

The debate on public space which emerged in the 1990s is structured around 'narratives of loss' (Banerjee, 2001) claiming the 'end of public space" (Bodnar, 2015). These narratives highlight trends of increased control and exclusion of undesirables in public space, concomitant to the growing role of new types of places for public life. Design and management codes from these spaces are

subsequently reproduced in a growing commodification of urban open public spaces.

These critical approaches to public spaces can be grouped under two overlapping debates (Dessouroux, 2006), emphasizing how the growing importance of public spaces as sites of leisure and consumption and a greater implication of private actors in their governance are interrelated and mutually reinforcing. The first one thus focuses on the decadence of public life, structured around consumption and leisure practices, and the aesthetization and festivalization of public spaces seeking to capitalize on this 'privatization of uses' (Fleury, 2010).

In a broader trend of a 'fall of the public man' and a retreat to communal and domestic forms of sociability (Sennet, 2002) and of impoverished social relations in a spectacular society (Debord, 1996), public life and public spaces are seen as having lost their authenticity (Koch and Latham, 2013). Consumption and leisure practices dominate, while international design and marketing standards homogenize emerging designscapes (Julier, 2005). Consequently, public spaces are said to be unable fulfill their roles as arenas for sociability and construction of a public sphere. Such disenchantment is reinforced by the emergence of alternative places of public life, most notably the mall. In such spaces, forms of public interaction might be identical to publicly owned open

spaces (Bordreuil, 2007), but restrictions to access, practices and freedom of speech have been amply documented (Kohn, 2004; Mitchell, 2003).

The second debate revolves around the growing implication of private actors in public space governance, through private management or ownership - public space privatization is used in this narrow sense throughout the article. The debate focuses on its consequences in terms of people's right to the city and democratic control and accountability. These works scrutinize the economic and security arguments behind tighter controls of access and conduct in public spaces, as private management schemes tend to emphasize their role in the economic performance of local stakeholders. This implies the creation of sanitized and controlled environments, where middle-class consumers and tourists feel at ease and safe. Economic arguments thus coalesce with security ones. Fear of crime and generalized suspicion towards undesirables (Bauman, 2006) lead to hard and soft mechanisms of control and exclusion of certain publics (Carmona *et al.* 2008). Privatization is thus associated to the decreasing publicness of public spaces (Zamanifard *et al.*, 2018), and to the fulfilment of their social and political roles (Koch and Latham, 2012; Kohn, 2004). Neoliberalism and revanchism, respectively, are structural trends often mobilized to explain privatization phenomena. The retreat towards gated and exclusive housing is the corollary of this avoidance of the Other, fueled by security concerns (Caldeira, 1996).

Yet, some authors have put forward more nuanced portrayals of the effects of privatization. In his research on New York's privately-owned public spaces (POPS), Schmidt *et al.* (2011) show how new designs increased the social life of spaces, while at the same time posing barriers to certain practices and user categories. POPS would then be simultaneously more *and* less public than pre-existing spaces.

Moreover, the underlying bias in prevailing views on public space have also been exposed. The first one is of a spatial nature and questions the applicability of theories of Anglo-American origin to other geographic contexts (e.g. Baptista, 2012; Drummond, 2000; Gibert, 2014). In addition to this, the 'flagship bias' (Langstraat and van Melik, 2013) has equally been criticized. Analyses of privatization have focused on paradigmatic spaces, examples of the trends its authors seek to denounce (Carmona et al., 2008; Paddison and Sharp, 2007). Consequently, the theories they originate are seen as hardly applicable to ordinary public spaces, less central in entrepreneurial urban strategies.

Furthermore, authors have questioned the 'end of public space', by showing the overwhelmingly public production of public spaces in continental Europe (Carmona, 2015; Fleury, 2007; Langstraat and van Melik, 2013; van Melik and Lawton, 2011); that public spaces remain largely the property of the state (Fleury, 2010; Langstraat and van Melik, 2013); and the plurality of governance arrangements implicating a diverse set of non-state actors,

including not-for-profits (De Magalhães and Freire Trigo, 2017). Nevertheless, the debate is far from closed. Recently, Don Mitchell (2017) has answered critiques of the hyperbole in 'the end of public space', by claiming its dialectical and procedural nature and recalling how central the production of (abstract) public space is in the capitalist project.

Authors have also signaled an insufficient analysis of the role of local public action in mediating the causal links between structural trends and the micro-geographies of actual public spaces (Dessouroux, 2006; Johnsen and Fitzpatrick, 2010; Madanipour et al., 2014). This echoes feelings of saturation of critical approaches to public space (Hubbard, 2008; Koch and Latham, 2012), including its inability to empathize with the problems city authorities face when producing public spaces and, consequently, to participate in the construction of solutions and to identify *what works* along what doesn't.

This paper pursues some of the less explored avenues suggested by these 'critiques of the critical'. Going beyond 'quantitative' demonstrations of the publicness of European public spaces or of nuances of its impacts on spatial practices, it contributes to a growing body of literature exploring the manifold meanings, practices and effects of public space governance (De Magalhães and Carmona, 2006; De Magalhães and Freire Trigo, 2017; Zamanifard et al., 2018). It does so through a restitution of the local scale of public space production in Lisbon, namely the conditions and arguments that made the privatization of

Martim Moniz an appropriate solution for the actors involved. This process-based approach to the subject sheds light on some of the causal links between the entrepreneurialization of Lisbon's urban policies and the micro-geography of Martim Moniz.

Empirically thorough approaches to processes and actors of public space production are neither new nor incompatible with normative and critical standpoints (e.g. Levine, 2002; Mitchell, 2003). There are numerous studies on the spatial and political logics of public space policies and their implementation, including an identification of the different normative views at play (Betin, 2001; Dessouroux, 2006; Fleury, 2007; Jacob and Hellström, 2010); on the impacts of participatory techniques (Söderström et al., 2001; Vareilles, 2006); on the gradual definition of public space projects and regulation practices, including investigations of the locus of decision (Calderon and Chelleri, 2013; Ehrenfeucht and Loukaitou-Sideris, 2007; Smithsimon, 2008); on the circulation of policies and design and management models (Didier et al., 2013; Söderström and Geertman, 2013; Ward, 2006)… These works have demonstrated how actual production processes are defined by contingent, and therefore unique, interactions between autonomous actors and a set of political, technical and organizational constraints operating at different scales. Yet, with the exception of BIDs and events (Smith, 2013, 2018), there is little detailed work on the *emergence* (rather than the operation and/or the effects) of new governance arrangements in specific spaces. This is the purpose of this paper.

This article is based on qualitative fieldwork carried out between 2012 and 2015, including 36 semi-structured interviews with local actors, an analysis of planning and policy documents and of local press[2]. Interviews lasted between 30 minutes and 3 hours, and some interviewees were met more than once. Interviewees include a diverse set of actors of public space production in Lisbon: municipal technicians (directors, mid-level public servants and designers), members of deputy mayors' cabinets, civil society representatives and different private actors (kiosk leaseholders, service providers, consultants, design studios). Despite repeated attempts by the author, no elected officials were interviewed. Interviews were, for the most part, recorded and transcribed, and a thematic analysis was made. The research was done independently from all involved stakeholders: the research was funded through national agencies and no collaborative research methods were used.

Entrepreneurial Lisbon and its public space policy

The municipal government elected in 2007 adopted a new policy addressing the city's continuing loss of residents and jobs, derelict and vacant housing stock, growing social polarization and public debt. The city's ability to attract residents, visitors and investors alike became a major objective for a severely cash-strapped municipality.

This is the typical conundrum which led many cities to adopt different forms of entrepreneurial governance and policies (Harvey, 1989). Accordingly,

the policies Lisbon's municipality adopted have been labeled as local forms of neoliberalism (Tulumello, 2015). The municipality replaced direct intervention in urban rehabilitation with mechanisms and incentives to encourage private investors and began to sell an important part of its real estate scattered throughout the city[3] (Câmara Municipal de Lisboa, 2011). Among these incentive mechanisms, the refurbishment of public spaces is expected to attract private investment to the rehabilitation of the housing stock.

Moreover, the City Council designated neighborhoods of priority intervention (acronym BIP/ZIP), eligible for a program funding small interventions ran by local partnerships. Emphasizing entrepreneurship, community making, partnerships, self-organization and capacity building (Tulumello, 2015), BIP/ZIP further demonstrates the municipality's new-found enabling role. Public spaces should play a role in facilitating people's access to the city, both physically and socially, as 'meeting and citizenship spaces' (municipal technician, interview, 08/07/2014).

Additionally, public space is a key component of the city's efforts for increased attractiveness. The ambition of creating 'vibrant' public spaces to attract residents and visitors (Tulumello, 2015) goes hand in hand with a perception of under-used and poorly maintained public spaces among municipal actors (Gomes, 2016). As a result, the municipality has heavily invested in the refurbishment of existing public spaces, in the creation of new

ones and has adopted new management practices capable of providing such convivial spaces – a convivial urbanism of sorts.

Pavement cafés, events and emergent new actors: Lisbon's take on convivial urbanism

By convivial urbanism, I designate an ensemble of design and management practices explicitly promoting conviviality, i.e. the interaction among individuals and between individuals and the built environment (Banerjee, 2001; Shaftoe, 2008). While often effective in increasing use of public spaces, these practices are not neutral. They target specific publics and can result in increased control and exclusion of activities and user groups, deemed undesirable in these new settings (Schmidt et al., 2011), in what Zukin (2010) has dubbed 'domestication by cappuccino'.

Lisbon's different municipal services name their target audiences in varied ways but coalesce around the new urban middle classes and visitors: tourists and 'new urbanites' for the deputy mayor to urban planning, 'working-age residents' for green space designers, 'residents' and 'Lisboans' for social development and intercultural policy actors. Common to all these discourses is the idea that one *chooses* to go and stay at a public space (Bodnar, 2015; Fleury, 2007). Consequently, the design and management solutions which ensue all seek to *supply* a real or potential *demand* with 'things to see and do' (Gomes, 2012). In Lisbon, this has led to consensual, mainstream, go-to solutions catering to a specific set of practices and life-styles.

11

A first recurring solution is the installation of kiosks serving food and beverages, especially in the rehabilitation of the city's urban green network. The new designs systematically include kiosks (and a terrasse) managed by private entrepreneurs or non-profit organizations. When public spaces are big enough, kiosks are put nearby playgrounds, lawns and fitness equipment, so that synergies between different activities and user categories occur. Similarly, pavement cafés are systematically encouraged and mentioned as critical factors for attracting new users to new public spaces and creating a lively urban atmosphere.

A second recurring technique is the organization of public space events. Long-standing ones have been expanded, both in their duration and geographical scope. Moreover, the deputy mayor to public space's cabinet encourages events in redeveloped green areas, to increase their visibility and attract new users. New events, led by private entrepreneurs, have appeared, occupying many of the city's parks in the spring and summer. Additionally, kiosk lease-holders are accompanied in the organization of small events.

Finally, the municipal strategy for intercultural relations was anchored in *Todos* ('Everyone' in Portuguese), a contemporary community arts festival which takes place yearly in one of the city's ethnically diverse neighborhoods, engaging residents and third sector actors. The festival's goal is to promote the

interaction between 'Lisboans' and foreign communities and to attract new users to the neighborhoods, thus fighting overarching negative representations.

Public space policy, and most notably kiosks, pavement cafés and events, proved to be a rather malleable and consensual set of solutions, deployable throughout the city in manifold combinations and in the name of different policy objectives. Their generalization has also led to the emergence of non-state actors who are recurring partners or recipients of municipal initiatives. NCS and the *Mercado* is one such example.

Creating the *Mercado de Fusão*

Despite consensual policy discourses and recurrent design techniques, public space production processes in Lisbon are reasonably open-ended. The coherence in processes and design solutions stems from a strong organizational culture, rather than a precise regulatory framework (Gomes, 2016). Consequently, while the *Mercado de Fusão* is one of its kind in Lisbon, its implementation did not require any sort of legal exceptionalism.

Mouraria, a testing ground for Lisbon's new urban policies

The Martim Moniz square is on the foot of one of Lisbon's historic centre's hills, between some of the city's biggest tourist attractions and the Mouraria neighbourhood. For long stigmatized (Menezes, 2012a), the neighbourhood also embodies 'a working class, patrimonial and multicultural Lisbon' (Menezes,

2011: 1), where immigrant populations and commerce coexist with 'traditional' Lisboans.

Martim Moniz occupies a vacant space created by the partial demolition of Mouraria, by 1940s hygienist policies. Only in 1997 was the square formally developed (Menezes, 2012b), and the entirety of the urbanization plan for the area, including the construction of housing around the square, was not finished until the 2010s. During this period, it was used by several marginal categories, including drug users and immigrant/ethnic minorities, sometimes undocumented (Menezes, 2012a). The square's image of an immigrant centrality was reinforced by two adjacent shopping centres, whose shops are mostly operated by migrant entrepreneurs. While cementing Mouraria's image as an 'ethnic' and 'migrant' neighbourhood (Malheiros et al., 2012), retail also played a role in its slow, gradual, opening up to new user categories of different national origins (Menezes, 2009).

Soon after the inauguration of the square in 1997, the municipality installed over 40 kiosks selling different goods, to increase its use. The operation was a failure, with all but ten kiosks going bankrupt and eventually being given away to the city's parishes. Subsequently, a perceived increase in illicit activities and insecurity led to police operations and video-surveillance (Menezes, 2009). By the 2000s, however, and until the implementation of the *Mercado* in 2012, the square was mostly an important sociability space for migrant communities.

Some illicit activities continued, while tourists were regular clients of at least of one of the kiosks. Representations of Mouraria as an immigrant and typical neighbourhood, dirty and unsafe persisted, despite budding gentrification (Malheiros et al., 2012). These representations and timid signs of change shaped municipal intervention, which intensified in the aftermath of the 2007 elections, when Mouraria became the testing ground for the municipality's new urban policies.

Between 2007 and 2013, the neighbourhood was targeted by many of the sectoral policies mentioned earlier. From 2009, municipal services piloted an EU-funded urban rehabilitation program. Mouraria's main public spaces were refurbished with the purpose of increasing their use by residents and, most importantly, attracting real estate investors and tourist activities. Pavement cafés and events were also part of the program. In 2009, *Todos*'s first edition also took place in the neighbourhood. The festival was supposed to be itinerant, but as the rehabilitation of Mouraria became one of the Mayor's flagship initiatives (he even moved his office into the area between 2011 and 2013), *Todos* ended up taking place in the neighbourhood for four more years. In 2010, as the public space renovations started, an *ad hoc* institution was mandated to coordinate the rehabilitation and to create a community development program, which was seen as lacking from the former. The program for Mouraria's social and community development (PDCM) was elaborated by 40 partner institutions (public and third-sector) and funded by the city's participatory budget in 2012

and 2013. Finally, Mouraria was designated as one of the city's BIP/ZIP and was among those most targeted by initiatives (Tulumello, 2015). The multiplication of small-scale funding mechanisms aimed at the third sector created a network of third sector institutions which became effectively involved in the governance of the neighbourhood's rehabilitation process (Gomes, 2017).

Martim Moniz was initially left out of the municipal rehabilitation program, despite it being a big square on one of the neighbourhood's edges[4]. However, Mouraria's status as a testing ground for new municipal policies and its designation as a major political territory[5] by the municipality are two major preconditions in making the Martim Moniz privatization-ready, for three sets of reasons.

Firstly, there was a very strong political commitment to the neighbourhood's socio-spatial change, which implied reversing existing negative representations. This was the first step in a political project of opening up the neighbourhood to the outside and attracting new activities and spatial practices, residents and users. Hence the profusion of municipal initiatives in the area, which had a strong signalling effect to other actors including real estate developers, but also entrepreneurs, commercial activities and third sector entities. These actors responded to existing funding opportunities in the neighbourhood, as well as to the stability promised by strong municipal presence. This strategy proved quite effective, with myriad projects, activities,

venues and building renovations appearing in a short period of time (Magalhães, 2016).

Secondly, this political commitment to change was rather malleable in terms of the actual initiatives promoted. These were defined incrementally between 2008 and 2011, in generally autonomous ways. Each initiative implies *ad hoc* organizations and budgets. Despite their differences, they were easily integrated to municipal efforts, coalescing around the consensus on socio-spatial change and feeding on recurring interactions between a set of stakeholders.

Thirdly, neoliberal or not, Mouraria was also a space for experimenting new governance regimes, continuously giving shape to the abovementioned coalition of actors, who provide services in social and community development, culture and tourism, as well as operating bars, cafés and events.

Nonetheless, this context is not sufficient to explain how the Martim Moniz became privatization-ready. There are three further factors to be considered: the discursive construction of Martim Moniz as a space needing intervention, yet different from Mouraria as a whole; NCS's development strategy and progressive integration of public spaces in their business model; and the pre-existing relationship between the municipality and NCS.

Making the Martim Moniz privatization-ready
Defining the Martim Moniz as a square needing intervention

Despite being an important migrant centrality, the perception of a square not living up to its potential lingered within local politicians and technicians. In the same speech quoted earlier, the deputy mayor added 'Everybody thinks we can't go to Martim Moniz, but it's one of Lisbon's great places' (Lusa, 2012). This political reading of the square's uses as insufficient aligns with a technical discourse on the square's 'scale'. Large squares such as Martim Moniz

'need a greater porosity, a scale of action and a type of events and are fed by type of energies that are different [from Mouraria's small squares], they're of a different nature. They're more open to the exterior, at least for their scale' (municipal director, interview, 10/01/2013).

Thus, Martim Moniz's role as a centrality for migrant communities and other users was not compatible with the square's 'greatness', size and, therefore, the need for it to be open to the exterior. The representation of a square where nobody went lasted. Consequently, the square needed intervention, but of a different kind than Mouraria, because of its different nature. The type of intervention needed, however, went beyond the municipality's competencies:

'The municipality's core business is not animating squares […]. It's being a facilitator […]. So, there was an intention to revitalize Martim Moniz […] and the municipality decided that those fit for the task […] would be private actors whose core business was doing that type of thing, animating public spaces, cultural events…' (municipal director, interview, 10/01/2013).

This excerpt illustrates the municipality's ambiguity in dealing with public spaces: conviviality becomes a political objective, yet municipal practices do not extend beyond design and the everyday management of public spaces. Apart from some events, their everyday animation, be it through kiosks, pavement

cafés or recurring events are seen as competencies belonging to (and better provided by) the private sector. Rather than a rupture in existing practices, the *Mercado de Fusão* represents a (spatial) extension of existing logics, fuelled by the initiative of a private operator (and not the municipality's, as the previous excerpt implied).

NCS's business strategy
NCS is a company founded in 2004, initially working on the audio-visual sector and as music agents. They began organizing clubbing events in Cais do Sodré[6], which they describe as 'totally still, nothing happened over there', and therefore as 'an opportunity to work in a central area, with great potential in terms of nightlife' (entrepreneur, interview, 08/01/2013). This experience inaugurated a corporate strategy NCS will replicate subsequently: creation of booking opportunities for their artists and of a relationship with a target audience they will cater to in all their activities. Such is the case with *OutJazz*, a multi-site outdoors music festival in green spaces throughout Spring and Summer.

NCS's projects for Martim Moniz are analogue. In the company's search for new business ventures, 'new kiosks in new public spaces [are the direction] the city is moving towards' (entrepreneur, interview, 08/01/2013). NCS targets the square for two reasons. First, it is 'a diamond in the rough' (idem). Like Cais do Sodré before, Martim Moniz was 'an abandoned square [...where] no one has arrived yet' (idem) and comparable to many other ethnic neighbourhoods in European cities: unappealing, derelict, where low-income populations live.

However, Martim Moniz's proximity to the city centre, where NCS's target audience is, and to some of the city's main tourist routes made it a square with 'potential' (idem). Their purpose is 'to attract new blood' (idem), especially from the centre.

The surrounding area's multicultural character is the inspiration for the *Mercado*'s concept, with kiosks serving food from different parts of the world. However, few restaurateurs from the area were sought out, the idea being 'to bring signature projects' and up and coming chefs from the city centre. This would bring 'a completely new public', because

'the public which is there [in Martim Moniz] is not really that representative […]. I mean, it's there, but it's not the public who brings life to a square this big […], we need a lot of people […]. Our audience is tourists, they all stop there because it's the tourist route, we are currently bringing arts to the square […] because we want to capture that artistic audience, […] the same audience who comes to *OutJazz* […]. That's the kind of public who will spend an afternoon drinking beer in a terrasse […], listening to music and enjoying art. That's why we invested in a program which includes cinema, dance, concerts, DJs, etc.' (entrepreneur, interview, 08/01/2013).

Throughout the interview, the entrepreneur is forthcoming about the *Mercado* being a first step in a broader business strategy, including other commercial developments in the nearby area (a bar on a rooftop overlooking the square, which opened a few years later) and the attraction of other like-minded investors. Martim Moniz is chosen due to its central location, the municipal rehabilitation program nearby and the potential gains from investing in a deprived area likely to increase in value in the very near future. Thus, the *Mercado* acted as a front, whose purpose was to reverse existing

representations and create new habits, to secure an actual demand for NCS's future ventures. The company's ongoing collaboration with the municipality was a vital resource in making the *Mercado* happen.

Old friends speaking the same language
NCS's frequent dealings with the political actors of the municipality began in 2009, through negotiations for OutJazz. In exchange for an exemption of municipal permits, the municipality could influence venue choices. Both parties took part in meetings where NCS's perception of the location of its target audience and the municipality's efforts in animating 'under-utilized' spaces or signalling recent redesigns were negotiated.

In the context of this relationship, NCS made a proposal to 'transform Martim Moniz' (entrepreneur, interview, 08/01/2013), as part of its entrepreneurial strategy. To do so, the company assembled different elements from the municipality's vernacular of convivial urbanism and its rehabilitation program in Mouraria, from its own areas of expertise and from the neighbourhood's image and socio-cultural composition.

NCS's objective of upscaling Martim Moniz channels municipal objectives for the area, focused on substantive change. Neither methods nor stakeholders of said change are a particularly worrisome issue, mirroring City Hall's efforts in adopting an enabling role for non-state actors. Moreover, the *Mercado* adopts the municipal vernacular of convivial techniques. The initiative is presented as a revitalization of the abandoned kiosks on the square[7], adapting them to the

City's technique of animation through food and drink venues with terrasses and events. The event program is a multicultural version of NCS's *OutJazz* and the *Mercado* is the company's take on the municipal kiosks, enhanced with a stage (given their area of business) and a market (in order to attract other businesses catering to the same target audience). This municipal vernacular is extremely malleable, reflecting a commitment to conviviality in public spaces as an end in itself, inherently good. Here, too, the *Mercado* is perceived as pursuing municipal public space policies.

The lease for the *Mercado* further demonstrates the absence of a rupture with existing practices within the municipality. Like other kiosks in the city, the lease covers the concession for kiosks and terrasses and its maintenance, against rent and, in some cases, the responsibility for installing the kiosks. The difference in the *Mercado* is that the concession area effectively covers two thirds of the square. However, there is no juridical novelty in the relationship between the municipality and the lease-holder.

The emergence of the *Mercado* as a management scheme in continuity with existing practices, rather than a novel approach to public space management, explains the relative simplicity of its implementation. The deputy mayor for public spaces is receptive to NCS's initial proposal. However, the square was controlled by the municipal development corporation (EPUL), in charge of the development of the square and surrounding real estate program

since the 1980s. In order to garner political clout enough to convince EPUL, he contacts the deputy mayor for International Relations (behind *Todos*). He pitches the *Mercado* as a gastronomy fair, echoing highly popular culinary workshops hosted by residents of different ethnic backgrounds during the festival. Once again, the malleability of municipal techniques is clear: cooking workshops held by migrant families in a deprived area during an arts festival are made equivalent to kiosks serving fusion food, managed by a private corporation. Convinced, EPUL launches an international competition for the market closely based on the company's proposal, and garners one sole response, NCS's. A lease is signed in 2011 by EPUL, the municipality and NCS.

Discussion

Throughout this article, it became clear how the *Mercado* illustrates current policies of urban upscaling, catering to the urban middle classes and tourism. There, the city's convivial urbanism portrays an idea of public space very much aligned with the 'privatization of uses' through leisure and consumption. In the *Mercado*, this implies an effort of replacing preexisting practices and users, apparently mirroring patterns of exclusion and displacement identified in the public space literature.

The *Mercado* has had a significant impact on the social life of Martim Moniz (Rodrigues, 2014)[8]. Throughout most of the day, the square is reasonably empty, except in the early and late afternoons, when the terrasses start to fill up. The *Mercado* was quite successful in attracting tourists and 'White Portuguese'

users, who are now regularly present in the square, and especially so during the myriad events NCS organizes during the week. Immigrant communities are still present in the square, particularly in its edges and in the southernmost sector, which is not managed by NCS. They are also the majority of users in the tent area where the market takes place on weekends – except in market days. Not surprisingly, use of the terrasses and participation in events are the dominant practices in the square. More informal activities, such as biking or playing sports, are present in the tent area and in the southernmost part of the square, mostly carried out by children and immigrants.

The partial privatization of the square, and the concentration of kiosks and terrasses in a sector, allow a certain porosity of uses and publics which cannot be described as a total replacement of the square's constituency. Yet, the *Mercado*'s disconnection from the surrounding area's residents, and especially immigrant ones, is hard to argue against. Festivities and institutional events catering to the different national communities of the area do take place in the square, often sponsored by the respective embassies. But such initiatives belong to the same type of tokenism behind the use of the area's multiculturalism as an inspiration and a concept in the *Mercado*, or of the initial concession of kiosks to three local entrepreneurs, rather than an actual inclusion of immigrant communities in the dynamics and logics of the management scheme[9]. It also mirrors the difficulty in engaging immigrants in Mouraria's community development program (Matos et al., 2014) and in the rehabilitation

of Mouraria more generally. The *Mercado*'s success in attracting a new clientele and businesses to the area (despite its apparent failure to generate profit and prevent high turnover in kiosk leaseholders) is concomitant to impoverished possibilities for sociability, largely determined by the commercial nature of the venture.

The limited spectre of practices it caters to and affords can be linked to the process leading up to its installation. Even though it went through the formal procedures of public tendering, the *Mercado* was largely the product of bilateral negotiations between the municipality and the entrepreneur. The absence of any sort of public participation in the process – which is already very limited in Lisbon public space production (Gomes, 2016) – further prevented the emergence of alternatives to its commercial nature. The process might also explain the absence of any visible opposition to the project before its implementation: some contestation of the overall rehabilitation of Mouraria also targeted the *Mercado* (Brito Guterres, 2012) and some commentators and academics have subsequently written poignant critiques. However, to our knowledge, these did not become the subject of a more general public debate.

Thus, the *Mercado* clearly embodies many of the concerns expressed by the literature on public spaces in the context of entrepreneurial and neoliberal urban policies. In Lisbon, they are a central piece in its attractivity strategy. The *Mercado* is also, arguably, Lisbon's first experiment with privatization as a governance arrangement of previously publicly managed spaces. In present

time, it remains an exception, which elicited the question of how it became privatization-ready.

Throughout this paper, I have argued that the *Mercado* emerges rather seamlessly from existing practices within Lisbon's municipality. The privatization of the square is not the result of a coherent political strategy for public space privatization. Rather, it is the result of opportunistic tactics from both the municipality and NCS, which coincided in the emergence of the *Mercado de Fusão*. The cash-strapped municipality positions itself as an enabler of non-state actors. As public space conviviality emerges as a major political objective, the private sector is seen as its natural provider (but *not* of everyday public space management services). This position led to the generalization of kiosks, terrasses and events throughout the city, of a rather small scale. In a sense, the *Mercado* is just a concession for kiosks, terrasses and a program of events. Seeking new business ventures, the Martim Moniz appears as an opportunity for NCS, not in itself, but as a front for future projects in the area. Acting upon the coincidence of both parties' objectives was made easier by the preexisting relationship between the two.

Two recent developments confirm this absence of a major shift in public space governance. The first one is the announcement, by the municipality, of the redevelopment of Martim Moniz and the most likely termination of the *Mercado* and a return to regular municipal management (*O Corvo*, 2018b). The latter has come under fire by residents and local elected officials for the nuisances and

incivilities it generates, especially at night time. At the same time, the municipality announced the temporary closing of the Adamastor belvedere for renovation work, at the heart of Lisbon's touristic historic city (*O Corvo*, 2018c). Claiming that the belvedere's use is too intense for existing maintenance capabilities and an increase in insecurity and nocturnal nuisances, the municipality has also decided on significant changes to its management. When it reopens, the belvedere will be gated and closed every night; the municipality is renegotiating the existing kiosk's lease, so that it will cover a larger expanse of the belvedere and additional management tasks, including maintenance and security. These intentions have sparked some opposition from citizens, local politicians and media commentators, who frame their arguments in the broader context of rampant gentrification and touristification of central Lisbon[10] (*O Corvo*, 2018a).

These two examples echo the accretive approach to the rehabilitation of Mouraria. The municipality adopts a tentative approach to policy implementation that is extremely reactive to contextual changes and opportunities, and micro-local stakeholder configurations and power balances. With the attraction of new residents and tourists, convivial spaces become arenas of conflict between different functions and user categories. The objective shifts from attractivity to the management of its excesses. The city then puts *ad hoc* governance and regulatory mechanisms in place. This pattern has emerged elsewhere in the city, especially in areas of intense nocturnal activity (Gomes,

2017; Nofre *et al.*, 2018). The Martim Moniz and Adamastor are the two most recent examples.

Still, public space privatization becomes more likely as the encroachment of private interests in public spaces increases. The *Mercado* materializes the strong link between Lisbon's take on a convivial urbanism, reliant on the food and beverage and events industries, and a growing commodification of the city's public spaces, in a context of growing touristification and gentrification. Lisboan convivial urbanism has also created a new market which saw the emergence of new non-state actors regularly collaborating with the municipality, including third sector ones (Galhardo, 2014; Gomes, 2017), or for the reorientation of traditional real estate developers (Nofre, 2013). These actors then push for new business opportunities in public space, as was the case in the *Mercado*.

Through this case study, I have made the case for procedural approaches to the production of public spaces. Echoing existing work on public space governance, this paper insists on the different scales and temporalities of public action, the interplay between actors and the actual justifications they put forward. The purpose of dissecting the process leading to the *Mercado* as an isolated event, then, is not to brush off concerns expressed by critical approaches to privatization. Rather, it insists on the importance of analyzing the broader policy context and the instruments it puts in place as an additional explanatory factor, beyond a narrow view of the changing role of the local state.

The key to understanding the birth of the *Mercado* is convivial urbanism as a vehicle for the commodification of public spaces and reconfigurations in the city's governance and stakeholder networks.

Consequently, at the heart of public space privatization in Lisbon is an inability to imagine public sociability as something other than sitting on terrasses and participating in events. The paradox of conviviality as a policy objective is that it ends up limiting the possibilities for a wide array of social and political activities in public space. As producing public space becomes an issue of providing a discrete set of affordances for leisure and consumption, its outsourcing to private actors becomes a possible, and rather unimportant, solution.

Conclusion

As Lisbon grapples with an unprecedented pace of change, the challenge for a progressive production of public spaces lies in opposing alternatives to its convivial urbanism, and especially on the apparently automatic design and management solutions it entails. Whatever these alternatives might be, it seems crucial to open up production processes so that these can be expressed. Current processes are excessively confined to the municipality and a restricted network of actors, with public opinion rarely intervening, except in conflicts over nuisances. Without minimizing the importance of eating, drinking and enjoying one's time outdoors, opening up production processes implies recognizing public spaces as open-ended, coveted by diverse publics and as sites of

possibility, not excessively determined by a restricted view of conviviality. A progressive public space policy should first strive to enable, then regulate, expressions of these different possibilities.

Notes

[1]Even though the value might seem small to some commentators, the initiative was running on a deficit by the time of fieldwork, in 2013. Rodrigues's (2014) work describes the high turnover of most of kiosk concessions (struggling to pay the rent for the individual kiosks to NCS), further demonstrating the financial fragility of the *Mercado*. NCS sustains the operational deficit of the market because of its passion for the project and its role in a broader business strategy (see further below in the article).

[2] All quotes and extracts were translated from Portuguese by the author.

[3] This policy has been recently been put to a halt, given the impacts of tourism and rehabilitation in central Lisbon's housing market.

[4] The square was not included in institutional communication on the rehabilitation program until the *Mercado de Fusão*'s creation was decided.

[5] The actual borders of this political territory are not only flexible (as the latter integration of Martim Moniz shows), but also somewhat independent of the neighbourhood's traditional perimeter, spreading further (see Ferro, 2012)

[6] Cais do Sodré is a historical bohemian area close to the harbour, where prostitution was common. As the port's activity declined from the 1970s onwards, many of the area's bars closed or struggled to stay open. From the 1990s, it attracted a new clientele, including youngsters, Erasmus students and tourists, before booming as one of the city's main nightlife destinations in the late 2000s and undergoing a process of commercial gentrification (Nofre, 2013).

[7]Only three of them operating by the time the *Mercado*'s lease was signed (Rodrigues, 2014).

[8] All data on the spatial practices in the *Mercado* is derived from Rodrigues's work.

[9]NCS claims a strong presence of local migrant sellers in the early days of the market. However, strict enforcement of existing rules by the municipality soon became incompatible with the often informal nature of vendors (Rodrigues, 2014).

[10]All the more so that the municipality's decision follows the recent inauguration of a luxury hotel in the vicinity. Opponents to the project have questioned the hotel owner's apparent deep knowledge of the municipal intervention, suspecting it is working closely with the municipality in shaping the belvedere's future (*O Corvo*, 2018a).

References

Banerjee T (2001) The Future of Public Space: Beyond Invented Streets and Reinvented Places. Journal of the American Planning Association 67(1): 9–24.

Baptista I (2012) Practices of Exception in Urban Governance: Reconfiguring Power Inside the State. Urban Studies. Epub ahead of print 13 August 2012 DOI: 10.1177/0042098012453858.

Bauman Z (2006) Confiança e Medo Na Cidade. Lisbon: Relogio d'Agua.

Betin C (2001) La construction de l'espace public. Le cas de Lyon. Géocarrefour 76(1): 47–54.

Bodnar J (2015) Reclaiming public space. Urban Studies 52(12): 2090–2104.

Bordreuil S (2007) Urbaniser le mouvement? Flux et interaction. In: Bourdin A (ed.) Mobilité et Écologie Urbaine. Paris: Descartes & Cie., pp. 127–140.

Brito Guterres A (2012) Interações reflexivas sobre o novo plano MARTIM MONIZ. Buala - cultura contemporânea africana. Available at: http://www.buala.org/pt/cidade/interacoes-reflexivas-sobre-o-novo-plano-martim-moniz (accessed 27 February 2012).

Caldeira TPR (1996) Building up walls: the new pattern of spatial segregation in São Paulo. International Social Science Journal 48(147): 55–66.

Calderon C and Chelleri L (2013) Social Processes in the Production of Public Spaces: Structuring Forces and Actors in the Renewal of a Deprived Neighbourhood in Barcelona. Journal of Urban Design 18(3): 409–428.

Câmara Municipal de Lisboa (2011) Estratégia de reabilitação urbana de Lisboa 2011/2024. Lisbon: Câmara Municipal de Lisboa. Available at: http://www.cm-lisboa.pt/fileadmin/VIVER/Urbanismo/urbanismo/Reabilitacao/estrat.pdf (accessed 25 April 2014).

Carmona M (2015) Re-theorising contemporary public space: a new narrative and a new normative. Journal of Urbanism: International Research on Placemaking and Urban Sustainability 8(4): 373–405.

Carmona M, Magalhães C de and Hammond L (2008) Public space: the management dimension. Londres: Routledge.

de Magalhães C and Carmona M (2006) Innovations in the Management of Public Space: Reshaping and Refocusing Governance. Planning Theory & Practice 7(3): 289–303.

de Magalhães C and Freire Trigo S (2017) Contracting out publicness: The private management of the urban public realm and its implications. Progress in Planning 115: 1–28.

Debord G (1996) La Société Du Spectacle. Paris: Editions Gallimard.

Dessouroux C (2006) La production des espaces publics dans la ville contemporaine. Enjeux, acteurs et logiques de gestion et d'aménagement dans trois communes de la Région de Bruxelles-Capitale. PhD Thesis, Université Libre de Bruxelles, Belgium.

Didier S, Morange M and Peyroux E (2013) The Adaptative Nature of Neoliberalism at the Local Scale: Fifteen Years of City Improvement Districts in Cape Town and Johannesburg. Antipode 45(1): 121–139.

Drummond LBW (2000) Street Scenes: Practices of Public and Private Space in Urban Vietnam. Urban Studies 37(12): 2377–2391.

Ehrenfeucht R and Loukaitou-Sideris A (2007) Constructing the sidewalks: municipal government and the production of public space in Los Angeles, California, 1880–1920. Journal of Historical Geography 33(1): 104–124.

Ferro G (2012) Re-inventar um bairro: análise de uma reforma sócio-urbanística no bairro da Mouraria. Master's Dissertation, Universidade Nova de Lisboa, Portugal.

Fleury A (2007) Les espaces publics dans les politiques métropolitaines. Réflexions au croisement de trois expériences: de Paris aux quartiers centraux de Berlin et Istanbul. PhD Thesis, Université de Paris 1 Panthéon-Sorbonne, France.

Fleury A (2010) Public/privé : la (re)distribution des rôles dans la production des espaces publics à Paris et à Berlin. Métropoles (8). Available at: https://metropoles.revues.org/4346 (accessed 10 November 2015).

Galhardo J (2014) Le mythe du ghetto de la Mouraria à Lisbonne: la mise en récit d'un territoire plastique. Articulo (Special issue 5). Available at: https://journals.openedition.org/articulo/2430 (accessed 30 April 2018).

Gibert M (2014) Les ruelles de Hồ Chí Minh Ville, Việt Nam. Trame viaire et recomposition des espaces publics. Thèse de doctorat en Géographie. Université Paris I Panthéon-Sorbonne, Paris.

Gomes P (2012) Factors of good public space use. In: Actas do XIII Coloquio Ibérico de Geografia Respuestas de la Geografia Ibérica a la crisis actual, Santiago de Compostela, October 2012, pp. 608–618. Meubook. Available at: http://ria.ua.pt/handle/10773/9247 (accessed 19 July 2016).

Gomes P (2016) Prendre en compte les usages sans prendre en compte les usagers : la mise en œuvre de la trame verte de Lisbonne (2007-2013). Urbia (Hors série n.° 3): 197–211.

Gomes P (2017) La production de l'espace public à Lyon, Lisbonne et Louvain-la-Neuve: politiques, processus et prise en compte des usages. PhD Thesis, Université Paris-Est, France.

Harvey D (1989) From Managerialism to Entrepreneurialism: The Transformation in Urban Governance in Late Capitalism. Geografiska Annaler. Series B, Human Geography 71(1): 3-17.

Hubbard P (2008) Book review: Publics and the city. By Kurt Iveson. Oxford: Blackwell. 2007. 252 pp. £24.99 paperback. ISBN: 9781405127301. Cultural Geographies 15(4): 524–525.

Jacob M and Hellström T (2010) Public-space planning in four Nordic cities: Symbolic values in tension. Geoforum 41(4): 657–665.

Johnsen S and Fitzpatrick S (2010) Revanchist Sanitisation or Coercive Care? The Use of Enforcement to Combat Begging, Street Drinking and Rough Sleeping in England. Urban Studies 47(8): 1703–1723.

Julier G (2005) Urban Designscapes and the Production of Aesthetic Consent. Urban Studies 42(5–6): 869–887.

Koch R and Latham A (2012) Rethinking urban public space: accounts from a junction in West London. Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers 37(4): 515–529.

Koch R and Latham A (2013) Inhabiting Cities, Domesticating Public Space: Making Sense of the Changing Public Life of Contemporary London. In:

Madanipour A, Knierbein S, and Degros A (eds) Public Space and the Challenges of Urban Transformation in Europe. London: Routledge, pp. 156–166.

Kohn M (2004) Brave New Neighborhoods: The Privatization of Public Space. New York: Routledge.

Langstraat F and van Melik R (2013) Challenging the 'End of Public Space': A Comparative Analysis of Publicness in British and Dutch Urban Spaces. Journal of Urban Design 18(3): 429–448.

Levine C (2002) The paradox of public art: Democratic space, the avant-garde, and Richard Serra's 'Tilted Arc'. Philosophy & Geography 5(1): 51–68.

Lusa (2012) Martim Moniz recebe restaurantes, animação e mercado. Diário de Notícias, 6 August. Lisboa. Available at: http://www.dn.pt/portugal/sul/interior/martim-moniz-recebe-restaurantes-animacao-e-mercado-2598213.html (accessed 6 April 2016).

Madanipour A, Knierbein S and Degros A (2014) A Moment of Transformation. In: Madanipour A, Knierbein S, and Degros A (eds) Public Space and the Challenges of Urban Transformation in Europe. New York et Londres: Routledge, pp. 1–8.

Magalhães, AMM (2016) Intendente: Turismo, Consumo e Lazer num Território em Transformação. Master's Dissertation, Universidade de Lisboa, Portugal.

Malheiros J, Carvalho R and Mendes L (2012) Etnicização residencial e nobilitação urbana marginal: processo de ajustamento ou prática emancipatória num bairro do centro histórico de Lisboa? Sociologia, Revista da Faculdade de Letras da Universidade do Porto Número temático: Imigração, Diversidade e Convivência Cultural: 97–128.

Matos M, Castro A, Costa P, et al. (2014) Avaliação/ Monitorização do Programa de Desenvolvimento Comunitário da Mouraria. Relatório Final da Equipa externa de Avaliação. Lisbon: Dinâmia'CET.

Menezes M (2009) A praça do Martim Moniz: etnografando lógicas socioculturais de inscrição da praça no mapa social de Lisboa. Horizontes Antropológicos 15: 301–328.

Menezes M (2011) 'Todos' na Mouraria? Diversidades, desigualdades e diferenças entre os que vêm ver o bairro, nele vivem e nele querem viver. In: Atas do XI Congresso Luso-Afro-Brasileiro de Ciências Sociais - CONLAB, Salvador, 2011. Universidade Federal da Bahia. Available at: http://www.xiconlab.eventos.dype.com.br/resources/anais/3/1306516109 _ARQUIVO_MARLUCIMENEZES_TEXTO_CONLAB_2011.pdf (accessed 7 February 2013).

Menezes M (2012a) Debatendo mitos, representações e convicções acerca da invenção de um bairro lisboeta. Sociologia, Revista da Faculdade de Letras da Universidade do Porto (Número temático: Imigração, Diversidade e Convivência Cultural): 69–95.

Menezes M (2012b) Sobre a intervenção socio-urbanística na cidade consolidada. O caso da Mouraria em Lisboa. In: Jornadas LNEC 'Cidades e Desenvolvimento', Lisbon, 2012. Available at: http://jornadas2012.lnec.pt/site_2_Cidades_e_Desenvolvimento/COMUNI CACOES/T5_MENEZES_c018.pdf (accessed 7 February 2013).

Mitchell D (2003) Right to the City : Social Justice and the Fight for Public Space. New York: The Guilford Press.

Mitchell D (2017) People's Park again: on the end and ends of public space. Environment and Planning A 49(3): 503–518.

Nofre J (2013) 'Vintage Nightlife': Gentrifying Lisbon downtown. Fennia 191(2): 106–121.

Nofre J, Martins JC, Vaz D, et al. (2018) The 'Pink Street' in Cais do Sodré: urban change and liminal governance in a nightlife district of Lisbon. Urban Research & Practice: 1–19.

O Corvo (2018a) Aumenta a contestação à colocação de uma vedação e à imposição de horários no Miradouro de Santa Catarina. 4 September. Available at: https://ocorvo.pt/aumenta-contestacao-a-colocacao-de-uma-vedacao-no-miradouro-de-santa-catarina/ (accessed 30 October 2018).

O Corvo (2018b) Está em preparação uma grande remodelação da Praça do Martim Moniz. 11 September. Available at: https://ocorvo.pt/esta-em-preparacao-uma-grande-remodelacao-da-praca-do-martim-moniz/ (accessed 30 October 2018).

O Corvo (2018c) Miradouro de Santa Catarina vai ter vedação e horário para tentar controlar enchentes e salvar espaços verdes. 26 July. Available at: https://ocorvo.pt/miradouro-de-santa-catarina-vai-ter-vedacao-e-horario-para-tentar-controlar-enchentes/ (accessed 30 October 2018).

Paddison R and Sharp J (2007) Questioning the end of public space: Reclaiming control of local banal spaces. Scottish Geographical Journal 123(2): 87–106.

Rodrigues NMD (2014) Intervenções, Espacialidades e Relações de Poder. O caso da praça do Martim Moniz. Master's Dissertation, Instituto Universitário de Lisboa and Universidade Nova de Lisboa, Portugal.

Schmidt S, Nemeth J and Botsford E (2011) The evolution of privately owned public spaces in New York City. URBAN DESIGN International 16(4): 270–284.

Sennet R (2002) The Fall of Public Man. London: Penguin Books.

Shaftoe H (2008) Convivial Urban Spaces: Creating Effective Public Places. Londres: Earthscan Publications.

Smith A (2013) 'Borrowing' Public Space to Stage Major Events: The Greenwich Park Controversy. Urban Studies 51(2): 247–263.

Smith A (2018) Justifying and resisting public park commercialisation: The battle for Battersea Park. European Urban and Regional Studies: Epub ahead of print 4 April 2018. DOI: 10.1177/0969776418767731.

Smithsimon G (2008) Dispersing the Crowd: Bonus Plazas and the Creation of Public Space. Urban Affairs Review 43(3): 325–351.

Söderström O and Geertman S (2013) Loose threads: The translocal making of public space policy in Hanoi. Singapore Journal of Tropical Geography 34(2): 244–260.

Söderström O, Manzoni B and Oguey S (2001) Lendemains d'échecs. disP - The Planning Review 37(145): 19–28..

Tulumello S (2015) Reconsidering neoliberal urban planning in times of crisis: urban regeneration policy in a "dense" space in Lisbon. Urban Geography: 1–24..

van Melik R and Lawton P (2011) The Role of Public Space in Urban Renewal Strategies in Rotterdam and Dublin. Planning Practice & Research 26(5): 513–530..

Vareilles S (2006) Les dispositifs de concertation des espaces publics lyonnais - Eléments pour une analyse du rôle de la concertation des publics urbains dans la fabrication de la ville. PhD Thesis, INSA Lyon, France.

Ward K (2006) 'Policies in Motion', Urban Management and State Restructuring: The Trans-Local Expansion of Business Improvement Districts. International Journal of Urban and Regional Research 30(1): 54–75..

Zamanifard H, Alizadeh T and Bosman C (2018) Towards a framework of public space governance. Cities. Epub ahead of print 23 February 2018 DOI: 10.1016/j.cities.2018.02.010.

Zukin S (2010) Whose Culture? Whose City? In: Orum AM and Neal ZP (eds) Common Ground? Readings and Reflections on Public Space. Londres: Routledge, pp. 110–117.