We asked 20 architecture and urban planning experts — theorists and practising architects with public space design experience in the Czech Republic and abroad — to provide professional commentary on the Public Space Design Manual and proposed Public Space Development Strategy.

The objective behind the request was to supplement the propositions and rules set out in these documents with the experts’ valuable experience and obtain ideas for additional topics that should have been addressed in the manual but are absent, as well as suggestions for the general layout of the document.

The request for the expert opinions also included a questionnaire comprising four general questions on the major problems with public spaces in Prague, the possible solutions to them and the role that the manual can play in rectifying them.

**In your opinion, what are the greatest shortcomings of Prague’s public spaces?**

In my opinion, the biggest discord apparent in Prague’s public spaces is what can be called the victory of particularism. The interests of drivers, transport engineers, network and road administrators, stall vendors, advertisers and the operators of some attractions always appear to have priority over an overall concept, openness and long-term public interest. This leads to the disintegration and fragmentation of the public realm by the erection of barriers that do not divide the space up logically or naturally according to its spatial characteristics or the events that take place in it, but that in fact do the opposite.

**Miroslav Cikán**
(architect, co-author of the UNESCO Management Plan for Prague)

I find the space occupied by the river to be of critical importance, as “parked” (permanently anchored) boats block most views of the panorama of Prague. Although boats are in fact a kind of real estate, they face practically no restrictions. They anchor along vertical embankments in the middle of the UNESCO reserve. They are not subject to the regulations that apply on land, and shipping regulations are not aligned with the city’s interests in any way.

**Jan Tabor**
(architect, theoretician and columnist)

The greatest shortcoming of some important urban spaces is the presence of utterly unabashed, excessive and incomprehensible commercialisation, which, it seems, is expanding into places where not long ago it would have been considered unthinkable: Charles Bridge and its environs and the Old Town Square are encased in pseudo-folkloric extensions and inundated with poor but hypertrophic advertising. The tourist part of Prague is gradually and systematically losing the remnants of its identity.

Cars continue to be given too much priority and motor-vehicle traffic is visible to a disproportionate degree. According equal rights to pedestrians, children, families, cyclists, etc. is taking place very slowly, with efforts lacking the courage required.

**Michal Kohout**
(architect and academic at the Faculty of Architecture of the Czech Technical University)

Save a number of honourable exceptions, Prague’s public spaces have no character. The quality and magic of a place are always nullified by the inundation of weed-like elements, by which I mean infrastructure, advertising and innately designed information systems. Solutions that favour traffic (moving or parked cars) are always given preference. No one shows much interest in the beauty of a space and the joy that arises from using it. Wherever such a space was designed, the inherently Czech ineptitude of those responsible for managing and maintaining it very soon destroyed it.

**Jaroslav Zima**
(architect and urban planner)

The greatest shortcoming of some important urban spaces is the presence of utterly unabashed, excessive and incomprehensible commercialisation, which, it seems, is expanding into places where not long ago it would have been considered unthinkable: Charles Bridge and its environs and the Old Town Square are encased in pseudo-folkloric extensions and inundated with poor but hypertrophic advertising. The tourist part of Prague is gradually and systematically losing the remnants of its identity.

Cars continue to be given too much priority and motor-vehicle traffic is visible to a disproportionate degree. According equal rights to pedestrians, children, families, cyclists, etc. is taking place very slowly, with efforts lacking the courage required.

**Zdeněk Lukes**
(architecture historian and columnist)

The city is markedly affected by the unfair “privatisation” of public space caused by parking.

**Zdeněk Lukes**
(architecture historian and columnist)

Public spaces in Prague are designed without a concept in mind, and I often rather have the feeling that no one has ever given serious thought to them.

**Jaroslav Zima**
(architect and urban planner)

I find the space occupied by the river to be of critical importance, as “parked” (permanently anchored) boats block most views of the panorama of Prague. Although boats are in fact a kind of real estate, they face practically no restrictions. They anchor along vertical embankments in the middle of the UNESCO reserve. They are not subject to the regulations that apply on land, and shipping regulations are not aligned with the city’s interests in any way.

**Miroslav Cikán**
(architect, co-author of the UNESCO Management Plan for Prague)

The greatest shortcoming of some important urban spaces is the presence of utterly unabashed, excessive and incomprehensible commercialisation, which, it seems, is expanding into places where not long ago it would have been considered unthinkable: Charles Bridge and its environs and the Old Town Square are encased in pseudo-folkloric extensions and inundated with poor but hypertrophic advertising. The tourist part of Prague is gradually and systematically losing the remnants of its identity.

Cars continue to be given too much priority and motor-vehicle traffic is visible to a disproportionate degree. According equal rights to pedestrians, children, families, cyclists, etc. is taking place very slowly, with efforts lacking the courage required.

**Michal Kohout**
(architect and academic at the Faculty of Architecture of the Czech Technical University)

The city is markedly affected by the unfair “privatisation” of public space caused by parking.

**Jaroslav Zima**
(architect and urban planner)

Public spaces in Prague are designed without a concept in mind, and I often rather have the feeling that no one has ever given serious thought to them.

**Zdeněk Lukes**
(architecture historian and columnist)
On the theoretical level, there is a lack of all-round discussion about the value and potential of existing public spaces, about how they relate to each other in the urban structure and about how to create mutual synergies that reinforce the concept of a liveable city.

On the practical level, the ignorance of certain values and the absence of vision result in public space improvements being nothing more than technical and infrastructure investments, with only technical standards and regulations being cited as arguments in favour of “improvement”. Conceptual design, which is the domain of architects, is then logically applied only marginally to historical locations, but in the context of Prague as a whole, this is completely insufficient.

**Boris Redčenkov**  
(architect, academic at the Faculty of Architecture of the Czech Technical University)

In the last few years, Prague has been gradually foregoing the possibility of intervening and influencing the refurbishment of existing public spaces or the design of new ones. This is due in part to changes in the ownership of, for example, important land open to development and to the transfer of the responsibility for the design of public spaces to the companies in charge of technical infrastructure. It is also due in part to insufficient pressure being placed on engineers and developers who are developing extensive tracts of land but lack understanding of what the terms public realm and quality thereof means. Investment into public spaces is thus minimal.

**Jakub Cígler, Assoc. AIA**  
(architect)

The number of cars parked in beautiful squares and streets, i.e., the domination of cars over pedestrians; the random, poorly thought-through repairs and temporary solutions; the flood of tasteless advertising; the great number of huge, roofed-over and glass-enclosed restaurant “patios” perched on wooden platforms that encroach into public space; the excessive segregation of the public through the use of barriers, kerbs, fences, flowerpots, railings, etc.; the poor level of maintenance based on incoherent and random repair work; the effort to add some “greenery” through planting strips or flowerbeds that are crude and crass in their design and there “just because”; the absence of contemporary artwork and, conversely, the city’s lack of concern for old artwork in public space that is damaged or naturally deteriorating, especially standalone Baroque statutes; the city’s failure to remove hideous graffiti (e.g., on the buttresses of Letenské sady, which can be seen from the embankments of the Old Town and lower New Town across their entire length); huge boat restaurants congestiong the waterfront; and so on.

**Petr Malinský**  
(architect)

The greatest shortcoming in Prague’s public spaces: neglect. The subordination of public spaces to motor-vehicle traffic and the related infrastructure, not only in terms of design, but also in terms of what is even more harmful — scale. The almost absolute dominance of tourists in the historical centre and its commercialisation, and the resulting changes in shopping and dining infrastructure and building and frontage use.

**Ivan Reimann**  
(German architect of Czech ancestry, professor of architecture at the Dresden University of Technology)

The public realm is by its nature open, ever-changing and, therefore, unfinished. It is important to understand it as a whole and then design it accordingly; however, its architects have to be seen as coordinators rather than designers and, as such, they have to create a whole that functions despite different tendencies and that has the potential to undergo further change. Efforts to come up with “definitive” solutions for public spaces often lead to the creation of dead zones that quickly become aesthetically outdated.

Chronically problematic locations include not only the outskirts of the city, but, unfortunately, even the centre, especially the squares. The majority of squares (Václavské náměstí, Staroměstské náměstí, Malostranské náměstí, and many others) have lost their original purpose with no adequate replacement. The loss of natural functions, the radical drop in the number of inhabitants, the creation of parallel commercial “pseudo-public” spaces, the commercialisation of the centre for tourists and the commercial rather than residential dominance of the buildings surrounding the city’s squares have all resulted in a situation that in many respects appears to be hopeless. It is appearing that public spaces are the last tool for returning life to the city and commencing its “internal colonisation”. If this does not happen, the term “historical city centre” will become a label for a sterile commercial and tourist zone that has nothing in common with the actual “centre” of the city.

**Richard Biegel**  
(architecture historian and Vice-President of the Society for Old Prague)
**In your opinion, what are the greatest shortcomings in the design, execution and use of Prague’s public spaces?**

The process of designing and executing public spaces in Prague for the most part takes place in the form of organised chaos. The various public space managers focus on their own needs without placing any greater demands on the quality of the public realm as a whole. Many of their projects have not involved an architect to pay attention to the design concept. When the city does in fact force itself to take a logical approach to public space design and organises a public architectural competition, it is able, following the decision made by the panel of experts, to effectively torpedo its own efforts by the activities of its administration.

**Jaroslav Zima**

(architect and urban planner)

Absence of an overall vision. Lack of courage to take on more visionary projects that would lead to a fundamental breakthrough in the approach to the public realm (as has happened in Barcelona, for example). Uncoordinated interventions, with the technical aspects always prevailing in the end (traffic and technical infrastructure being considered first, and only then the design possibilities).

Leasing public spaces to dubious users who pursue purely economic interests (especially in the historical centre). In the case of new building projects, even the public space concept is left up to private investors, with the city having no real tools for ensuring its visions are taken into account. In my opinion, the procedure should be the same as has been applied since the time Charles IV founded the New Town or as that applied by Vienna to its Ringstrasse: the city’s role is to plan and establish public spaces first and only then sell the adjoining land.

**Petr Kratochvíl**

(architecture historian and theoretician)

The absence of spatial coordination of the various plans in the spatial planning system, i.e., a level that in this country and around the world was and still is essentially fulfilled by regulatory plans. It is also the absence of systematic public space maintenance and management based on a comprehensive strategy laying down the hierarchy and management priority for the various types of public spaces and, at the same time, specifying responsibility for its proper implementation.

**Michal Kohout**

(architect and academic at the Faculty of Architecture of the Czech Technical University)

What is missing is consistency and persistency in law enforcement — i.e., illegal, tasteless and degrading interventions are not removed immediately by the city and the costs of removal and restoration of the space back to its original, or better, state are not billed to the perpetrator.

**Petr Malinský**

(architect)

I see the fundamental shortcomings to be the want of a concept, the impossibility of carrying out conceptual coordination and information management, and the absence of an organisation in charge of coordinating the various processes to ensure that the set vision and hierarchy of interventions, which has to transect the interests of the municipal districts or private entities, are observed. A long-term and continual process that is generally shared has to be set up.

**Boris Redčenkov**

(architect, academic at the Faculty of Architecture of the Czech Technical University)
The use of public spaces is dependent on the content of the public buildings surrounding them. That is the city’s internal public realm. If public space is beautiful on the surface but there is no content, it is a sham that will collapse into its own void. The spaces are thus related and should determine the quality, degree and manner to which the space is liveable and representational. From this perspective, it is necessary to understand public space design as one of a number of primary factors determining the quality of the whole. Areas that are full of activities and events are created at the points where the external and internal realms meet each other, and these have to become a conscious part of the architectural design of the buildings that provide these areas for public interaction.

Conceptual development and cultivation should help public transport lose its mass–like character and instead offer comfort, raising the level of service so that passengers feel they are “being transported” instead of “transporting themselves”. This non–financial economy of “comfort” should then become a matter of social prestige, bringing profit in the form of a calmed public space that is not submersed in exhaust. It is a certain kind of reflection that the post–totalitarian society is apparently still not ready for.

Miroslav Cikán
(architect, co–author of the UNESCO Management Plan for Prague)

I have the feeling that people have begun to pay attention to this topic only recently and are playing catch–up.

Zdeněk Lukeš
(architecture historical and columnist)

Both design preparation and execution are not happening in an integrated way: each organisation that is involved in a project acts in isolation and promotes its own interests and standards. A common situation visible in Prague’s street and squares is traffic infrastructure being given clear priority over all other components and thus absolute dominion over the public realm. This should not be the rule. Even valid standards should be flexible in the interests of improving the quality of public space (as is the case in other countries and cities).

Jiří Klokočka
(architect and urban planner, academic at Sint–Lucas Architectuur in Ghent and at the Faculty of Arts and Architecture at the Liberect Technical University)

At least as important as defining any public space design “vision” is creating a procedural and decision–making structure allowing the vision and objectives to be fulfilled. This is very difficult, as these structures and procedures are influenced by political interests, but absolutely important. The manual should supplement or, better yet, be a part of the proposed structures and procedures (perhaps later, because it will take some time). It should not be formulated simply as a recommendation (how the parties involved in designing space should communicate), but be binding for all parties. Clear priorities and the way projects are awarded determine how projects are handled and almost “automatically” lead to the correct results.

If the issue of implementation is not resolved, the manual will remain a theoretical discourse.

Ivan Reimann
(German architect with Czech ancestry, professor of architecture of the Dresden Technical University)

At the moment when society sends out a clear signal that it wishes for a change in the approach to the public realm and to the city in general, more chances should be given to unusual (and even “anarchistic”) solutions. It is of course necessary to stipulate certain legislative restrictions to limit how far one can go with regard to the public realm, but these rules will have a clear impact on the physical essence of the specific space. One has to realise that spaces that are considered public in the modernist zone are not counted in metres or acres, but hectares. This space will have to be structured hierarchically, which will have a binding impact on its management and maintenance. The need to find alternative forms of management of the public realm (participation of the private sector, leasing to not entirely institutionalised groups, and so on) cannot be precluded.

Day–to–day procedural problems arise, especially from the dominance of certain infrastructure managers, the preference for a traffic solution to a pedestrian one, the absence of a street greenery concept and a small number of physical modifications of spaces on the liveable street. The mainstreaming of public opinion, focused on particular measures such as “build a playground” , makes open discussion about the potential of public spaces difficult.

Petr Hlaváček
(architect, Vice–Dean and academic at the Faculty of Architecture of the Czech Technical University)
I. Introduction 9
  I.1 Definition of public realm and public space 12

II. Objective, nature and application of the document 15

III. Current state of the public realm 17

IV. Starting points and objectives of designing public space 23
  IV.1 Starting points of the public space design process 23
  IV.2 Role of the public realm and public space in the city as a whole 25
  IV.3 Target public space quality criteria 26
  IV.4 Basic public space quality framework 27
  IV.5 Examples of the key attributes of high-quality public space 28
  IV.6 Basic theses of quality of the public realm and public space 30
  IV.7 Basic theses of the tools for achieving quality in the public space design process 31

V. Process of designing, managing and using public space 35
  V.1 Stakeholders in the process 36
  V.2 Specific levels of the process 38
    V.2.1 Public space development strategy and planning 38
    V.2.2 Management and maintenance 42
    V.2.3 Economy of public space 44
    V.2.4 Data collection, systematic evaluation and implementation of experience into practice 45
    V.2.5 Procedural support of “bottom-up” activities in using public space 46

VI. Annex 49
  VI.1 City creation processes / Investment in construction and development 51
  VI.2 Investment in construction and development 52
  VI.3 Overview of legislation protecting public interests / Overview of the most important administrative bodies concerned 54
  VI.4 Basic diagram showing the investment process with public law implications 56
  VI.5 Levels of public involvement and influence (according to Patterson Kirk Wallace) 57
  VI.6 Bodies involved in the city/town creation process (urban planning) 58
  VI.7 Tools for forming (public) interest in connection with the city/town creation process (urban planning) by group 59
  VI.8 Application of interests and tools 60

VII. Authors 63
Public space office

To this day, there is no holistic or conceptual approach to the development of the public realm and public space in Prague.

In 2013, Prague established the Public Space Office under the Prague Institute of Planning and Development. Its mission is to gradually create a general Public Space Development Plan for Prague, which is the first and vital condition to creating first-rate public spaces.

Establishing the office, setting its tasks and determining the documents to be developed there are all part of a fundamental change in the city’s approach to planning and development, which began in 2012. This included transforming the Prague Development Division into the Prague Institute of Planning and Development (Institut plánování a rozvoje hlavního města Prahy — “IPR Praha”); commencing work on a new spatial plan, the Prague Metropolitan Plan; and updating the Prague Strategic Plan; and drafting the new Prague Building Regulations. The change also involves the development of new documents outside IPR Praha, such as the UNESCO Management Plan for the Historical Centre of Prague[1].

I. Introduction

The proposed public space development STRATEGY and the public space design MANUAL

The proposed Public Space Development Strategy (the "Strategy") and the Public Space Development Manual (the "Manual") are integral parts of the Prague Public Space Development Plan. The reason for issuing these documents first and within a relatively short period of time is the need to influence as quickly as possible the public space projects being undertaken at the time in order to make them liveable and in order to apply a comprehensive approach to spaces as a whole as well as to the city as a whole.

The proposed Strategy and Manual address the general principles, rules and procedures for the development of public spaces. They therefore intentionally do not address specific places. Specific plans for specific localities or spaces should be developed gradually along with other related documents as part of the Prague Public Space Development Plan.

The proposed Strategy can also be understood as an explanatory memorandum and introduction to the Manual.

The proposed Strategy in particular provides a general analysis of current problems and defines general objectives. It outlines possible solutions and the tools that can be used.

The proposed Strategy contains a number of topics that should be developed into separate documents in the future. The topics herein thus only provide a foundation and starting point for future materials.

Prague Public Space Development Plan

The gradual creation of the Prague Public Space Development Plan (the “Plan”) should fill one of the main gaps in planning the development of the city; the non-existence of general management of the city’s public spaces that would focus on quality and liveability and on their structural importance in the city.

[1] The name of the document is only a working name. The concept of the document was drawn up in February 2009.
The Plan should primarily address planning and preparation of public space development with regard to the urban character thereof. This also includes an assessment of the related levels that have an influence on the quality of public space, such as execution, management, maintenance and use, or the related and essential economic and legislative criteria. In terms of methodology, it should include in particular a theoretical basis, analysis, and a strategic, tactical, conceptual and implementing methodological level.

The creation of the Prague Public Space Development Plan has to be a long-term continuous process that includes updating, responding to the city’s current needs and processing feedback: planning or legislative documents from the city or mutually influencing documents gradually being developed under the policy etc.

An important part of the Prague Public Space Development Plan should be a map of the city’s important public spaces and the city’s investment priority strategy arising from it.

Furthermore, conceptual plans for the various public spaces or areas of the city should be developed as part of the Prague Public Space Development Plan or in connection with it. These plans should serve either as the basis for preparing the investment plan directly or as long-term conceptual and coordination documents that aim to achieve the general quality of the places in connection with investments arising from immediate maintenance needs or the technical state. These plans will be developed in compliance with the Prague Metropolitan Plan and will build on the principles of locality and on drawings related to public space and the spatial layout of the landscape. These conceptual plans would at the same time be part of a more detailed spatial plan (the spatial plan for a defined part of Prague, the regulation plan, land-use studies, etc.).

The systematic development of the conceptual plans is a long-term process. As this process has to date not existed in Prague, the gradual supplementation of conceptual information on various locations is more realistic in the near future than comprehensive coverage of the territory.

A host of other materials should become part of the Prague Public Space Development Plan. The foundations for these materials will also be laid in the Prague Metropolitan Plan, the updated Prague Strategic Plan, the Prague Building Regulations and the UNESCO Management Plan for the Historical Centre of Prague. The following documents should gradually be developed as part of the Prague Public Space Development Plan or as related materials (the names of the documents being prepared are only working names and will be specified during their development).

### General analytical, strategic and methodological documents

**Prague Public Realm Development Vision**
A declaration by the city administration on the general direction and objective of the approach to development of the public realm and public space.

**Prague Public Space Development Strategy**
The city’s strategic document setting out the public space development objectives and the tools and timeframes for achieving them.

**Proposed Prague Public Space Development Strategy (IPR Praha, 06/2014)**
A document analysing the current problems and defining the public space development objectives. It serves as an explanatory and supporting platform for the Public Space Development Manual. It is intended chiefly for the city administration — local government and State administration. As this is one of the first documents to be published, it contains the rudiments of the other documents that will eventually be drawn up. It is the intellectual foundation for the Public Space Development Manual.

**Prague Public Space Development Manual (IPR Praha, 06/2014)**
This document defines the rules, principles and tools for achieving quality public spaces. It focuses particularly on the design, technical preparation, execution, management and maintenance of public spaces. As this is one of the first
documents to be published, it contains the rudiments of the other documents that will eventually be drawn up.

Public Space Economics Analysis and Strategy
This document will contain urban economic criteria and socio–economical analyses, including analyses and assessments of the sustainability of the various economic types of public spaces. It will outline the possibilities for balancing the costs and benefits within the public and private sectors.

Quality Public Space Procedural and Legislative Environment Analysis, Strategy and Methodology

Public Space Investment Policy
(being drafted by IPR Praha)

Street Lighting Policy

Public Space Furniture Catalogue

Prague Public Space Unified Information System

General Prague Tree Alley Plan

Prague Public Space Decentralised Drainage Methodology

Conceptual documents for specific and thematic areas of the city

- Prague Waterfront Concept (IPR Praha, 02/2014)
- Housing Estate Public Space Approach Policy
- Periurban Park Policy

Related efforts

Theoretical platform and debate
These are the basic starting points for all other documents. Experts and professionals, especially universities and research institutions, should take part in them.

Roles of the various stakeholders in the development of a quality public realm and public spaces
Prague Public Space Development Plan is only one of the tools available to the city for the development of the public realm and public spaces. In order to achieve the objectives proposed in the Plan, they have to be implemented and all stakeholders have to back the policy. The decisive balance and responsibility lies however with the municipal government and the State administration.
I.1 Definition of public realm and public space

**Public space**
The document uses the term public space to describe the physical space in the environment open to the public. It is chiefly a tract of land, or the “floor” of the city’s exterior, with all the amenities of public space also being an integral part of it. Public space is a subset of the public realm.

For the purposes of this document, the term public space also pertains to publicly accessible roads in developed areas and undeveloped areas, which the Prague Metropolitan Plan (IPR Praha, 05/2014) in its rationale[2] does not define as public space but as a part of the landscape (this applies, for example, to roads in undeveloped areas and in areas not suitable for development that are a continuation of roads in developed areas or areas suitable for development). The reason for expanding the term for the purposes of the proposed Strategy and the Manual is that quality public space in a city is dependent on continuity even across undeveloped areas and areas not suitable for development (e.g., streets verging into roads). The principles and rules of the proposed Strategy and the Manual are thus valid even for such spaces. At the same time, it is necessary for the purposes of the Manual to identify a subset of space in the landscape (defining its “floor”), just as public space is a subset of space in the city (developed areas and areas suitable for development) defining its “floor”.

The proposed Strategy and the Manual use the term public space for physically accessible spaces in the countryside, such as roads and lookouts. The general rules and principles that apply to public spaces apply to these areas as well. Legally, publicly accessible space in the landscape is considered different to public space in developed areas and areas suitable for development, that is, “the legal concept known as public permeability of the landscape gives everyone the right of passage through all land that is not exempted from this right”. In practice, however, this concept frequently does not work and the use of the public space concept could be a way to define public access to those parts of the landscape that should serve as “public space”. The proposed Strategy and the Manual address space in the city’s exterior that may not fulfil the criteria of public accessibility, such as certain commercial property, courtyards, etc. The reason is that these spaces play an important role in the overall quality of the city’s exterior, despite access to them being restricted or only visual. At the same time, from the point of view of design, the same rules usually apply to them as to public space.

**Public accessibility**
Public accessibility means that everyone is permitted access without restriction, regardless of the form of ownership, and that there are no restrictions on use other than time restrictions.

**Public realm**
The term public realm is used for all parts of the physical environment that are accessible to the public. In addition to public space, this can include spaces in the city’s exterior, courtyards and building interiors open to the public. Accessibility to the public realm also precludes restrictions on use other than time restrictions. The term public realm also applies to intangible space, meaning relationships, ideas, events, the media and so on. At the same time, the term public realm can be viewed as a whole or as a continuum.

---

II. Objective, nature and application of the document

The proposed Prague Public Space Development Strategy is a proposal for the elaboration of the Public Space Development Strategy.

**Public Space Development Strategy**
The Public Space Development Strategy should define the objectives and tools for the development of quality public spaces in Prague.

It has to include an action plan that contains not only the objectives, but also the specific tools for attaining them, time and investment schedules, and a specification of the bodies responsible for the various tasks, all supported by specific commitments from the city’s management.

— When defining the strategy, the vision has to be formulated first.

— Adoption of the vision by political representatives will at the same time be a declaration of their readiness to fulfil this vision.

— The vision should be shared by the city’s residents; its formulation is the basis for a social agreement.

— The way the vision should be brought to fruition should be defined in the city’s policy strategy.

— The vision should include in particular a definition of the importance and quality of public spaces in the city and the quality criteria that apply to public spaces.

**Proposed Public Space Development Strategy**
This document articulates the starting points and goals for proper development and generally outlines the tools that could be used to achieve this end.

It is based on the Prague Metropolitan Plan (Concept Rationale of the Metropolitan Plan, IPR Praha, 05/2014) and the strategic objectives of the updated Prague Strategic Plan (IPR Praha, 2014), especially Objective 5 — Environment.

The various topics are defined in the following chapters in the form of theses (propositions). The theses constitute a selection, not an exhaustive list, that may be subject to further elaboration in related documents.

→ [Public Space Design Manual/A.1 Introduction]
III. Current state of the public realm

The vision and strategy should not only be initiatory in nature. They must be based on an analysis of the basic existing problems, as their resolution is crucial to creating quality public spaces in Prague and a good quality of life for the city’s inhabitants.

The problem areas can generally be divided up thematically and at the same time according to the phases in which quality — be it good or bad — is created in public spaces and in which the core of the problem may lie.

In many cases, defining the problem means answering the problem.

**The city's strategic policy**

— Failure to use the city’s potential

Prague’s urban and social structure has great potential for the creation of high-quality public spaces, but the actual state of the public spaces and way they are used do not correspond to this potential.

The strength of Prague’s public spaces lies chiefly in the excellent basic structure of the historical and compact city. Prague’s urban structure is first rate, with its legible street network and sufficient number of squares and parks. Only minimum funds would be required to improve the appearance of a great many public spaces and the way they are used, as what is needed is some refurbishment, the addition of some missing street furniture, small compositional interventions, and often just a thorough clean-up. This however applies mainly to the centre and wider centre (the historical city, the compact city and some better parts of the garden city).

Prague has a sufficient number of public spaces; in the modernist city, the problem is that there are too many.

The social structure of society continues to be relatively homogenous with little tendency toward segregation.

— The city’s policy does not define the importance that a quality public realm and quality public space has for the city and life in it. There is thus no definition of what constitutes quality in terms of the public realm and public space. As such, society remains oblivious to what is a quality public realm and public space.

— No political vision for the city has been articulated to allow for public realm and public space development objectives or for the tools for achieving these objectives to be defined.

— There is no concept in place that would set out the city’s public realm and public space development priorities; nor is there a timeline or long-term investment plan for development.

— There is no coordination of the elements that comprise public spaces.

— The basis for decisions on improvements of public spaces are usually the special interests of certain entities, not the greater public interest in the overall quality of the place.
Prague’s budget does not have a specific investment expenditure heading for public space. Public space improvements are thus limited in the budget and, by extension, in the city’s policy, to technical and infrastructure investments only. The planned public space expenditures are scattered across a number of headings, usually technical in nature, with funds being allocated directly to the managers (especially the Technical Administration of Roads and the Prague Public Transport Company), which makes a conceptual and holistic approach impossible.

At the same time, the planned investments into quality public space are minimal.

When the political representation changes, the continuity of public space plans is disrupted. Usually, the elected representation that follows does not continue with the plans prepared by its predecessor, suspending them or even overhauling them completely. This is not done because the plans are bad or the content is wrong; the changes are motivated by special interests, i.e., “politicking”. However, a public realm of excellent quality is a common, shared value, and efforts aimed at improving the public realm must not be politicised and personified. What is more, urban development plans are always long-term, and more than one term of office is not long enough to prepare proper plans.

There are countless situations where the city does not make sufficient use of all the statutory instruments available to it to influence the quality of its public realm. There are also serious cases where these instruments do not in fact exist at all, for example the space of the Vltava River within the city, where the city’s possibility to influence the number and operation of tourist boats and anchored structures such as “botels” and boat restaurants (which are essentially “real estate” on the water but whose placement is not subject to spatial planning or building permits) does not correspond to the importance of the place as a historically valuable public space of citywide importance.

Preparation of public space plans in the city’s policy

The city’s policies and administration have no system for preparing a public space investment concept. Most investments are directed at technical and infrastructure plans and allocated directly to the technical and transport infrastructure managers (Technical Administration of Roads, the Prague Public Transport Company, etc.). The various plans are designed only by technical specialists and include technical modifications only. There is no prior conceptual design for improving the overall quality of the place in terms of broader contexts and the architectural quality and liveability of the space. Furthermore, the work carried out is often not coordinated even amongst the various managers. Thus, the huge amounts invested would have, in the presence of a properly prepared concept, brought much greater improvement to the overall quality of the public space.

The task of designing buildings and planning repairs in the city is usually not given to a qualified expert on overall quality of space — an architect. Designing and repairing public space are tasks usually assigned in a way that prevents the best expert being found. Act No. 137/2006, on public contracts, as amended, allows the assignment to be awarded in a competitive or public tender where the only criterion is the bid price (or execution deadline) instead of in an architectural competition or a competitive or public tender where the main criterion is professional qualifications.

There is no coordination of the public space plans of the various investors and managers. Such coordination should be the city’s responsibility and conducted already during the planning phase, not during the later building permit process.

The building authorities are the bodies of the last instance that can bring quality back into the game. Without coordination of plans, especially with regard to the quality of space, during the preparation phase, the relevant public authorities (the building authorities in particular) are the bodies of the last instance that can demand compliance and coordination with the overall quality of the space. The building authorities usually do not intervene, but only check compliance with regulations (according to their interpretation of their responsibilities under the Building Act).
The city’s property law policy

- There is no strategic property law policy that applies to public spaces. Public land that is not being used at this time but has the potential to become a functional public space is often sold off into private ownership without an assessment by experts or policymakers of the urban development strategy and public space utilisation possibilities. Giving up ownership of public land usually means a long-term (or permanent) loss of any fundamental influence over the quality of such space in the city.

The above also applies to public land and/or the buildings leased to private parties. Lease agreements are often very disadvantageous for the city and their duration in this context incommensurate. Furthermore, they usually do not contain qualified terms and conditions assessing how the use or physical modifications made under the lease affect the appearance of public space and its use.

- Change in the form of public space managers from organisations funded from the city’s budget to joint-stock companies. The change of form of the managers from organisations funded from the city’s budget to joint-stock companies (for example, the Prague Public Transport Company and now possibly the Technical Administration of Roads) is a step that leads to the city losing important influence over the management and operation of strategic parts of public space.

Preparation and planning

- Especially due to the absence of an architect when preparing the majority of public space investment plans, numerous bad decisions or even no decisions are made in the various stages of the process, from project planning to execution. Only specific parts of the space are dealt with, without an assessment of the effect of the contemplated modifications on the quality of the entire space and on the wider surroundings.

Technical criteria are given preference over liveability and aesthetics if not the only criteria taken into account. The absence of an architect is often filled by public officials who “design” during the building permit process, which again leads to specific criteria being preferred without the quality of the whole being taken into account. This approach also reinforces the erroneous impression that the presence of an architect is unnecessary with regard to the design of the space as a whole.

- There is usually no general public space concept or investment plan for refurbishment, nor the related designation of responsibility. The result is then a simple list of the specific requirements by the individual managers or relevant public authorities. These requirements are always highly biased with no consideration of their role in the whole. In most cases, they are, unfortunately, automatically and schematically derived from regulations or a simplified interpretation of regulations. This approach makes it impossible to design a highly liveable urban environment.

- The decision-making responsibility that should be allocated to one specific entity is divided up among numerous committees.

- Infrastructure is confused with the objective of a liveable and aesthetic urban environment. The role of infrastructure is, as this term implies, only to provide support for the objective.

- The planting of trees is not part of the building permit process. As such, planting is carried out haphazardly, without the general composition of the place, refurbishment plans or the presence of underground utilities in mind. Once trees grow, they become difficult to remove and unnecessary damage occurs, something that could have been avoided if the planting had been coordinated from the start.

Management, operation and maintenance

- There is no system — coordinated and managed by the city — in place for managing the specific parts of public space. The responsibility for managing...
public space is scattered across numerous entities without any system in place. It is therefore not clear who is responsible for what, and there is no consistent coordination by the city.

- Transfers of assets between the city and its managers are not logical and do not work. The problem begins already on the property law level. Once an investment project — planned by either the manager or the municipal district — is completed, the assets are not transferred in line with a logical link to management, operation and maintenance. In many cases, the responsibility for management and maintenance of not just certain specific elements, such as street furniture and some trees, but also entire key areas of public space, such as signalised crossings or tram routes, is lost.

- The system for assessing operating costs is poor. The primary criterion when assessing managers is operating costs. However, certain investments for improving the quality of public space increase operating costs, making investment into quality undesirable.

- Cleaning and maintenance are insufficient. Cleaning and maintenance of public spaces are not given the attention they deserve. Although sufficient funding is provided, it is not used effectively. There is no general maintenance concept, coordination is ineffective, and the responsible companies often do not have the appropriate expertise (e.g., when maintaining vegetation). There is no effective system of control or enforcement, even though thorough and regular cleaning and maintenance would be enough to substantially increase the quality of certain places. This situation results in the absence of regular maintenance and the resulting need for more expensive refurbishment, i.e., public spaces that are in disrepair are kept just on the brink of life. Professional care for existing trees in the city is extremely undervalued. Investments are rather directed at planting new trees.

**Appearance of Public Spaces**
The lack of preparation, design and management results in the poor appearance of public spaces, which is manifested in the following, for example:

- Public spaces are often not interlinked, do not form a uniform composed and hierarchical urban structure and do not fulfil the basic requirements of continuity and permeability.

- Public spaces in the modernist city are highly neglected and are borderline functional, let alone liveable or aesthetic.

- Public spaces in the historical part of the city are degraded by commercialism that panders to tourists and by the related transformation of buildings from residential structures to commercial ones. The way that numerous important squares look and are used does not correspond at all to their representational and residential potential. Important squares often serve as parking lots, others as a “Disneyland” for tourists. The cultural value of the place is thereby destroyed — this includes the various layers of cultural history inherent in the space and the potential offered by quality contemporary culture.

- Many public spaces are vague, without a defined character or purpose.

- The aesthetic quality and liveability of many public spaces are low. This is chiefly due to the absence of a design concept for refurbishment and an architect in charge of it.

- Solutions that favour transport often predominate and determine the appearance of the space. The appearance should however be the result of the overall design of the place and the transport infrastructure should only play a supporting role.

- The high volume of automobile traffic and the related physical layout and organisation of the space often degrade the space, even making full- fledged use of public space impossible. This is a problem especially of public spaces that would otherwise have great potential or importance in the urban structure.

- In terms of balancing various interests, the “privatisation” of many public spaces for parking is objectively unjustified.

- A large number of public spaces that have the potential to become high quality public spaces are not fully used because they are not sufficiently furnished.
(seating, areas to lie down, sidewalk cafes, etc.). One of the reasons why seating and other structures that make a space liveable are not situated in public spaces is the fear of socially problematic individuals. This, however, is entirely nonsensical and goes against the purpose of the public realm. Socially related problems should be dealt with using other means (prevention, regulation, restriction). Socially weaker groups should not be excluded from the public realm by definition; the rules of use have to be observed, however.

Public spaces are polluted by objects, especially technical infrastructure, that form a barrier to use, degrade the aesthetic quality of the space and could have been eliminated if a design concept had been prepared, an expert and architect had been involved in the planning and the city had been in charge of coordination.

Public spaces contain numerous physical, mental and social barriers. The needs of the handicapped are not taken into account. Numerous barriers that initially seem to protect pedestrians actually promote fast and unrestricted automobile traffic and hinder natural pedestrian movement and trajectories.

Public space components quickly degrade due to insufficient clean–up and maintenance. Furthermore, their poor state attracts socially problematic individuals, who in turn hasten the physical degradation of the space.

The value hierarchy of society
The value hierarchy of quality public space is defined neither by the city with its policy nor by the public. This results in transport, technical and utilitarian values (which appear and exist of their own accord, as most arise by instrumentation and automatism) clearly predominating over humanistic values (which require conducive conditions, active formation and protection).

The result is, e.g., the predominance of “heavier” traffic — such as automobile traffic, which, if not regulated, always dominates the space — over “weaker” traffic — such as pedestrian traffic, which requires active protection. Weaker traffic has not be paid systematic attention. Heavier traffic is based on exact data that should be thoroughly mapped and assessed on par with weaker traffic.

Society does not define the value hierarchy of the various kinds of traffic — car, public transport, cycling and pedestrian traffic — or of the residential qualities of public space. Even though it is always best to find a balanced solution that satisfies all users, in reality the various interests are in conflict and preference has to be given to one or the other.

Role of society
As there is no public space development vision or strategy, the city’s residents are not involved systematically in such development.

General awareness of what public space should look like is low compared to developed major cities. This is reflected in how individuals and society influence the appearance of public spaces around them, in terms of how they use them on a day–to–day basis and the fundamental decisions they make on their development.

Using public spaces
The poor appearance of public spaces and the way the functions of such spaces are set up by the city are affecting the way they are used.

A large number of public spaces are not full–fledged living areas. Living naturally in the urban exterior — living, resting, walking, socialising, etc. — does not occur here. The quality of the space, but also in the mentality of society as a holdover from the past, when meeting in public spaces was discouraged, may be the cause. Numerous restrictions on using public space are another relic of the past; the use of public space should now be encouraged. The low use of public space relates to the overall change in the lifestyle of society, where being in a public space is no longer a necessity, but a choice.

The situation is changing only gradually, e.g., small neighbourhood events are taking place ever more often in Prague thanks to active local communities and non–profits, and efforts are being initiated locally to improve quality permanently. The city still lacks the tools to support and make use of these “bottom–up” initiatives, however.
IV. Starting points and objectives of designing public space

IV.1 Starting points of the public space design process

Definition of the role of public space in the city, target quality criteria, hierarchy and the tools for achieving them.

Public space design can be considered as any activity influencing the form and function of public space, i.e., not only the planning and creation of public space, but also its management and use.

In the public space design process, it is first necessary to define the role of public space and the public realm generally, public space quality criteria and their hierarchy and the tools for achieving them.

Defining the role of the public realm and public space in the city on both the physical level and the ideological level

Defining the role of the public realm and public space in the city is a prerequisite for creating the conditions not only for their quality, but also for their very existence and support thereof in planning and designing the city.

Defining this role is the necessary why, i.e., a determination of the purpose that has to precede any other what and how, i.e., looking for forms and tools.

The appearance and function of the public realm and public space are the forms. Tools are found on the level of preparation (strategy, planning, investment, etc.), implementation (construction and refurbishment of public spaces), management, operation, maintenance and use.

Determining the importance of the existence and quality of the public realm and public space in the hierarchy of design and use of the city

In the past — not only in the period before the Velvet Revolution, but also in the years that followed — and right up to the present, technocratic and instrumental points of view in urban design have predominated over humanistic points of view in urban design have predominated over humanistic points of view.

In practice, this has been exacerbated not only by the overall hierarchical values set up in society, but also by arguments advocating and in fact enforcing the superiority of these technocratic and instrumental requirements based on “hard” data and terminology that by their nature are easily incorporated into the legislative language of regulations. The qualitative attributes of the environment that reside on the humanistic level and work with “soft” terminology even in science are then in practice not taken into account at all, let alone given priority on equal footing. The result is a state of the environment in our cities that surprises us — nevertheless, we continue to accept or tolerate the official technocratic and instrumental interpretation of life and the environment surrounding us.

For current practice in the design of the built–up environment it is thus necessary to terminologically and semantically establish the definition of quality of the built–up environment on the humanistic level. Clear
terminology and theses (propositions) with regard to these qualities then not only have to pass muster in practical arguments but should, ideally, also be enshrined in current legislation. They have to be “enforceable” in some form or fashion and generally speaking “given priority” over other interests, especially specific technocratic ones.

The humanistic quality of the environment generally lies, for example, in liveability, aesthetics and the socio-cultural dimension or in the representative and communicative role. In the public realm, these attributes are part of the residential quality of a place: liveability, richness of experience, sensory perception and learning.

Functionality is an integral part or basic condition for quality of the built-up environment. Its role is however to create support for the final purpose, which is general quality of life. For this reason, functionality should not be given priority to the detriment of humanistic qualities.

**Defining the attributes of the comprehensive quality of public space**

The primary objective is the holistic quality of public space (with the mentioned role in the city as a whole being part of this).

In practice, public spaces are often built or refurbished primarily as part of specific projects — usually related to transport or technical infrastructure or building construction — where public spaces are only the secondary product thereof, or, for example, refurbished only to improve their structural or technical state. However, if the ambition is to focus on improving the overall quality of public space, then the same or comparable financial investment can lead to a much greater improvement in the overall level of quality of the result.

A condition to achieving overall quality is the existence of a general concept for the place concerned and coordination of all interventions by the city (including the influence of maintenance, management and use).

**Defining the tools for designing quality public space**

In urban design theory on the scientific, academic, methodological and even planning and political levels, the preference is to focus on describing the ideal state or criticising the existing one. The issue of functional and realistic tools for achieving the declared objectives is often suppressed, underestimated or even entirely ignored. This results in these theories and the actual processes that affect the appearance of urban space running out of sync. Ways thus have to be found to bring theory on the ideal state in line with the actual implementation of such state.
IV.2 Role of the public realm and public space in the city as a whole

With regard to the city and society as a whole, the public realm and public space have to assume certain roles to have meaning and purpose: particularly ideological and experiential roles in addition to urban planning, infrastructure, economic and environmental roles.

A. Urban planning role
Public spaces form the basic urban structure of a city. Traffic and technical infrastructure as well as individual buildings and whole developments need to be subordinated to the standard of quality of public spaces and their logic.

B. Infrastructure and technical role
Technical quality and functionality are prerequisites for other “softer” roles of public spaces, such as their infrastructure role, i.e., a supporting role that provides the foundation for other roles and supports them. High quality and systematically organised transport, especially public transport, has an initiatory role leading to an increase in the comprehensive quality of the respective locations and the city as a whole.

C. Ideological role
Urban design should be based on a social agreement on the desired appearance of the city, as the city is chiefly a shared space. The values recognised by all of society create the basic foundation or metastructure of such agreement, which secures stability and complexity of its internal structure.

The public realm is the framework and embodiment of the social agreement. The public realm forms the basic ideological metastructure of the city.

---

Political role
The public realm is a material condition for a political space. The existence of the public realm and its quality are a reflection of how democratic society is.

Humanistic role
The humanistic role is at the same time the superstructure and the reason for the existence of the public realm. It consists of attributes that go above and beyond the technical, utilitarian and instrumental dimension of the environment. This role has been an integral part of the displayed environment throughout history. Its role has weakened substantially only as a result of the technical revolution and the related shift in societal values.

The public realm is a place and means for drawing us into the community and the world.

Cultural and social role
The public realm is the basic platform for social interaction in the city. This role should be preserved even while acknowledging that virtual space will take over a substantial part of social space, where the role of the physical public realm will be to communicate with the virtual one and assimilate it.

Public spaces have a communicative, representative and symbolic character.

The public realm and public space have the ability to influence the pattern of human behaviour and are the basic tools for fostering society that each and every urban policy should make use of and not waste.

---

Role in protecting and developing cultural heritage
“The image of Prague as a cultural asset is represented by the complex of tangible and intangible culture.”[4] The city’s role is to actively protect this image and at the same time develop it.

The public realm is one of the city’s facets that contains, reflects and initiates the mutually shared ideological content of society and the displayed environment.

Culture is the outcome and subject of what is shared by society. The public realm is the framework and representation of a society’s culture and is thus a part of the cultural heritage as a legacy of the past for the present and of the present for the future.

The quality of the tangible and intangible components of the public realm is the subject of cultural heritage management. If we perceive cultural heritage management as a public interest, then to a certain extent it has to take place through the public realm.

---

Before public space quality criteria can be formulated, the terms public realm and public space have to be defined in terms of quality.

Active and latent public space
Making provisions for quality when using the term “public space” in urban planning

The basic definition of the term public space — see Definition of public realm and public space — is more or less a quantitative definition. For a qualitative definition, however, we have to divide public spaces up further into those spaces that fulfil the appearance and functional requirement and those that, although accessible to the public (i.e., those that are the “floor of the city’s exterior”), do not fulfil any fundamental purpose, are not used in any way, do not have a perceptible spatial or typological character and are thus spatially and functionally barren. This “nondescript” space often has the potential to become functional. Public space can thus be further divided up into active and latent public space.

Latent public spaces should be considered only temporary. Based on the assessment of their potential to become active public spaces and an analysis of the city’s actual needs in terms of the number of public spaces in a given location, a decision should be made in the planning process to have such spaces become active public spaces or have their status changed to a different use, such as building land.

At the same time, the term active space does not only mean that events take place in them, but that they have an active role in city. Such role may for example even be intended, composed “functional or visual emptiness” in a space that is full of people and events, such role being fulfilled by spaces that are not physically accessible to the public.

This qualitative assessment could be effectively applied to the field of investment, where active public spaces should be supported, i.e., spaces that truly fully fulfil the role of the public realm.
**Holistic Quality**
The basic criterion is quality of public space as a spatial whole, which includes physical and functional attributes as well as relationships and experiences that cannot be perceived partially and that should preferentially be subordinate to the quality of the whole.

Even though quality is based on the existence and the proper fulfilment of a general public space design concept, it is at the same time necessary to allow for its “final openness” — leaving the space open to the multi-layered, ever-changing facets of life.

**Quality Criteria of the Physical Structures of Public Space**
Public spaces are first and foremost defined by their physical framework — urban or landscape — and their character. The space defined by the urban environment forms the basis of the quality of public space. It is the primary bearer of the operational layout.

It is important to have functions and events in mind when designing a city; these however belong to the category of mutable and shifting attributes of space.

The quality of public space is not composed primarily of the design of the objects in it; the design can only improve or detract from the quality.

**Quality of Functionality**
Quality of functionality is a prerequisite to all else, as without it, all other criteria usually do not function as they should. Hierarchically, it always has to be in the infrastructure role, i.e., it has to support the objective, which is the liveability of the space.

**Quality of the Experiential Framework**
The purpose of the physical constituent of the displayed environment is first and foremost to create a framework for experiences. These experiences are thus the primary, final objective of public space. The physical framework of a space should allow, support, initiate and generate such experiences.

The ability of the physical framework of public space to generate, initiate, support and allow experiences and the ability of society to fill this attribute of public space with experiences not only work together to contribute and augment quality, but reinforce one another by their interaction.

**Public Space Quality on the Sensory, Emotional and Cognitive Level**
In addition to fulfilling a utilitarian and residential function, public space also provides an experiential and cognitive dimension. This includes immediate sensory experience, emotional experience, aesthetic perception, cognition, etc.
IV.5 Examples of the key attributes of high-quality public space

**Liveability**
Quality public spaces are those that are alive, i.e., that are actively used by people for recreational and other activities. Quality public spaces are inviting, i.e., people want to stop and spend time in them. People seek out the company of others. They are attracted to places that are rich in sensory perception and experiences. The greater the ratio between places that people spend time in and places that people only move through, the better the quality of public life in the city. Urban public spaces should always offer a percentage of quiet places for relaxation and lively places for social events.

Contribution to the liveability of a place is a sufficient number of places to sit or lie, free and quiet places to stop and rest, places to relax and places that are active, such as sidewalk cafes or places that encourage social, cultural or sporting activities. A pleasant atmosphere (shady or sunny places, places protected from the wind or noise, places with pleasant smells) makes a location more attractive to spend time in.

The city as a whole becomes much more liveable if there is a sufficient number of parks within walking distance, as well as trees and vegetation generally.

The primary function of a large portion of public spaces is purely utilitarian. This applies especially to transport infrastructure spaces. However, efforts also have to be made to make such places more liveable and enjoyable — to an extent that the basic utilitarian function of such spaces is not suppressed.

**Convenience and Comfort**
People move about the city mainly out of necessity (to get from one place to another). A smaller percentage of activities are voluntary (relaxation). Movement can however often also mean more than just getting from one point to another: it can also mean rich experiences (on the sensory, emotional, intellectual, social and societal level).

City streets cannot be seen simply as transport corridors. Their residential qualities have to be promoted. Quality movement is safe, unrestricted, effective and rich in sensory perception and cognition.

Walking through the city allows for a greater degree of interaction with the space. The human scale of a place corresponds to this form of movement; speed, conversely, separates a person from their environment. Modifying the appearance of the surroundings to be viewed at greater than walking speed deforms its human scale, as this creates long tracts that are poor in sensory stimulation and increases the scale of the perceived detail.

With respect to streets where transport is the dominant function, one must not give up on the quality of the public spaces located there and efforts have to be made to identify all possibilities for increasing their liveability, which includes not only making them as accessible as possible for pedestrians, but also maximising visual contact from vehicles or perception from adjoining spaces that are further away.

**Possibility of use by all residents**
The term public essentially includes the term equality of use. Public space should allow not only public access, but also comfort of use to all groups of residents, i.e., to groups of all social, cultural and social categories, as well as to groups with limitations, such as seniors, parents with prams, the visually impaired and the physically handicapped.

**Accessibility, permeability**
A city where distances are short helps substantially to improve and enliven public spaces. The prerequisites for this include a compact urban structure and a legible structure of public spaces, as well as the representation and fusion of all the basic urban functions (housing, work, shopping, education, culture, sport, recreation, etc.) and their location within walking distance.

A condition for permeability is observance of the minimum scale of permeability, i.e., especially making sure access is not blocked by closed-off commercial properties or dead-end roads and paths.

Permeability is reinforced by barrier-free access, the elimination of unnecessary detours, the elimination of steep grades, etc.

Another condition to satisfactory permeability of the surroundings is the ease of orientation for users. The basis for this is the creation of a public space hierarchy that, on the one hand, has to be part of the urban composition and, on the other, legible for the user. Public spaces that are important on the citywide scale form the basic landmarks in the city and the structure of permeability.

In terms of the quality of use of public space, good permeability and access for pedestrians and cyclists are a priority. These forms of transport contribute — in an initiatory, not regulatory, way — to reducing the negative impacts of automobile traffic.

Public transport should have priority over individual automobile transport in terms of permeability and accessibility.
Freedom of choice
Many activities that take place in public spaces are essential in nature, i.e., they are activities that people carry out under any and all circumstances regardless of the quality of the place. Other activities are a matter of choice. High-quality public spaces should provide space for the widest range of voluntary activities.

Human scale
The urban environment is there for people to live in. All of its attributes should thus be measured against “human” scale.

Safety
The feeling of safety is a basic requirement for a good quality of life in the city. This means safety of movement, social safety (protection from crime) and so on. Social safety is greater in spaces that have a clear layout and are lively (the permanent presence of a high number of people ensures “neighbourly supervision”).

Healthy environment, quality of climate
People by their nature seek — subconsciously or rationally — a healthy environment. Public spaces should thus provide clean air, little noise, moderate temperatures, pleasant smells, sufficient light, protection from the wind, shade, etc.

Places for relaxation and physical activity also have to be comfortable in terms of ergonomics (the shape and placement of the elements that help to make the space liveable) and the senses (temperature and haptic attributes of the elements that users come into contact with).

Sensory, cognitive and aesthetic qualities
Sensory, cognitive and aesthetic qualities are integral to the liveability of a space and should not be neglected under pressure from utilitarian needs.

Communicativeness
Quality spaces should communicate with their users. Public spaces should communicate clearly both on the level of general use (information, orientation, etc.) and on the sensory and representational level (symbolic and representational role, aesthetic quality, etc.).

Legibility — possibility to identify with one’s environment
The possibility for residents to identify with their environment (both over the long-term and short-term) is a condition for a high quality of life in it. The means of identification are temporal (contemporary and historical context) and spatial (identity of place and spatial context).

It is easy to identify with places that have their own character and an intelligible context; conversely, “bland”, anonymous and autonomous places elicit feelings of alienation, and people do not seek them out. Identification with the environment enforces social cohesion.

Appropriate social contact
A specific attribute of city life is the high degree of social contact with unknown people in the public realm. Social contact can be viewed as positive and be sought out; at the same time, it can be the subject of concern. Public space should always allow a voluntary degree of social contact. At the same time, it should support and initiate the positive aspects of social contact: dialogue, meeting new people, active participation in society, etc.

Social interaction can take place on different levels, from the local community level up to the citywide level, and include visitors. Especially in the case of local communities, participation in the design and management of a space is a form of social contact that can substantially improve the quality of the appearance of the space and its use.

Flexibility
Polythematic and polyfunctional public spaces are usually more lively and sustainable over the long term.

The usability of public spaces should respond to changes in daily rhythms, weekly cycles and the seasons. Over the longer term, they should reflect the age, social and cultural composition of the residents.

Sustainability
The overall quality of public spaces, the quality of their role in the urban structure, sufficient resources for their management and maintenance and a sufficient number of people who can and want to use them are the conditions of their sustainability.

The use of durable materials and design, the quality of the workmanship or resistance to external events (floods etc.) contribute to this along with the flexibility of use of public spaces and the timelessness of their appearance.

A condition of sustainability of public spaces is early maintenance based on regular monitoring, which includes regular cleaning. Unkempt spaces attract vandalism and increases the speed of deterioration. Intensive protection and care are often more cost-effective than complete renovation.
IV.6 Basic theses of quality of the public realm and public space

When designing public space, it is always necessary to assess quality criteria both on the physical level (quality in the context of the broader urban structure, the architectural quality of the place itself, technical functionality and so on) and on the experiential level (fulfilment of purpose, functionality of use, quality of experience, etc.) and ideological level (representational and symbolic or, for example, role in society, and so on).

— Public space forms the basic structure of a city, and the placement of technical infrastructure and buildings needs to be subordinated to this fact.

— The quality of the public realm is the main factor affecting quality of life in the city.

— Quality public space is most of all liveable, i.e., safe, accommodating to all groups of people, healthy, lively, communicative, stimulating and beautiful.

— The emotional qualities of life are just as important as the functional qualities.

— Human scale and the human senses are the basis for designing public space.

— Public space should not only be accessible, but also attractive to all groups of people.

— Public space in a city should encourage pedestrians to move about and spend time in it. Liveability of public space should be a priority, and transport and technical infrastructure should conform to it.

— Transport solutions in the city’s public spaces should also take into account the needs of pedestrians and cyclists in particular. In spaces intended to be liveable, these needs have to be given priority.

— The degree and manner of parking in public spaces should correspond to the primary objective, which is a high quality of life in public spaces. Parking should be minimised here and addressed chiefly by other means, such as P + R, park houses, tolls, parking zones or reasonable fees.

— Proper maintenance and cleaning are essential to quality public spaces.

— One of the conditions for quality public spaces on streets and in squares is communication with the frontage of the surrounding buildings (“active frontage policy”).

— At this time, the removal of barriers — physical, mental, social and functional — is one of the important tasks in the development of public spaces.

— Public spaces should serve their primary utilitarian function using simple means that require minimum investment and maintenance. At the same time, these means should always be proposed in a way that ensures liveability of the space on the sensory, experiential and cognitive level.
IV.7 Basic theses of the tools for achieving quality in the public space design process

The tools can generally be defined within the various stages of the public space design process, from strategic preparations and investment, to planning, design, management, operation and use. The structure used below aims to provide clarity to the reader; in reality, however, the various objectives overlap, extending into a number of areas and stages of the process.

Strategy development, planning, investment and economics

There is no shortage of public space in Prague as a whole. The optimum number of public spaces is one that the city is able to maintain economically and that people are able to actively use. The investment priority under the current structure should thus be to improve the quality of existing public spaces that have potential. The city should then initiate and enforce the establishment of new public spaces in connection with plans for new developments, with the spaces in such developments being reasonable in number and quality.

The extent of investment in public spaces always has to be considered not only in terms of urban quality, but also in terms of economic sustainability derived from the true economic situation of the city, which includes not only investment into the construction of such spaces, but also into their maintenance and management to guarantee the requisite level of quality.

Today the objective is no longer autonomous megalomaniacal projects, but specific continual interventions that boost the potential of the city’s existing spaces to become quality public spaces.

To ensure that the development of public spaces is possible and that such development has continuity, the municipal government should declare and guarantee that funds from the municipal budget allocated to the development of public spaces will be available for at least one electoral term.

In efforts to improve the quality of existing public spaces, it is often enough just to remove superfluous utilitarian and unnecessary structures, add seating and similar street furniture to make the spaces more inviting, and undertake regular thorough maintenance, in conjunction with cleaning and oversight.

The public and private sector must work together on investments in and management of public spaces, the objective being that both parties will benefit from this approach.

It is also necessary to work with local initiatives working to improve the quality of public spaces, utilise their potential, support them and coordinate their objectives with the interests of the city.

The degree to which public spaces are commercialised needs to be considered carefully. For example, primary public spaces, especially of a residential character, should in principle not be forced to generate profit if it is to the detriment of the quality of their basic residential function. If any profit is generated, it should be reinvested back into the same place if the place requires it, while respecting the solidarity of the various headings of the municipal budget at the same time.

Spatial planning and design

In the case of Prague, the existence and quality of public spaces have to be based on all planning levels: from the strategic and land-use plan to the design of the space.

The existence and quality of public spaces must already be defined in the Prague Metropolitan Plan. This will provide assurance of the quality of public spaces, which consists of an adequate number of such spaces, the proper establishment of a physical framework of the various spaces and the logic of their mutual structure, supported by the assurance of a quality city that does not expand into the outskirts.

It is necessary to define the hierarchy of public spaces, which will help prioritise investments aimed at improving their quality. A network of strategic public spaces in Prague needs to be defined, and then their relationship to one another needs to be reinforced. Together such places create a shared image of the city. This network should be a priority for investments in public spaces.

The hierarchy of public spaces based on importance can be on the national, metropolitan (citywide), municipal district, local (locality) or community (street, block, etc.) level. It has to be specifically understood which public spaces should be of local importance and use and which can be of citywide importance and use. The decision on such designation relates to the location in the city structure, to the potential of the space itself, etc. When formulating the form and function of public spaces with citywide potential and use, this objective should not be forgotten, for example due to preference for particular local interests; its fulfilment should be a priority. The existence of these superpositional “nodal” public spaces reduces the risk of the creation
of a fragmentary city, in both the urban planning and political meaning of this term. These public spaces of citywide importance are the shared mental grid of the city.

At the same time, it is also necessary to focus on the small, seemingly unimportant places that comprise the basic environment of ordinary day-to-day city life. Of course, a fundamental shift on the social level is required as well: it is necessary to change the relationship that the residents of Prague have to the city’s public environment and increase the level of people’s social engagement along with their own activity and responsibility. The same applies to private entities.

Pinpointed initiatory interventions need to be undertaken, especially in problematic locations, to create places that have a positive impact on the surrounding areas, the objective being not only to improve the quality of the place itself, but to create an epicentre initiating improvement of the urban space and life in it in the adjoining areas, especially “from within”, i.e., based on the activities of residents and private investors as well.

When designing new public spaces, their role and position within the overall structure of the city are primary, as their creation establishes or supplements it. For example, in peripheral urban structures that are not city-like in character, the role of public spaces is to create such character and initiate the expansion of this character into the surrounding structure.

The structure of public spaces should help connect the centre and the periphery and through the help of legible hierarchical spaces and their connection to each other create a mental map of the city.

In connection with any intervention in public spaces, even where the objective is reconstruction of transport or technical infrastructure, the priority of any project should be the liveability of the space.

When refurbishing or designing new public spaces in the existing urban structure, strategic decisions on the degree of intervention are important with regard to the long-term spatial concept and investment feasibility in the city’s planned economic time horizon.

Wherever it is expected that the general design concept of a place will be successfully implemented, it is an error to carry out uncoordinated fragmentary interventions, which may end up being not only a wasted investment, but also an obstacle to fulfilling the design concept. On the other hand, wherever an ideal, comprehensive restoration is not possible in the foreseeable future due to economic and technical reasons, it is worth identifying forms of interventions, be they temporary or partial, such that can substantially improve the quality of public spaces. The design concept should be developed sufficiently in advance to avoid loss of potentially higher target quality and efficiency as a result of the uncoordinated and non-conceptual fragmentary interventions of an autonomous nature.

When refurbishing existing public spaces, the first effective step can be “cleansing”, which means removing all unnecessary structures that do not primarily serve the functional requirements of the space or finding a way to fulfil the purpose of these structures in a better way. In the same way, all operations not part of the function of the public space or that conversely have to do with city’s requirements unrelated to the space and are detrimental to the quality of the space should be eliminated.

The purpose of designing and refurbishing public spaces is to create and enhance the specific identity of a given locality. The character of the city as a whole is then to a large extent formed by the sum of these identities and their influence on one another.

The primary function of a large portion of public spaces is purely utilitarian. This applies especially to transport infrastructure spaces. However, efforts also have to be made to make such places more liveable and enjoyable — to an extent that the basic utilitarian function of such spaces is not suppressed.

**Management, operation and maintenance**

Regular cleaning and proper maintenance can in many cases substantially improve the quality of public spaces. Often such efforts can prevent the need for expensive refurbishment.

From the point of view of investment and design, it is necessary to clearly differentiate between projects that by their character and scope are essentially maintenance projects and projects that by their size and overall effect on the quality of the space are investment projects. It is necessary to change current practice, where a high percentage of major public space projects (e.g., projects undertaken by the Technical Administration of Roads) are undertaken as part of standard or ongoing maintenance and where surfaces and elements are fully replaced and the design of the space, despite often being unsatisfactory, is kept the way it is. Furthermore, maintenance work is undertaken without a building permit — i.e., no concept that would specify the impact of the repairs on the overall quality of the space is prepared — and, more importantly,
without the input of an expert/architect. The nature and size of these investments would, however, often allow the overall quality of the space to be improved. Current practice thus leads to ineffective spending.

Investment plans, i.e., those that by their nature and size go above and beyond what could be considered maintenance, should be prepared by the city’s body in charge of investment, not by the organisations that are in charge of management and maintenance.

Utilisation
The public should be involved in all phases of designing public space — from planning to influencing how the space is used. This involvement should not only pertain to the requirements that the city’s inhabitants can legitimately demand. Residents should also be allowed to become actively involved in designing and maintaining quality public space.

It is again necessary to build and maintain the public’s general awareness of what quality public space should look like, as it is this general awareness that allows quality public space to be designed somewhat as a matter of course, through day-to-day regular use and management of those places where architectural planning is not required. This awareness, which grows out of a long-running continuity and tradition in democratic, especially Western European, countries, has for the most part disappeared in our country due to the fatal disruption that took place in the second half of the 20th century. Experience with what constitutes quality public space is required before the public can create this quality around itself every day or demand it and assess it on the public level and political level.

Quality public space can help prevent the exodus of residents from the city centre. The task of public space is to bring people back to the centre. Whereas public spaces were previously used by the people living in close proximity to them, they are now located centrally in areas where housing has given way to shops and offices and must be used by “visitors” from different parts of the city. This transformation places specific demands on public space in terms of attractiveness and use.

What is important is that the degree to which sharing the public realm is voluntary or necessary is correctly set.
V. Process of designing, managing and using public space

The following text addresses the general principles and basic theses of procedures related to creating (planning, designing, executing), managing, operating, maintaining and using public space. It does not provide a systematic list, but emphasises the elements that are the most problematic and entirely absent in current practice.

These elements are based predominantly on the current distribution of the roles and statuses of the various stakeholders in the process and on the legislative and political framework of the environment, so that they are usable even in the current situation. As part of the documentation connected to the proposed Public Space Development Strategy and Public Space Design Manual, a new process and framework have to be proposed and more in-depth, system-wide changes have to take place gradually. This topic will be addressed in more detail chiefly in the Public Space Investment Policy, which will be part of the Public Space Development Plan, the result of which should be optimisation of the relationship and procedures between the relevant stakeholders, with a more advanced and systematically more detailed enshrinement of the general quality of public spaces in investment plan preparations as the most important criterion.

The objective of the principles is a holistic approach to public spaces and their development, especially with regard to the architecture, urban planning, liveability and usability generally, i.e., an approach that has so far not been given preference.

Cooperation, coordination and the correct delegation of the tasks of the various stakeholders in the process and their relationships to the various tools is key to achieving overall quality of public spaces.
V.1 Stakeholders in the process

A. City administration

**Prague municipal government**
Role: Primary initiatory and decision-making role with regard to strategy and planning on the citywide level. Decision-making role on all other levels (execution, management, operation, maintenance and use).

The role of the municipal government is to fulfil the vision under the strategic and investment policy, with the proposed Public Space Development Strategy primarily being intended for this along with the Public Space Design Manual.

The municipal government bears the greatest amount of responsibility for the overall quality and results of public space development.

Formulating the vision (in cooperation with experts). Establishing the conditions for implementing the vision. Arranging the creation of the strategy and policy by assigning the task to experts. Arranging financing of the plan from the budget. Arranging the conditions for coordinating the various stakeholders in the process.

**Municipal districts**
Role: Primary initiatory and decision-making role with regard to strategy and planning on the local level. Decision-making role on all other levels (implementation, management, operation, maintenance and use).

**State administration**
Role: Approval with regard to strategy, planning, execution, management, operation, maintenance and use.

B. Executive branches of the city

**Contributory organisations of Prague and organisations financed from the budget of Prague**
Role: Executive role with regard to technical preparations, management, operation and maintenance.

**Experts, creators of the supporting strategic, spatial planning, design and technical documentation (planners, designers, architects, urban planners, landscape architects, specialists, etc.)**
Role: Primary executive role with regard to strategy, planning and supervision. Secondary role on all other levels (management, operation, maintenance and use) with regard to the impact on the quality of public spaces.

Formulation of the vision, strategy and policy/concept. Development of planning and design documentation. Coordination of specific projects with the general policy/concept.

**Managers, operators, tenants**
Role: Executive role with regard to management, operation, maintenance and use.

C. Private entities

**Public space project investor**
Role: Primary initiatory and decision-making role with regard to strategy and planning of private investment projects. Decision-making role on all other levels (execution, management, operation, maintenance and use) in the case of private investment projects.

**Formulation of the vision, strategy and policy/concept. Development of planning and design documentation. Coordination of specific projects with the general policy/concept.**

**Managers, operators, tenants**
Role: Executive role with regard to management, operation, maintenance and use.
D. The Public

Role: Initiatory and participatory role with regard to strategy, planning, management, operation, maintenance and use.

Users (the public) are understood as the creators of city’s public space.
V.2 Specific levels of the process

The principles and elements of the process that current practice entirely ignores or pays little attention to are the subject of this section.

V.2.1 Public space development strategy and planning

Selected important principles and elements of the process

When designing, restoring, refurbishing, managing and maintaining public space, a holistic approach is required to achieve and maintain the quality thereof, i.e., understanding each specific project as part of a single whole that is able to constitute quality public space only if it is a perfect combination of all its parts. It also has to be kept in mind that the decisive component of the holistic quality of public spaces is the quality of the architecture of the buildings that surround and delineate the space and how they are used.

Each modification and refurbishment of a specific part of a public space is a modification and refurbishment of the whole space and should be designed and executed with this in mind.

The profession with the qualifications and education necessary to identify the optimal relationship — substantive and semantic — between the specific elements that comprise a public space and determine, especially during preparation and planning, their role within the whole space is the architect (urban planner). To achieve and maintain the overall (holistic) quality of public spaces, it is extremely important that an architect be present, especially in key phases of the design and refurbishment process. Depending on the character of the space, the architect’s (urban planner’s) main partners are usually the landscape architect and transport urban planner.

A. Importance of quality planning preparations

Thorough planning and design preparations contribute to the overall quality of public spaces.

Of vital importance is the existence of a concept based on the vision and the correspondence of all specific projects and phases with the concept.

Determining sufficiently in advance the minimum periods required by the specific activities and steps to allow for the specific project to be executed properly and in a coordinated manner is also crucial. This will prevent situations where decisions are made under time pressure, making it then impossible to achieve the originally planned level of quality. (A typical example that leads to poor quality is the watering down of plans to the extent that they are no longer subject to administrative proceedings related to zoning decisions and building construction permits, which in practice means missing the chance to improve the quality of the public space in question. Another example is the substitution of planned solutions with an inappropriate, but momentarily available one, due to the failure to make arrangements with suppliers prior to the execution of project because they were not included in the time schedule, etc.)

B. Role of stakeholders in the public space planning process

To ensure the overall quality of public spaces, it is necessary, in addition to making arrangements for all necessary phases, to arrange for each stakeholder to fulfill their basic responsibilities. The current tendency to merge or skip roles is one of the reasons why the final results are usually poor. At least the basic relationships between the investor (local government) — project coordinator — architect, designer (designer specialist) — implementation coordinator — construction/technology supplier should be ensured, with a clear hierarchy and clearly allocated and defined competencies and responsibilities. Leaving out any role (by substituting it or merging it with another) increases the risk that important information will be omitted, leading to bad decisions and inefficient spending.

At this time, one of the main reasons why public spaces are poorly designed and refurbished is the absence of a concept (and the related absence of an architect, who creates the concept and coordinates each specific project to ensure conformity with the concept) and the absence of a project coordinator.

C. Project coordinator

The project coordinator is the executive body of the investor (local government). It should represent the municipality, as the investor. Depending on the scope of the project, the project coordinator can be someone from within the municipality or someone assigned to this role by the municipality. The role of the coordinator of projects financed from the municipal budget should be mainly to:
— Ensure that a concept for the place is drawn up.
— Coordinate investment plans; if needed, arrange for the investment plan to be modified; categorise the specific plans into projects that, due to their character, require an architect to develop a concept and head the project, and other projects of a maintenance character that have a minimum impact on the quality of the public space.
— Ensure observance of criteria and priorities when decisions are made and, based on the investor’s instruction, execute key decisions.
— Assess disputes between the various stakeholders and recommend solutions in the case of conflicting demands.
— Manage the Information portal →[par./p. 45]. Include the plans in the preparation schedule according to information from the information portal.
— Coordinate the parties to the project, arrange additional financing for the project (by coordinating the respective headings of the stakeholders’ budgets); identify available external resources.
— Ensure that all stakeholders are kept fully informed and coordinated.
— Prepare the supporting technical documents for decisions related to the concept.
— Create and control the time schedule.
— Arrange for risk management.
— Provide technical coordination of the preparation and design phases.

— Supervise the transfer of assets and communication between the investor and the final property manager; at the same time, ensure that each executed project has its own manager.

D. Architect: author of the concept, coordinator of correspondence with the concept, and designer

Based on a clear assignment from the project coordinator and investor, the architect draws up a detailed, integrated concept for the site. The architect processes the various inputs and requirements from the other contributors and specialists. He or she formulates the assignment for the specialists, assessing discrepancies and recommending solutions should the requirements be at odds.

The architect coordinates and formulates the assignment for the designer specialists, as the experts and suppliers of the technical solution. Depending on the nature of the project, the architect is also understood as the project team if it is necessary to include designers with a more in-depth knowledge of a specific area, e.g., transport urban planners, landscape architects, etc.

E. Decision–making competencies

The basic condition for attaining and maintaining quality of public spaces is the strict division of the competencies of the stakeholders in decision–making. (For example: The manager of a specific part of the public realm does not have the ability to create a concept for the general appearance of the public space, the technical infrastructure network manager is not fully competent to make decisions on matters related to strata and especially the surface located above “its” network — the competent body in this case is the manager of the street network, but the street network manager does not have the competency to decide on the impact of a specific project on the overall quality of the space, and so on.)
Some important stages in the planning and execution process
These are the stages of the planning and execution process that current practice neglects.

A. Preliminary preparations
For every public space plan, the urban planning and architectural contexts have to be assessed first. The potential for improvement of the space has to be guaranteed, and if another investment project is planned for the same space, the two projects should be combined. Only then will it be possible to make proper decisions about timing, the assignment and design, the method used to select designers and engineers and the way the plan should be executed. The basic initial information for this assessment should be contained in the information portal operated by the project coordinator’s office.

The contexts should be assessed based on the relevant supporting documents: the surveys of the public space (not only technical surveys, but also thorough sociological surveys, as these are able to provide a picture of real needs and requirements of users and, if interpreted correctly, can substantially increase the likelihood of success of the project).

In the case of plans affecting the overall quality of public spaces, an overall concept has to be prepared at the very onset by the architect and his/her team of specialists. Should the investor have no concept, the “Concept statement on the public space investment project” (the “Concept Statement”) — issued by IPR Praha to effectively determine the scope and placement of the plan and the quality and functionality requirements of the public space, the plan’s role in Prague’s comprehensive public space strategy and its impact — takes its place in part. This document cannot and must not, however, act as a full substitute for systematic conceptual preparatory work.

The Concept Statement also includes the requirement that the public space policy centre be involved in further preparatory work on the investment, with the degree of involvement depending on the importance of the investment, the degree to which it will affect the quality and functionality of the public space and the importance of the public space in which it will be situated.

To ensure quality and the fulfilment of the purpose of the Concept Statement, the managers of the specific parts of public spaces and technical infrastructure have to provide the policy centre (project coordinator) with all relevant information.

B. Public involvement
If a public space is to be truly adopted by the user, the locals should be involved, especially at the beginning of the planning process. The likelihood that the investment will be successful and funds used effectively will then increase substantially. There is also a much greater probability that the project will have a positive impact on social relationships and community spirit.

Communication with locals during other stages will contribute to the functionality and further sustainability of the project.

The use of various participation methods in connection with planning requires time as well as funding for professional consultants who are able to obtain the required information from the public through structured discussions and pass it on to the designers and planners.

C. Selection of the design contractor
The design contractor has to be selected in a transparent manner. The primary goal must be to select a contractor with excellent expertise and qualifications. The selection method is chosen based on the importance and scope of the investment and the importance of the public space in question. Its method has to be agreed between the investor and public space project coordinator (concept/policy supervision by IPR Praha).

For minor contracts the following method is appropriate:
- Direct award, closed call or public commercial tender, especially based on the contractors’ qualifications evaluated according to the submitted references (for the study phase, zoning decision, building construction permit, construction project documentation, etc.)

For major contracts the following method is appropriate:
- Architectural competition (for the study phase, zoning decision, building construction permit, construction project documentation, etc.)
- Public commercial tender (for the study phase, zoning decision, building construction permit, construction project documentation, etc.) with the criterion that the contractors’ expertise and qualifications be evaluated based on the submitted references
D. DESIGN
To guarantee overall quality of public spaces in broader contexts, the design work in the study phase should be carried out or arranged exclusively by the project coordinator in cooperation with IPR Praha.

The study results should be used as the basis for more detailed design work, which should be awarded based on the designer’s expertise. All stakeholders involved in the project should stipulate their requirements during the design stage. If the contractor drawing up the blueprints for the next stages of the project is not the author of the concept or study, his involvement in all of the following stages, including implementation, through audits, cooperation, coordination, etc., needs to be arranged according to the project coordinator’s specifications. The contractor’s competencies have to be part of the contractual terms and conditions agreed with the other parties involved in design and execution.

If the requirements are at odds with the public space design concept, this conflict has to be resolved by the investor based on the recommendation of the architect/author of the concept or study (or project coordinator if the plan has no architect).

E. PROCUREMENT OF PERMITS
A holistic approach to designing public spaces may require unusual solutions in order to achieve overall quality, or they may be required because of the spatial conditions of the public space. Such solutions should be discussed sufficiently in advance with the public authorities in charge of issuing permits to allow for any modifications to be made in time; otherwise, there is a risk that the required permits will not be issued and work on the project will be delayed.

The public space project coordinator should assess the design documentation prior to its submission to the appropriate public authorities, especially with respect to the fulfilment of quality requirements and the role of the space in the city’s general public space strategy.

The manager’s conditions for accepting the project should be taken into account when giving permission to projects to be handed over to the manager upon completion.

Should the manager not agree with the project, he should list the reasons (anticipating the decisions of third parties is not a sufficient reason), so that the investor and the designer have a relevant basis for modifying the project.

F. SELECTION OF THE CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTOR
The construction contractor has to be selected as transparently as possible to achieve the best quality–price ratio of the deliverables. Selection of the contractor based solely on the lowest price substantially increases the risk of additional costs, poor execution, and greater fault rate, which usually results in overstepping the budget, often in excess of the amount saved by selecting such contractor.

G. IMPLEMENTATION
Once the construction contractor has been selected, a sufficient amount of time has to be spent on coordinating the various project suppliers.

An example of good practice from abroad can be found in Germany, where a construction schedule is approved by investors only once contracts have been concluded with all the subcontractors. This reduces the need for improvised alternative solutions, where quality is often abandoned in favour of meeting deadlines only because coordination is poor and subcontractors are not arranged sufficiently in advance.

Proper and thorough technical supervision and author supervision by the architect, performed when checking conformity of the work with the concept and the approved design documentation, are primarily what affects the quality of the implementation of the project in the public space.

The personal presence of the architect/author of the study concept and the designer contributes to the resulting quality of public spaces, especially when decisions need to made because of new facts and circumstances.

H. ASSUMPTION OF MANAGEMENT
When designing projects to be handed over to a public manager, a sufficient level of cooperation has to take place from the onset, so that the manager does not refuse acceptance of the completed project. Such cooperation should be the investor’s responsibility (unless agreed otherwise), as it is mainly in his interests to have the completed public space properly managed and maintained.
V.2.2 Management and maintenance

COORDINATION OF THE MANAGERS
OF THE VARIOUS PARTS OF PUBLIC SPACES
Prague has numerous managers in charge of the various parts of public space (tram lanes have a different manager than the roadway does; tram islands have a different manager than the shelters do; and so on). In order to achieve overall quality of public space and an effective investment, an unavoidable precondition is their coordination from the very moment that the investment project is thought up.

Ensuring mutual awareness of the intentions and plans and establishing close cooperation between managers is a prerequisite to a coordinated approach to fulfilling a joint concept of the public spaces concerned, which can lead to final quality. The city has to arrange and be responsible for cooperation and coordination of the various managers.

COORDINATION OF THE MANAGERS
OF THE VARIOUS PARTS OF PUBLIC SPACES

Inadequate coordination, which is common due to the poor practice prevalent today, leads to situations where, for example, a street or sidewalk is dug up numerous times over a short period of time or the street network manager finances the repair of the surface features of technical infrastructure only because the owner and manager of such infrastructure is not known at the time of repair, and so on.

A system-wide solution has to include information sharing to an extent that prevents responsibility for repairs and maintenance of certain assets and property being assumed by someone else without this being agreed and settled in advance between the parties involved, even in emergencies (e.g., breakdowns).

It is necessary to eliminate situations where repairs not requiring a construction permit but affecting other parts of the public space in the remit of other managers take place without the knowledge of such managers and without taking into account such managers’ maintenance and repair requirements.

PROPERTY LAW RELATIONSHIPS
Prague does not have effective procedures in place for settlements between the managers of its assets under property law (exchange, handover, etc.). The different legal forms of the managers (some managers are joint-stock companies, other are organisations funded by the city or the municipal districts) complicate matters even further. The city should find a way to remove barriers and standardise settlement between managers on the citywide level. Settlement needs to be initiated internally, between the city’s districts and its organisations, but also has to take place externally, between the public sector and private sector.

An appropriate tool can also be the creation of a land fund, where plots of land will be offered as a consideration, along with the creation of a monetary fund financing land purchases.

Public space should never be sold into private ownership, even if such space is “latent” public space, i.e., public space that is not spatially or functionally defined but does have the potential to become so. If public space is sold, the city loses influence over the quality and the public nature of such space forever. If public space is put into the hands of the private sector for reasons of efficiency, for example, it is always more advantageous and strategic for the city to lease such space instead of selling it.

DISASTER AND EMERGENCY SITUATIONS
Taking advantage of disaster and emergency situations — where public spaces and technical facilities (especially utilities network) can be repaired with observing standard procedures, often without the involvement of the other stakeholders — does not contribute to the quality of public spaces at all. Disasters and emergency situations have often been taken advantage of to carry out repairs that other stakeholders would not consent to and to avoid delays arising from efforts to find a compromise acceptable to all parties (which is the project coordinator’s responsibility). To achieve sustainable quality, it is important to find a solution that all parties agree on; otherwise a long-term unsatisfactory state will usually prevail.
Major repairs

Major repairs are costly and in most cases have a far reaching effect on public spaces. As such, they have great potential to change and improve the quality of public spaces. Current practice does not include conceptual preparation, which would determine whether the work constitutes an investment that requires a zoning decision or construction permit (which would allow for a complete overhaul of the space) or just repairs to the existing state. This decision should be made by the project coordinator – see Preliminary preparations →par./p. 40.

Standard maintenance and clean-up

To increase the quality of certain public spaces, “mere” thorough and regular clean-up and regular maintenance are often enough. By increasing funding for clean-up and maintenance and undertaking more thorough reviews that resources are being used effectively, it is often possible to ensure and maintain the quality of public spaces more cheaply than through major repairs or reconstruction work demanded by the poor technical state of the space.

Professional maintenance of greenery

To ensure healthy and robust vegetation and trees in the city, a professional with the appropriate education and experience is required.

For example, by using professionals and allocating sufficient funding to the maintenance of trees, it is possible to increase the lifespan of trees and thereby contribute to the overall quality of the space where they grow. A mature tree is much more beneficial than newly planted seedlings.

Each new tree-planting project should be proposed or approved by a landscape architect. At the same time, cooperation with the technical infrastructure manager needs to be arranged, especially if utilities are involved.

The manager and the architect should work together to come up with a solution that allows utilities to be protected and trees to be planted (the higher costs of protecting utilities in specific locations should be included in the cost of tree planting).

It should be kept in mind that trees and alleys of trees are part of the urban structure (objective) unlike utility networks, which are part of infrastructure (support for objective).

Communication and public involvement

Timely communication with the public is important. Maintenance plans sometimes include steps and measures that may elicit strong reactions from the public because they can negatively affect the quality of the environment and quality of life in public spaces, albeit temporary. It is in the interests of the manager to discuss these steps and measures in detail and well in advance with the public and provide clear arguments in support of them. Public protests and obstructions caused by poor information about the steps and measures, which often can be interpreted as being against the public interest (such as the removal of trees and shrubs), can thus be avoided.

Wherever it is possible and effective, the public should also be included in the implementation of the construction or maintenance project.

Grouping maintenance work

Maintenance schedules should be synchronised to restrict the functionality of public spaces as little as possible. This means taking into account the various determining factors – such as the heating season or occupational health and safety – as they pertain to the various parts of public space when scheduling maintenance.

Safety checks

Safety is an important aspect of quality public spaces. It can be ensured by monitoring (camera system, permanent guards, patrols, etc.) or by modifying the space or adjusting opening hours. As physical modifications usually mean barriers, monitoring can be considered the best option. Good overall quality of a place and full-fledged use of the surrounding structures and amenities allows natural neighbourly supervision, which is equally important.
V.2.3 Economy of public space

**INVESTMENT COORDINATION**

--- **PUBLIC SPACE HEADING IN THE PRAGUE CITY BUDGET**

Funding is the foundation of the whole urban policy and essential quality development of public spaces. Any plan that the city has for public space can only be taken seriously when local governments take responsibility and direct funding to the city’s budget for the plan.

Restructuring the Prague city budget by creating a new public space investment heading is a step that will make a holistic approach to the design and refurbishment of public space possible. Public space funding is at this time scattered across numerous departments, municipal organisations and companies (Transport Department, City Investor Department, City Greenery Department, Technical Administration of Roadways, Property Administration and Management Department, Prague Public Transport Company, etc.) which then utilise the funds to refurbish those parts of public space that are in their remit, not to achieve overall quality.

This restructuring of the budget would allow investment projects to be combined more easily by location. Achieving overall quality of public space by balancing technical, functional, aesthetic, residential and other aspects could then become the main parameter for the realisation of such space.

--- **PUBLIC SPACE HEADING IN THE MUNICIPAL DISTRICT BUDGETS**

A similar restructuring should be carried out on the level of the municipal districts as well.

This will make it possible to coordinate the investments of the city and the investment of the municipal districts more easily.

--- **ECONOMY OF PUBLIC SPACE**

The primary purpose of public space is to provide a good environment for life in the city, not to generate profit. Of course, it is good if public space generates profit, but this must not be at the expense of its primary purpose: creating a quality environment for life. If the state of the space demands it, the funds generated by operations in the space should be fully reinvested back into the space. The fact that quality public space creates substantial indirect economic benefits should also be recognised.

An example of good practice is Business Improvement Districts (BIDs) in major North American cities. These are zones where the local businesses pay a special tax, which is then fully invested back into the same zone, usually to improve the environment and maintain the public spaces there.

--- **SEPARATING INVESTMENT AND OPERATING COSTS WHEN BILLING SERVICES**

A practice that is not very successful is the (mandatory) inclusion of investment costs in the services billed by the management organisations. (For example, per–km tram operating costs do not only include amortisation costs and operating costs, but also tram track investment costs. It is then impossible to compare such a distorted price with per–km bus operating costs that do not include similar investment costs, and so on).

Operating and investment costs of the organisations responsible for management should also be separated. This will result in a better overview of the actual price of their services and allow investment costs to be combined and coordinates with investments in other sectors.
V.2.4 Data collection, systematic evaluation and implementation of experience into practice

Public space management should also include an assessment of the quality of public space as the basis for implementing experience into all stages of the public space development process.

**Pilot projects**

Pilot projects are one of the tools to effectively test and assess the benefits or disadvantages of system-wide changes related to the creation, management, maintenance and use of public space. Pilot projects are distinguished by their monitoring certain indicators selected specifically for a particular project and assessing such indicators to obtain the supporting data for system-wide inclusion of the tested measure in standard principles, procedures and tools. Pilot projects should always be used wherever it is necessary to test unusual approaches to the design, management, form and operation of public spaces or, for example, to test new materials and elements. Pilot projects are probably the only tool that can be used in situations where the true impact of a proposed measure on the life of a public space cannot be foreseen (i.e., learning by doing). Pilot projects are also a means of obtaining feedback from the various stakeholders in the public space design process and from the final users of public spaces.

**Information portal**

A number of stakeholders in public spaces have data on the parts in their remit. This data includes technical data, standard maintenance schedules, major repair plans, investment plans, etc. Collecting such data into one place together with data from administrative proceedings under Act No. 183/2006 Coll., the Building Code, and providing the stakeholders with commensurate access to such data will substantially facilitate mutual coordination when creating and managing public spaces. At the same time, it could be the cornerstone of efforts to taking a conceptual approach to preparing investments in public space. The availability of information about public space investment plans would guarantee sufficient time for careful preparation of the investment, especially in terms of achieving and maintaining general quality of public space.

**Envisaged operation of the information portal**

The information portal should be an addition to the Single Citywide Information System for Public Space Management and Work Support under Act No. 183/2006 Coll., the Building Code, which is in the process of being developed. The information portal would share technological solutions with this system and provide information about planned but still not executed projects.

The information portal should have a clear graphic map interface with the possibility of setting filters according to chosen parameters. Data would be entered in the same way as in the single system for work support via a web client. Information that is key to categorising projects, such as anticipated year of execution, amount of financing, type of project (maintenance or investment), etc., would be filled in there. This information would then be the key to filtering what is displayed. The obligation to enter data has to be enshrined in the law and enforceable. The system should be updated in regular (short) intervals or in real time each time the documentation related to a new project is uploaded. The system will be in the remit of the project coordinator’s office, which will review the information regularly to make sure that it is accurate and current, add categories and classifications and perform regular maintenance.
In addition to appearance and function, the activities that take place in public spaces are a good half of what constitutes quality public spaces. The proposed Public Space Development Strategy and the Public Space Design Manual deal mainly with the creation (strategy, planning, and execution), management, operation and maintenance of public spaces. The topic of use is taken into account here especially in relation to the levels being addressed, i.e., in terms of their possible influence on the creation of conditions for quality use, be it organised or, particularly, spontaneous. The phenomenon of use is an extensive topic unto itself that would require a separate document to address it in full.

**Simplifying the procedure for obtaining permits for events in public spaces**
The red tape involved in obtaining a permit and the costs that are incommensurate to the means available to the applicant — most often individuals or non-commercial organisations (civil associations, non-profit organisation) — often discourage the organisation of many events, especially those that are initiated “from bottom up” by local residents and that usually have a positive effect on strengthening community and good neighbourly relations.

It is necessary to simplify the procedure for obtaining permits, so that applicants need only go to one place and once and not have to wait for more than a month for the permit. This can be arranged for example by designating a single location for submitting applications and by imposing the obligation on the various local government and State administration officials and street network managers to report and share information with each other.

**Establishing the rules for automatic granting of closure**
A generally binding decree stipulating the rules and conditions for organising events, with traffic closure being granted automatically if such rules and conditions are fulfilled, is another step leading to more simple and transparent use of public space. The rules should be tied to the nature of the event and address the duration of the event, safety, nature of the traffic closure, etc.

To make the process of granting closure to events automatic, a municipal district or the City of Prague could publish a manual on the use of its most burdened public spaces that would reflect experience with events that were successful in the past and serve as inspirational examples.

**Exempting local fees**
Exempting local fees can be an effective tool to promote events in public spaces. Such exemptions are in the purview of the local government.

Decision to grant exemptions should be transparent, systematic and backed by a political declaration. This will allow applicants to anticipate which events will likely be exempted and which will not. An example of good practice is the exemption of events held under the auspices of the municipal district (city) or events organised by the non-profit sector.

### V.2.5 Procedural support of “bottom-up” activities in using public space

**Promoting life in public spaces**
One of the reasons why public spaces exist and one of the indicators of the overall quality of public spaces is their use. The degree and manner to which public space is used is dependent not only on the physical framework, but also on the manner and the degree to which the possibilities for using and inhabiting the physical framework are initiated and regulated.

Maximum efforts should be made to promote such use of public space. This means, e.g., strengthening social cohesion of the community, the cultural contribution or the contribution to the quality of life in the place generally. Such use can be termed beneficial to the public. In addition to creating the conditions that make people want to inhabit public space spontaneously (which is the most important form of habitation of public spaces), the city has to encourage the organisation of meaningful activities, especially those developed “from bottom up”.

**Agreement on the definition of the character of various kinds of events**
An important step toward simplifying the use of public spaces would be a citywide agreement on the definitions of the various kinds of events and their classification. This does not pertain only to events that are beneficial to the public and charity events, which are already exempt from paying local administration fees, but also to other types of events and the rules for permitting them.
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VI.1 City creation processes / Investment in construction and development

The relationship between public space and its maintenance, refurbishment or creation. Phases, stakeholders, tools, legal regulations

Stakeholders—instruments—
—time/perspective—information
City creation processes — specific processes tied to using, maintaining, refurbishing or creating public space — are very complex processes involving a very diverse group of stakeholders, divided according to the above into individuals and groups defending both private and public interests.

In the case of public spaces, the emphasis is on the activity of the public authorities, represented on the one hand by local governments in connection with activities and decisions on the local level, and State administration, that is either the State or the local governments acting as its representatives. In the whole decision–making process, the administrative courts have a special standing: their decisions substantially influence how the law is applied in their jurisdictions. Professional bodies (especially architects, engineers and technicians involved in construction and development) also enjoy special status.

In addition to local governments and the State administration, individuals and groups of users, owners, investors as well as professionals and the general public are involved in using, maintaining refurbishing or creating public spaces. All these stakeholders have a wide array of tools available to them to promote their interests:

A. Political and programming tools
1. Comprehensive “municipality development programme”
2. Various municipal policies (social, security, health, etc.)

B. Legal and administrative tools
1. Legislative (related to drafting amendments to regulations, drafting new regulations or repealing regulations)
2. Administrative
   — Administrative decisions in administrative proceedings (standards)
   — Control/inspection
   — Initiatory
   — Organisational/coordinative/methodological

C. Economical, including financial, tools
1. Economical — utilisation of assets / investment activities
2. Financial
   — Utilisation of the budget / decision–making on investments and creation of necessary funds
   — Subsidies — credit — loans
   — Insurance

D. Material/professional tools
(usually planning– and design–related)
1. Urban planning, architectural and landscape, including spatial and technological
2. Engineering and technological
3. Infrastructural

E. Information, research and education tools
These tools may be used in connection with city creation by the various stakeholders at different times, in different perspectives and at different intensities. Research gradually identifies these tools, allocates them to stakeholders and the relevant phases and describes their use across a whole range of topics (to identify shared values...) and scales (from broader relationships, through the city and its districts, to specific plots of land or city detail).

These tools can be used by different actors at different times and with a different perspective and intensity when forming the city. Their use is regulated by law and bound by a shared/agreed value framework. Research identifies theses tools and describes their use in a whole range of topics (to identify shared values...) and scales (from broader relationships across the whole city and its parts to specific plots of land or details of the city).
Public space represents those parts of the city that have a special character and in which the interests of individuals (residents/users) merge with the interests of groups to the degree described above. The way public space is used is extraordinarily variable and heterogeneous, which to a great degree predetermines the position and actions of the various stakeholders. A special form of action taken by various stakeholders when using, maintaining, refurbishing or creating public spaces is investment (private investment on land that is adjacent to public space and comprises its tangible framework or private investment in the public space itself in combination with public investment by the local government or other public stakeholders).

From the point of view of public law, investment can be organised into three basic stages:

A. Preparation
   The investment plan is formulated and the economic and private conditions for its successful execution are created during this stage. Future public contexts, especially the assumptions and conditions of land–use planning and the assumptions and conditions related to public and private interests that can be affected by the investments, have to be taken into consideration already at this stage, however.

B. Execution
   This stage is further divided up:
   - In connection with land–use planning or more generally land–use preparations and zoning decisions, including assessment of the impact of the concept on the environment (SEA)
   - In connection with zoning proceedings and the material and legal conditions that have to be fulfilled, including any assessment of the impact of the construction on the environment (EIA)
   - In connection with the building permit process or permission to modify a project during construction
   - In connection with executing the project and its completion, launch and use

C. Completion/_finalisation
   During this stage, the business plan is executed in the anticipated form (sale, lease, etc.) — if a public space is refurbished or a new public created, conditions have to be stipulated for putting it into operation and using it and the impact of the investment on ownership rights has to be dealt with (compensation of the affected owners in the case of negative externalities; contributions from the affected owners in case of positive externalities of the executed investment).

Investment generally, in connection with the development of public spaces, then chiefly represents a very comprehensive activity that is subject to a very high number of regulations, (…) in addition to the constitutional framework, mainly regulations in the following basic areas:

- **Construction**
  - Building Code and related regulations
  - Professional practice

- **Public administration**
  - Municipalities/regions/Prague
  - Districts
  - Central administration
  - Professional administration
  - Municipal administration and administrative procedure

- **Health management**
  - Healthcare and human hygiene / public health, spa industry
  - Veterinary hygiene

- **Nature and landscape management**
  - Environmental management and SEA/EIA
  - Nature and landscape management
  - Air management
  - Water management
  - Forest management
  - Agricultural land management
  - Mineral wealth management and geological and mining practice

- **Culture management**
  - Care for historical monuments
  - Other parts of cultural heritage
From this long list, the ones that are most important are building regulations and regulations related to the built–up environment; other legal regulations touch upon the topic in connection with public (administrative) processes; they, nevertheless, have a special significance in investment as a whole regardless of the stakeholders who have this tool available to them. The annexes hereto provide an overview of the affected administration authorities/offices and the enabling regulations and an overview of buffer zones if they are stipulated or required by these regulations, as well as a general overview of the most important legal regulations impacting (to various degrees) the way public space — the basic structure of the urban structure — are used.
VI.3 Overview of legislation protecting public interests /
Overview of the most important administrative bodies concerned,
whose activities are substantially related to construction

**State administration authorities in the field of public health care**
- Human hygiene [Act No. 258/2000 Coll. — Section 80 (1)(i); Section 82 (2)(j); Section 94 (1)]
- Spa industry [Act No. 164/2001 Coll. — Section 37; Section 38]
- Veterinary hygiene [Act No. 166/1999 Coll. — Section 49 (1)(i) and (j); Section 56 (1); Section 76 (1); Section 77a]

**State administration authorities in the field of the environment**
- Environmental impact assessments — EIA [Act No. 100/2001 Coll.; Section 10i; Section 21(k); Section 22(d)]
- Nature and landscape [Act No. 114/1992 Coll.; generally Section 77 (2)(i); Section 77a (3)(y); Section 78; Section 79 (3)(u); Section 90 (1); Section 67; Section 70]
- Landscape [Section 12]
- Felling trees growing outside forests [Section 8]
- Exemptions from protected areas and localities [Section 44; Section 45a et seq.,]
- Exemptions from protection of endangered species of fauna and flora [Section 56 and 57]
- Agricultural land fund [Act No. 334/1992 Coll. — Section 5 (2); Section 5 (3); Section 15(d); Section 17(a); Section 17a(a); Section 18 (1); Section 21 (2)]
- Land consolidation [Act No. 139/2002 Coll. — Section 2; Section 20 (1)(d)]
- Forests [Act No. 289/1995 Coll. — Section 14 (2); Section 48 (2)(b) and (c); Section 48a (1) (a) to (c); Section 49 (3)(c); Section 58 (2)]
- Air [Act No. 201/2012 Coll. — Section 11 (2)(c); Section 27; Section 40 (2); authorisation Section 32 et seq.,]
- Water
- Surface and ground water sources [Act No. 254/2001 Coll. — Section 105; Section 106 (2); Section 107(a); Section 107(c); Section 108 (2); Section 115 (6) et seq.,]
- Mineral water sources [Act No. 164/2001 Coll. — Section 37; Section 38]
- Minerals [Act No. 44/1988 Coll. — Section 15 (2); Section 18 (1); Section 19; Section 29 (5); Section 33 (8); Section 35 (3); Act No. 62/1988 Coll. — Section 13 (2) and (3); Act No. 61/1988 — Section 10 (10)]
- Land consolidation [Act No. 139/2002 Coll. — Section 2; Section 20 (1)(d)]
- Forests [Act No. 289/1995 Coll. — Section 14 (2); Section 48 (2)(b) and (c); Section 48a (1) (a) to (c); Section 49 (3)(c); Section 58 (2)]
- Air [Act No. 201/2012 Coll. — Section 11 (2)(c); Section 27; Section 40 (2); authorisation Section 32 et seq.,]
- Water
- Surface and ground water sources [Act No. 254/2001 Coll. — Section 105; Section 106 (2); Section 107(a); Section 107(c); Section 108 (2); Section 115 (6) et seq.,]
- Mineral water sources [Act No. 164/2001 Coll. — Section 37; Section 38]
- Minerals [Act No. 44/1988 Coll. — Section 15 (2); Section 18 (1); Section 19; Section 29 (5); Section 33 (8); Section 35 (3); Act No. 62/1988 Coll. — Section 13 (2) and (3); Act No. 61/1988 — Section 10 (10)]

**State administration authorities in the field of cultural heritage management**
- State monument protection [Act No. 20/1987 Coll. — Section 11 (3); Section 14 (4); Section 28 (2)(c), (d) and (e); Section 29 (2)(b) and (c); Section 44a]

**State administration authorities in the field of infrastructure**

A. Transport
- Road traffic [Act No. 13/1997 Coll. — Section 31; Section 32; Section 40 (2)(f) and (g); Section 40 (3)(f); Section 40 (4) (c); Section 40 (5); Section 44 (1) / Act No. 361/2000 Coll. — Section 124a]
- Railways [Act No. 266/1994 Coll. — Section 7 (2); Section 56(d); Section 56a; Section 64]
- Air transport [Act No. 49/1997 Coll. — Section 40; Section 41 (1); Section 87 (2) for military airports]; Section 88 (1) (p); Section 89(q); Section 95
- National water transport [Act No. 114/1995 Coll. — Section 4; Section 5 (4)]

B. Technical
- Water management — water supply and sewerage [Act No. 254/2001 Coll. — Section 105; Section 106 (2); Section 107(a); Section 107(c); Section 108 (2); Act No. 274/2001 Coll. — Section 14 (3)]
- Power supply [Act No. 458/2001 Coll. — Section 16(h); Section 46 (12); Section 68 (6) and (7); Section 69 (3); Section 87 (4); Section 94 (2); Section 96 (1) / Act No. 406/2000 Coll. — Section 13 (1); Section 13 (2)]
- Electricity
- Gas
- Heat
- Other
State administration authorities in the field of fire safety / Fire Rescue Service

- Fire safety [Act No. 133/1985 Coll. — Section 31(3); Section 95; Section 99]

State administration authorities in the field of supervision of licenced trades and labour inspection

- Licensed trades [Act No. 455/1991 Coll.]
- Labour inspection [Act No. 251/2005 Coll. — Section 5 (1)(i)]

State administration authorities in the field of real estate record keeping and management

- Cadastre [Act No. 256/2013 Coll.]
- Land consolidation [Act No. 139/2002 Coll.]
- National borders [Act No. 312/2001 Coll. — Section 8(f); Section 17]
VI.4 Basic diagram showing the investment process with public law implications
**VI.5 Levels of public involvement and influence (according to Patterson Kirk Wallace)**

- **LEVEL 1**
  - Low level of public involvement and influence
  - Inform/educate

- **LEVEL 2**
  - Inform/educate
  - Gather information

- **LEVEL 3**
  - Intermediate public involvement and influence
  - Discuss

- **LEVEL 4**
  - Engage

- **LEVEL 5**
  - High level of public involvement and influence
  - Partner
VI.6 Bodies involved in the city/town creation process (urban planning)

Roles and forming (public) interest in connection with the city/town creation process
VI.7 Tools for forming (public) interest in connection with the city/town creation process (urban planning) by group

With a special focus on city/town creation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individuals</th>
<th>Civil (general) public</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public representatives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individuals</th>
<th>Users / Owners / Investors (individuals + legal entities)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individuals</th>
<th>Experts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City assembly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council / Mayor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighbouring statutory city / towns/municipalities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City assembly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council / Mayor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality with extended powers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City assembly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council / Mayor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City assembly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council / Mayor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative bodies concerned / administrative offices concerned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public health</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monument care</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traffic infrastructure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technical infrastructure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crisis management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ministry / Government</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parliament of the Czech Republic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constitution court / Supreme court / Supreme administrative court</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
VI.8 Application of interests and tools

For example the “Finance” Tool

Stakeholders / Interests (bodies)

Time / Deadline
Application / Decision / Implementation
(priority/conditionality/phasing-in)

Values
- Nature and landscape
- Cultural and civilizational
- Social and economic

Shared Value Framework

Process of acquisition of land-use planning documentation:
Negotiation (mutually shared) framework for resolving conflicts/disputes when promoting specific private/public-private/public interests

Shared Value Framework

Values
- Nature and landscape
- Cultural and civilizational
- Social and economic

Time / Deadline
Application / Decision / Implementation
(priority/conditionality/phasing-in)

Tools (implementation)

Finances
- Private/public
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