



PALGRAVE STUDIES IN CULTURAL PARTICIPATION

palgrave▶pivot

Culture, Participation and Policy in the Municipal Public Park

Abigail Gilmore

palgrave
macmillan

Palgrave Studies in Cultural Participation

Series Editors

Andrew Miles
Department of Sociology
University of Manchester
Manchester, UK

Lisanne Gibson
University of Dundee
Dundee, UK

This series will provide a platform for contributions to a newly defined field of ‘participation studies’ (Miles and Gibson, forthcoming 2021). Participation in cultural activities is a research subject within a number of disciplines and fields, ranging from sociology to cultural studies, incorporating tourism, leisure heritage, museum, media, theatre, and cultural policy, to business and management studies. This series will bring together debates across these disciplines to consider the subject of cultural participation in all its dimensions.

The series brings together research on traditional cultural tastes and practices with research on informal ‘everyday’ activities. In doing so it broadens our understanding of cultural participation, focusing on participation as a pluralistic concern, exploring the links between the cultural, civic and social dimensions of participation, and reconsidering its framing in time and space by political economy, material resource and cultural governance.

Abigail Gilmore

Culture, Participation and Policy in the Municipal Public Park

palgrave
macmillan

Abigail Gilmore
University of Manchester
Manchester, UK

ISSN 2661-8699 ISSN 2661-8702 (electronic)
Palgrave Studies in Cultural Participation
ISBN 978-3-031-44276-6 ISBN 978-3-031-44277-3 (eBook)
<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-44277-3>

© The Editor(s) (if applicable) and The Author(s), under exclusive licence to Springer Nature Switzerland AG 2023

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are solely and exclusively licensed by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use. The publisher, the authors, and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, expressed or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made. The publisher remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

This Palgrave Macmillan imprint is published by the registered company Springer Nature Switzerland AG.

The registered company address is: Gewerbestrasse 11, 6330 Cham, Switzerland

Paper in this product is recyclable.

*This book is dedicated to Juno, my old lady Patterdale terrier,
and former accomplice to so many valuable walks in the park.*

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to acknowledge and thank all funders and supporters of the research underpinning this book: Arts & Humanities Research Council (AHRC) Connected Communities: Communities, Culture and Creative Economies and Creative Scotland *Understanding Everyday Participation—Articulating Cultural Values* (grant reference (AH/J005401/1) and AHRC Connected Communities Festival 2015 ‘*Connecting the museum and the park—everyday participation and community stewardship of local cultural assets*’; University of Manchester School of Arts Languages and Cultures Impact Fund, Social Responsibility Fund and Supplementary Research Leave. With grateful thanks also to the Faberllull Foundation who provided valuable thinking space at the Future of Cultural Institutions residency, Olot, Catalonia in 2019. Heartfelt thanks and warm wishes go to all my fellow researchers on the UEP team, led by Professor Andrew Miles: Professor Ele Belfiore, Dr. Varina Delrieu, Dr. Patrick Doyle, Dr. Jill Ebrey, Dr. Delyth Edwards, Professor Lisanne Gibson, Sarah Hughes, Dr. Felicity James, Dr. Luciana Lang, Dr. Adrian Leguina, Professor Jane Milling, Dr. Susan Oman, Professor Kerrie Schaefer, Dr. Louise Senior, Dr. Mark Taylor, Dr. Ruth Webber, Claire Huyton, Dr. Charlene Linton, Dr. Patrick Doyle, Dr. Ben Dunn and all the coders and other research assistants who worked on the project. UEP turned out to be a very fecund project: a most unified endeavour in radical re-evaluation of cultural practice and value in everyday life, even after we realised how hilariously over-specified and under-resourced it was. Thank you all for your commitment and perseverance in this impactful and important project.

I would also like to thank all participants in the research, and to highlight those from cultural, civic and policy organisations who generously gave their precious time, including Fran Hayfron, Esme Ward, Helen Marks, Jo Beggs, Alistair Hudson (The Whitworth/Manchester Museum Partnership), Amanda Wallace and Hannah Williamson (Manchester Art Gallery), Emma Anderson and all at Macclesfield Museums. Thank you for the kind permission to use and reproduce images from your archives. Huge thanks and kind regards to Dr. Ana Sanchez-Santana who undertook the PhD researcher-in-residence under my supervision and brought political sciences acumen to this brief foray into the museum in the park so nobly. Many thanks go to Kerenza McClarnan, director of Buddleia, Luciana Lang, Jeni Allison, Torange Khonsari, and Max Dunbar at the Manchester Jewish Museum for our attempts at commoning in Cheetham Park, and to the Platt Fields Friends Group, especially Dan Thomson, Jane Crowley and Richard Stout, to Ruth Colson, Yuxi Wang, Yun Xiong, Liz Mitchell and Meg Parnell, Platt Hall/Manchester Art Gallery, John Mouncey and all at Manchester Parks team, for enthusiasm, resilience and remote working during tough Covid times. Thank you to Saira Qureshi for permission to use her image of the ‘weekly kneel’ for Black Lives Matter. I would also like to thank the group of ‘parky academics’ whom I met during lockdown and whose inspiring interdisciplinary work and chats kept me going in those strange times: Professor Andrew Smith, Dr. Ian Mell, Dr. Meredith Whitten, Dr. Anna Barker, Dr. Katy Layton-Jones, Dr. Nicola Dempsey and Ian Baggott-Smith. A massive thanks to Amie Kirby for her research assistance and diligent proofing.

I would like to thank friends and family: Susan Oman for continually feeding me internet park nerdery and pulling me out of a Ruskin hole almost intact, Craig Hughes-Noehrer for being my first reader and Lukas Hughes-Noehrer for his support, Simon Buckley for rambling and ranting around Macclesfield Forest. Thank you to my brother, Sebastian Jones, one-third of my Spanish family for sharing and translating, and my family in the Northwest of England, Bob, Ava Bea, Ani and Grace, for putting up with me with only the occasional eyeroll despite very little interest in the subject matter.

Abigail Gilmore is a senior lecturer, Arts Management and Cultural Policy, Institute for Cultural Practices, University of Manchester. Her research concerns participation, policy and place, from a PhD on local music industries, scenes and policies, to recent research on everyday participation, public space and place governance. Roles include lead for the

Creative Placemaking theme for the Manchester Urban Institute, principal investigator for the *Beyond the Creative City* Manchester-Melbourne-Toronto project and co-investigator for the *Strategic Coordination Hub for Local Policy Innovation Partnerships*, led by Birmingham City-REDI. Recent publications include an edited volume with Victoria Durrer, David Stevenson and Leila Jancovich, 'Cultural Policy Is Local: Understanding Cultural Policy as Situated Practice' (Palgrave Macmillan) and 'Pandemic Culture' with Ben Walmsley and Dave O'Brien (Manchester University Press). She lives in Macclesfield in the North West of England.

Praise for *Culture, Participation and Policy in the Municipal Public Park*

‘Finally, we have a book which engages seriously with parks not just as ‘recreation’ but as a vital part of the social infrastructure and inseparable from fully democratic, locally focused cultural policy. So often overlooked, Abigail Gilmore has pushed public parks directly into full view and provided us with the foundations of a new engagement with these spaces as essential to democratic public participation.’

—Justin O’Connor, Professor of Creative Economy,
University of South Australia

‘This book draws on extensive interdisciplinary scholarship for a deep dive into the social and political life of the public park in Britain. From the nineteenth-century creation of the park as an escape from the industrial revolution to the present-day environmental case for them as “the lungs of the city”, it offers the park as a metaphor for another way of living as well as a space in which cultural life is lived in all its richness. By examining case studies across the north of England and Scotland, that sit across the publicly managed (by either state or volunteers) to privately owned it considers different approaches to governance and their precariousness in the face of neo-liberalism despite evidence of their public value. The empirical data the book draws on shows how parks are seen as egalitarian and democratic spaces in which we might “practice citizenship”. Yet, it also shows the tensions that exist in who decide on their appropriate use. The book makes a strong case for the park as a valuable research site for understanding the importance of as well as the functioning of the cultural commons and also demonstrates the failures of cultural policy to safeguard them as cultural assets. It is a valuable read for anyone interested not only in the public park but in participation and public value, cultural policy and governance.’

—Leila Jancovich, Professor in Cultural Policy and Participation,
University of Leeds, UK

CONTENTS

1	Everyday Spaces for Participation and Policy	1
2	Parkmaking, Municipalisation and Cultural Policy	31
3	Pleasure Grounds and People's Palaces: The Museum in the Park	67
4	The Social Lives of Public Parks	103
5	Municipal Care: Public Parks and the Governance of Place	135
6	The Political Economy of Contemporary Public Parks	175
	Index	201

LIST OF FIGURES

Fig. 2.1	The Manchester Drink Map. (Image courtesy John Rylands Research Library. © The University of Manchester)	45
Fig. 2.2	Promenading in Platt Fields park, postcard from Manchester in the early twentieth century	48
Fig. 2.3	West Park, 1866 painting by George Stewart, schoolmaster of Macclesfield School of Arts. (Image courtesy Macclesfield Museums © The Silk Heritage Trust)	54
Fig. 3.1	Meersbrook Hall. (Photo credit: Abigail Gilmore)	78
Fig. 3.2	West Park museum, 1898. (Drawing by T. Roylance Lawton showing the modest design promoted by Marian Brocklehurst, Image courtesy Macclesfield Museums @The Silk Heritage Trust)	86
Fig. 3.3	The Whitworth's cafe extended into the park. (Photo credit: Abigail Gilmore)	88
Fig. 3.4	Crowds watching Circus RAJ performing at the front of the Whitworth art gallery. (Photo credit: Abigail Gilmore)	91
Fig. 3.5	The “weekly kneel” for Black Lives Matter in Platt Fields. (Photo credit: Saira Qureshi)	94
Fig. 3.6	Platt Hall window exhibition. (Photo credit: Abigail Gilmore)	95
Fig. 4.1	Green spaces in Cheetham and Broughton. (Gilmore 2017)	108
Fig. 4.2	Cultural assets mapping in the Dartmoor area, including commercial assets such as shops, cafés, post offices, pubs; leisure centres, parks, playgrounds; schools and playgroups; churches; village halls, community centres, libraries, museums, by Orian Brook. (Milling et al. 2018)	111
Fig. 5.1	Local authority expenditure and income—parks and open spaces, England only. (Source: DLUHC/MHCLG 2022)	137

Fig. 5.2	Local authority expenditure: culture and related services, 2009–2022 England. (Source: DLUHC/MHCLG 2022, General Fund Revenue Account Outturn RO5 Cultural, Environmental, Regulatory and Planning Services)	138
Fig. 5.3	Taxonomy of parks in Cambridge and Peterborough. (Cambridge Open Space n.d.)	152
Fig. 5.4	Manchester Parks Strategy and the mandate for participation in Park Action Planning. (Manchester City Council 2017, p. 13)	165
Fig. 5.5	Local authority net expenditure* on parks and open spaces, Manchester and Salford (thousands). (Source: DLUHC/MHCLG 2022) *Net expenditure comprises running and employee costs less income from sales, fees and charges, and grants passed on to third parties	166
Fig. 6.1	Notice in community-planted replacement tree, Lavapies, Madrid. (Photo credit: Sebastian Jones). The sign says in Spanish ‘This beautiful Mediterranean hackberry tree was planted by the residents of Lavapies. Look after him and he will give you stupendous shade’	186
Fig. 6.2	The heavily branded Mayfield Park and Depot. (Photo credit: Abigail Gilmore)	191
Fig. 6.3	“Piccadilly Wall—The North Is Not a Petri Dish”. (Photo credit: David Dixon) The title is a reference to the central government imposed lengthy lockdowns and restrictions on hospitality and entertainment specific to Manchester and the North West during the Covid pandemic CC BY-SA 2.0; https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/2.0/legalcode	192

LIST OF TABLES

Table 4.1	The ‘Straw Matrix’ of participation $\times$ investment	106
Table 4.2	Park segmentation by participant and practice	117



CHAPTER 1

Everyday Spaces for Participation and Policy

Abstract This book concerns the significance and values of everyday participation in municipal public parks, the connections these have with cultural policy, placemaking and place governance, and to the practising and stewardship of public space. Adopting a critical cultural policy lens, it identifies the municipal public park as a mundane but extraordinarily treasured place for participation and production of cultural values, for regulation, resistance and the practising of citizenship. The first chapter sets out the motivations for studying public parks as spaces for local governance and cultural policy, outlining the book's theoretical orientation and the conceptual terms that it explores and prioritises in subsequent chapters, which concern the values of parks, their 'cultural-ness' and 'public-ness' and their relevance to policy. It also sets out the structure of the book and outlines the empirical research on everyday participation in England and Scotland, the basis for the inquiry into these important cultural policy spaces.

Keywords Municipal park • Cultural policy • Local governance • Cultural value • Public space • Cultural public sphere • Green lungs • Public good

INTRODUCTION

The municipal public park is both a mundane and exceptional object of study. This book explores the significance of urban public parks and the contributions they make in our everyday lives, as communal spaces of participation. I consider them as cultural spaces and resources, component parts of broader cultural ecosystems, in their facility of public space and public value and as long-standing instruments and agents of cultural policy. The impact of the global COVID-19 pandemic throughout 2020 and 2021 significantly heightened this consideration. As coronavirus transmission locked people out of their workplaces, leisure spaces, cultural and night-time economies, it presented the public park in a new light, in an accelerated rise to the top of the essentials list for everyday living, exercise and respite from the torpor of home-schooling, Netflix streaming and Zoom calls.

For those who have had access, and particularly for those without private gardens or means of transport to rural landscapes, parks became green havens offering places to hear birdcalls, breathe fresh air and absorb the natural environment. During national lockdowns, parks were the sites of family parties, birthdays and anniversaries, illicit gatherings, work meetings, daily walks and ‘pubstitutes’.¹ On any single evening in early summer 2020, the local English municipal park contained joggers slaloming around picnickers and dog-walkers, children feeding ducks, teenagers hogging playgrounds, knitting groups social distancing on benches, skateboarders dodging mobility scooters, alongside circus skills, personal training and yoga groups. Serendipity and DIY culture augmented existing natural heritage, public art and statuary within parks. Parks became impromptu festival sites, theatres, art galleries and living rooms, imbued with a tacit recognition of the rules of the pandemic – social distancing, family bubbles – and littered with the detritus of mask wearing and hand sanitising amongst the barbecues and beer cans.

Manchester’s Park Team and more than 100 voluntary groups that they support have worked tirelessly to provide safe access to the green lungs of the city. The number of people visiting parks has risen by more than 20% and the pressure to keep them clean and safe has risen accordingly, with 147,000 bags of litter collected from parks last year. (Manchester City Council 2021, p. 130)

The use of parks as cultural spaces, sites of domestic practice and everyday participation, is far from new, nor is the regulation of human behaviour within these spaces, whether through external supervision or internalised convention. As this book argues, municipal public parks support multiple forms of participation that generate cultural value whilst facilitating the regulation and control of individual (and public) bodies and their behaviour. They have done so since their establishment in the nineteenth century, drawing on much older practices of land use and governance within human settlements. As public spaces, they present opportunities for social encounter, observation and judgement that are at once a means for management and a source of public good. The pandemic has made these attributes keener to the public eye, if not more demanding of the attention of those who hold the purse strings. Despite the evidence of its centrality to lockdown life, there is no statutory duty on the part of the government to care for and maintain public parks in England, the main site of this study, and there remain many inequalities of access and diversity of policy support for green spaces in cities all over the world (Shoari et al. 2020).

There are many investigators and supporters of public parks across academic disciplines, from researchers who look at city green spaces from environmental, ecological and urban planning perspectives (e.g. Dobson and Dempsey 2020; Mell 2022) to social scientists who explore parks' relations to social order, public management and economic geography of towns and cities (e.g. Low et al. 2009; Cohen et al. 2016; Barker 2017; Smith 2013). As Jones (2018) argues, parks are a fertile ground for cross-disciplinary study, since they are evolving ecological spaces, which transform and mediate and which can be read through a wide range of lenses. There are park historians who study changes in the aesthetics, dynamics and uses of parks over time (e.g. Colton 2016; Hickman 2013; Layton-Jones 2018; O'Reilly 2019), many of whom write from the perspective of their own public engagement with specific urban parks as curators, voluntary stewards and lay preachers of their value (e.g. Conway 1996; Ruff 2016). There are also those whose focus is on the very concept of the public park as a necessary invention that is both a metaphor for utopia and lost paradise (e.g. Jones and Wills 2005), people's palace and commonplace institution (e.g. Elborough 2016) and a time capsule which offers a text written by the city as "site of serious urban enquiry" (Jones 2018, p. 41). All of these observers are passionate and ardent fans of the park, whatever their disciplinary perspective.

What this book aims to do differently, and the contribution it aims to make to this interdisciplinary terrain, is to explore municipal public parks through a lens of cultural policy to make connections between parks and other forms of local publicly funded, state-supported cultural provision that brings people together in participation in public space, in ways that both satisfy and frustrate policy makers whilst realising a multitude of cultural values. My interest is in how public parks, their histories and uses, are recognised and understood as policy instruments, and also policy problems, within contemporary everyday life. They are, I argue, part of local cultural ecosystems that also include art galleries, museums, libraries and theatres, concert halls and comedy venues, pubs, clubs, community programmes, studio spaces, festivals, gyms, leisure centres, football stadia, church halls and other faith spaces. Their study reveals much to the critical cultural policy researcher and scholar of arts and cultural management, which will complement and contribute to existing knowledge on discourses of cultural value and their association with the regulation and promotion of participation.

It is no accident, therefore, that I begin by turning to a common reference point in cultural policy studies, the English Victorian art critic and social commenter, John Ruskin.

PARKS AND VALUE

There is an often-cited John Ruskin quotation that signals the purpose and value through which public parks are esteemed:

The measure of any great civilisation is its cities and a measure of the city's greatness is to be found in the quality of its public spaces, its parks and its squares. (NHMF and HLF 1996, p. 9)

Lord Rothschild used this quotation in his foreword of the 1995–1996 Annual Report of the Heritage Lottery Fund and National Heritage Memorial Fund, which set out the terms through which the new Urban Parks Programme would invest in public parks to halt their state of rapid deterioration, as visible and popular beneficiaries of the new National Lottery funding. This signalled a specific shift in cultural policy, amongst a number of other fundamental changes during the 1990s, by deliberately extending the breadth of the remit for heritage funders and hence the definition of what comprises heritage value and historic environment (Tandy

2019). It was partly an outcome of *Park Life*, the influential report by consultancy Comedia (Greenhalgh and Worpole 1995), which put forward the recommendation for lottery funding as a necessary means to halt decline, based on substantial empirical research into public perceptions and uses of public parks. This research acknowledged the multifarious historical and contemporaneous attachments of value to parks through their community use and, importantly, highlighted how, despite the changing urban fabric, parks still convey more public value than was recognised by their contemporary place in urban policy agendas. It made an important new case for National Lottery funds to go to parks on the basis that this would meet a significant proportion of the lottery distributors' funding criteria by creating spaces for community wellbeing through sports and recreation, arts and cultural programming, memorialisation and heritage and upkeep of the public realm.

The considerable values that urban parks hold for both people and places, and the articulation of these values as both intrinsic and extrinsic, contributing to a range of policy interests, are central concerns of this book. I will be arguing that the values articulated through the relationships of individual and social bodies with public parks are part of affective communication within the "public cultural sphere" (McGuigan 2004). In addition to social, political, economic and other value domains, parks are vehicles for both imagining the good life and working out salient thoughts and feelings of "life-world concerns" (McGuigan 2004, p. 134), as much as, if not more than, great arts and literature. Through these relationships to the emotional and aesthetic, and their predominantly public ownership, municipal parks are part of urban cultural ecosystems, governed, buffeted and bankrolled by cultural policy flows and forces. This raises a further central theme of the 'parks value paradox': despite an explicit recognition of public value and multiple forms of evidence to support these claims, public funding for municipal public parks in England is of consistent contention and their status as assets, rather than liabilities, for local government in constant jeopardy.

The Ruskin quotation above has frequently been attached to lobbying for greater recognition of the objective value of parks worldwide, appearing in many briefing and advocacy documents, from open letters to newspapers (Barber 1992) and submissions to Select Committee enquiries (House of Commons 1999) to public space strategies in New Zealand (Wellington City Council 2009) and hotel brochures in India (RARE 2020). Its original provenance amongst Ruskin's many writings has been

seemingly lost²; if genuine, its sentiment originated at a time of continuing concern about the shocks, checks and balances of mass urbanisation and industrialisation in the nineteenth century. It is worth briefly unpacking the statement within this context, to explore how it heralded municipal approaches to cultural policy and why it is important to the arguments of this book.

Within the statement, public squares and parks are components of the urban environment, with qualities which play active parts in making cities great, and great cities, in turn, demonstrate civility: parks, therefore, act as nested quality indicators in the benchmarks for cities and for civil society. To understand better the relations to cultural policy, the logic chain in Ruskin's measure for value needs to be reversed, as in this direction we see that it is the propensity of public parks to instil civilising agendas within urban populations, through their prescription of cultural values for the betterment, enrichment and containment of society. Arguably, parks make the civil population that allows cities to prosper, rather than the other way round. But let us not (yet) get hung up on correlation or causation: a measure is an indicator, not a predictor, presumably.

Further, a number of things can be construed by the term 'quality' as a measure for how parks are related to civilising processes. 'Quality' might mean the design and architectural standards of these new public spaces, the ways that the location, planning and planting of parks present landscapes and vistas within cities as incursions of nature in the urban realm. It might mean the affordances that their designs have in bringing together different publics in social encounter and interaction, creating zones and amenities that require people to assemble, to observe each other, take part in exercise and keep them away from less healthy pursuits. These were all strategies of the Victorian parkmakers at the time of Ruskin's writing, as is discussed later, in Chap. 2.

Ruskin is known for his art criticism, his philanthropy and his polemics against the political economy of industrial capitalism in his vast collected works of lectures and public letters, published assiduously in *Fors Clavigera*. Whilst he advocated for the promotion of engagement with nature and beauty, he also knew that parks were places of social control and class distinction. For example, he finds parks to be the display sites for wealth and self-aggrandisement (and self-containment) for the un-curious, where Victorian gentlemen would wander "my richer readers, only round the parks, every day, instead of from place to place through England, learning a thing or two on the road?" (Letter 66, June 1876, *Fors Clavigera Volume*

VI in Cook and Wedderburn 1907, p. 631). Here Ruskin is berating his peers for not wanting to see the different walks of life that he accesses as he travels around the country on his own peculiar civic mission. Another earlier letter features a diatribe on London society as a drain on the rest of the country, whose country people provide its food, and whose manufacturing classes provide clothing, “iron railings, vulgar upholstery, jewels, toys, liveries, lace, and other means of dissipation and dishonour of life”. In this, he describes the metropolitan classes as “Park Squirrels” and Hyde Park, London, as a “great rotatory form of the vast squirrel-cage; round and round it go the idle company, in their reversed streams, urging themselves to their necessary exercise” (Letter 44, August 1874, p. 136). Ruskin is therefore aware of (and I would argue ambivalent about) the qualities of parks as sites for the promotion and display of *certain* tastes, and values, and the parading of aesthetic judgement, cultural taste and status. These are juxtaposed with his interests in opening up common land for productive use, in creating a ‘national store’ of treasures and supporting education in the arts through the Guild of St George (Hewison 2018).

As contemporary municipal strategies, parks are also the sites of co-located museums to provide arts education for working people, as proposed by Ruskin contemporary and Manchester Art Museum founder, Thomas Horsfall, in an open letter to the Manchester Guardian in 1977, which was promoted by Ruskin in his own open letter to the working people of Sheffield:

In each of our parks a small gallery of the kind might be formed, which might of course, also contain a few good engravings, good vases, and good casts, each with a carefully written explanation of our reasons for thinking it good. (Horsfall, cited in Ruskin, Letter 79, Life Guards of New Life, July 1877, *Fors Clavigera Volume VII*, p. 155)

New Victorian parks often held remnants of their previously private status such as grand houses and halls to which an art museum brought new purpose, or if not, a reclaimed manor house site provided the opportunity for new architectural practice. The gallery in the park encapsulated Ruskin’s and Horsfall’s ambitions to bring together art and nature with moral improvement and education, housed within city limits and conserving collections and assets that could be accessible equally to all, as discussed further in Chap. 3. Its influence can be seen on the policy and