Land Management in Diepkloof: Land Shortage, Participation and Contestation

Jonathan Mafukidze & Fazeela Hoosen

Abstract

This paper analyses contestations and contradictions that characterise land management related participatory decision-making at a local level. It discusses challenges, setbacks and successes that came out of invaluable efforts made by local authorities and residence of Diepkloof, to engage in seeking a collective solution to the problem of land scarcity and the subsequent housing shortage that arises from it. It analyses the resultant effects of open public discussions and debates and brings to the fore weaknesses characterising this participatory process most of which are unintended after-effects of the process of engagement. Basing its arguments on an intensive fieldwork carried out in 2007 involving both the local administration and the local community of Zones 1 to 6, this paper argues that the idea behind engaging the local communities in consented search for solutions to local housing challenges was vital but was not well planned and orchestrated to the extent that authorities were not well equipped to deal with contestations that ensued. This paper argues that participatory processes in principle "deepen" democratic processes, but they also potentially negatively impact on social cohesion if not carefully followed through. This was evident in Diepkloof where social tension developed when "propertied" actors who incidentally also boast of unquestionable social capital accrued over the years felt belittled and provoked when their views where contested at meetings by the young and "propertiless". Whereas such participatory engagement aims at and should ordinarily assist in finding a solution to social challenges, it is evident that when mishandled it not only creates social tension and even animosity within communities but also brings into question the authorities intention in using such a process well aware of their own incompetence at handling it. As an unintended consequence, it awakens latent mistrust that communities usually have towards the state considering the history of the country. This paper further argues that the disturbance of social cohesion negatively impacts upon the realisation of free association for the socially weak who have to co-exist with unhappy local heavyweights. The process of getting inputs resulted in a battle for supremacy as community members fought not only to be heard but also to silence the other. Each group appeared to claim that "real knowledge" resided with it hence could only be tapped from it. The authorities on the other hand did not know and did not try to ensure that "normalcy" prevailed after the consultation exercise. This paper therefore, recommends that, as a process, participatory decision-making requires a committed, informed and well intentioned handling by all parities so that all stakeholders identify not only with the ultimate product but also with the way it is conceived.

> *"Easy to preach but difficult to practice, effective pubic participation in planning and public management calls for sensitivity and technique, imagination and guts" (Forester, 2006, 447)*

Introduction

Land shortage for housing development in South Africa is a factor that is hampering speedy housing delivery. In her presentation to President Thabo Mbeki at the Western Cape Provincial Imbizo on July 22, 2007, The Mayor of Cape Town, Helen Zille clearly stated that land shortage was constraining the "rate of housing delivery" in the city (Zille, 2007). Zille argued that Cape Town needed 8 750 hectares of land for housing to catch up with its intended rate of housing delivery [ibid]. In Gauteng, land shortage is also a huge impediment to housing delivery and one such area facing acute land shortage is Alexandra, one of South Africa's oldest and densely populated townships. The City of Johannesburg notes, "a major challenge facing the Alexandra Renewal Programme is land shortage. There is no space to build houses in the township …" (City of Johannesburg, 2006). In response to land shortages the City of Johannesburg decided to build "unique RDP flats …" which are "multi-storey complexes … as the best solution to house the homeless in Alex, where available land for housing is in short supply" (City of Johannesburg, 2006). The city's hope was that "this project" would "provide a solution and at the same time afford decent accommodation for Alex residents" [ibid]. Evidently, land shortage in South Africa plays a significant part in influencing choices of approaches to housing shortages especially with regards to the type of housing to be delivered.

A search for solutions to land shortage and the rising need for housing delivery is a challenge that has for the past decade occupied the minds of politicians, policy-makers, developers and scholars who have grappled with finding a lasting solution to it. It is also a challenge that has for the past few years partly influenced the trajectory of housing development resulting in the promotion of such tenures as "social housing, backyard rental, hostel redevelopment" and the upgrading of shack settlements on secluded marginal spaces which are far away from the employment and service centres (Gauteng Department of Housing, 2008). In Gauteng, "middle and upper-income residential areas, mainly in the northern suburbs of Johannesburg and Tshwane, supporting low densities, are located near to most of the urban opportunities, whereas low-income areas, supporting medium and high population densities are mostly located on the urban periphery and isolated from urban opportunities and services" (Gauteng State of the Environment Report, 2004).

The failure to transform the use of geographical space, which also impacts on the use of social space, is seen as one aspect adversely affecting the development of South African inclusive democracy. As it is, space affects freedom, access, power, image, identity and the subsequent development of a democratic culture that hinges on sensitivity to inclusion, diversity, multiplicity and tolerance (Robinson, 1998). In essence, the perpetuation of spatial segregation and the subsequent segregation that goes with it negatively impacts on the process of democratic integration (Donaldson, 2005). On their part, the poor who have no access either to a house or a piece of land on which to live have over the years been dramatising the severity of the problem of exclusion by settling themselves on "unoccupied" publicly owned pieces of land (Greater Johannesburg, 1999).

According to the Centre on Housing Rights and Evictions, the Johannesburg metropolitan area alone had about 190 informal settlements by 2005 (COHRE, 2005). Most of the informal settlements are characterized by "insecure residential status, inadequate access to safe water,

inadequate access to sanitation and other infrastructure, poor structural quality of housing, and overcrowding. They are also often built in locations at high risk for natural disasters such as floods and landslides" (ICLEI, 2004, 2). After realizing that it would not be able to stop the sprouting of new informal settlements because of its inability to acquire and avail land on which to develop houses for them, the Municipality of Johannesburg, like authorities in other cities in a similar position, is in principle, finding solace in turning towards upgrading these informal settlements [ibid]. In so doing it intends to improve the delivery of services and to bring these informal settlements into the city structure and development process.

Huchzermeyer argues that the upgrading of informal settlements itself (in situ upgrading) is progressing slowly to the extent that it continues to exacerbate the marginalization of residents (Huchzermeyer, 2006). Technological innovation is also being thrown in together with "in situ upgrading" to improve the quality of structures and in turn the lives of slum dwellers and also to protect the environment (Napier & Mulenga, 2002). In so doing the City of Johannesburg hopes to meet its share of contributing towards the realization of the Millennium Development Goal 7 target 11 which advocates for the achievement of "… significant improvement in lives of at least 100 million slum dwellers, by 2020" (United Nations, 2005).

In areas such as Diepkloof the poor no longer have access to empty marginal spaces, which they could move to in response to rising housing needs after the occupation of Motswaledi, a strip of land close to Chris Baragwaneth Hospital. Marginal pieces of land such as Motswaledi functioned as safety valves for the outlet of tension resulting from mounting land shortages. As such, informal settlements assuaged suffering arising from land shortages while minimising chances of conflict between authorities and the land hungry. Cognisant of the rising housing shortage in Diepkloof vis-à-vis the absence of safety valves, the municipality of Johannesburg set out to involve residents in the search for a lasting solution to the housing problem in the midst of land shortages. This process, which appeared to be informed by participatory democratic theory, triggered negative social relations as citizens engaged in pubic discussions (see Moote, McClaran & Chickering 1997, Hauptmann 2001, Smith & Vawda 2003).

This paper aims at creating an understanding of contestations and contradictions that characterise participatory decision-making in land management processes at a local level. It discusses challenges, setbacks and successes that came out of invaluable efforts made by local authorities and residence of Diepkloof, to engage in seeking a solution to the problem of land shortage and the subsequent housing shortage that arises from this. It further seeks to bring to the fore, the reasons for and the unintended after effects of municipality led public discussions that took in Diepkloof in 2006/7. In so doing this, this article identifies and evaluates the level of participation that took place. The understanding of the participatory process and levels of participation is rooted in literature.

Both primary and secondary data for this study were gathered as part of a broader Land Management study undertaken in Diepkloof. The case study method was used with the aim of understanding the land management processes in Diepkloof. Literature on land management were sourced and engaged with. Primary data was qualitatively collected through in-depth interviews and formal and informal discussions and qualitatively, that is thematically analysed. These qualitative techniques allowed for accessing the perspectives of community members and local authorities on land management processes and issues as experienced on the ground. Only 4 city officials were interviewed using an unstructured interview schedule

to gain the perspective of authorities. Field data were collected from initially 22 individuals within the community using a structured questionnaire and from a further 12 individuals through unstructured formal discussions.

Understanding Participation

Participation processes are vital for administration in the South African context since they contribute towards the realization of citizenship in a new democracy. It is more important in townships inhabited by former "subjects" according to pre-democracy administrative categorizations (see Mamdani, 1996). As subjects, inhabitants of townships were not required to make contributions towards policy planning and implementation. In contrast, citizens who inhabited "white" land were endowed with rights to make contributions to decisions on issues that affected their lives. As such, the relationship between citizens and the state was consensual while that of subjects and the state were conflictual. At one level participatory processes are therefore important for emphasizing a shift in relationship between the state and its "new" citizens and to dramatize the existence of such citizenship. At another level, participation is important for contributing towards informed decision-making.

For this study, participation is understood from the perspective of the theory of participatory democracy, which is closely related to deliberative democratic theory. These two perspectives share much in common to the extent that their difference shall not be dwelt upon in this study as contributions from either side form building blocks of this study's analytical framework. According to both participatory democratic theory and deliberative democratic theory "good democratic politics ensures that citizens to participate in "collective decision-making on matters that affect their lives" (Hauptmann, 2001). Participation is an important component of "citizenship, "which according to Prah"… implies the entire mode of incorporation of a particular individual or group into society" (Mayavo, 2002). This is important for various reasons. First it allows for the realization of both legal-status and social citizenship (see Kymlicka & Norman, 1994). Citizenship-as-legal-status speaks of a full recognition in law of one's membership to a community [ibid]. Such citizenship emanates from the realms of politics and is legally constituted and protected (see Mamdani, 1996 & Neocosmos, 2006). But, social citizenship, which largely is, citizenship-as-desirable-activity draws from "the extent and quality of one's … participation in …" a "… community" (Kymlicka and Norman, 1994). Such participation, according to Hauptmann "gives people a better understanding of their own interests and the interests of others, and, in some cases, brings them to see what would be best for the entire group" (Hauptmann, 2001, 398). However for this to happen, Moote, McClaran and Chickering argue, participation should take place at all levels of policy, that is, from "initiation through decision implementation and monitoring" (1997, 877). Such should also be seen as a "collective learning process where all participants acquire and share information and all participants accept responsibility for policy decisions [ibid]. The multi stage requirement is vital in that it militates against the effervescence of conflict at the implementation level. According to Susskind and Cruik-shank 'public participation' facilitates "… decision implementation by resolving conflicts during the planning process, rather than delaying implementation of completed plans while decisions are reviewed through appeals and adjudication (Moote, McClaran and Chickering, 1997, 877).

In land management related issues participation involves engaging in discussions relating to land use and ownership rights. In this study, it involved discussing whether building high rise flats was an acceptable way of resolving the shortage of land for housing construction. Since the discussion centered only on that aspect, it clearly reflects that residents were not involved

at other levels argued for in Moote, McClaran and Chickering (1997). It is no wonder then that the process did not go beyond this point due to conflict as is discussed below. A closer look at what happened in Diepkloof adds impetus to the argument raised by Wondoleck (1988), Kemmis (1990), Shannon (1992) that "administrative decisions will be more acceptable to the citizenry if they are made through a collaborative process that builds community and shared understanding, and therefore overcomes societal divisiveness and polarization (Moote, McClaran and Chickering, 1997, 878). It is this paper's presumption that had the people of Diepkloof participated in discussing land shortage in general they may probably have touched on the aspect of building high-rise blocks of flats and might even have settled for it. But simply because they were involved in discussing whether the implementation of such a decision was good or bad, they arrived at a stalemate which the administrators could not resolve. Poor efficacy due to limited involvement is legitimately seen as a cause for lack of compromise on the part of polarized groups of participants involved in Diepkloof. Efficacy is seen as "the extent to which a public participation process fosters public support through of land management decision and expedites implementation of that decision [ibid]. Informed leadership of the participation process, sincerity in using the process and involvement of all stakeholders at all levels of the process is seen to be as vital as informed and well intentioned participation of affected communities throughout the process.

However the involvement of residents at various levels is seen to be problematic though desirable. The "complexity, size and scale of some advanced industrial societies" make it difficult to involve all members at all levels (Moote, McClaran and Chickering, 1997, 401). In some instances not all people want to be involved at all levels as some opt to be represented by others while some do not see themselves as capable of comprehending and discussing some issues. These aspects however do not invalidate the essence of holding inclusive discussions at various levels but actually reinforces it. Delegation or waver of the right to participate is seen by many as participation therefore it is important to stick to the process and have others opt out than work on the assumption that they may not be willing or able to comprehend. The nature of discussion usually is not such that all present participate, but that they are there or opt not to be there as issues are openly deliberated. According to Scheufele, discussion "… among citizens has long been identified as a necessary condition for a healthy and functioning democracy …" as it contributes towards "… consensus-building" (2000, 727). It also helps in building an "informed and participatory citizenry" capable of opinion sharing. When discussion yields solutions to problems then participation will have transcended the ritualistic practice of engaging citizens merely for purposes of gaining legitimation of administratively made decisions.

Moote, McClaran and Chickering argue that public land management agencies and authorities are criticized for involving the public in order to "nominally meet their statutory requirements while effectively continuing to dispense predetermined management decisions (1997, 877). This is also seen in the case of public participation in the environmental management process, especially that of Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA's) (McDaid & Kruger, 2004). An active sincere involvement of community members elevates them to the level of participants, while a ritualistic encounter relegates them to being simply customers to borrow from Smith and Vawda (2003). Customers purchase products while participants are citizens who actively participate in fundamental collective decision making [ibid]. The definition of participation adopted for this study is one given by Johnson which takes it to be "… involvement in bargaining over issue definition, available options, resource to carry out the decisions and final choices (Smith & Vawda, 2003: 31).

Participation occurs within social contexts characterized by power differentials, which impact on the participatory process and beyond. Social relations within a social context define social space and history of individuals, groups and place and this influences social relations. Communities, as noted by Moore are characterized by "spatiality of power relations", that is power relations within a social space (Fontein, 2007: 3). These are sometimes enmeshed in the history of people and a place. Place or landscape, as Moore argues, sometimes exists "not only as the site of struggles, as backdrop to ongoing political contestation, or as symbolic or cultural resource, but also as the productive result of entangled local and trans-local practices and discourses" [ibid]. Place therefore exists as a product of cultural, political and economic processes [ibid]. Articulation within such space is strongly influenced by place producing factors or notions that place value on these aspects. Articulation produces and is produced by socially and historically produced factors.

In Diepkloof for instance, as is shown below, an articulation of place in relation to history and the failure to do so, coupled with historical accomplishments that cascaded into social capital or absence thereof segmented a community into two groups. One group was buoyed by historically, socially acquired and materially derived power while the other anchored itself on what it perceived as astute knowledge that aimed to drive development with a human face by way of providing a sensible solution to a complex social problem which is land and housing shortage. In that context, both micro and macro politics, the symbolic value and meaning of space, micro-livelihood practices on the one hand and attachment to place and an appreciation of the possibility of subjecting it to transformation without it loosing what it symbolically, politically, socially and politically stands for. In so doing the community experiences contestations over knowledge, which could be summed up as who knows and what do those who know, know and why? How did they come to know as well as what do we know as a community, why and how. Historical, political and material factors define those who know and those whose knowledge must be subjugated by that of those with "acceptable" knowledge. The conscious awareness of the existence of the Foucauldian notion of power and the social constructivist struggles over the construction and deployment of knowledge is important for administrators during the implementation of a participatory process.

In present day South African politics and administration, participation is seen as a popular solution to problems. Hemson argues that participation is not only seen as a way of enhancing service delivery but of promoting public accountability as well (Hemson, 2007). Such participation involves the engagement of citizens, civil society and administrative authorities. Social tension and conflict are integral components of such processes and in principle are assuaged through proper consented handling by all parties involved.

Understood through Arnstein's model, participation occurs at various levels within such contexts and these range manipulation which is the lowest level to citizen control which is the highest possible level of participation (Arnstein, 1969, 217). This model is flexible and could be used to appreciate the level at which participation occurs at both macro and micro levels hence we adopt it to analyze such a process at a local level in Diepkloof. This model has been used widely to understand, and to rate the effectiveness of participation in South Africa. This theory is visually illustrated below: -

Arnstein's ladder of citizen participation (Arnstein, 1969, 217)

8) 7) 6)	Citizen Control Delegated Power Partnership	Degrees of Citizen Power
5) 4) 3)	Placation Consultation Informing	Degrees of Tokenism
2) 1)	Therapy Manipulation	Non-participation

This participation ladder is represented slightly differently as compared to Arnstein's visual ladder diagram. Each rung explained by Arnstein corresponds to the extent of citizens' power. The lower two rungs describe non-participatory methods which are regarded rather as forms of manipulation and therapy. These two rungs are said to "enable power holders to "educate" or "cure" the participants" (Arnstein 1969: 217), and not to enable people to participate in processes. It is therefore seen as a hindrance to effective participation. The succeeding three rungs allow for information sharing and provide local people with a voice but are not that effective as there is no monitoring and therefore "no follow-through, no "muscle," hence no assurance of changing the status quo" (Arnstein 1969: 217). The level of placation allows power-holders to have the continued right to make the final decision, with citizens merely playing an advisory role (Arnstein 1969). This only allows for inputs from participants but does not allow for a consensual decision being made amongst participants, which does not result in a 'just' decision making process.

The last rung of the ladder represents the highest level of participation. Citizens have total power and control of the decision-making process at this level of participation. Effective partnerships are developed thus enabling effective participation and empowerment of people, especially the marginalized. Rung 6, allows for negotiations about decisions taken and at rung seven, citizens may posses' delegated power, through majority representatives in decision-making committees. This model represents the simple point "that there are significant gradations of citizen participation" (Arnstein, 1969, 218). Therefore in order to reach the highest level of participation were total citizen power is reached it is important to build the capacity of and educate individuals.

This ladder of participation allows this study to locate the level of participation in Diepkloof within a broader analytical framework. We are persuaded to argue that despite the good intentions that prompted the participatory process reality on the ground points out that the process could not ascend beyond tokenism.

Diepkloof: Historical background
Diepkloof, Soweto's eastern settlement constitutes of four settlement types that lie close to one another within a very small geographical space and established during different periods in history. The largest of them is the formal township, which incidentally is also the oldest. The smallest is the hostel area followed by Motswaledi, an informal settlement that lies west of Chris Baragwaneth Hospital. The second largest is a relatively affluent enclave, which

constitutes of Phases 1-3. This paper focuses on the formal township, which comprises of Zones that range from 1 to 6. Sponsors of the main study as discussed in the methodology section made the choice of this settlement however its appropriateness for this paper lies in that it is where challenges around inclusive participatory decision-making were identified.

Diepkloof Zone 1-6 was established in 1959 as a dormitory resettlement township to accommodate black victims of forced removals mainly from Alexandra (Lebelo, 1988). It is located approximately 15km south west of the City of Johannesburg and its close proximity to the Johannesburg CBD and main industrial site makes it an attractive residential area for many. Most of its residents are either landowners or tenants. Tenants are said to comprise mainly of people born within Diepkloof and are reluctant to relocate to other areas partly citing proximity to areas of economic activities as a major reason for staying according to respondents, although there also exists a significant population size of those who came from outside. Diepkloof was a product of harsh political processes characterised by relocation and various forms of victimisation and these had a bearing on shaping the political culture of the township. Since its establishment to house victims of forced removals from Alexandra, Diepkloof has had political activism as its defining characteristic.

According to Marks, in the early 1990s, Diepkloof developed a strong civic association and an organised militant youth whose participation in the politics of the day projected Diepkloof as "one of the most politically active townships in Soweto" (Marks, 1995). Much of its political involvement was in search of inclusion within a socio-economic and political space defined by state orchestrated racialised exclusion. The state stood out as the major adversary of this township's residence until the attainment of democracy in 1994. During their struggles for space, residents formed associations such as the Diepkloof Civic Association, which played a significant role in the 1980s in expressing dissent towards unfavourable and unjust unilateral administrative decisions [ibid]. Through the Association, the community could voice its unhappiness as and when the administration imposed unfavourable decisions. For instance, when "councils increased rents, evicted defaulters and demolished shacks …" in the 1980s, the association as the mouth piece of the residents raised concern and with no positive response forthcoming, it led residents into the dramatisation of discontent along the streets (Marks, 1995).

Diepkloof also produced student organisations that were politically active in the late 1980's. It is from this active participation that some senior residents of Diepkloof distinguished themselves as leaders and representatives of the community and in the process acquired social capital. Their success epitomises the unity of purpose that the township enjoyed over the years and this makes this group stand out as the embodiment of social cohesion that the community enjoyed in the face of adversity. Therefore, senior residents according to ontological narratives, that is from "… stories told by ordinary people in everyday life …" is a pride of Diepkloof (Somers, 1992, 603).

Land use in Diepkloof is predominantly residential as it was a black dormitory township (Proptalk, 2006). Despite it being a residential space, residents did not own the houses in which they lived for more than forty years. This was because the laws under which most black townships were established and administered in apartheid South Africa did not provide for black property ownership. The Black (Native) Laws Amendment Act, No 46 of 1937 and the Black Communities Development Act, No 4 of 1984 unequivocally stipulated that no property rights were given to black people despite that they recognised the territorial racialisation of black and white space. It is evident that in apartheid South Africa, the state

played a pivotal role in ensuring that residential areas for blacks were established on a very small geographical space so that from the onset they had a propensity to overcrowding. It also ensured that houses built for blacks were of an inferior quality and were badly serviced especially compared to those for whites. For instance, in the 1940's the Minister of the then Native Affairs instructed "that all future housing schemes should be shorn of all non-essentials in design and amenities, and be as cheap as possible" (Carr, 1990, 42). There is no evidence that there were plans for the extension of these townships in response to a growing population and this deliberate omission in the planning process has plunged present day administrators into a quandary as they are faced with acute housing shortages amidst crippling land shortages.

Housing access and population size: a historical synopsis
As already noted, there are three main areas in Diepkloof each characterized by settlement type and income. The bigger part of Diepkloof covering Zone 1-6, which is also our area of study, consists of original grey three and four roomed dwellings that are called 'matchbox' houses by locals, which were built and owned by the previous government to accommodate the large number of black migrants into the city who were collecting at Alexandra (City of Johannesburg, Website). However, over the years, residents, who are a working class population, have extended these "matchbox" houses into large houses.

About 53% of the population of Johannesburg lives in Soweto, Diepkloof and Orange Farm (City of Johannesburg: Website). According to the 2001 Census, the population of Diepkloof was 104 098 persons, about a tenth of the population of Swaziland, inhabiting an area that is approximately 2.50218 meters squared in size (Encyclopaedia of the Nations, 2007).

However, in recent years, commercialization began taking place in Soweto and also in parts of Diepkloof and quickly gained rapidity due to positive stakeholder responses. Commercialization has been in the form of re-development and re-use of council owned land and buildings. Established developers are showing interest, not only in Diepkloof, but also in the whole of the Soweto area and this is bound to change the flow of money to other areas with services. Over the past few years, the municipality began to work to change this situation through encouraging different forms of developments and land-uses in which local businesses and pre-dominantly black owned businesses could settle and create economic opportunities within Soweto (JPC, 2006). This is slowly changing the use of land in Diepkloof for example the Diepkloof Business District is aimed specifically at introducing different land uses to Diepkloof.

At the local level, planning departments have experienced and are experiencing procedural problems in the implementation of projects that aim to restructure land in the former townships. Also coupled with procedural problems, in many of the townships including Diepkloof, there is very little vacant land available for housing. Therefore this has led to a tension between government and communities, around providing access to land and housing within former townships.

Participation produced consensus, contestation and contradictions

> *"To us, Diepkloof Extension is not a mere residential area, it is also an employment area, an area in which we work, easily and cheaply accessible, an immediate reminder of black success which works as a fountain of materialistic inspiration to all of us".*   *(Diepkloof Zone 2, male respondent)*

This part of the discussion highlights some of the pertinent participatory findings. It touches on aspects of sense of belonging, community cohesion that grew from protracted conflicts with the state and resolution of intra-community ethnic conflict. This sense of community was tested by the participatory process that resulted in significant social tension that caused a rethink of the question of belonging and even of citizenship. It also addresses contradictions in what people say and do, and distance between what they say they want to achieve and what they are doing. It moves further to analyze what the authorities set to achieve and the pathway they followed which resulted in both the intended and unintended.

Although they see themselves as fortunate victims of forced removals in that they accessed houses, residents of Diepkloof also note that the settlement was designed to allow for ethnic conflict and social disharmony. The feeling of the residents towards what happened to them and how it affected their lives has been ambivalent from the 1950s until this day. For instance one resident from Zone 3 revealed that "*Godula mo Diepkloof gobe go swana lego dula tiropong*" which translates to "residing in Diepkloof was similar to residing in town", that is in the CBD of Johannesburg. It is a shared view that residing in Diepkloof was prestigious and as such residents began to identify with Diepkloof. The prestige that went with the Diepkloof identity became a unifying force, a foundation of a shared sense of belonging. It also contributed those nuances that became building blocks of a sense of community. The acceptable size of the houses, which were either 3 or 4 rooms, and the proximity of the township to Johannesburg's CBD and several industrial sites is what gave life to the township's prestigious status.

However, the residents noted that they were ethnically grouped, that is they were allocated a house in areas marked off for specific ethnicities within each Zone. Specific areas were divided and set apart for specific ethnic groups and as such in every zone there are areas known to belong to particular ethnic groups and predominant are those for the Shangaan, Zulu and Sotho refereed to locally as *EmaShangaaneni, EmaZulwini and EbaSuthwini.* However, since authorities established the applicants' ethnicities from their names and not through direct communication, many applicants were ascribed to wrong ethnic groups because their names suggested that they belonged to those groups or were difficult to categorise. As a result of this, there are no areas that absolutely carried people of one ethnic group. Therefore areas carry names of predominant groups but that does not mean that they carry exclusive members of ethnic groups. Regardless of this accidental multi-ethnicity, the state's ethnicisation of residential areas allowed for the development of a sense of negative inter-ethnic sense of difference and an intra-ethnic sense of solidarity especially in times of conflict between members of two or more ethnicities.

However due to individual effort, proximity, intermarriages, co-existence and due to the need for collective responses towards the ramifications of an oppressive state, these geographically compartmentalised ethnicities gravitated towards community formation. Racialised state led community –administration adversity, intermarriages and all the other mentioned factors resulted in a "horizontal comradeship" and a mutual fraternity, which moulded a community

in Diepkloof (Anderson, 1991). Many potentially negative aspects ended up having positive unintended consequences. For instance, the short distance between houses, which undeniably resulted in some conflict between neighbours also allowed for close contact between residents, which in itself is good for the development of a strong society without infringing on the privacy of families. Inferably, this means that land administration policies that aimed at achieving ethnic territorial separation and antagonism of an urban population managed to a lesser degree to fomented conflict that could be considered ethnic but other factors enabled the residents to transcend the spatial and ethnic divide and to craft social cohesion.

With no more space on which to build houses for the growing population of Diepkloof, the municipality decided that it was important to build high-rise flats on open spaces within Zones 1-6. It took this fantastic idea to the community of Diepkloof to find out what was thought about it. The community dissected the issue over several days of state conducted discussions. Several issues were raised for and against the idea. The idea found support in young, landless people most of whom were tenants. Some of them were born and raised in Diepkloof while others came from outside. Their argument was that this was a brilliant idea that would allow them to continue living in Diepkloof, a township they felt attached to. They further argued that those who opposed the idea were doing so simply because they were not directly involved. Furthermore, they alleged that most of those who opposed the idea were landlords who were insensitive to the plight of the younger "other" simply because they earned money through tenancy. Landlords, it was argued, were averse to the idea of their "mere" tenants ascending to the level of becoming landlords within the same community. Therefore, an element of jealousy was pilled on allegations of insensitivity. Finally, this group also argued that their opposing counterparts were melancholic about the past; they wanted to use space to freeze time. They alleged that this was going to happen through retaining everything as it has always been. This, they argued was naïve in that it would not be possible. They argued that what needed to be preserved were the norms and values of the people of Diepkloof so that they would not be swept away by transformation.

Those who were against the idea argued that, the open spaces were not as open as they appeared to be since they were being utilized in different ways. They noted that the community held meetings on these open spaces and some of these meetings were very important in defining the destiny of residents. They further argued that a lot of economic activities occurred on these spaces and their disappearance would place the livelihoods of many households into jeopardy. More importantly, they noted that these spaces were used by the youths for recreation and exercising, therefore losing them would leave the young people without any significant form of entertainment and space of their own where they would meet away from the surveillance of elders. They pointed out that these spaces produced great South Africans such as Lucas Radebe whose footballing career was natured and nurtured in Diepkloof. Therefore, they felt obliged to protect the legally of producing great citizens in every way possible.

Lastly, they argued that the state was up to its old divisive tricks, which date back to the apartheid days. The state, they argue is simply coming up with a plan of dividing the residents of Diepkloof so that it will be able to dominate and manipulate them. This is happening because the state is well aware of their history and is trying to destroy the legally of unity and activism. As such, it is setting up "father against son to ensure that the house crumbles" argued one old man. They further note that the state has pitted young misguided youths against respected members of the community who have a reputation for fighting oppression and domination. The youths do nothing else but to "undress these revered cadres

in public. But are these young people able to deal with the wrath of their insulted elders" retorted one elderly female resident of Zone 4.

Upon seeing that the discussions were slowly gravitating towards a point of explosion, the municipality withdrew, according to members from both groups. The official version is that the authorities did not withdraw completely but simply took a step back in order to formulate a better way forward. It however erred in that it did not inform the residents that it was engaging in a temporal tactical withdrawal. As a result, residents were left in the dark and they began to fill in the knowledge vacuum on their own. It is difficult however, to establish why both groups perceive this withdrawal as flight to safe havens. Furthermore, since the community had the only options of agreeing and disagreeing with the development, this showed that the agenda had already been set by the authorities, which ultimately left the final decision with them, which if situated on Arnstein's (1969) ladder fits into the level of tokenism, not allow for full and effective 'citizen' participation.

What are the lessons learnt from such a participatory process: discussion
The process of participation is vital but is more complicated than it appears to be, especially if it involves addressing an important basic need such as access to housing. Therefore administrators need to be trained enough to be able to handle the process while citizens have to be educated enough to know that they should listen to others as much as they should be listened to. In so doing they will appreciate that it is ideas that advance the public good that should triumph over individual or group interests.

Public participation is further complicated by the fact that, although individuals exist as actors, they play roles in communities in which they live and these bestow different identities upon them some of which are a source of authority and power. Some acquire social capital and command different amounts of respect due to their past and present roles and are seen and see themselves as important to their community and deserve special respect. Therefore, when engaging in public discussions, a prior knowledge of the history of the community, of the identity of revered and influential actors and of the socio-cultural milieu of that community is vital. For instance, an open space that looked desolate to the eye of the outsider has political, economic and socio-cultural value to the insider. Prior knowledge of such would help one structure the discussion in such a way that amicable solutions could be reached. To many an actor, history is vital, especially when they consider themselves to be victims. In that regard, the state needs to be conscious of the inherited heinous history of the state and work in a way that convince residents that it has a positive role to play in their lives. History of space and that of individuals needs to be taken cognizant of so much so that process or engagement do not appear to be aimed at violating or denigrating that which others stand for or to defile sacrosanct space regarded by others as an identity marker.

In Diepkloof, for instance, residents place different types of value on land. These differing values resulted in the current discontentment amongst residents with regard to the use of available land. In order to understand this tension amongst residents it is necessary to unpack the differing values placed on land by residents. There exists a strong sense of historical attachment to land by residents in Diepkloof' due to the area's history and this brings about a commonly shared special way of looking at and relating with the land. However, this also places a deeper non-economic value to the land. Many Diepkloof residents across age groups felt that it is their right to reside in the area due to the fact that they have been residing there for many years, were born there, or have a stronger sense of historical attachment to the place. This strong sense of value and attachment to the place, which stems from common

history, political struggles, birth right and home-ground, provides a backdrop in understanding the way in which the Diepkloof community as a whole perceives its surroundings.

Hanyane argues that "… society is made up of different communities; each community has its own unique needs, demands, expectations and, most essentially, interests. Therefore different communities will have different interests" (Hanyane, 2005, 262). However, even though a community may have particular interests and may assign common values to a place community members may have different approaches to preserving or retaining such sense of place and this may result in conflict. Interests tend to change over time and more so when important issues are at stake. This can be seen in Diepkloof, were due to change in the housing situation, there has been a conflict of interest amongst residents within the community.

Public participation allows individuals and groups "to express deeply felt differences and to defend diverse interests" which may be a cause of contestation if not managed in the proper manner (Forester, 2006). Therefore it is the responsibility of the local authority or planners to effectively manage this situation. As stated by Forester (2006), planners need to minimize and prevent conflict, despite differing interests and should encourage mutually acceptable actions whilst working with multiple stakeholders and should achieve consensus amongst stakeholders, even though it is felt by stakeholders that planners are on someone else's side (Forester, 2006). This is the main challenge faced by facilitators of public participation especially in post-apartheid South Africa, where community members have a sense of distrust towards local authorities, which stems from attitudes towards previous apartheid authorities.

The way a society is organized is also important when considering social engagement. For instance, the landlord tenant binary appeared to hinder progressive debate in Diepkloof since it situated actors in fixed self-serving interest groups. Authorities found themselves less prepared to move residents beyond this factor. Age, which is also tied to social capital and property ownership, also appeared to define group allegiance and the moment that was allowed to define group identity, it swayed actors towards defending what they valued as members of particular age groups and this drew from history, ideas and social and material accomplishments. For instance, contributions by the youth were easily taken to be aimed at undermining the authority of elders while those of elders could easily be seen as emanating from insensitive comfortable minds that place more emphasis on melancholy than on resolving immediate socio-economic challenges. The young positioned themselves as pro-democratically driven development while looking at elders as retrogressive forces that are out of touch with the current world. Elders on the other hand perceive themselves as custodians of values, defenders of inner social space through a preservation of geographical space upon which group solidarity, freedom and aspirations were acted out. They looked at the youth as an impatient misguided lot that was bound to acquire wisdom in the passage of time. Elders who agreed with building flats and youths who were against the construction of flats were considered lost sympathizers of wrong groups and not as thinking valuable members who were essential to the process. Such polarization yields more social fragmentation than social cohesion.

It is important to note that the process lost course and ended up being a power and knowledge contestation. Each group was striving not only to be heard but to subdue the opposing other. Contestation, transformed a process that required cooperation into a contest. Some claimed knowledge because of history and ownership of space. For instance landlords could not see

how tenants could make decision over their territorial space. To them, landlords own Diepkloof and it should be them and not tenants who make decisions over the trajectory of development. Knowledge is therefore tied to other factors. To others, the participatory process provided an opportunity to move towards accessing a permanent place of residence and therefore it had to be pushed through. The arguments that were proffered by others made little sense to them. Therefore, the only knowledge that was sensible to them was one bound up with the advancement of their interest. For both groups, knowledge was closely related to interest and domination over the other.

Residents of Diepkloof think that the authorities did not accept their argument and fear that they are going to implement the views of the "other". The land hungry are convinced that this is not a subject that requires consensus or majority appreciation but one that should be implemented to ensure that the marginalized realize a basic human need. They note that a lot of younger people were afraid of appearing to contest the views of their landlords and as such remained quiet. Unequal power relations were therefore a significant factor in deciding who spoke and who remained quiet. It is clear that poor communication and lack of consultation on the part of authorities is partly to blame for all this contestation.

Unbeknown to the people of Diepkloof, they segmented their society into insider/outsider antagonistic groups. They unintentionally found themselves revisiting the question of belonging and citizenship. It appeared that to some, free participation in Diepkloof should be a preserve of property owners. As such, this is the group that should have monopoly over citizenship and belonging. It is clear that one is not expected to belong to an area where they do not own property. Legalistic citizenship as well as universal politically and legally recognized national citizenship can be subordinated to locally constructed notions of citizenship. In practice, membership to a community can be withdrawn from or extended to individuals and groups during critical moments such as these. People that regarded themselves as insiders over many decades where horrified to find the very same community to which they felt attached sticking the outsider label upon them.

One could conclude that public participation in the land management process in Diepkloof was undertaken to fulfill ritualistic democratic requirements more than to solicit citizen contribution towards informed policy formulation and implementation. As such it was loosely conducted and abandoned at such a crucial time when it needed to be well driven. It therefore resulted in social tension. It is clear that the authorities learnt a lot from the deliberations to allow them to arrive at a decision however, the best participation practice as noted by Arnstein (1962) involves citizen participation at all decision-making levels. What occurred in Diepkloof could be seen as "placation" according to Arnstein's categories (1962). The reasons being that the local authority consulted the community and since the majority of the community agreed that the land is better off kept as an open space, the local authority accepted this decision, as this supported their initial decision. Other interests were not taken into consideration as it did not support the authorities' initial decision and fit into the overall plans that were drawn at the provincial level in the planning of the Spatial Development Frameworks (SDF). Therefore, since the majority of the stakeholders agreed with this decision it was seen as representative of the common good.

Therefore this flawed participation process has robbed certain Diepkloof residents off a sense of equality and identity as well as self worth which is supposed to emanate not only from the process of participation but from a sense of belonging as well (Lawrence and Stanton in Hanyane, (2005)). The broader question, which this paper brings to the fore is how is civic

interest taken into account in the decision-making process in developing broader plans and policies, so as to take into account local concerns? This remains a difficult question that needs to be answered. As noted by Hanyane "there is no satisfactory constitutional rule by which individual preferences may be aggregated and this creates an important obstacle for decision-making in the public sector" (Hanyane, 2005, 262).

Conclusion
This article has analyzed the outcomes of contestation and contradiction of a particular land management participation process in Diepkloof. Contestations stemmed from a difference of interests amongst Diepkloof residents along generational lines which stemmed from historical accomplishments through social capital and a sense of knowledge power. This article has showed that within this background (cultural, historical) of differing interests in achieving the common goal of retaining a sense of community in Diepkloof, local officials have not retained 'normalcy' out of the participation process but led to moderating debate. The way a society is organized is important when considering social engagement, as this shapes and is the deciding factor in shaping outcomes of participation processes. Furthermore, in analysing participation and decision making processes it is vitally important to take into consideration the context (historical, cultural aspects) of a community.

Local officials lack capacity and skill in dealing with and resolving such conflicting situations is also seen as a contributing factor including a set agenda that did not provide room for further involvement and decisions to made, which led to conflicting outcomes. Therefore, local officials need to be more aware of the historical context of a community and incorporate this in making decisions that involve the very same people. Also, of concern is the eradication of mistrust between local authorities and communities that stem from the previous apartheid authorities, It is the responsibility of the local authority in eradicating this, through not only enhancing community participation but listening to the needs (even if differing) of the community. However, if not handled properly by all stakeholders, participation may result in social fragmentation and conflict within a community, which will harm future participation processes.

This article has highlighted the need for further research to be undertaken on the outcomes of participation processes in land management/planning processes in South Africa, and the impacts of these for future participation and decision-making processes. Furthermore, it also highlights the importance of taking into consideration the historical and cultural context and its impact in influencing participatory outcomes especially in South Africa that will enable fruitful (inclusive) outcomes and ultimately enhance participatory democracy. There are however, a few recommendations that could be made to ensure that participation yields better results so enhance participatory democracy.

Recommendations
This paper recommends at the outset that as a process, participatory decision-making requires a committed, informed and well intentioned handling by all parities so that all stakeholders identify not only with the ultimate product but also with the way it is conceived.

This recommendation is made taking into consideration Foresters (2006) assessment of a mediator in her resolution of a longstanding dispute between stakeholders in California. This assessment outlined that mediating participation between stakeholders is a better option than moderating debate. Therefore this would encourage local officials in Diepkloof and in South Africa as a whole, to play a role in achieving multiple and diverse interests between

stakeholders through mediation. Moderating, leads arguments towards counter-arguments, furthermore, it results in contestation and tension amongst stakeholders within a participation process, which is harmful to future participation processes (Forester, 2006). However, mediating would assist in stakeholders to "respond to one another's concerns and to craft workable agreements leading to mutual gain" (Forester, 2006, 452). This would allow for all stakeholders to conceive and ultimately identify with the outcomes of the participation process.

It is also recommended that it is the responsibility of the local official(s) to mediate participation so as to eradicate any existing disputes amongst stakeholders and to create consensus so as to not result in further conflict. There is a need to develop their skill in dealing with these situations. This can be achieved by investing in skilled mediators and in building the capacity of local officials, as South Africa still needs to meet service delivery demands.

However, in extreme cases of conflicting interests, as outlined by Forester, stakeholders should make an effort to "recognize past grievances as a step toward, not as a substitute for, future action" (Forester, 2006, 453). Therefore this should be kept in mind for future participation processes in Diepkloof. In light of this, it is recommended that increasing efforts should be made by local officials to learn about underlying interests and concerns within the community so as to leave a harmonious relationship amongst the community and which will enable a better participatory environment for future development proposals.

What is required on the part of the community in solving the problem of land shortage and housing demand is to develop a sense of community capacity. This can be achieved through supporting a common goal, which is already achieved in Diepkloof. This common goal is to retain the sense of community and attachment to the place; however differing ways of retaining this sense of place resulted in conflict and contestation. Therefore in Diepkloof there is an urgent need to enhance community capacity, as there is differing interests in achieving a common goal. As advised by Henkin and Zapf (2006) structured community-building activities that allow for community visioning and planning to address specific community problems (Henkin and Zapf, 2006) are required in addressing this. Furthermore, the community needed to be involved higher up in the decision-making process in planning of developments for the area (eg, SDF, IDP), than being involved at the latter stages when the agenda is set and vital decisions have already been made.

References
Anderson, B. 1991: *Imagined Communities: reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* rev.ed. London: Verso.

Arnstein, S. R.,1969: *A Ladder of Citizen Participation*. In American Institute of Planners, *Journal of the American Institute of Planners, Vol. 35, No. 4, July 1969, pp. 216-224*. Boston: American Institute of Planners. Retrieved February 17, 2006 from http://lithgow-schmidt.dk/sherry-arnstein/ladder-of-citizen-participation.pdf, Accessed 08 January 2008.

Bekker, J.C., 1987: *A home of your own: A manual on home ownership in the townships*: South African Legal Rights Foundation, J.L. van Schaik (Pty) Ltd: Pretoria.

Carr, W.J.P., 1990: *Soweto: Its creation, life and decline*, South African Institute of Race Relations.

Centre on Housing Rights and Evictions, 2005: *Any Room for the Poor? Forced Evictions in Johannesburg, South Africa: Draft for Discussion, 17 February 2005*. http://cache.search.yahoo-ht2.akadns.net/search/cache?ei=UTF-8&p=Informal+settlements+in+johannesburg&fr=yfp-t-203&u=www.cohre.org/get_attachment.php%3Fattachment_id%3D3066&w=informal+settlements+settlement+johannesburg&d=fDS0RjWxQy_C&icp=1&.intl=us

City of Johannesburg – news archive – *Unique RDP flats planned for Alex* http://www.joburg.org.za/content/view/1006/192/

City of Johannesburg Property Company, 2005: *Soweto Property Investor*, Region D, City of Johannesburg Website: http://www.joburg.org.za/regions/regiond_about.stm: Accessed 27/04/2007.

COHRE, 2005: *Any Room for the Poor? Forced Evictions in Johannesburg, South Africa*. Centre on Housing Rights and Evictions (COHRE), Geneva.

Diepkloof Business District (DK3) Progress Report, 2006: Johannesburg Property Company: August 2006.

Donaldson, R., 2006: *Mass rapid rail development in South Africa's metropolitan core: Towards a new urban form?,* Land Use Policy, Vol 23, Issue 3, pp 344-352, http://www.sciencedirect.com/science?_ob=ArticleURL&_udi=B6VB0-4G4KYRK-1&_user=1023141&_rdoc=1&_fmt=&_orig=search&_sort=d&view=c&_acct=C000050499&_version=1&_urlVersion=0&_userid=1023141&md5=ba91627560bdae9e19d4db589cd89193

Encyclopedia of the Nations, 2007: Swaziland Population, http://www.nationsencyclopedia.com/Africa/Swaziland-POPULATION.html

Fontein, J 2007: Review of *Suffering for Territory: Race, place and power in Zimbabwe*, by David Moore. Durham: Duke University Press http://afraf.oxfordjournals.org/cgi/content/full/adm028v1

Forester, J., 2006: Making Participation Work When Interests Conflict, *Journal of the American Planning Association*, Vol, 72, No. 4, pp 447 – 456.

Gauteng Department of Housing: *Key Priority Areas* http://www.housing.gpg.gov.za/keypriorityareas_mixed.html

Gauteng State of the Environment Report, 2004*: Chapter 5. Land* http://www.environment.gov.za/soer/reports/gauteng/Chapter%205%20Land.pdf

Greater Johannesburg: Pressures in poverty http://www.environment.gov.za/Enviro-Info/sote/citysoe/johannes/Virtual/CSOE/csoe/html/NonJava%20Site/Poverty/Pressures.htm

Hanyane, B., 2005: Defining the concept of civic interest in post-apartheid South Africa, A question of administrative philosophy in the making, *Politeia*: Vol 24, No 2, pp 255 – 270, Unisa Press.

Hauptmann, E. 2001: Can Less Be More? Leftist Deliberative Democrats' Critique of Participatory Democracy. *Polity*, Vol. 33, No. 3, (Spring, 2001), pp,. 397 – 421.
 http/www.jstor.org/stable/3235441

Hemson, D., 2007: Can participation make a difference? Prospects for people's participation in planning, *Critical Dialogue – Public Participation in Review*, Vol 3, No 1, pp 9-15.

Hoosen, F. and Mafukidze, J., 2007: Report : *Land Management and Democratic Governance Issues in Diepkloof,* Johannesburg, Commissioned by Planact and CUBES, Ford Foundation Project.

Huchzermeyer, M., 2003a: Addressing segregation through housing policy and finance. In Harrison, P., Huchzermeyer, M. and Mayekiso, M. (eds.), *Confronting Fragmentation: Housing and Urban Development in a Democratizing Society*, pp. 211-227. UCT Press, Cape Town.

Huchzermeyer, M. 2006: *The struggle for in situ upgrading of informal settlements: Case studies from Gauteng* (Paper to be presented at the Southern African Housing Foundation Conference & Exhibition, Cape Sun, 9-11 October 2006)
http://abahlali.org/files/huchzermeyer%202006%20The%20Struggle%20for%20In%20Situ%20Upgrading%20of%20Informal%20Settlements%20-

ICLEI- Local Governments 1 for Sustainability, 2004: *Human Settlements and Local Governments* http://www3.iclei.org/implementationguide/documents/human_settlements.pdf

Julia du Pisani and Dennis Macozoma (engineering) Mark Napier (architectural) Louiza Duncker (social) Further contributions: Simon Marvin http://www.gdnet.org/pdf/napier.pdf

Kymlicka, W. and Norman, W., 1994: Return of the Citizen: A Survey of Recent Work on Citizenship Theory. *Ethics*, Vol. 104, No. 2, January 1994, pp. 352 – 381

Lebelo, M., 1988: *Sophiatown Removals: Relocation and Political Quiescence*, Honours Dissertation, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg

Mabin, A., 1995: On the problems and prospects of overcoming segregation and fragmentation in Southern Africa's cities in the postmodern era. (In Watson, S. and Gibson, K. (eds.), *Postmodern Cities and Spaces).* Blackwell, Cambridge.

Magigi, W & Majani, B.B.K., 2006: *Housing Themselves in Informal Settlements, A Challenge to Community Growth Processes*, Land Vulnerability and Poverty Reduction in Tanzania: Promoting Land Administration and Good Governance, 5th FIG Regional Conference, Accra, Ghana, March 8-11, 2006.

Mark, M., 1995: *Onward Marching Comrades: The career of the charterist movement in Diepkloof, Soweto*, Paper presented at the History Workshop Conference at the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg.

Mathekga, R, & Buccus, I., 2006: The challenge of local government structures in South Africa: Securing community participation: *Critical Dialogue – Public Participation in Review*, Vol 2, No 1, pp 11-17.

Mayavo, P., *Non-Citizens in a Democratic Space: Perspectives on Human Security in Zimbabwe's Large-Scale Commercial Agriculture under the Land Reform Programme: 1980-2002* http://www.accord.org.za/ajcr/2004-1/AJCR%20vol4-1%20pg45-63.pdf

McDaid, L and Kruger, L., 2004: *Funnelling Participation towards more Effective Environmental Decision-making in EIA's*, Annual National Conference, International Association for Impact Assessment: South African Affiliate, IAIA Conference Paper.

Moote, M. A, McClaran, M. P, Chickering, D. K., 1997: Research Theory in Practice: Applying Participatory Democracy Theory to Public Land Planning, in *Environmental Management*, Vol. 21, No. 6, pp. 877–889, New York, Springer-Verlag New York Inc. http://www.springerlink.com/content/wvfunrwbv67jgdyy/fulltext.pdf

Mwangi, I., 1997: The nature of rental housing in Kenya, in *Environment and Urbanisation*, 9(2), 141-159.

Napier, M & Mulenga, A.L., 2002: *Environmental technologies in South Africa: pathways towards sustainable innovation in human settlements?* Coordinated and compiled by Mark Napier, Authors: Mark Napier and Anastasia Lungu Mulenga, with direct quotes from other evaluators. Evaluators: Anna Ballance, Michelle Binedell, Rob Hounsome (environmental).

Prop Talk., 2006: *Diepkloof takes off; R100-m Business District development*: Official newsletter of the City of Joburg Property Company: Winter 2006.

Robinson, J., 1998: Spaces of democracy: remapping the apartheid city, in *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, vol 16, pps 533 - 548) http://www.envplan.com/epd/fulltext/d16/d160533.pdf

Scheufele, D. A., 2000: Talk or Conversation? Dimensions of Interpersonal Discussion and Their Implications for Participatory Democracy, in *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*; inter 2000, 77, 4, AB/INFORM global

Sihlongonyane, M. and Karam, A., 2003: *The impact of the national housing capital subsidy scheme on an apartheid city: The case of Johannesburg*. Paper prepared for the Conference of the South African Planning History Study Group. Freestate University, Bloemfontein, 15-16 May.

Sinclair, J and Diduck, A., 1995: Public Education: An undervalued Component of the Environmental Assessment Public Involvement Process, in *Environmental Impact Assessment Review*, Vol 15 (3) 15, pgs 219-240, available at www.sciencedirect.com.

Smith, L and Vawda, A., 2003: Citizen vs. Customer: Different Approaches to Public Participation in Service Delivery in Cape Town, in *Urban Forum*, Vol. 14, No. 1, January-March 2003 http://www.springerlink.com/content/lhjh1hkpqx6tpe05/

UN Millennium Development Goals, http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/goals.html.

Zille, H., 2007: *Presentation to President Thabo Mbeki Western cape Provincial Imbizo,* July 22, 2007
http://www.capetown.gov.za/en/mayor/Documents/Mayor%20Speeches/ZILLE_Presentation_PRESIDENTIAL_IMBIZO_22_Jul_07_257200713619_.ppt